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PART 1

Introduction

MOGENS HERMAN HANSEN

The chapters on the concept of *patris* and on victors in panhellenic games are by Thomas Heine Nielsen. For reading and commenting on various sections we would like to thank Mr Peter Fraser (ethnics), Prof. Paula Perlman (*theorodokoi*), Prof. Robert Parker (*the polis* as a religious organisation), Prof. Thomas Martin and Dr. Keith Rutter (coins), Prof. John Graham (colonisation).
This Inventory of poleis of the Archaic and Classical periods is the result of an investigation conducted by the Copenhagen Polis Centre in the years 1993–2003. The Polis Centre is a research institution set up and funded by The Danish National Research Foundation for a ten-year period which expired in September 2003. As the name of the Centre reveals, its assignment has been to study the polis. The polis was the typical Greek form of community in the Archaic and Classical periods, the one Sophokles, Herodotos, Sokrates, Plato and Aristotle had in mind whenever they thought about man’s place in society—the one we today must understand if we want to understand what, for example, Plato wrote. Nevertheless, in 1993 the polis had not yet been investigated by historians on a thorough empirical basis. There were some 1,500 poleis altogether, and they were spread over the entire Mediterranean world. Numerous case studies had been published, especially of Athens and Sparta. But nobody had ever conducted a comprehensive investigation which included the approximately 1,498 other poleis. How many of them do we know? How big were they? Where were they? What was common to at least a majority of them? Were Athens and Sparta typical or untypical poleis? Such a task was much too big for any individual scholar and had therefore never been properly undertaken. Right from its foundation in 1993 the Centre had two primary aims.

The first was to produce a comprehensive inventory of all known Archaic and Classical Greek poleis (city-states), including colonies, attested in contemporary sources. The plan was to compare this Inventory with all general references to the nature of the polis in the same sources, and then, on the basis of an analysis of both the extension and intensity of the concept, to find out what the Greeks thought a polis was, and to compare that with what modern historians think an ancient Greek polis was. Thus, in this part of our research, we preferred the emic to the etic view preferred by others, and, in all our publications, we have carefully avoided mixing up the two different approaches: the term polis is often used synonymously with the term “city-state”, and the concepts behind the two terms are often, but erroneously, thought to be co-extensive. The concept of polis, however, is an ancient concept and reflects the ancient Greeks’ understanding of their own political and social order, whereas the concept of city-state is a modern heuristic concept invented by historians to describe not only the Hellenic poleis but also a number of other city-state cultures ranging from the Mixtec city-states in Mexico to the Malay city-states in Indonesia and from the Viking city-states in Ireland to the Swahili city-states in Kenya and Tanzania. The Hellenic civilisation from the Archaic period down to the Roman Empire is only one of many civilisations organised into urbanised micro-states rather than forming one or a few large macro-states, each dotted with cities.

Consequently, the second major project undertaken by the Polis Centre has been to search for all occurrences in world history of regions broken up into city-states and to make a comparative study of them all, in order to elucidate similarities and differences; on the basis of this investigation we have suggested a redefinition of the concept of city-state and advocated the introduction of a new concept to be distinguished from the concept of city-state, viz. the concept of city-state culture. While each of the individual city-state cultures can be described in accordance with the emic view, the comparison between city-state cultures necessitates the etic approach and, being purely heuristic concepts, city-state and city-state culture are constructed and analysed in accordance with an etic view.

The only viable way to implement these two projects was to form two large international teams of experts. To provide a description of all attested city-state cultures, the Centre gathered a team of historians, philologists, theologians, archaeologists, anthropologists and sociologists, each an expert on one specific city-state culture. Including respondents, this team consisted of forty-eight scholars from seventeen countries. The results of this investigation were published in two volumes: A Comparative Study of Thirty City-State Cultures (Copenhagen, 2000) and A Comparative Study of Six City-State Cultures (Copenhagen, 2002).

1 For the original research programme, see Hansen (1994).

To construct the Inventory of poleis, the Centre built up a team of ancient historians and archaeologists, each responsible for describing all poleis within a defined region. In some cases two or three scholars shared a region; see supra vii–ix. All members of the team were issued with a standardised database card, showing the topics we had selected for investigation, and a vade-mecum explaining how to fill in the database cards and, on the basis of the cards, compose the descriptions of the individual poleis as well as the introduction to the chapter. All chapters were sent to the Centre in Copenhagen, where they were made consistent and edited by the two editors of this book. In addition to this book, the investigation entailed a number of publications. Seven symposia were held, and their acts published as *Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre* 1–7 (Copenhagen, 1993–2004), and articles on issues related to the polis were sent to the Centre and successively published in *Historia*, Einzelschriften as *Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre* 1–7 (Stuttgart, 1994–2004). For more detailed information about the Polis Centre publications, see supra xii–xiii.

As the title reveals, this book is principally an inventory of all identifiable Hellenic poleis of the Archaic and Classical periods. Now, an ancient Greek polis consisted of a nucleated centre, called polis in the urban sense, and a hinterland, called chorai or ge. Accordingly, the description of a polis must include a description of its territory and in particular of other settlements lying within that territory. Furthermore, no polis existed in a vacuum. All the Hellenic poleis formed one huge network stretching from Emporion at the foot of the Pyrenees to Phasis at the foot of the Caucasus, and from Olbia at the mouth of the river Hypanis, to Naukratis in the delta of the Nile. But a polis did not have regular contact with all the other approximately 1,500 poleis. The large system of Hellenic poleis was subdivided into smaller clusters of poleis. Between the individual poleis and the Hellenic world as a whole there was a kind of intermediary unit: the ethnos, an ethnic group associated with, and usually living in, a specific region, also called ethne. When the project started in 1993, some colleagues suggested that we should print all the poleis in alphabetical order, starting with Abai in Phokis and ending with Zone in Thrace. Instead we have preferred to list the poleis region by region. Each of the chapters in Part 2 describes all poleis within a region and is introduced with a description of the region and a list of all second-order non-polis settlements lying in the region.

1. The Regions

The subdivision of the Hellenic world into regions is a function of the subdivision of the Hellenes into ethne. Like polis, ethnos had both a personal and a geographical meaning. Apart from the Aegean Islands, the Greek homeland (infra 151) was subdivided into regions each inhabited by an ethnos in the personal sense. Akarnania, for example, was an ethnos inhabited by the ethnos of the Akarnanians. In the Greek homeland every polis, except island poleis, belonged to an ethnos. The Greek colonies, however, were not gathered together in regions inhabited by a specific ethnic group. Neighbouring poleis were often settled with colonists belonging to different ethne and sometimes colonists from different ethne joined to found a colony. Nevertheless, even the colonies tended to appear in regional clusters: all the poleis in Spain and France were primary or secondary colonies of Phokaia in Asia Minor. Kyrene was the founder of all the other poleis in Libya and kept them as dependencies. Some of the poleis in Sicily were founded by Dori ans and some by Ionians, but the Sikeliotai came to think that they all formed a larger community, and in C5–C4 Syracuse succeeded in controlling almost all the poleis in Sicily and some of those in Italy as well. In Skythia Pantikapaion became the hegemonic centre of the Bosporan kingdom and dominated all neighbouring poleis. And along the north coast of Asia Minor, Sinope played a similar dominant role. Admittedly, these geographical segments were not ethnic entities as were the regions of Hellas itself, but, on the other hand, our endeavour to organise the Mediterranean world colonised by the Greeks into “regions” is not just a purely artifi-

---

4 For a substantiation of the view that all Hellenic poleis belonged to one and the same city-state culture, see Hansen (2000b) 141–45.
6 For ethnos in the geographical sense, see Ps.-Skylax 34–35, 43–46.
7 Ps.-Skylax 34–45, cf. Hdt. 5.77.4, 7.32.2–3; Dem. 59.101; Aesch. 2.116. For the earliest attestation of regions, see Hom. Il. 4.49ff.
8 The southern cluster of Aegean islands were called Κυκλάδες νῆσοι (Hdt. 5.31.2; Thuc. 1.4.1; Ion. 4.116; Ps.-Skylax 48 and 58), allegedly because they were lying in a circle around Delos (Eust. Comm. in Dionys. Per. 525). Some were Ionian, some Dorian, and they never formed an ethnos. In a few cases an ethnos was co-extensive with a polis, e.g. Athens with Attika (Hdt. 1.57.3).
9 Thuc. 6.3–5, 7.57.
cial subdivision of the Greek world in the wider sense. Therefore, the poleis are here described region by region. Some of our regions are, more or less, modern constructs, e.g. Spain and France or the islands in the Aegean Sea; others are well-defined ethnic and sometimes even political entities, e.g. Arkadia and Boiotia. But, as explained above, even the artificial regions often have some coherence and the regional organisation has several advantages over a purely alphabetical listing of all poleis: the distinction between first-order and second-order urban settlements, i.e. the settlement pattern of the Hellenic world, can be studied only on a regional basis. Furthermore the important pattern of the Hellenic world, can be studied only on a regional basis. Furthermore the important similarities and relationships between poleis in the same region can be understood only if the poleis are described side by side: wars between neighbouring poleis, the formation of federations mostly organised on a regional basis, the type of constitution which often is the same in most or all poleis within a region, similar style in the building of city walls and temples, coins struck on the same weight standard and with similar or identical types, inscriptions in the same dialect, the same naming habits, e.g. the use or omission of patronymics and/or sub-ethnics. Each chapter describes the poleis in one region and opens with a short description of the region and its characteristics: its name, extent, borders, population, settlement pattern and some aspects of political and social organisation that concern all the poleis of the region, i.e. the formation of a federation, or a religious festival celebrated by all the poleis within the region.

Rather than arranging the regions in alphabetical order, we have preferred to organise this book as a periplous: we start in Spain and pass through Sicily, Italy and along the coasts of the Adriatic Sea to Akarnania, then through all of Mainland Greece and the Aegean Islands until we reach Makedonia and Thrace. The periplous proceeds along the north coast of the Propontis, round the coasts of the Black Sea, along the south coast of the Propontis to Troas, Aiolis, Ionia, Karia and Lykia. After detours to Crete, Rhodes and Cyprus, the journey ends with Syria, Egypt and Libya.

2. The Non-Polis Settlements

An important part of the Polis Project is to investigate whether all major towns were poleis in the urban sense, and to what extent the polis town was the only nucleated settlement within the territory of a polis state, or just the largest one, surrounded by a number of villages. A major obstacle to answering these questions is that the settlement pattern of the Hellenic world as known from written sources has never been investigated and, as known from archaeological evidence, can be ascertained only for a few scattered regions that have been surveyed during the last two decades.13

The publication in 2000 of the marvellous Barrington Atlas has changed the situation dramatically. All the compilers of the maps have had to take a position on the settlement pattern of every region of the Greek and Roman world. True, they record only whether a site is a settlement, not whether it is a polis or not. But they have all been asked to apply the same method and system of classifications, so that all the material is, in principle, comparable. When their classification of settlements is matched with our political classification of settlements according to whether or not they are poleis, it should be possible to suggest at least some answers to the above questions.

Accordingly, in 1995 we established a close co-operation with the Barrington Atlas (here abbreviated Barr.), and all members of our team were asked to use the atlas and its directories (of which we had preprints and proofs), to record all sites classified as settlements of the Archaic and/or Classical period, and then in the first part of each chapter to list all settlements not attested as poleis.14 Only sites classified as settlements were to be included. Sanctuaries, forts, towers and cemeteries were to be omitted. A comparison between this list and our list of poleis in the second part of each chapter ought to provide us with a picture of the settlement pattern seen from the political point of view. Was there any large urban centre in the region which was not a polis in the urban sense? And what proportion of all nucleated settlements in a region were polis centres?

The list of non-polis settlements falls into two parts. In the first part we record all settlements known from ancient sources, no matter whether they have been located or not. Included are sites mentioned in written sources as settlements of the Archaic and/or Classical periods. Of these some are known from archaeological evidence too, while some are known exclusively from written sources. Next we include sites mentioned in late sources as settlements of the

---

13 For ongoing surveys in 1994 and the area covered by each survey, see Alcock (1994) 250.
14 Conversely, the members of our team reported back to the Atlas on debatable locations, datings and classifications, and 11 members are listed among the reviewers, see Barr. xiii and xviii. Two scholars, S. Mitchell and G. Reger, were both compilers of maps in Barr. and authors of chapters of the CPC Inventory of poleis.
Hellenistic and/or Roman periods only, but archaeologically attested as settlements of the Archaic and/or Classical periods as well. The second part comprises settlements known exclusively from excavations or surveys and, so far, not identified with any of the settlements attested in the written sources.

Each entry follows a fixed scheme. The toponym is recorded, first the transliterated form in bold type and then the Greek form in brackets. Then come selected references to the settlement in ancient sources. If the source has a site-classification, it is added in brackets, e.g. (κώµη) or (ἐπίνειον) or, in late sources, (πόλις), referring to polis status in the Hellenistic and/or Roman period. A short description of archaeological remains may follow and the entry concludes with references to literature and, for the chronology, to Barr. Barr. distinguishes five periods: A (Archaic), C (Classical), H (Hellenistic), R (Roman) and LR (late Roman). Since we stop at the end of the Classical period, we record only Barr. A, or Barr. C, or Barr. AC. We do not normally record whether the site is known as a settlement in later periods too, and accordingly in Barr. marked H or R or LR.

As we have discovered, however, one problem is that Barr.’s coverage of second-order settlements varies considerably from map to map and, within a map, from region to region. Argolis, for example, is found on Map 58. In the introduction to the map the compilers write: “no sites known solely from survey are marked here, and likewise very few known only from excavation (their ancient names unattested in each instance).” In this inventory, in the chapter about Argolis (infra 599–619), Piérat attempts to list all sites classified as settlements, altogether seventeen known from ancient sources and thirty-three known exclusively from excavations and surveys. Barr. records sixteen of the settlements known from ancient sources, but none of the thirty-three archaeological sites. Conversely, according to Barr. Map 56 and the accompanying directory, there were on Lesbos, in addition to the six poleis, twenty-one settlements of the Archaic and/or Classical periods, fourteen mentioned in ancient sources, seven known exclusively from their archaeological remains. But according to Nigel Spencer and Hector Williams, only two of these were proper settlements. The others were either sanctuaries or single houses or, if they were settlements, later than the Classical period. These two cases represent the largest difference between the recording of second-order settlements in Barr. and in the inventory.

In the lists of non-polis settlements disagreements with Barr. are explicitly recorded. Missing settlements are recorded as: “Not in Barr.” Conversely, sites that according to the author(s) of our chapter ought to be excluded are recorded as “Barr. C, but only Hellenistic remains are attested” or “Barr. C, but only remains of a sanctuary have been found”, etc. Such reservations are found in most chapters, but it must be kept in mind that even the adjusted lists of settlements in this volume can be trusted only for properly surveyed regions such as southern Argolis or Lakonia. In most regions only future surveys and excavations can provide us with a reliable picture of the settlement pattern.

3. The Poleis

Within each region the poleis are listed in alphabetical order and an entry is organised as follows:

**Number.** All poleis are numbered sequentially from 1 to 1359 and, whenever possible, cross-references are to polis numbers not to page numbers, e.g. Seriphos (no. 517).

**Heading.** As heading (in bold type) we use transliterated forms of the toponym and (in brackets) the city-ethnic in nom. sing. masc., e.g. Korinthos (Korinthios). If no toponym is attested, the heading is just the city-ethnic in nom. plur. masc., e.g. (Eteokarpathioi). For the meaning of the term city-ethnic, see 62 infra. A toponym marked with an asterisk is reconstructed from, e.g., a Latin form attested in Pliny’s HN, e.g. *Thydonos. Only one form of toponym and city-ethnic is recorded, viz. the most common in Archaic and/or Classical sources rather than the one found in Strabo or Pausanias and preferred in many historical atlases, e.g. the polis on the north coast of the island of Ikaros which in Classical sources—and here—is called Oine, but in Strabo Oinoe. The Attic–Ionic form is usually preferred to an epichoric variant, e.g. Orchomenos instead of Erchomenos. If a polis changed its name and city-ethnic within the Archaic and Classical periods, both toponyms and city-ethnics are recorded, e.g. Histiaia (Histiaieus)/Oreos (Oreites).

**Map reference** is to R. J. A. Talbert (ed.), *The Barrington Directory*.

---


16 Let me add that these unavoidable differences between Barr. and our Inventory have not in any way diminished our admiration for Barr. as one of our generation’s greatest achievements in ancient history.
A KEY TO THE INVENTORY

Atlas of the Greek and Roman World (Princeton, 2000), in this inventory abbreviated Barr. We record the map number, latitude and longitude, e.g. Delphi: “Map 55. Lat. 38.30, long. 22.30.” The exact latitude is 38.29, but we record the coordinates with an exactitude of 5 minutes of arc only. If the polis in question is unlocated, we write for, e.g., Kallipolis: “Map 52. Unlocated.” If an unlocated polis is not recorded in Barr.’s map-by-map directory, we write for, e.g., Sombia: “Map 52. Unlocated. Not in Barr.” If the author agrees with the Barr. location, there is usually no further discussion of this issue. If the author disagrees with the Barr. location, a discussion of the issue follows either here or in a following section (indicated by “see infra”).

Size of territory is subdivided into five different categories: 1: 0–25 km², 2: 25–100 km², 3: 100–200 km², 4: 200–500 km² and 5: 500 km² or more. In cases of doubt the size is recorded as one of the five numbers followed by a query or as one of two numbers. A polis that presumably had a territory of over 500 km² is recorded as 5?, and a polis with a territory of perhaps c.15 km² and certainly not over 100 km² is recorded as: 1 or 2. In the numerous cases of serious doubt, a query alone is used. The section further below about the territory and its borders may include a discussion of its size.

Type of polis comprises four categories: A, [A], B and C. Type: A means that the community in question is called polis in at least one source of the Archaic and/or Classical period, no matter whether polis is used in the political, territorial or urban sense. Type [A] signifies a community subsumed under the heading polis alongside a number of other communities. A community is classified as type B or C if it is not called polis in any source of the Archaic and/or Classical period but is known for one or more of the activities characteristic of a polis: being a member of a federation, striking coins, passing a proxeny decree, appointing a theordokos to host foreign theoriai, having a victor in one of the Panhellenic games, possessing a prytaneion or a bouleuterion, defeating its neighbour in a battle, etc. The difference between B and C is that, in the case of B, we believe that the community was probably a polis and that it is only due to lack of sources that it is not explicitly attested as such, whereas in the C cases the identification of the site as a polis is less certain and in some cases a possibility only.

Types α, β and γ indicate the degree of Hellenicity. A polis type α is a Hellenic polis in which elements of non-Greek civilisation are small or even insignificant (e.g. Akragas, Poteidaia and Kyrene). A polis type β is either a mixed community in which Greeks and non-Greeks live side by side (e.g. Emporion in Spain or the polis on Athos) or a not fully Hellenised community whose indigenous population has adopted a fair number of Hellenic institutions and customs mixed with their indigenous background (e.g. Halikarnassos and Xanthos). A polis type γ is a predominantly barbarian community in which there are some elements of Hellenic civilisation (e.g. Kaunos and most of the Karian polis recorded in SEG 40 991–92). Many of the polis types β and γ became fully Hellenised in the course of the Hellenistic period. Often the categorisation has to be based on a deplorably insufficient knowledge. Thus, if Ps.-Skylax classifies an otherwise poorly known community as a polis Hellenis, it is recorded in the inventory as an α, whereas more information sometimes shows that it should have been classified as a β, e.g. Phasis (no. 711). When the sources fail us, as often happens, we print a query. The distinctions between α, β and γ are, of course, fluid and some of our classifications may be questioned, but to refrain from applying this categorisation would lead to a grossly distorted picture of the Hellenic polis world.

In Mainland Greece and the adjacent islands all polis were obviously type α. Therefore the distinction between α, β and γ is applied only outside what is traditionally called the Greek “homeland” or “heartland” (cf. 151 infra). The problem is to discover or, rather, to decide where to draw the line between Hellenic or Hellenised regions and regions in which Hellenic polis were lying like islands in an otherwise non-Greek civilisation. In this inventory the “Greek heartland” comprises Mainland Greece from Epeiros to Makedonia,17 the adjacent islands in the Ionian and the Aegean Seas and the central part of the west coast of Asia Minor (Aiolis and Ionia); see infra 151. Thus, the categories α–γ are applied in the regions from Spain to Illyria, from Thrace to Troas, and from Karia to Libya. The discussion of this issue is usually placed at the end of the entry.

Attestations of toponym and city-ethnic. The focus is on sources of the Archaic and Classical periods, but references to Hellenistic and even Roman sources are often included and are always recorded if there is no earlier attestation. However, city-ethnics invented by Steph. Byz. are usually ignored. In Index 3 infra, sources later than C4 are marked (L). Variant forms are recorded, but simple differences in spelling (x0 for ξ in the C5 Athenian tribute lists) or in dialect (ττ for σσ) are usually ignored.

Attentions of *polis* status. Here, as everywhere, the focus is on sources of the Archaic and Classical periods. In selecting the sources we prefer non-Athenian to Athenian sources (if we have a choice) and epigraphic sources to literary texts. We cover as many centuries as possible, citing sources of C7 (very rare), C6 (rare), C5 (common) and C4 (very common). We try to bring attestations of the different senses in which *polis* is used, i.e. in the political sense, in the urban sense and in the territorial sense. The very few attestations of *polis* in the sense of acropolis are recorded too. We omit references to named communities called *tetrarchs* and *territorials*.

The every few attestationsof *named community* is classified as a *bronze coins in C5l*. References to late sources in which a classification is corroborated by the fact that Agyrion struck description of events of 392 (Diod. 14.95.4–7) and his clas-

In selecting the sources we prefer non-Athenian to Athenian sources of the Archaic and Classical periods. Occurrences of *polis* status are followed by references to the community in question being called *polisma* or *asty* or *patris*. The two first terms concern the urban aspect of the *polis*, the third its status as a political community. Only sources of the Archaic and Classical periods are cited. Occurrences of *polites* and *politeia* are cited too, but not systematically except for communities which are not attested as *polis*, so the occurrence of terms like *polites* and *politeia* may be the best evidence we have for *polis* status.

Use of city-ethnic. In analysing the uses of the city-ethnic we distinguish an internal from an external use, and an individual from a collective. “Individual” signifies instances of the city-ethnic used as part of a name, mostly in the singular (*IG* xii.3 251.12–13: Ἀγροτέλης [Ἀγ]ροὺ[φ] [Ἀ]σικής *K̄īd̄o政*) but sometimes in the plural (*IG* xii.3 251.15–16: Καλλίγνωτος, Ἀναγόρας Πάροι). “Collective” signifies the use of the city-ethnic denoting one or more unnamed citizens (Thuc. 8.92.2: Ἀργεῖοι ἄνθρωποι) or the citizens collectively = the Argive *polis* (*SEG* 34 282.4: ὁ ἄνδρος τῶν Ἀργεῖων). “Internal” signifies the use of the ethnic inside the *polis* in question (*APTEEION* on C5–C4 coins), “external” signifies the use of the ethnic outside the *polis* (Io 165: Αριστιῶν Θεοφίλου Ἑπιδαύριος, an Olympic victor from C4m) or inside the *polis* when citizens had to be recorded alongside citizens from other *poleis* (*IG* v.1121.68: Εὐφάνης Ἑπιδαύριος παῖς in a C4s cursive inscription from Epidaurus). If no earlier sources are available, attestations in Hellenistic sources of the different uses may be included, but in the analysis of the evidence *infra* in Index 8 only references in Archaic and Classical sources are taken into account. The use of sub-ethnics (see *infra* 59) is recorded in this section of the entry.

Territory. The next section treats the territory and records its name (if known) and borders, and sometimes includes a discussion of its size. Second-order settlements (if any) and major extra-urban sanctuaries are listed here, as well as references to dependent *poleis* lying within the territory of the *polis* in question.

Population. The rare pieces of information we have about the size of the population are usually reported after the territory. Most of the sources are army figures from which we can get a rough idea of the number of adult male citizens of military age who are fit for military service, e.g. Mantinea (no. 281). For some *poleis* we have (fragmentary) lists of adult male citizens or ephebes, e.g. Eretria (no. 370).

History. For a large and fairly well-known *polis* the central part of the entry starts with a chronological outline of its history. The major themes selected for mention are, for colonies, foundation and sometimes refoundation; for all *poleis*, involvement in wars and major battles, treaties and alliances, membership of leagues and federations; conquest, destruction and andrapodismos of the *polis*; conquest of other *poleis*; sympoliteia and/or synoecism with other *poleis*; inter-*poleis* relations such as the sending and reception of envoys; the occurrence of *stasis*.

Constitution and political institutions are usually treated together and the section comprises information about type of constitution (monarchy, oligarchy, democracy) and change of constitution, the citizenry and its civic subdivisions (tribes, demes, phratries, etc.), political institutions (such as *ekklesia*, *boule*, *dikasteria* and *archai*) and
public enactments. If it is more convenient, information about *stasis* provoked by constitutional issues, membership of a federation and similar matters is treated here rather than in the preceding section.

**Proxenoi.** Attestations—for larger poleis selective—of proxenia given by the polis to citizens from other poleis and awarded by another polis to a citizen of the polis.

**Theorodokoi.** Attestations of theorodokoi appointed to host theoroi sent out to announce the celebration of a Panhellenic festival and invite the polis in question to be represented at the festival and to respect the sacred truce.

**Panhellenic victors.** For small poleis all victors are recorded, for large poleis a selection and/or a count of the number of victors at the four major Panhellenic festivals: the Olympia, the Pythia, the Isthmia and the Nemea. A few attestations of victors at the Amphiparaia and other festivals are recorded too.

**Divinities and cults** are recorded only in so far as they are attested in sources of the Archaic and Classical periods. We do not share the all too common belief that a cult mentioned by, e.g., Pausanias can be interpreted retrospectively and mentioned in a work about the Archaic and Classical periods. We are also suspicious of the view that the head of Athena on a coin proves that the polis in question must have had a cult of Athena. For the large poleis, only the major cults are mentioned, and lack of space forbids a detailed description of many others. Information about a tutelary divinity is always recorded, but we must bear in mind that it is often difficult to establish which divinity counted as the tutelary divinity, and that some poleis did not have a specific tutelary divinity, whereas others had several. Major festivals are mentioned and information about the calendar, if reported, belongs here.

**The urban centre.** The account of the polis in the urban sense begins with the defence circuit. A short description of the remains, if any, is followed by information about their date and about sieges, of which some may testify to fortifications antedating the present remains. The description of the town itself brings information about the size of the area enclosed by the walls, the layout of the city if grid-planned, and major public monuments: religious architecture (sanctuaries, temples and theatre), centres for sports and military training (gymnasion, stadion, hippodromos), political architecture (prytaneion, bouleuterion, dikasteria, archeia, occasionally a specific ekklesiasterion) and other buildings related to the urban infrastructure (stoas, arsenals, harbour facilities, fountain houses, aqueducts).

**Mint.** The section on coins comprises information about dates, metals, standards, denominations, types and legends. References to handbooks, monographs and articles are, whenever possible, supplemented with a reference to SNG Cop., the *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum: The Royal Collection of Coins and Medals, Danish National Museum* 1–8 and suppl., one of the few large collections of Greek coins which fairly recently has been published in its entirety with illustrations.

**Degree of Hellenisation.** The entries for colonies and Hellenised communities often concludes with some remarks about the degree of Hellenisation. To what extent did the Hellenic colonists live side by side with the indigenous population? And to what extent were indigenous settlements Hellenised?

**Metropolis.** If the polis founded colonies in the Archaic and/or Classical periods, the names of the colonies are recorded with a reference to the relevant entries.

**Chronological delimitation.** The Inventory comprises Archaic and Classical poleis as attested in contemporary sources and, to some extent, in later retrospective sources and later sources interpreted retrospectively. The term “contemporary sources” is interpreted as follows: (a) upper limit: we leave out the Homeric poems. Although the poleis described in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* undoubtedly reflect physical and institutional aspects of historical poleis, they are set in a mythological context and do not belong in an inventory of named historical poleis. Thus our earliest literary sources are Hesiod’s *Works and Days* and the fragments of Archilochos and Tyrtaios. The oldest epigraphical source is probably the law from Drieros of C7m (ML 2; *Nomina* 1 81). (b) Lower limit: we include literary sources and dated epigraphical sources down to the death of Alexander the Great in 323. Of epigraphical sources we also include as contemporary those dated to C4 without further specification, e.g. dedications, sepulchral inscriptions, some decrees, etc. Later retrospective literary sources are, e.g., passages in Diodorus, Strabo, Plutarch and Pausanias referring to events and institutions of the Archaic and Classical periods. Later retrospective epigraphical sources are, e.g., the renewal of a treaty originally concluded before 323, confirmation of an earlier grant, or references in inscriptions to earlier events. Later sources referring to their
own age are usually ignored, e.g. the descriptions of poleis found in Strabo and Pausanias. But later sources may be used if they can be interpreted retrospectively: a law or decree of c.320–300 may be used as evidence for the political institutions of the polis in question in C4m, provided that it can be assumed that the polis had not in the meantime been exposed to a change of constitution. Thus, Pontic Chersonesos (no. 695) seems to have been a democracy throughout the Classical period, and therefore the democratic citizen’s oath of C4l/C3e may be used as evidence of the political institutions in C4s (IOSPE r° 401).

Finally, for reasons explained infra 30–32 we have treated the three centuries from c.650 to c.323 as one period so that a synchronic presentation of the material is applied for the Inventory as a whole, but every entry includes, whenever possible, a description of the historical development of the polis in question, and we have drawn up an index of all poleis in the year 400, omitting all poleis that had disappeared before the end of C5 as well as those that emerged in C4 only (see infra 53–54 and Index 10).

**Selection of Attestations.** All source references are exempli gratia, especially in the case of large poleis. It would serve no purpose to list all occurrences of polis or asty applied to Athens or Corinth or Thebes; or to record every single proxenos and Panhellenic victor coming from large poleis.

**Selection of Evidence.** Similarly, the treatment of the various topics is selective and has to be. In the section about political institutions only the major magistrates are invariably listed, e.g. strategoi. Especially for large poleis, only the principal divinities and cults are mentioned. On the other hand, for small poleis and for larger poleis that are poorly attested in our sources, e.g. Karystos (no. 373), we sometimes have to record almost every single piece of evidence in order to shed some light on the history and institutions of the community.

**Organisation of Information.** Strict uniformity has been imposed in the first sections down to use of the city-ethnic. In the following sections the different chapters present a higher degree of variation both in the selection of topics and in the organisation of the material. Some scholars have focused more on cult and religion than on the archaeological remains of the urban centre. Others have done the reverse. Some submitted short succinct summaries, others detailed descriptions which we had to cut down to half their original size. Often we have deeply regretted that, to make the chapters and the individual entries comparable in size and coverage of the sources, we had to cut out valuable and meticulously collected material. In other cases we have expanded very short entries. As can be seen from this publication, variations have often been allowed to persist. The descriptions of the mints, for example, range from summaries of essential features to elaborate accounts of almost all issues.

4. **The Chronological Delimitation of the Project**

We believe and argue that the Hellenic polis emerged in C8 and existed throughout the Archaic, Classical, Hellenistic and Roman periods. It disappeared only in late Antiquity. Nevertheless, we have limited our investigation to the Archaic and Classical periods for the following reasons. Philip II’s victory over the Greek cities, Alexander’s conquest of the Persian Empire and the foundation of approximately 300 new poleis in the Near East inaugurated not the demise of the polis but a transformation of it. The differences between the Classical and the Hellenistic polis leap to the eye if one pictures a polis in C5: city walls were no longer built and normally were not even repaired. If the polis was the residence of a prince or governor, there would be a palace. The political architecture had become monumentalised, especially the bouleuterion. The gymnasion had been moved from the suburbs into the urban centre and monumentalised. The ephebeia, unknown before C4, was now the most important public institution. The agora was now framed with monumental stoas. In addition to the urban centre we hear about a number of komai, second-order urban settlements situated in the hinterland of the polis. The women’s place in the polis was no longer confined to religion; women had become much more integrated; and so had a significant number of free foreigners who in many poleis were admitted to the ephebeia. The polis was not to the same extent as before a society of adult male citizens. The civic subdivisions into which the citizenry had been organised had faded out, whereas a number of private or semi-private economic and social institutions had sprung up alongside the public institutions of the polis. To the cults of the old gods and heroes were now added new cults of

---

monarchs and deified abstractions such as homonoia. Not only a large number but all poleis had become dependencies. On the other hand, autonomia (self-government) had now become the explicit ideal and goal of the polis. The spectrum of constitutions is almost reduced to one type: demokratia prevails, while tyrannis and oligarchia are eclipsed. A growing co-operation between poleis had resulted in an institutionalised network of relations between the poleis: isopoliteia, arbitration in disputes, increased participation in the growing number of Panhellenic festivals, etc.

In spite of all the differences between a polis in C5–C4 and a polis in C1, most scholars who have worked with the polis in general without precise chronological limits have used the sources anachronistically. It is very common, for example, that scholars open their account of the concept of polis by quoting Pausanias’ remark on the minute polis of Panopeus in Phokis.19 Thus, in their description of the emergence and nature of the Archaic and Classical polis, Finley and others use a source of the second century AD, although this source explicitly describes a contemporary polis. Similarly, numerous articles on poleis in Pauly’s Realexzyklopädie begin with the classification of the settlement found in Strabo’s treatise of C1.

To avoid an anachronistic analysis and to understand the development of the polis, one must conduct two separate investigations: one of the Archaic and Classical polis based on Archaic and Classical sources and allowing a restricted use only of later retrospective sources, and one of the Hellenistic–Roman polis based on the later sources. Eventually, the historical development of the polis will emerge by comparing the two investigations. The Polis Centre has conducted the first study. The ideal solution would have been to conduct both investigations simultaneously. But the Polis Centre did not possess the necessary resources, nor did we have the time for such a gigantic project. We have to leave it to others to study the later transformation of the polis: the turn it took after Alexander the Great’s conquest of the Persian Empire and the foundation of hundreds of new poleis in the Near East, as well as the further turn it took in C2 when the Greek poleis came under Roman rule.
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To produce an Inventory of Greek *polis* makes sense only if the *polis* was an essential element of Hellenic civilisation both as an institution and as a concept. That is usually taken for granted, but ought instead to be substantiated.1 Was the *polis* really the political unit *par excellence*? Did it matter to the ancient Greeks if they lived in a *polis* rather than in some other form of community? Was it something in which they took pride? As an introduction to this work we can adduce a number of observations in support of the orthodoxy.

(1) In sources of the Archaic and Classical periods there are more than 11,000 occurrences of the term *polis* and almost as many of its derivatives: *polites*, *politia*, *polisma*, *politikos*, *politeuein/politeuesthai*, etc. The majority of the occurrences of *polis* are found in Athenian sources, but some 2,000 come from non-Athenian texts.2 The number of attestations shows that it was impossible for the Greeks to think or speak or write about any public matter without incessantly using the word *polis* and its derivatives.3 The term and the concept behind it were thus of the utmost importance, not just as the designation of a physical phenomenon but also as a key concept in Greek political thought.

(2) In Hellas in the Archaic and Classical periods “belonging” in a political context meant, first of all, belonging to one’s *polis*. For a Greek citizen the *polis* was his fatherland (*patris*). Above *polis* level he might belong to an *ethnos*; below *polis* level he might belong to a civic subdivision (a *demos* or a *phyle*, etc.). But he would not think of sacrificing his life for his *ethnos* or his *demos*, whereas he was expected, if necessary, to die for his *polis*.4 The *polis* provides its citizens with a sense of common identity, based on traditions, culture, ceremonies, symbols and sometimes (presumed) common descent.

(3) Thucydides tells us that when, in 431, many Athenians had to evacuate their houses and sanctuaries in the countryside and move into Athens, they felt it “as if they were leaving their *polis*”.5 This passage is often adduced as evidence of the importance of the deme as a political unit and is sometimes paraphrased to mean “that the deme was, as it were, the *polis* writ small” or that “many citizens of Attica may have looked to their deme first and their city second”.6 But we doubt that the Thucydides passage has anything to do with demes. The reference is to the citizens’ homes (*oikiai*) and sanctuaries (*hiera patria*). There is nothing about demes. Some of these sanctuaries may have belonged to demes, but what Thucydides emphasised is the ancestral character of these sanctuaries, which, in many cases, stretched much further back than Kleisthenes’ reforms, when, probably, many of them (but not all) were transformed into deme cults.7 The principal opposition stressed by Thucydides is

---

1 The conceptual and linguistic aspect of this problem has been judiciously problematised by Murray (2000) 234–35.
2 Apart from Homer and Hesiod (see 8 supra), the more important non-Athenians are Archilochos of Paros, Alkaios of Mytilene, Tyrtaios of Sparta, Pindar of Thebes, Bacchylides of Keos, Herodotos of Halikarnassos, Theopompous of Chios, Epirus, Alkaios of Mytilene, Thucydides, Demosthenes, Alcibiades, etc. The majority of the occurrences of *polis* in historians (Hdt., Thuc., Xen., Hell. Oxy. and fragments of Thucydides, Ephoros, etc.), some 3,000 in the attic orators (most in Demosthenes and Isokrates), some 2,000 in drama (Ajax, Soph., Eur., Ar, Men. and fragments), and c.1,500 in inscriptions. There are some 2,200 attestations in Plato and Aristotles and no more than c.300 in geographical treatises (almost all from Ps.-Skylax). To complete the picture, there are c.300 occurrences in Homer, c.200 in lyric and iambic poets, and c.150 in Aineias the Tactician.
3 Murray (2000) 235 holds that “any investigation of the word *polis* is likely to find it most frequently exemplified in the philosophical context of theories of the *polis* or in the geographical context of settlement patterns”. This statement is not supported by our findings. In Archaic and Classical texts there are some 2,500 occurrences of *polis* in historians (Hdt., Thuc., Xen., Hell. Oxy. and fragments of Thucydides, Ephoros, etc.), some 3,000 in the attic orators (most in Demosthenes and Isokrates), some 2,000 in drama (Ajax, Soph., Eur., Ar, Men. and fragments), and c.1,500 in inscriptions. There are some 2,200 attestations in Plato and Aristotles and no more than c.300 in geographical treatises (almost all from Ps.-Skylax). To complete the picture, there are c.300 occurrences in Homer, c.200 in lyric and iambic poets, and c.150 in Aineias the Tactician.
4 In Lykourgos’ patriotic speech Against Lokoocrates—the Athenian who fled from his fatherland in 338 after the defeat at Chaeroneia—there are no fewer than 70 occurrences of *patris*, often juxtaposed with *polis*, laws (*nomoi*) and sanctuaries (*hiera*). To die for one’s *patris*—*polis* in Tyrtaios (fr. 10.1–4) and Anakreon (Anth. Pal. 15.4). For the identification of *polis* with *patris* see infra 49, Hansen (forthcoming) and Nielsen (2004). For the cosmopolitan view—rare before the Hellenistic period—that one’s *patris* is wherever one wants to live, see Eur. frs. 774, 1034; Ar. Plat. 1151; loc. 4.81.
5 Thuc. 2.16.2: ἔξωκιν δὲ καὶ γυμνῶς ἐξέρρησεν οἶκοι τα καταλέιποντας καὶ καὶ άν διδασκόντων ἄν τέσσαρα ἔκ της κατά το ἄρχοντα πολιτικά πάντα διαίτα ἰ γιατί τα μελλόντας μεταβαλλεῖ καὶ οὐδέν ἄλλο ἢ πόλιν τήν αὐτῷ ἀπολέσσας ἰωστός (“But it was with sorrow and regret they abandoned their homes and ancestral sanctuaries—which they had always had due to the ancient constitution—and had to change their whole way of life, and each felt it as if he was leaving his *polis*”).
6 Thuc. 2.16.2: “the deme was, as it were, the *polis* writ small.”
7 Whitehead (1986) 177. Far from all local cults were *deme* cults: Osborne (1985) 178–81. For sanctuaries and cults of the *demes*, see the 24 sacrificial
between living independently (αὐτονόμῳ in the country (ἐν τοῖς ἄγροις) and living in the city (ἐν τῷ ᾿Αθήνᾳ). It is the οἶκος that is the principal object of emotion, and we think that a better paraphrase would be: "my home is my polis", or rather, "leaving my home is almost like leaving my polis". What Thucydides wants to emphasise is the feelings an ordinary Athenian had towards his home, but the comparison he has chosen reveals the strong feelings a citizen must have possessed towards his polis.

(4) A Greek citizen’s full name consisted of his own name (ονόμα), his father’s name (πατρονυμίκον) and the name of his polis, in the form of either a city-ethnic or a sub-ethnic (infra 58). To have a city-ethnic and/or a sub-ethnic was a prerogative of the citizens of the polis and an indication of citizen status. In Western civilisation the Greeks are unique in using a kind of hereditary surname as an indication of political status, and this naming habit, which was used from the Crimea to the Pillars of Hercules, reveals how much it meant to a Greek to be a member of his polis.

(5) Most Greeks believed that human history had been a progress from bestiality to humanity and civilisation, and in many accounts the formation of poleis was a decisive step towards civilisation.

(6) Aristotle describes man as a politikon zoon and asserts that a person who is apolis is either subhuman or superhuman. Other forms of community, such as the oikia or the kome, or the ethnos, are not as developed and valuable as the polis, which is the perfect form of human society (Pol. 1252a–6, 1253b–31). The ideal life for which man is made is the life of a citizen (Pol. 1288b53). Ho politikos bios is described as the life of a citizen who participates in the running of the political institutions of his polis (Pol. 1283b24–43). Similarly, persons who do not participate in the polis, such as women, foreigners and slaves, are essentially inferior. They live in the polis but they are not members of the polis (Pol. 1275b7–8, 1326b18–20). In his political philosophy Aristotle establishes a hierarchy within the human race, and only those who live in poleis and are members of a polis, typically adult male Hellenes, are capable of fulfilling man’s purpose in life (1327a18–33).

(7) During the council of war before the battle of Salamis the Corinthian general Adeimantos tried to silence Themistokles by saying that he had no right to speak as long as he had no patris and was apolis. Now, Themistokles did not reply: "It is irrelevant whether or not we have a patris and a polis; what matters is that we have 200 ships." No, his answer was that Athens had an even better claim than Corinth to be labelled polis and ge (here echoing patris) as long as the Athenians had 200 ships (Hdt. 8.61). This exchange of words is undoubtedly anecdotal, but it shows that Herodotos and his contemporary readers (or listeners) took the concept of the polis very seriously. It is worth noting that, a century and a half later, Lykourgos made the same point: in leaving Athens the Athenians had not left their polis but had just moved it to Salamis (Lycurg. 1.69).

(8) When Kyros had conquered the Ionian cities, their representatives met at the Panionion to discuss whether they should put up with being Persian subjects or consider the alternatives. But, according to Herodotos, already before the Persian conquest the philosopher Thales had advised the Ionians to set up a common bouleuterion at Teos, and his proposal ended with the remark that the other poleis would be inhabited as before, but would change their status and become like demes (Hdt. 1.170.3). The plan came to nothing, but the political status of a community—to be a polis or just to be a dème—was obviously a matter of considerable consequence.

(9) According to Thucydides, the so-called synoecism of Attika in the age of Theseus consisted in the reduction of a number of poleis to local communities without a bouleuterion and a Prytaneion (Thuc. 2.15.2). Thucydides is emphatic in pointing out not just that all the other Attic rendering "polis animal", see Arist. HA 60b13–14 and Hansen (1996b) 199 with n.13.

communities lost their political institutions, but that one polis only was created by the reform. (10) In Archaic and Classical authors from all parts of the Greek world there are several score of passages in which the importance of the polis is emphasised. The following four are typical. According to Phokylides, a C6 Milesian poet, “A small polis well settled on the top of a hill is better than stupid Nineveh.” The pre-Socratic philosopher Demokritos of Abdera claimed that “a well-governed polis is the greatest prosperity and everything depends on that” (fr. 252). In Xenophon’s Memorabilia, polis is singled out as one of the essential human concepts that are worth discussing and need a definition (Xen. Mem. 1.1.16). Aristoxenos of Taras, a contemporary and pupil of Aristotle, is reported to have said about Myson, one of the Seven Sages, that he never rose but from a polis but from a kome, and an insignificant one at that.

To conclude: the concept of the polis mattered to the Greeks. They did not just live in polis, they found it important to live in polis rather than in some other form of political community. They were highly conscious of this, and that is one reason why the polis and the ancient Greek concept of polis are so important and well worth studying.

As is apparent from this Inventory, the Hellenic world of the Archaic and Classical periods comprised more than a thousand polis and, apart from some regions on the

12 Phokylides fr. 4, Diehl: πόλις ἐν σωτράλῳ κατά κόσμον ἀκέκλησα σωμική κράτεις Νίνου ἀφραινούσης.
13 Aristoxenos fr. 130, Wehrli-Diog. Laert. 1.108. Myson was from Chen (Pl. Ptit. 343A), which was either an otherwise unknown community, or a perioikic polis in Lakedaimon (no. 328) or a small polis in Oita (no. 425). But even if Chen is identified with one of the two small polis, that does not change Aristoxenos’ view of the comparative importance of a polis and a kome.
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This investigation covers only a segment of the lifespan of the Hellenic *polis*, viz. the Archaic and Classical periods. We have deliberately not attempted to search for the origin of the *polis* during the Dark Ages or investigate the life of the *polis* during the Hellenistic and Roman periods (see *supra*). But our analysis of the *polis* in the periods we cover is of course related to our views about the full time-scale of the *polis*. Therefore we have an obligation in this introduction briefly to expound our views about the history of the *polis* from its emergence to its demise.

The chronology of the *polis* is still hotly debated. Can the *polis* be traced back to the Mycenaean period (c.1650–1100), or did it emerge in the Geometric period (c.900–700)? And if one prefers the latter view, did it emerge as early as C9, or as late as c.700? Scholars are still divided over these issues and even more over the question of when the *polis* came to an end. Some historians place the decline of the *polis* in C4 and its fall in the years after 338. The prevailing view, which we endorse, is that it persisted through the Hellenistic and Roman periods and disappeared in late Antiquity only after a long decline that lasted several centuries. The disappearance of the *polis* was gradual and imperceptible, just like its emergence.

1. The Origin of the *Polis*

For the origin of the Greek *polis* we have three different types of evidence: (a) the linguistic evidence obtained by a comparative study of related words in other Indo-European languages, (b) the literary and epigraphical evidence of C8–C6, and (c) the physical remains of early settlements.

A. The Linguistic Evidence

The study of the etymology of the term *polis* is extremely important, since by extrapolation it takes us back to a period before the earliest written sources we have. First it should be noted that the early variant form of *polis*, namely *ptolis*, is probably attested in the Mycenaean Linear B tablets in the form *po-to-ri-jo*. But, alas, *po-to-ri-jo* is not attested as a noun, only as (part of) a personal name, and we have no clue as to what *po-to-ri-jo* may have meant in Mycenaean Greek.

A comparison with other Indo-European languages yields better results. The Greek word *polis* is related etymologically to Old Indian *púr*, Lithuanian *pilies* and Latvian *pils*. In all three languages the original meaning was “stronghold” or “castle”, but in Old Indian the word developed the meaning “town” or “city”, whereas in the two Baltic languages it seems to have kept its original meaning.

From the etymology it is reasonable to infer that the original meaning of *polis* in Greek too must have been “stronghold”. Our sources support this assumption: in both literary and epigraphical texts of the Archaic and Classical periods *polis* is occasionally used synonymously with *akropolis* in the sense of “citadel”. But whereas *akropolis* could designate both an eminence used as a settlement and a fortified place devoid of human habitation, *polis* used synonymously with *akropolis* seems always to have denoted a small defensible hill-top settlement, and not just a hill-top fortification. Remains of such fortified settlements, dating from the period c.1000–800, have been found in Zagora on Andros, in Dreros and Anavlochos on Crete, and in several other sites of the Protogeometric and Geometric periods.

We shall never know for sure, but it is not an unreasonable guess that such hill-top settlements were called *poleis* by their Greek inhabitants. To sum up: the Indo-European

---

1. KN As 1571,12, cf. Thumb and Scherer (1959) 335 §337 134; Morpurgo Davies (1965) 262.
3. It is misleading when Benveniste (1973) 298 claims: “we have thus here an old Indo-European term, which in Greek, and only in Greek, has taken on the sense of ‘town, city’, then ‘state’”. In Sanskrit *púr* certainly developed the meaning “town”, “city”, and since many of these cities were actually states, I would not preclude that the word may take on the sense of “state” or “political community” as well. In Lithuanian *pilies* has developed “palace” and not “town” as its secondary meaning.
etymology strongly suggests that the original meaning of *polis* was neither city (or town) nor state (or political community), but stronghold, and more specifically, a small defensible hill-top settlement.

After this brief survey of the etymology of the word *polis*, it is evident that the question, How old is the *polis*, makes no sense when put crudely. In the sense of stronghold the *polis* may have a history that stretches back into the Mycenaean period. Yet what historians usually mean when they ask about the origin of the *polis* is something different, namely: How old is the Greek city-state?, i.e. how far back can we trace the *polis* as we know it from the written sources and the archaeological evidence of the Classical period? But even in this form the question is hard to answer, because the development of a type of society is a gradual process. When does a nucleated settlement deserve to be called a city? And when can its political organisation be taken to be a kind of state?

To cut the Gordian knot, we shall suggest here a preliminary definition of the Classical Greek *polis* and then investigate how far back this definition can be traced. The *polis* was a small, highly institutionalised and self-governing community of citizens (called *politai* or *astoi*) living with their wives and children in an urban centre (also called *polis* or, sometimes, *asty*) and its hinterland (called *chora* or *ge*) together with two other types of people: free foreigners (*xenoi*, often *metoikoi*) and slaves.  

It is still debated whether the origins of the *polis* in this sense can be traced all the way back to the Mycenaean period. We prefer to follow those who believe that discontinuity overrides continuity. The palace-centred Mycenaean communities in Knossos, Pylos, Mycenae, Thebes and Athens must not be seen as, essentially, a type of *polis* that in the Dark Ages dwindled to insignificance but reappeared in C9–C8. The *polis* seems to have emerged in the Geometric period (900–700), not by devolution following the breakdown of Mycenaean society, but in connection with an upsurge in population, wealth and civilisation. Furthermore, urbanisation and state formation seem to have developed interdependently. Consequently, to answer the question, When did the (Classical) *polis* emerge?, we have to work backwards from c. 500 and as far back as our sources go.

### B. The Written Sources

In our opinion, the earliest indisputable attestations of named communities called *poleis* in the sense of “city-state” are Thasos (no. 526) attested in Archilochos, 10 Sparta (no. 345) attested in Tyrtaios, 11 and Dreros on Crete (no. 956) attested in the oldest Greek law preserved on stone. 12 In these sources *poleis* has the sense of both a political community and an urban centre, and as a political community it is a community of citizens. 13 All three sources are from C7m and point to a *terminus ante quem* of c. 650 for the *polis* as a city-state.

What, then, about Homer? Pace Finley and others, who held that no trace of the (Classical) *polis* could be found in the Homeric poems, 14 it is now generally believed and convincingly argued that *polis* in the sense of political community is amply attested both in the *Iliad* and in the *Odyssey*. A C6 Greek audience listening to a performance of the poems would have had no difficulty in recognising Phaiakian Scheria as a colony founded by Naussithoos (*Od. 6.7–10, 262–72*), and the two *poleis* depicted on the shield of Achilles (*Il. 18.490–540*) as contemporary walled cities.

The problem is that it is impossible to date the Homeric poems precisely. Comparative studies show that orally transmitted epic poems are constantly reformulated and undergo substantial changes until a specific performance is “frozen” by being committed to writing. 16 Next, in their fixed form they are like a coin hoard: the latest coin dates from the time it was buried, whereas the oldest may have been struck centuries earlier. Similarly, the events and the societies described in an orally transmitted epic poem may belong to different strata and constitute a strange mixture of old and new. Let us adduce just one example, usually passed over in silence. 17 The “Hellenic city” is adorned... 

---

6 For a more elaborate version of this definition, see 30 infra. 
9 The view that the *polis* of the Archaic period is essentially different from Bronze Age societies does not preclude the possibility that some of the Bronze Age communities were organised as city-states and formed a city-state culture. Thus, Crete in the New Palace period may have been a city-state culture comprising five self-governing city-states rather than one state with five major urban centres but governed from Knossos. See Cherry (1986) and Hansen (2002) 7. 
10 Archilochos fr. 228, West; *polis* in the sense of community of citizens (*astoi*): fr. 13.2, in the sense of town: fr. 49.7. 
11 Tyrtaios fr. 4.4, West; *polis* in the sense of town (fr. 10.3); in the sense of community (frs. 4.8, 12.28) of citizens (*demotai* and *demou plethos* in frs. 4.5 and 9). 
12 ML 2.1–2, now dated C7m in *Nomima 1* 81, C7s in Koerner (1993) no. 90. 
13 The distinction between citizens and non-citizens is attested, e.g., in Draco’s law on homicide (ML 86.28–9 (c.624)) and in a law from Gortyn (I.Cret. 4.13, *Nomima 1.1 (CY)*). 
17 Hansen and Fischer-Hansen (1994) 25. It is striking that, emphasising the
with palaces\textsuperscript{18} and, occasionally, with temples.\textsuperscript{19} The palaces are to some extent reminiscent of those excavated in Pylos, Mycenae and Tiryns.\textsuperscript{20} Such palaces disappeared at the end of the Bronze Age (c.1200–1100) and the oldest known palace in a Greek \textit{polis} is that of Dionysios I in Syracuse, erected just before 400.\textsuperscript{21} Conversely, temples are unknown in the Mycenaean world but are the most conspicuous type of monumental architecture from c.700 onwards.\textsuperscript{22} References to temples are rare in the Homeric poems, but they are mentioned in descriptions of Troy and the city on Scheria. Thus, it is unlikely that any early \textit{polis} had both a palace and a temple inside its walls, and it would be pointless to look for a historical site which matches the “Homeric City”. We must read Homer as poetry.\textsuperscript{23} In many ways the poems mirror society of C8–C7; the occasional mention of temples is just one such example. But the “Homeric \textit{polis}” also includes reminiscences of walled Bronze Age palaces, weapons and war chariots used in the Mycenaean period,\textsuperscript{24} a vague knowledge about the great urban centres in the Near Eastern empires, and a city in a wonderland imagined by the poet(s) of the \textit{Iliad} and the \textit{Odyssey}. To disentangle these four elements is a very difficult task which we prefer to avoid.

Consequently, we cannot expect the Homeric poems to present us with a coherent picture of the political organisation of the societies described in the \textit{Iliad} and the \textit{Odyssey}. In the \textit{Iliad} book 2 the composition of Agamennon’s army and the origin of each individual contingent is described in a long passage called the Catalogue of Ships (II. 2. 484–759). These verses contain the highest concentration of named \textit{poleis} in the Homeric poems. But the \textit{poleis} listed are not city-states. The toponyms classified as \textit{poleis} or \textit{ptoleithra} are towns in “territorial states” ruled by kings or princes. Thus, Crete is an island with 100 \textit{poleis} all ruled by Idomeneus (II. 2. 645–52). Furthermore, a close study of all the settlements enumerated in the Catalogue of Ships reveals that, with some notable exceptions, it reflects Greece in the Mycenaean period rather than in the Geometric or the Archaic period.\textsuperscript{25} Conversely, the notable exceptions show that it is not a true picture of the Mycenaean world.\textsuperscript{26} On the other hand, the \textit{poleis} depicted on the shield of Achilles and the description of the Phaiakian \textit{polis} Scheria must reflect the social and political structure of Hellas in the Geometric or early Archaic periods.

To make matters worse, we cannot even fix a \textit{terminus ante quem}, since we do not know when the Homeric poems were written down. Some ancient historians are tempted to adopt Barry Powell’s suggestion that a man living on Euboia c.800–750 created the Greek alphabet out of the Phoenician with the express purpose of writing down the \textit{Iliad} and the \textit{Odyssey}.\textsuperscript{27} A much more recent date is suggested by Minna Skafe Jensen, who argues that the Homeric poems were written down for the first time in Athens in c6m in connection with the Peisistratid reform of the Panathenaic festival (Jensen (1980) 96–171).

Summing up, we prefer to suspend judgement on the so-called Homeric Society\textsuperscript{28} and, for the same reason, we refrain from using the Hesiodic poems which were also transmitted orally until they were written down, we know not when. Our cautious conclusion is that, as far as the written sources go, the essential characteristics of the Classical \textit{polis} can be traced back to a \textit{terminus ante quem} of c.650.

C. The Archaeology of Greece

On the other hand, archaeology has made great strides in recent years and the remains of urban centres may take us a step forward, or, rather, further back. Several Early settlements have been excavated in the Aegean Islands: Zagora on Andros, Emporio on Chios, and Lefkandi on Euboia, just to mention three of the most prominent. Most of them are small hill-top settlements protected by a fortification wall. They flourished in the so-called Dark Ages (c.1000–800) and were all abandoned c.700 (Snodgrass (1991) 7–9). Were

\textsuperscript{18} Iron Age aspects of the poems, Morris and Powell (1997) make no mention of “Homeric” palaces and temples. For palaces we must go back to Wace (1962).

\textsuperscript{19} II. 6.244ff (palace of Priam); Od. 1.365 (palace of Odysseus); Od. 3.181ff (palace of Nestor); Od. 4.20ff (palace of Menelaos); Od. 7.81ff (palace of Alkinnoos).

\textsuperscript{20} II. 1.39, 5.446, 7.83 (temple of Apollo in Troy); II. 6.297–300 (temple of Athena in Troy); Od. 6.10 (temples of the gods in Scheria).

\textsuperscript{21} Wace (1962) 490; Pullmann (1992) 191–92. Both the Mycenaean remains and the Homeric “Halls” (\textit{domata}) are so magnificent that the traditional designation of them as “palaces” seems well chosen. For a perhaps exaggerated emphasis on the purely imagined character of the Homeric king’s house, see Dalby (1995). For an attempt to reconcile the Homeric “palaces” with remains of Iron Age residences, see Ainiar (1997) 265–68.


\textsuperscript{23} For some “primitive temples” antedating 700, see Lawrence (1996) 61–65.

\textsuperscript{24} Judiciously emphasised by Scully (1990) 2–3.

\textsuperscript{25} Greenhalgh (1973) 7–18; Ducray (1986) 38–41.

\textsuperscript{26} Hope Simpson and Lazenby (1970) 153–71. See, however, the recent discussion of the Catalogue by McInerney (1999) who argues that it is “a product of the eighth century” (124).

\textsuperscript{27} The most disturbing problem is the lack of correspondence between Nestor’s realm as described in II. 2.591–602 and the evidence of the Linear B tablets found in the palace at Ano Engialos, discussed by Hope Simpson and Lazenby (1970) 155–56.

\textsuperscript{28} Powell (1991) adducing as possible analogies (11–12), e.g., Wulfsa’s invention of Gothic script \textit{c ad} 400. The epigraphic evidence, however, indicates that a much better analogy is, e.g., the Nordic runes. They were invented in the first century \textit{ad}, but it took many centuries before they were used for longer texts.

\textsuperscript{29} See also the judicious and cautious approach in Baurain (1997) 403.
such settlements the centres of early poleis? If polis is taken in the sense of a smallish settlement and/or stronghold, the answer is probably “yes” (see supra). But if polis is taken in its Classical sense of a town which was the centre of a self-governing political community, the answer is a non liquet. There are no traces of securely identifiable political architecture antedating c.550, and the archaeological evidence cannot provide us with information about the political organisation of these early nucleated settlements. We have no idea about how Zagora was governed. It may have been a small self-governing community, or a subdivision of another political community, e.g. Lefkandi, or it may have controlled the whole of Andros.

Yet a study of the Greek colonies, especially the western colonies, may provide us with a clue. The traditional view is that the formation of the polis preceded colonisation (Graham (1964) 159). In recent years this view has been challenged by the opposite hypothesis: that the polis emerged or at least developed in consequence of colonisation, and that it is the emergence of the polis in the colonies that influenced polis formation in the homeland.30 Urbanisation, the opposition between the Greek settlers and the native foreigners, and the conscious introduction of common laws and new political institutions are features that are central to the concept of the polis, and all may have developed in the colonies before they became prominent in Hellas itself. Now, in the Greek colonies in Sicily and southern Italy, urban centres of remarkable size can be traced back to their foundation in the C8s,31 or at least to a period shortly after their foundation. Obvious examples are Syracuse (no. 47) and Megara Hyblaia (no. 36).32 Furthermore, each colony is attested as a self-governing political community as far back as our written sources go, i.e. in the late C6. Combining the archaeological evidence of urban centres from the late C8 with the reasonable assumption that each of these colonies was founded or soon emerged as a self-governing political community, the inference is that the polis in its Classical sense of “city-state” can be traced back to c.734, when Syracuse was founded by some Corinthians headed by an aristocrat called Archias. It does not necessarily follow that Corinth too was a polis at that time. The founding of, e.g., Syracuse may well have been a private enterprise organised by Archias, rather than a political enterprise warranted by a decision made by the Corinthian polis.33 It is worth noting, for instance, that the district of Achaia in the northern Peloponnese was very active in colonisation in C8, but did not develop poleis internally until much later, probably not before c.500.34 As clusters of villages, Corinth (no. 227), Argos (no. 347) and Athens (no. 361) can be traced back to the late Geometric period (Morris (1991) 33), but we do not know when they became poleis in the political sense of the term.

2. The End of the Polis

It is still a common view that the independent Greek polis flourished in the Archaic and Classical periods, but was crushed by the Makedonians and disappeared in C4s. The turning point is often pinned down to the battle of Chaironeia,35 and from some accounts one gets the impression that the polis in the sense of city-state perished on the day the battle was fought, i.e. on 2 August 338. A collection of the available evidence, however, shows that the independent city-state was declining at least a century before Chaironeia, and that independence (autonomia) never was an indispensable characteristic of the polis,36 whereas the polis, i.e. the political community of citizens united in the running of their city’s institutions, continued to exist throughout the Hellenistic and Roman periods,37 and that is now, we think, the prevailing view.

The dissociation of the concept of polis from the concept of autonomia (Hansen (1995)) is supported by the observation that the concept of autonomia seems to have emerged as late as C5m (Ostwald (1982) 14–26), i.e. at least 200 years later than the concept of the polis. One might object that most poleis were independent before C5m, and that the concept was explicitly formulated only after autonomia began to come under threat in C5m, when the Delian League was transformed into an Athenian Empire. The problem with this explanation is that dependent poleis are amply attested

---

29 Hansen and Fischer-Hansen (1994) 30, 35–36, 42–44, 75, 81. It is still debated whether the large apsidal peripteral building excavated in Lefkandi (c.1000) was a chieftain’s house or an early temple; see Lawrence (1996) 62.


31 Reasonably reliable foundation dates of many of the western colonies, not always matching the foundation dates reported by Thucydides at 6.2–6, are now established by archaeological evidence alone, and there is no reason to suspect a circular argument, i.e. that archaeologists base the chronology of Protocorinthian pottery on Thucydides’ foundation dates, whereas historians argue that Thucydides’ dates are corroborated by the Protocorinthian pottery found in the colonies; see van Compernolle (1992); Morris (1996).

in the Archaic and early Classical periods. From C7m onwards all the Greek *poleis* along the coast of Asia Minor were first under Lydian and then under Persian rule, and won independence only in the 470s after the Greek victories in the Persian War. In C6 the Corinthian colonies along the western coast of Greece were dependencies ruled by relatives of the Corinthian tyrants. The three secondary colonies founded by Syracuse in the course of C7 were dependencies of the Corinthian tyrants. The three secondary colonies along the coast of Asia Minor were dependencies ruled by relatives of the Corinthian tyrants. The three secondary colonies founded by Syracuse in the course of C7 were dependencies of Syracuse. And all the periplus *poleis* in Lakedaimon and Messenia, some fifty to a hundred *poleis* altogether, had been reduced to dependent status before 600.

There can be no doubt, however, that the number of dependent *poleis* was considerably increased in the course of C5 and C4. During the period C5m–C4m many *poleis* were deprived of their *autonomia* by being members of the Delian or the Peloponnesian League and being exposed to the imperialistic aspirations of the two hegemonic *poleis*: Athens and Sparta; and during the same period hundreds of other *poleis* changed their status from being independent states to being constituent states of a confederacy that regularly comprised all the *poleis* within a region. By C4m we find federal states in Boiotia, Phokis, Lokris, Euboia, Thessaly, Epeiros, Aitolia, Akarnania, Achaia and Arkadia. Furthermore, many *poleis* along the coast of Asia Minor had once again become subject to the Persian king, as they had been in the period before the Persian Wars.38 There is no historical atlas that includes a map of Greece c.350 showing which *poleis* were still independent and which had become dependencies, either by being dominated by one of the hegemonic cities or the Persian king or by being a member of a confederation. Such a map would reveal that when Makedonia under Philip II (360–336) began to manifest itself as a great power, the independent city-state was no longer the typical form of *poleis*. What disappeared with the rise of Makedonia in C4s was not the *poleis* but the hegemonic *poleis* such as Athens, Sparta or Thebes. The other *poleis* could not necessarily tell the difference between having been dominated by Athens or the Persian king and, again, being dominated by the king of Makedonia or some other Hellenistic monarch.39 Thus the *poleis* (i.e. the small political community of citizens living in or around an urban centre and united in running its political institutions) survived the end of the Classical period, and though the independent city-state had declined long before the defeat at Chaeroneia, the *polis*—as the Greeks themselves understood the term and the concept—persisted and prospered throughout the Hellenistic and Roman periods.

During the Hellenistic period the typical *poleis* seems to have been a democracy which had its *autonomia* (in the now restricted sense of self-government rather than true independence) established or confirmed by royal rescript.40 During the Roman Imperial period oligarchy replaced democracy; the focus of the political organisation became the council (*boule*) instead of the assembly (*ekklesia*) and the city was now governed by a local aristocracy which filled all important magistracies.41 Still the *poleis* was a self-governing community centred on a town.

The end of the Greek *poleis* began in the late third century AD, when Diocletian (284–305) created a centralised bureaucracy that crushed most of what was left of local self-government (Jones (1940) 85). In the West what remained of urban life succumbed after the invasion of the Germanic peoples in C5. But in the East the Greek *poleis* persevered for more than a century, and here the demise of the *poleis* was to a considerable extent caused by the rise of the Christian Church and its bishops (Saradi-Mendelovici (1988) 365–401). The bishops joined the imperial bureaucracy in undermining the self-government of the *poleis*; and the Church attacked the pagan urban institutions and urged its members to keep away from the agora, which, on the other hand, the pagan authors praised as the centre of urban life.43 Furthermore, *polis* religion had implied that each *poleis* had its individual cults and its own pantheon. The pagan gods and their cults were now replaced by a divinity which did not allow of local individuality. Yet the decline of the *polis* was a slow process, and *polis* was still an important political concept in the reign of Justinian (529–565). Procopius, for example, tells us how in AD 533 a small African village was turned by imperial decree into a *polis* in the political sense.44 However, “with the close of Justinian’s legislation the history of the city as an institution abruptly ceases. When the last remnants of civic autonomy disappeared we do not know: the titles which regulate the constitution of the cities were not struck out of the Code till the great revision under Leo the Wise. But they cannot have long survived Justinian.”45

---
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To counteract the Athenocentric studies of the *polis*, one of the main objectives of the Copenhagen Polis Centre has been to build up an inventory of all *poleis* of the Archaic and Classical periods. The principal purpose of this investigation is to find out what the Greeks thought a *polis* was, and to compare that with what modern historians think a *polis* is (Hansen (1994a) 14–17). The concept of *polis* found in the sources ought, of course, to be the same as that in modern historiography. But this is far from always the case. Let us adduce just one example. The orthodoxy is that the small Boiotian town of Mykalessos was not a *polis*; it was instead a *kome*. This is indeed the term used by Strabo, whose classification is cited in, for example, RE s.v. Mykalessos, and again in the *Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites* (PECS). What is passed over in silence in both these articles and in most other studies of the history of Boiotia is that Mykalessos is called a *polis* by Thucydides, not just once, but three times in a passage where he uses *polis* both in the urban and in the political sense of the word.

Scores of other examples could be adduced. In such cases the modern historian’s reaction has normally been to admit that such settlements may well be called *poleis* in our sources, but then to imply or to state explicitly that they were not *poleis* in the true sense. The curious result of such a policy is the view that our sources often apply the term *polis* to a settlement that, according to modern orthodoxy, was not a *polis*. We are faced with a *polis* that was not a *polis*.

The contradiction has its root in the fact that modern historians who write about ancient Greece like to use the term *polis* synonymously with the term “city-state” (e.g. Finley (1981) 4). But *polis* is a historical concept attested in Greek sources, while city-state is a modern heuristic concept (Hansen (2000a) 13). The term “city-state” (or, rather, the German term *Stadtstaat*) seems to have been coined in the mid-nineteenth century and was first applied to Rome in 1842 as a rendering of the Danish term *Statsorganisme* (Copenhagen, 1840) 20 n. 2 and *Bystat* (by-town, cf. Derby) in connection with the translation into Danish of M. N. Madvig, *Blik på Oldtids Statsforfatninger med Hensyn til Udviklingen af Monarchiet og en omfattende Statsorganisation* (Copenhagen, 1840) 20 n. 2 – Blicke auf die Staatsverfassungen des Alterthaums, mit Rücksicht auf die Entwicklung der Monarchie und eines umfassenden Staatsorganismus, in Archiv für Geschichte, Statistik, Kunde der Verwaltung und Landesrechte der Herzogthümer Schleswig, Holstein und Lauenburg (Kiel, 1842) 42. The terms *Bystat* and *Stadtstaat* were first applied to Rome in the republican period, and only later transferred to descriptions of, primarily, the Greek *polis* and the Italian *città*. The French term *cité-Etat* and the Italian term *città-stato* are both derived from *Stadtstaat* and/or *city-state* and neither is attested earlier than the twentieth century, see Hansen (1994b); (1998) 15–16. 4

The English term “city-state” was probably coined in 1885 as a rendering of the German term *Stadtstaat* in connection with the translation into English of J. Bluntschli, *Lehre vom modernen Staat*, 6th edn. (Berlin, 1886) 61 – *Theory of the State* (London, 1885) 60. The German term *Stadtstaat* was probably coined in 1842 as a rendering of the Danish term *Bystat* (by-town, cf. Derby) in connection with the translation into German of J. N. Madvig, *Blik på Oldtids Statsforfatninger med Hensyn til Udviklingen af Monarchiet og en omfattende Statsorganisation* (Copenhagen, 1840) 20 n. 2 – Blicke auf die Staatsverfassungen des Alterthaums, mit Rücksicht auf die Entwicklung der Monarchie und eines umfassenden Staatsorganismus, in Archiv für Geschichte, Statistik, Kunde der Verwaltung und Landesrechte der Herzogthümer Schleswig, Holstein und Lauenburg (Kiel, 1842) 42. The terms *Bystat* and *Stadtstaat* were first applied to Rome in the republican period, and only later transferred to descriptions of, primarily, the Greek *polis* and the Italian *città*. The French term *cité-Etat* and the Italian term *città-stato* are both derived from *Stadtstaat* and/or *city-state* and neither is attested earlier than the twentieth century, see Hansen (1994b); (1998) 15–16. 4

"Aristotle... was writing about the autonomous city-
polis in our sources were not independent and did not enjoy autonomia.6 Thus Mykalessos was a dependency of Tanagra (infra 88); the Greeks thought it was a polis, but according to modern orthodoxy its lack of independence or autonomia indicates that it was not a city-state.

If we establish and acknowledge a distinction between the ancient historical concept of polis and the modern heuristic concept of city-state, it follows that we can conduct two different investigations of ancient Greek society which may lead to different conclusions: if we study the city-state and apply the modern historians’ understanding of what a city-state is, we get one picture of Archaic and Classical Hellas. If we go through the written sources and list all settlements that are actually called polis in contemporary texts, we investigate the ancient Greeks’ understanding of their own settlement pattern and political organisation and get a different picture.

It would be wrong to say that one of the two pictures is the right one and that the other is misleading; rather, the two pictures are complementary. It is always legitimate to contrast a culture’s perception of itself with an outsider’s more detached perception of the same culture (Burke (1992) 45).

At the Copenhagen Polis Centre we want to know how the Greeks perceived their own settlement pattern, and therefore our investigation has been based, first of all, on a careful examination of the terminology used and the site-classifications found in our sources. In this type of study it is necessary to describe and define the ancient concept of the polis before we begin to compare it with the modern concept of the city-state. Since concepts have to be studied through language, we started with the terminology: in all literary and epigraphical sources of the Archaic and Classical periods we collected every attestation of the term polis in order to conduct two different investigations.

First, we examined how the term polis is used whenever we meet it. Our sources tell us, for example, that a polis waged war, or made peace, or entered into an alliance, or struck coins, or passed a law, or a sentence, or founded a colony, or defrayed expenses, or repaired the walls, and we hear about the territory of a polis, or its roads and water supply, or its altars, or its protecting divinity.8 The next task was to examine every single attestation of the term polis referring to a named polis such as Corinth, or Melos, or Megalopolis.

In the first investigation we analysed all the passages we had listed, no matter whether they concern a named polis or refer to a polis or the polis in general; and for this investigation a specific law passed by the polis Dreros is just as valuable a source as is a general reference in Aristotle that it is the polis which is responsible for passing laws.9 In conducting the second investigation, we restricted ourselves to the attestations that contain an explicit reference to a named polis and ignored all the passages referring to the polis in general.

These two different investigations relate to a very simple but very important distinction, acknowledged in linguistics and applied in that branch of philosophy which is devoted to the definition and classification of concepts. The meaning of a term is one thing; that which is denoted by a term because it has a certain meaning is another. In linguistics this distinction is sometimes referred to as the distinction between connotation and denotation; in philosophy the two terms used are the intension of a term (that is, its meaning) and the extension of a term (that is, the totality of objects to which the term refers). Linguistically, the connotation (or meaning) of the term “state” is something like “a geographically delimited segment of human society united by common obedience to a single sovereign” (Watkins (1972) 150), but the term “state” denotes any existing state, such as Greece, Denmark, Russia or Australia. Philosophically, the intension of the term “state” is the sum total of all the properties that must be possessed by a community in order to be called a state; the extension of the term “state” is constituted by the total number of existing states.9 If we concentrate on the connotation or intension of a term, we can determine its meaning by listing the essential characteristics which the term connotes, and then afterwards establish a list of the objects which fulfill the requirements of our definition. If  

---

6 Hansen (1996b) 21–43; (1996b); infra 87–92. While accepting the concept of the dependent polis, its application to the members of the Boiotian federation has been denied by Keen (1996) and Rhodes (1999); see infra 92.


8 Law on the proclamation of crowns passed by the polis of Athens (Dem. 18.120); the passing of laws is one of the principal duties of a polis (Arist. Rhet. 1360b18ff).

we concentrate on the denotation or extension of a term, we shall do it the other way round: we begin by enumerating all the denotata, i.e. all objects to which the term is applied. Next, we look for the essential characteristics which these objects have in common, and finally we establish the meaning of the term by assembling the common characteristics we have found in order to build up a picture of the concept behind the term.

After this digression, we shall return to our topic and ask the question: What is a polis? Let us subdivide the main question into three questions: Do we want to examine the term itself? Or the concept behind the term? Or the objects denoted by the term?

The term. An analysis of the term is principally a linguistic investigation, and in a study of ancient Greek history it is relevant only in so far as it can shed light on the meaning and uses of the term. By studying the etymology of the word polis, for example, we learn that it is related to Old Indian pūr, Lithuanian pilis and Latvian pils, and that these three words originally meant stronghold. Consequently the original meaning of polis must have been stronghold, and in this sense it may perhaps have been used about the fortified sites in Crete in C10 at, for example, Dreros and Anavlochos, etc.11

The concept. Historians study a term not for its own sake but in order to grasp the concept behind the term, to determine its essence, to find all the essential characteristics that go with it and transform these criteria into a description or even a definition of the concept. In doing all this they are faced with the problem that they have to apply modern terms and concepts in their description both of the ancient societies themselves and of the concepts used by the ancients themselves to describe them. Sometimes historians prefer in their analysis to use modern terms, such as “state” or “settlement” or “town” or “village”; but sometimes historians take over an ancient term found in the sources and use it in transliterated form. As pointed out above, polis is precisely such a term (Gawantka (1985) ) and accordingly we cannot conduct our investigation of the term polis before we have decided whether we want to study the ancient concept of polis as found in our sources or the modern concept of polis as we meet it in the nineteenth- and twentieth-century accounts of the history of ancient Greece, where the word polis is frequently used synonymously with the modern term “city-state”.

The objects. The third type of investigation is to focus on the denotata and analyse the communities or settlements referred to by the word polis. Such a study is not necessarily bound up with a study of the term itself to the same extent as is an investigation of the concept. It is a commonplace, but nevertheless true, that language is the medium in which concepts are expressed and words are the principal traces that ancient concepts have left behind for the modern historian to study. Symbols expressed in painting or sculpture or architecture etc. are important accessories, but to conduct an investigation of an ancient concept without focusing first on the words used to express it would be a nonsense.

On the other hand, the objects to which a term refers leave many traces other than the term itself. If we focus on the objects rather than on the concept, an examination of the terms used about the objects may be relegated to the background, and that is in fact what has happened in recent studies of ancient Greek society. Inspired by the growing number of archaeological surveys of the Greek landscape, the focus of interest has shifted from the written to the archaeological sources, and from the towns to the countryside.12 The result has been a rapidly increasing number of what can be called settlement pattern studies. Here the historian starts with the settlement pattern of a landscape, as far as it can be ascertained for macro-periods (Archaic, Classical, Hellenistic, Roman, late Roman), then the investigation is focused on the actual pattern of the social, economic and political structure of the landscape and its settlements, and only then does the historian start looking at the names given to the various types of settlement and the terms used to describe them (Hansen (1995c) 46–47). In such an investigation it does not matter very much how the Greeks classified the different types of settlement, and what they themselves thought of their settlement pattern comes second to the study of the settlement pattern itself.13

Prominent examples of such an approach are John Fossey’s studies of Phokis (1986), Boiotia (1988) and East Lokris (1990); Carter’s studies of Metapontion (1992) and, first of all, the impressive surveys conducted during the last two

---

10 Hansen (1996a) 34; see 16 supra.
12 Judiciously pointed out by Davies (1998) 237: “The second contribution of economic anthropology, reinforced by the preoccupations and findings of archaeological survey work, has been to divert attention away from the towns and traders towards landscapes and their unurbanised inhabitants.”
13 See Fossey (1990) 94–95: “The overall conclusion must be that in this area it is purely an archaeological investigation, almost entirely bereft of written sources, which can reconstruct the history of Opountian Lokris. The primacy of archaeology as our means of investigating the past of this part—and of many others—of Greece, even in the ‘historical’ period is beyond dispute, pace those colleagues in the Classical profession who would see archaeology essentially as an adjunct, or peripheral aspect of their discipline.”
decades, especially in the Peloponnesian. An account for the general reader, covering the whole of Hellas, is given by Robin Osborne in his Classical Landscape with Figures (1987). In this study the settlements under discussion are called either “cities” or “towns” or “villages”. A discussion of the Greek terminology as applied to each individual settlement is eschewed. Admittedly, Osborne states in his preface that he will use the English term “city” synonymously with the Greek term polis in its political sense (ibid.). Nevertheless, he sometimes uses the term village about a settlement that, in a contemporary source, is unquestionably called a polis in the political sense. Such inconsistencies, however, do not necessarily diminish the value of his book, since the Greek terminology and the Greeks’ understanding of their own environment are issues deliberately left out of consideration in this type of study.16

Such investigations are extremely valuable in their own right, but they are not designed to answer the question: What is a polis? This is nevertheless still an important question, although to some extent it seems to have become a neglected one. That is why the Copenhagen Polis Centre was set up with the explicit aim of answering that question or at least shedding light on some important aspects of it. We started from the term and, as stated above, we studied both its meaning (or intension) and its denotata (or extension). Building up an Inventory of all named communities called polis in Archaic and Classical sources, we focused exclusively on attestations of the term polis linked to a named historical locality such as Corinth, or Megalopolis, or Thasos, or Miletos. On the other hand, we left out references to named polis in a mythological context, e.g. the term polis applied to Troy, or Mykenai ruled by Agamemnon, or Athens by Theseus. As a result, all references to named polis in the Homeric poems and in tragedy were omitted.17

Next, for every single locality attested as a polis in a contemporary source, we collected information about some forty different aspects of its organisation: its territory, history, laws, constitution, proktonoi, cults, calendar, participation in Panhellenic games, mint, urban centre, walls, temples, political architecture, etc. In selecting the aspects we wanted to investigate, we used the information obtained in our first general investigation of the meaning of the word: since many sources confirm that it was a characteristic of a polis to strike coins, we recorded whether the individual polis in question had a mint. Since a participant in the Panhellenic games had to be a citizen of a polis in order to participate (infra 107), we recorded Panhellenic victors belonging to the polis. Since a boule was apparently characteristic of a polis and never attested in komai or demoi, we collected information about boule, etc. Many of the aspects we looked for could be studied only through archaeologica evidence. Did the polis in question possess an agora or a bouleuterion or a pytaneion? Was its urban centre protected by a circuit of walls?18

Every community explicitly attested as a polis in a source of the Archaic and/or Classical period has been included in our inventory and classified as a polis type A.19 If the polis in question is not called polis individually but is listed communities refer to Troy, sometimes to Argos, Sparta, Mykene, Pylos, Ithaka and a few other places. The most problematical passage is the Catalogue of Ships. The context is the Heroic Age and, in so far as they have a historical basis, many of the toponyms listed seem in fact to reflect the Mycenaean Age rather than the Iron Age “Homerian Society” (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970). In Aischylos, Sophokles and Euripides the context is the imagined Heroic Age, and it is not very helpful to be told, for example, that Athens is a polis ruled by Theseus (Eur. Suppl. 4, 28, 114, etc.). Exceptional are a number of passages from Aischylos’ Persai. Again, in lyric poetry as well as in prose there are some references to mythological polis which are left out of our investigation, cf. e.g. Lycurg. 1.62 (Troy) or Pind. Ol. 10.8.2 (Tiryns).


15 According to Osborne, Elis is the only “city” (–polis) in the region and other settlements are described as “villages” (124–27), but in the Hellenika Xenophon repeatedly refers to several of them as being poli, see 3.2.23, 3.2.30, 3.5.12, 6.5.2.

16 See e.g. Fossey’s thorough and valuable studies of the settlement pattern of Phokis (1986), Boiotia (1988) and Opoustian Lokris (1990) in which he focuses on site-location and has no discussion whatsoever of the site-classifications found in our sources.

17 Both Homer and tragedy are extremely important sources for the general and ideological aspects of the concept of polis, but of no value for a study of polis as a site-classification applied to named historical communities. In the Iliad and the Odyssey most of the attestations of p(t)olis used about named
among other communities under the heading *polis* (cf. infra 45–46), it has been classified as a *polis* type [A].

The next step was to collect information about communities which are not actually called *polis* in any contemporary source, but which are known for a number of the activities we examined in our investigation of communities actually called *polis*. For example, the community in question had a *bouleuterion* or a *prytaneion*; its citizens are known as victors in the Panhellenic games; or it possessed a mint. Its urban centre was protected by a circuit of walls, and a citizenship decree passed by the assembly is preserved or referred to in a literary source.

If such a community shared a number of properties with the communities actually called *polis*, the presumption is that it was in fact considered to be a *polis* by the Greeks, and that, any day, a new inscription may turn up in which the community is attested directly as a *polis*. One example is the Thessalian city of Atrax. It had an acropolis wall of C5e and a C4 defence circuit protecting the lower town. In C4m it appointed a *theorodokos* to host *theoroi* from Epidauros, and it had a C4 mint, etc. But it was only in 1984 that a funerary epigram was found in which Atrax is explicitly called a *polis* (SEG 34 560).

All communities performing activities characteristic of a *polis*, but not explicitly attested as a *polis*, have been added to our inventory, but classified as *poleis* type B or C. The difference between B and C is that for a B we have substantial indications that it must have been a *polis*, whereas for a C only one characteristic is attested, and not a decisive one, or there are so few that we cannot be sure that it is only due to lack of sources that the community in question is not actually recorded as a *polis* in Archaic and Classical sources. Thus, the classification of a *polis* as type A or [A] is mechanical and dictated by our method, whereas the distinction between B and C is to some extent subjective in that it involves an evaluation of which activities were the prerogative of a *polis* and not performed by other types of community and which activities are so important that they qualify a *polis* as a type B rather than a type C.

It should be added that a *polis* type A or [A] is not necessarily a better source for *polis* status than a *polis* type B. In some cases an Archaic or Classical author describing a named community as a *polis* may have been misinformed, or he may mix up two homonymous communities. The C4 treatise ascribed to Ps.-Skylax, for example, is a rather unreliable source for remote regions, such as the south coast of the Black Sea, where the term *polis* is sometimes applied to toponyms that apparently denote a river or a mountain.20

In such cases a *polis* type A is dubious evidence for *polis* status compared with a *polis* type B for which a whole series of the essential characteristics is attested.

Thus, our principal criterion for inclusion and classification is (1) the requirement that a locality is called a *polis* in at least one contemporary source, i.e. in Archaic and Classical sources down to the death of Alexander the Great in 323, or (2) that, in the Archaic and Classical periods, it performed a number of the activities characteristic of a *polis*.

In adopting this method we were faced with a number of problems. (1) To what extent was *polis* a loaded term and consequently subject to manipulation? (2) To what extent are our sources consistent in their terminology? (3) To what extent did the word *polis* denote the same concept c.600 and again c.320? (4) To what extent will the mass of Athenian evidence result in an inventory of *poleis* that reflects the idea of a *polis* in Classical Athens but obscures the complexity of the concept as used in the rest of the Greek world? (5) To what extent is our investigation influenced by the fact that the word *polis* is used not just in one sense but has a number of different meanings? In particular, to what extent is the construction of an Inventory of *poleis* impeded by the fact that *polis* sometimes means “town” and sometimes “state”? (6) To what extent is the concept *polis* affected by the term being used not only about Hellenic but also about barbarian communities?

1. The Possible Bias of the Word *Polis*

If living in a *polis* was something worth fighting for, *polis* must have been a loaded term. Thus there is a risk that the use of the term was subject to manipulation and that the classification of a settlement as a *polis* should not be taken at face value, but scrutinised as to when and by whom the classification was made. If this is the case, it will affect our investigation of the concept and—more seriously—it may spoil the value of building up an Inventory of all attested *poleis*. Let us illustrate this problem by a short digression about the modern concepts of democracy and state.

---

20 See infra Iasonia (no. 716), Karambis (no. 717), Kinolis (no. 720), Koloussa (no. 721), Limne (no. 725), Lykastos (no. 726), Odeinios (no. 727), Tetrakis (no. 731). However, some of these localities may have been *poleis*, cf. Euripos (no. 199) attested in Ps.-Skylax 34 but rejected by most scholars until the discovery of the *theorodokoi* lists from Epidauros (IG iv.1 95.15) and Nemea (SEG 36 331.A.28–30).
The meaning (or intension) of the term “democracy” is, e.g., “a political system in which the whole people make the basic decisions on important matters of public policy” (Holden (1974) 8), whereas the reference (or extension) of the term comprises all democratically governed states (Lijphart (1984) 37–45). But nowadays “democracy” has become a “hurrah word” (Holden (1974) 2) and—apart from China, Iran, Nigeria and a few others—every nation claims to be a democracy. So an inventory including every state called a democracy will comprise the great majority of all states, many of which do not fulfil the criteria included in the definition suggested above. To study the concept of democracy on the basis of a list of states called democracies would be grossly misleading (Holden (1974) 6–8).

The meaning (or intension) of the term “state” is, e.g., “a geographically delimited segment of human society united by common obedience to a single sovereign” (Watkins (1972) 150); the corresponding reference (or extension) of the term comprises all states. Like “democracy”, the word “state” is a loaded term, and it really matters to a people whether or not their country is recognised as a state, but, unlike democracy, there is very little disagreement about which countries to include in or exclude from a list of all states. Today the world is subdivided into 192 territorial states—the 191 members of the United Nations plus the Vatican, which does not want to join the UN.21 There are a few more de facto states: Taiwan, which is not allowed to join the UN because of China; North Cyprus, which is not recognised as a state by anyone except Turkey; and Somaliland. And there are some communities that aspire to statehood without having obtained it yet, e.g. the Palestinians. In almost all cases statehood is something that matters, but—a handful of communities excepted—it is not a disputed issue whether a community is a state. Therefore, a study of the extension of the term “state” and of the essential characteristics shared by all states will be a very valuable contribution to our understanding of the concept of state in our times.

Let us return to the term polis. Was it, like “democracy”, a hurrah word? Or was it, like “state”, a loaded term, but not one which became a slogan to such an extent that it was constantly disputed whether or not a given community was a polis? Admittedly, the council of war before the battle of Salamis provides us with one such example: it testifies to a disagreement between the Corinthian and the Athenian generals as to whether or not Athens at that moment was a polis (Hdt. 8.61). But this is a very special case, because the physical city did not exist any longer, whereas the population retained its identity.

There may have been other similar cases. Suppose, for example, that the inhabitants of a small town insisted on being recognised as a polis but were dominated by a strong neighbouring town whose inhabitants would deny that the small dependent town was a polis. One possible example is Aigosthena. In the Classical period the small fortified town of Aigosthena in northern Megaris was a dependency of the polis of Megara, and in a Megarian decree of c.300 it is classified as a kome (IG vii 1.18). But it is apparently referred to as a polis in the C 4 periplous ascribed to Skylax (Ps.-Skylax 39). Furthermore, c.240 it became a member of the Boiotian federation and in a decree passed c.200 Aigosthena is explicitly called a polis (IG vii 207.4). We may reject the classification found in Ps.-Skylax and hold that, in c.240, Aigosthena changed its status from being a kome in Megaris into being a member state of the Boiotian Federation, i.e. a polis (Feyel (1942) 91). But we cannot rule out the possibility that the Aigosthenitai had always claimed that they lived in a polis, whereas the Megarians would only grant them the status of being a kome. Or, alternatively, the status of kome may occasionally have been compatible with that of a dependent polis (cf. infra 92 and Helisson (no. 273)).

The periokic communities in Lakedaimon, on the other hand, are consistently referred to as being poleis.22 One suspects that the Spartans might have tried to deny them the status of polis, especially after the King’s Peace of 386,23 but among the sources that classify the periokic communities as periokic communities as poleis is Xenophon, who had no quarrel with the Spartans and, in our opinion, his use of the term guarantees that the Greeks were unanimous in their classification of the periokic communities as dependent poleis, i.e. as poleis without autonomia.

Another scenario is the refugee government. If a polis was torn by stasis and if one of the factions was sent into exile by the other faction, the exiles might try to form a government and behave as if they were the true polis (Seibert (1979) 373–74). The best-attested example concerns a member of the Second Naval Confederacy. Among the Athenian allies is recorded Διατρήσεως τῶν ἐν Νῆσσοις (IG ii 43 B 35–38). A comparison with the literary sources indicates

23 Paus. 7.34.2; Thuc. 5.54.1 (pace the note in Gomme, Andrewes and Dover 1970). Xen. Hell. 6.5.21; Ages. 2.24; Lact. Pol. 15.3; Ps.-Skylax 46; Isoc. 12.179; Strabo 8.4.15; Paus. 3.2.6; Polemon, Περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἀσσυρίᾳ πόλεων, p. 50, Prenner. See Shipley (1997).
that the demos in question was a rebellious faction of exiled democrats who had established themselves in a stronghold called Arkadia, probably to be identified with Nellos. Both Xenophon (Hell. 6.2.2–3) and Diodorus (15.45.4) contrast the exiled democrats with οἱ ἐκ τῆς πόλεως Ζακύνθιος, indicating that the position held by the exiled democrats was not a polis. But the exiles in Nellos are included in the list of allied poleis appended to the decree proposed and carried by Aristoteles of Marathon. Now, from the use of the term poleis in the heading of the list of allies we cannot infer that all the communities subdued were actually poleis in the sense of being political communities of citizens. Nevertheless, we cannot preclude the possibility that the Athenians and the exiled democrats themselves would claim that the stronghold on Zakynthos was a polis (Dreher 1995 176–78).

There are in fact other possible examples of rebellious splinter communities which seem to have succeeded in being recognised as poleis by some of the major poleis. In 403 the Athenians treated the exiled Samians as the Samian people proper (IG 11° 1.44) and their representatives as “envoys” (49: πρεσβεία); and the Spartans seem in 370 to have claimed that the exiled Tegeatan oligarchs were the true Tegeatan state, not the democrats who had come to power (Xen. Hel. 6.5.36; cf. Gehrke, Stasis, 155).

However, other sources indicate that a group of exiles did not necessarily see itself as the polis in exile. In Siphnos in C4e the exiled oligarchic faction did in fact set up a kind of refugee government by electing a strategos autokrator and a grammateus; but their decision to attack Siphnos (now ruled by the democratic faction) is described as a “deecree of the refugees”, not a decree of the Siphnians or the Siphnian poleis, and the decision they make is to attack the polis of Siphnos (Isoc. 19.38–39).

To conclude: the exchange of words between Themistokles and the Corinthian general Adeimantos is the only unquestionable example of a community whose status as a polis is claimed by one person but denied by another. Also, there is nothing strange about the fact that a large group of exiles from a polis torn by stasis at least for a period tried to act as if they were the true polis. In our sources there is a remarkable agreement and a very little disagreement about which communities were poleis, and the inference is that, like the word “state” but unlike the word “democracy”, the word polis did not become a slogan, and its application to named communities seems only very occasionally to have been a bone of contention. Admittedly, there were no “international criteria”—such as membership in a body like the UN—by which it was formally decided whether a given political community was a polis or not. Yet the rules for participation in the Panhellenic festivals, principally the Olympic Games, may have served as a yardstick not too far removed from some modern international agreements about statehood. A competitor had to be “the legitimate son of free Greek Parents” and “officially registered on the citizen roster of his native city” (Finley and Pleket 1976 61). We suspect that far from all poleis had rosters of citizens, but our sources show that every victor had to be a member of a community that had ratified the Olympic truce and that he was proclaimed victor as a citizen of his polis as well as in his own right (Nielsen 2002 203–11).

2. How Consistent are our Sources in their Use of the Word Polis?

Next, are the sources consistent in the way they use the term polis?

Many historians are sceptical, and as an example I will quote Peter Rhodes’s reaction to the way the Copenhagen Polis Centre constructed its Inventory of poleis:

I suspect we shall find that the Greeks themselves were not wholly consistent in their use of the word. They did not have the advantages of being able to use Liddell and Scott or Ibycus; and we ought to add here that they could not benefit from the researches of the Copenhagen Polis Centre: that is, they were often not as tidy and systematic in their use of their language as a tidy and systematic scholar would wish, and the principle that any political entity which a Greek is known to have called a polis must have been a polis may not be a useful principle on which to base our research.24

This apparently cautious approach may open up a different pitfall for modern historians: whenever a site-classification found in the sources does not fit their understanding of what a polis ought to be, they are inclined to dismiss the source as untrustworthy. Let us quote the judicious comment of Edmond Lévy: “Les modernes savent—or croient savoir—mieux que les Anciens ce qu’est une cité, ce qui leur permet de reprocher à Hérodote d’appeler indûment telle localité une polis, d’afirmer que telle polis n’est pas une vraie polis ou de traduire à l’occasion, quand le texte grec ne correspond pas aux conceptions modernes, polis par ‘petite

24 Rhodes (1995) 91–92. This was written in 1994, and it has to be added that, in the light of the investigations conducted after the 1994 symposium, Peter Rhodes has taken a much more favourable view of the method adopted by the Polis Centre.
site-classifications to the same locality; (b) different authors looked out for two different types of inconsistency: cause no surprise. The term asty terms could be used about any type of settlement. A place polis is not an inconsistency, since it could be used synonymously is not an inconsistency. Let us adduce just two examples: if, as some scholars believe, Thorikos had been classified as a contemporary polis by Hekataios, or Eleusis by Ps.-Skylax, these would have been flagrant inconsistencies, since Thorikos and Eleusis were incontestably demes and since, in Classical Attika, demos and polis were mutually exclusive terms. On the other hand, to call a place polis in one passage but chorion in another one is not an inconsistency, since chorion is a vague term that could be used about any type of settlement. Similarly, the terms asty and polisma are often used synonymously with the term polis in its urban sense (infra 47–48), which should cause no surprise.

In following these guide-lines, we have in our investigations looked out for two different types of inconsistency: (a) one author (or text) applies different and incompatible site-classifications to the same locality; (b) different authors apply different and incompatible site-classifications to the same locality. We have found very few inconsistencies, and in some of these cases it can be debated whether there is an inconsistency at all. Let us adduce just one example of each type. (a) In Herodotos, both Anthele and Alponos are classified both as poleis and as komai.29 (b) When referred to at large, the perioikic communities in Lakonia are called poleis in all our sources (infra n. 22); some of the named perioikic cities are called poleis, e.g. Anthene and Thyrea, but others are called komai, e.g. Oion, Tyros and Belbina.30

Conversely, the sources testify to a considerable degree of consistency. It is no wonder that all sources refer to, e.g., Athens, Megara, Plateaiai and Naupaktos as poleis. But it is worth noting that the consistency applies to many small settlements as well. There seem, for example, to have been six urban communities on the Athos peninsula (including Sane). They are called poleis by both Herodotos and Thucydides, five are listed in Ps.-Skylax’s Periplous, and five turn up in the Athenian tribute lists (Hansen (1996a) 20).

The conclusion of our investigations is that the Greeks used the term polis with remarkable consistency. One of the few notorious inconsistencies is Herodotos’ double classification of Alponos and Anthele as both poleis and komai, to which we can probably add some of the sites called polis in one source but known from other sources as civic subdivisions. There was a grey area between polis and civic subdivision, be it a demos or a kome or a phyle, etc. But the grey area seems to have been small, as small or perhaps even smaller than the contemporary grey area between what is a state and what is not a state. Today we have truly independent states, members of the EU, federal states, member states of federal states, protectorates, autonomous regions and colonies. And yet we can claim “that there has been a surprisingly broad area of agreement about what constitutes the essential elements of the modern state” (Pierson (1996) 6).

25 I have once before had the same experience. Until recently it was universally accepted by modern historians that the C4 Athenians were inconsistent in their way of using the terms nomos and phephisma and that the assembly often legislated by phephisma although the passing of all nomoi rested with the nomothetai. A collection of all relevant sources showed that the Athenians were much more consistent in their legislative procedures and in their use of the terms nomos and phephisma than modern historians believed (without having examined the evidence). See Hansen (1983).


27 The so-called Marathonian μεταφόραλες, composed of four δήμοι, is a contradiction in terms; but the tradition about the polis of Tetrapolis is probably an invention of C7–C6, see no. 366, infra 625.

28 Compare, e.g., Hell. Oxy. 20.3, Chambers (where the small Boiotian communities synoecised with Thebes c.430 are called choria) with 21.5 (where the term chorion is used jointly with polis about Hyampolis, which was undeniably a polis in the political sense).

3. The Possible Change of Meaning of the Word Polis during the Period c.650–323

Our investigation covers the period c.650–323, but this span of more than 300 years forces us to address the question

29 Alponos: Hdt. 7.216.1 (polis), 7.276.5 (kome); Anthele: Hdt. 7.276.2 (polis), 7.200.2 (kome).

30 Polis applied to Thyrea (Thuc. 4.56.2–57.3), Thyrea and Anthene (Thuc. 5.41.3). Kome applied to Oion (Xen. Hell. 6.5.25–26); Tyros: (F.Delphes 111.1.68); Belbina: (CGF Comica Aedespora fr. 343).
whether the concept of polis was transformed to such an extent that we ought to split it up into a number of successive concepts rather than perceiving it as, essentially, one concept which, of course, underwent some changes in the course of the period. The obvious way of dealing with this problem is to compare the standard picture of the C4 polis with what we find in our oldest sources: some C7–C6 laws inscribed on stone and what we can find in the fragments of contemporary lyric and iambic poets and in Hesiod’s Erga.31

Let us repeat in greater detail what we stated more briefly before (p. 17): in the Classical period the polis was a small, highly institutionalised and self-governing community of adult male citizens (called politai or astoi) living with their wives and children in an urban centre (also called polis or, sometimes, asty) and its hinterland (called chorai or ge) together with two other types of people: foreigners (xenoi) and slaves. As a political community, the polis was felt to be one’s fatherland (patris) and it was identified with its citizens more than its territory. Thus, a city-ethnic, i.e. an adjective derived from the toponym denoting the urban centre, was used collectively as the name of the polis and individually as a kind of surname whenever a citizen from a polis was mentioned alongside citizens from other poleis. Adult male citizens possessed the monopoly of political decision making but they were often split up into opposing factions and rivalry might entail civil war (stasis). Furthermore, warfare between poleis was endemic; the defence of the polis was a central aspect of the community and the urban centre of the polis was usually walled.

Every single aspect of this description can be found in sources dating from c.600. The smallness of the polis is emphasised by Phokylides, a C6 Milesian poet.32 In a lost poem, paraphrased and echoed in numerous later sources, Alkaios argues that a polis is not just a town but a community. The personal sense of the word is emphasised at the expense of the urban sense, but the antithetical way of expressing his view reveals that others might prefer to describe a polis as a city in the urban sense of the term,33 a sense of polis explicitly attested in Archilochos.34 The walls of the polis referred to in the paraphrase of Alkaios’ poem are directly attested in other poets.35 So, as far back as our written sources go, the word polis is used to designate both a community of human beings and its physical setting, i.e. an urban centre and its hinterland, two parts explicitly juxtaposed in one of Tyrtaios’ poems.36 Next, a C7s law from Dreros demonstrates that the persons who make up the polis act as a political community.37 Here the polis in the sense of community is identified with its politai.38 In another poem by Alkaios the citizens are described as some who participate in the meetings of the assembly (agora) and the council (boule), both situated in the urban centre.39 The highly institutionalised character of the polis is apparent from Tyrtaios’ description of political decision making in C7m Sparta.40 Rivalry between opposing factions of citizens leading to stasis is a recurrent theme in Alkaios’ poems.41 Finally, a Solonian law testifies to an opposition between citizens (politai) and foreigners and shows that the citizens form a (small) privileged group different from and smaller than the inhabitants of the polis in the sense of a city with its hinterland.42 On the other hand, when Tyrtaios

31 In excluding references to poleis in a mythological context (infra 8), I refrain from using the two Homeric poems and the Theogony by Hesiod.

32 Phokylides fr. 4,Diels: πόλεις ἐν κοιπίσει κατά κόσμον οἰκεύσασα σωμή κρέσσων Νίνου ἀφραινούσης (“A small polis well settled on the top of a hill, is better than stupid Nineveh”).

33 Alkaios fr. 426, Lobel and Page: τῶν λόγων ἐν πόλει μὲν Ἀλκαίοις ὁ ποιητής εἴπε... ἀλλ’ ἄρα ὁ λόγος οὐδὲ ξύλον τῆς πόλεως εἰν’ ἄλλ’ ὅπου ποτ’ ἄλλων ἄνωθεν μὲν εἰς ἐνέγκεια καὶ τείχες καὶ πόλεις (“The statement once made by the poet Alkaios... that poleis are neither stones nor timber nor the skill of builders but both walls and poleis are to be found where there are men capable of saving themselves”). Hippoxon fr. 50.1: οἶκες δ’ ἕπιστη τῆς πόλεως (“He lives behind the city”) (Ephesos).

34 Arch. fr. 49.7: φοῖβα νότισσι περί πόλιν πολυμορφῶν (“A thief who wanders about the polis at night”), The reference is presumably to Thasos.

35 Schol. Pind. Ol. 8.42: στέφανοι γὰρ ἄστερον τῶν πόλεων τὰ τείχη καὶ Ανακρέων τὸν λόγον ὥσπερ τῶν πόλεων ὄλωλεν (Apoll. fr. 391, PMG) (“since the walls of the polis are like a crown, and Anacreon: the ‘crown of the polis has now been destroyed’”).

36 Tyr. fr. 10.3–4: τὴν δ’ αὐτοῦ προπλησίαν πόλις καὶ πόλις ἀργόν / σταυρόν πόλεων ἐπιδείχνομεν (“The worst fate of all is to have left one’s polis and rich fields and live as a beggar”). Cf. also Solon fr. 36.25: πολλὰς ἀνὴρ ἐκ νόμων ἡ ἐγκρήσα τῆς πόλεως (“the polis deprived of many men”) is not just the town of Athens but all of Attika.

37 ML 2.3–2 (law from Dreros, c.600): δ’ ἐνδε φόνε (“It was thus decided by the polis”).

38 The earliest attestation of the term poliētēs (“citizen”) is at Archr. fr. 109.1.

39 Alkaios fr. 130.17–23, Lobel and Page: ξύλῳ μαίροις ἀκρωτίοι πρότειται / μέρους ἀγάλματος ἀκούσα / καὶ τὴν θεοτικήν καὶ πάντων τῶν ἡρας ἔχοντες πέδα των δέων / τὴν δὲ πολικὺς ἀγαθών τούτων ἀνδρός (“The most glorious thing of all is to have left one’s polis and enjoy the wealth and benefits of one’s country”).

40 Tyr. fr. 4.3–5: ἔργοι καὶ βουλής θεωρημέκροι βασιλείας, / ὅπλα μέλλας Σάρπης / ἀλέγεσθαι τῆς πόλεως, / έπειτα τοῖς νόμοις, πόλεως πόλεως / μεταφερόμενοι τὴς κακήν τῆς πολικῆς τῆς διπλῆς ἁγιασάτε / καὶ βουλής νόμοις ἀντανακλῆσαι. (“The god-honoured kings shall rule the boule they who care for the lovely polis of Sparta, and the revered elders, and next the men of the people, answering with straightforward thetra. They shall speak what is good and what is just and shall not give the polis any (crooked) counsel. Victory and power shall rest with the multitude of the demos. For thus spake Phoibos to the polis about these matters.”).

41 Alc. fr. 70, 130, 326.

42 Plat. Solon 24.4 (fr. 75, Ruschenbusch): οὐκέτ’ ἄλογοι καὶ ὣς τῶν δημοποιίων νόμων, ὅτι γνώθηται πολίταις ὧδε δίδωσι πλῆθος φανείσων δει-
uses *polis* in its personal sense and speaks of how the whole *polis* mourns for a brave soldier killed in battle, women and children are undoubtedly included among those who constitute the *polis*.43 The *polis*’s mourning for a brave soldier reflects the ideology that citizens are expected to die for their *polis*, in this context conceived as their *patris*.44 Wars between *poleis* are attested in dedications set up in Olympia to commemorate one *polis*’s victory over another *polis*, and here the *poleis* are identified by city-ethnics in the plural,45 whereas city-ethnics used individually were inscribed *c.600* by Greek mercenaries on the statue of Rameses II in Abu Simbel.46

Thus, the essential elements in the concept of *polis* found in the late Classical period are all present *c.600*. The concept of *polis* had a core that persisted unchanged throughout the period in question. Writing about the *polis* in *C4m*, Aristotle can have had no difficulty agreeing with the Archaic texts quoted above, and if Alkaios had had an opportunity to read Aristotle’s *Politics*, he would undoubtedly have been familiar with the philosopher’s descriptions of the *polis*. How widespread this concept of *polis* was in *c.600*, and how many *poleis* there were in Alkaios’ day, are different questions which we want to address in a different context.

4. Possible Regional Variations in the Meaning and Use of the Word *Polis*

Not only chronological but also regional variations must be taken into account. One might suspect that the concept of *polis* in Athens was different from what people thought a *polis* was in Mantinea, or Thebes, or Pantikapaion, or Syria.47


44. *Ttyr*. fr. 10.1-2: εὐγενῆς γὰρ καλὸν ἐνὶ προμάχοισ καίειν / ἀρραβόντα πόλις µὴ ὑπερῆσαι (“It is good for a brave man to fall and be glorified in his *polis*”).

45. SEG 24 300: *Θηβαῖοι τῶν θεάτων* (“The Thebans from the Hyettians”) (C6s).

46. ML 7c: *Περίτοις µὲν ἔγραφε ἡ Ἱαλύσιου*.

47. Altogether 135 of the 242 *poleis* are called *polis* individually in at least one inscription. Another 107 *poleis* are recorded only in inscriptions in which *polis* is just a heading of a list of named communities. By far the longest such list is the one appended to the so-called Charter of the Second Athenian Naval League
testations are to the *polis* in general or to an unidentifiable *polis*. The main difference between Athenian and non-Athenian inscriptions seems to be that, in publication formulas, the sense of “acropolis” is very common in Attic inscriptions down to C4e, but virtually unattested outside Athens. Apart from that, a comparison of the occurrences of *polis* in laws, proxeny decrees, funerary epigrams, inventories and other types of public document from different *poleis* reveals that the similarities in meaning and reference predominate in inscriptions from the entire Hellenic world (Hansen (1998) 67–68; Flensted-Jensen, Hansen, and Nielsen (2000)).

Apart from Thucydides, our principal source for the meanings and uses of the term *polis* in C5 is Herodotos, and he was not an Athenian but a Halikarnassian who probably spent the last two decades of his life in Thourioi. If we focus on the intension of the term *polis*, we note, for example, that Herodotos and Thucydides both take a *bouleuterion* to be the public building which constitutes a *polis* in the sense of a self-governing community (Hdt. 1.170.3; Thuc. 2.15.2). And if we examine the extension of the term *polis*, we can compare the two historians’ classification of the Greek settlements from Argilos west of the river Strymon to Poteidaia on Pallene. Herodotos lists the *poleis* in this region in book 7 in connection with Xerxes’ march through Thrace. Thucydides treats the same region in book 4 in his description of Brasidas’ campaign in 424–422, and a number of the communities are mentioned again in the peace of Nikias. A comparison between the settlements called *polis* by either author reveals a remarkable agreement and there is no detectable disagreement (Hansen (1996a) 24).

In his book *How to Survive under Siege*, Aineias the Tactician treats the *polis* both as a (walled) urban centre and as a political community which has to make decisions about its defence. His views of the *polis* are so varied and illuminating that they have inspired a historian to write an article entitled “Polisbegriff und Stasistheorie des Aeneas Tacticus” (Winterling (1991); see esp. 205–11). Who Aineias was is still in dispute, but the prevailing opinion—to which we subscribe—is that he was Aineias of Stymphalos, general of the Arkadians in the 360s (Whitehead (1990) 10–13). Thus he provides us with another non-Athenian view of the *polis*, but nevertheless one which is indistinguishable from what we would have obtained if a similar investigation of the concept of *polis* had been based on Thucydides, Xenophon and Demostenes.

As stated above, the questions we ask concerning every community called *polis* in a contemporary source have been generated by our investigation of how the term *polis* is used in all sources: a *polis* struck coins, passed laws, waged war, was protected physically by its walls and spiritually by its protecting divinity, etc. *Polis* appears as the subject in a large number of sentences which illustrate the variety of the activities performed by the *polis*. A list of such activities, in each case matching an Athenian with a non-Athenian source, demonstrates that there is no difference between Athens and elsewhere in what the *polis* is supposed to do.

To the above examples must be added how other *poleis* are treated in Athenian sources. In the *Politics* Aristotle adduces some 270 historical examples to illustrate and exemplify his analysis of the *polis*. Only some thirty of his historical examples concern Athens, whereas the other 240 examples are drawn from a wide range of *poleis*, e.g. Lakedaimon, Syracuse, Kyrene, plus some eighty other *poleis*. The impression one gets from reading the empirical part of the treatise, viz. books 3–6, is that the work is far from being Athenocentric. It may, of course, be objected that Aristotle is interpreting all the other *poleis* and their constitutions in the light of the Athenian constitution, but in so far as we can check them, Aristotle’s generalisations about the *polis* seem to be based on the non-Athenian much more than the Athenian examples (Hansen (1998) 104–5).

To conclude: our non-Athenian sources are so numerous and varied that, with due caution, it seems perfectly possible to counteract any tendency to draw a too Athenocentric picture of the *polis*. Furthermore, a comparison between Athenian and non-Athenian sources indicates that an Athenian’s idea of a *polis* cannot have been radically different from what an Arkadian or a Milesian or a Syracusan thought a *polis* was. Quite the contrary.

---

48 In Attic inscriptions there are 115 attestations of *polis* referring to the Acropolis of Athens, plus the reference to the acropolis of Erchia in SEG 21 541. Outside Athens the only occurrences we have found are IG IV 492.3 (Mykenai);SEG 41 725B (Eretria); IG X11.1 977A.35, 39 (Lindoia); I.Ephesos 1.2 (Ephesos). In LDélos 104–24.9 *polis* is completely restored. In SEG 26 1282.5–6 (Erythraí) the article r5 shows that the sense is “town” and not “acropolis” (pace RO 17).
5. The Multiple Meanings of the Word *polis*

In the next section about the uses of the word *polis* it will be argued (1) that the word *polis* has several meanings; (2) that the two predominant meanings are “town” and “state”, with “territory” (= town plus hinterland) as a much less frequently attested third meaning; (3) that in many cases *polis* bears both the predominant senses simultaneously and can reasonably be rendered “city-state”; but (4) that in many other cases *polis* means either “town” or “state”. Now, if *polis* in the sense of town and in the sense of state was often used to denote essentially different objects, it would be a waste of time to draw up an Inventory of all *poleis*. Some of the entries would describe a town which was not the centre of a state, and others would describe a state which had no urban centre. The validity of the enterprise depends on the validity of one further observation made in the *Polis* Centre and therefore, for the fun of it, called the *Lex Hafniensis de civitate*.\(^{50}\)

It concerns the use of the word *polis* in ancient Greek texts down to c.300 and runs as follows:

[1] In Archaic and Classical sources the term *polis* used in the sense of ‘town’ to denote a named urban centre is applied not just to any urban centre but only to a town which was also the centre of a *polis* in the sense of political community. Thus, the term *polis* has two different meanings: town and state; but even when it is used in the sense of town its reference, its denotation, seems almost invariably to be what the Greeks called *polis* in the sense of a *koimonia politon politeias* and what we call a city-state.\(^{51}\)

The *Lex Hafniensis* applies to Greek *poleis* only. For the use of *polis* in relation to barbarian communities, see *infra* 36.

An examination of all prose texts down to the end of C4 shows that there are 447 Hellenic communities called *polis* in the urban sense in Archaic and Classical sources (listed in Hansen (2000c) 182–92).\(^{52}\) Of these 447 urban centres, sixty-three must be left out of consideration because there is no other source antedating c.300 or referring to the Archaic and/or Classical periods (listed in Hansen (2000c) 193 nn. 40–41). Consequently there is no way of having the *Lex Hafniensis* either confirmed or disproved. Of the remaining 384 attestations, only twenty are problematic (discussed in Hansen (2000c) 195–202). One occurrence flatly contradicts our observation: in *Poroi* 54 Xenophon proposes to build a *polis* in the mine district at Laureion and to have it populated with slaves. This imaginary nucleated settlement is the only unquestionable instance of a *polis* town which was not the centre of a *polis* state.\(^{53}\) There are nineteen other instances in which it is an issue whether an attested *polis* town was a *polis* state as well. If, in everyone of these nineteen cases, we prefer an interpretation that does not conform with our rule, it still applies in 95 per cent of all cases.

Even assuming that some, or even all, of the twenty problematic *poleis* were not *poleis* in the political sense, that does not necessarily imply that they are exceptions to the rule. The explanation may well be that the author is simply wrong. When Theopompos, for example, in fr. 149 calls Dystos (no. 369) a *polis* in the urban sense, he may have been mistaken about the site-classification in both the urban and the political sense: viz. Dystos was a *demos* of Eretria and not a *polis* in any sense of the term, but Theopompos erroneously believed that it was. In that case the connection between the urban and the political aspect of the *polis* is not in dispute, and the error is due to Theopompos’ ignorance concerning the social and political organisation of Euboia.

The *Lex Hafniensis* testifies to one side of the close connection between the urban and political aspects of the concept of *polis*: every *polis* town was the urban centre of a *polis* state. The other side is the converse proposition: that every *polis* state was centred on a *polis* town. A full investigation has yet to be conducted, but a preliminary overview of the evidence does in fact support the converse proposition (Hansen (2004)).

Of all the 1,035 communities recorded in this Inventory, 287 are called *polis* in the political sense in Archaic and/or Classical sources. Of these, 204 are known to have had a walled urban centre attested not later than C4L.\(^{54}\) For a further twenty-four *poleis* an urban centre is attested either archaeologically (Elis (no. 251)) or in literary sources (Aitna (no. 8)) or in both types of source (Sparta (no. 345)). Of the remaining fifty-nine *poleis*, twenty-three are unlocated and thirty-four unexplored, and in all these cases we must suspend judgement. Of communities called *polis* in the political sense there are only two for which no urban centre has been found, in spite of the fact that they have been fairly

\(^{50}\) For the meaning of *lex* in this context, see Hansen (2000c) 203–4.


\(^{52}\) The investigation was conducted in 1999. Additional information has resulted in a few minor revisions of the figures; see 75 n. 21. An updated survey will be published in a forthcoming volume.

\(^{53}\) Gauthier (1976) 188 notes how surprising it is to find *polis* used in this context: “Cela surprend d’abord, car les bourgades dispersées du Laurion, même si elles s’étaient rapidement développées, n’auraient jamais formé une ville, au sens où nous entendons ce terme.”

\(^{54}\) In fifteen cases, however, the walls are still undated and some of these are possibly (early) Hellenistic.
thoroughly investigated: Epitalion in Triphylia (no. 305) and Delphi in Phokis (no. 177).55

A different approach leads to the same result: of the 287 communities called polis in the political sense, 243 (including Delphi) are attested as a polis in the urban sense as well. Of the remaining forty-four poleis, so far attested in the political sense only, twenty-six had a walled urban centre, and for five others an urban centre is attested. Of the remaining thirteen poleis, six are unlocated, six uninvestigated; for Epitalion, see supra.

Comparing the two investigations, it can be added that seventeen of the unlocated and twenty-seven of the unexplored poleis in the political sense are attested as poleis in the urban sense as well. Future surveys or excavations may in any forty-four cases disclose the remains of walls and/or habitation quarters. For the Classical period the only examples of communities explicitly attested as a polis in the political sense but apparently without a nucleated centre which the Greeks would call a polis in the urban sense seem to be Delphi and Epitalion, of which Delphi is in fact called a polis in the urban sense.56 Of course, a polis town was only very exceptionally an urban centre inhabited by more than 10,000 persons, the minimum population of a “city” according to some modern historians.57 On the other hand, an ancient Greek polis centre seems in the great majority of all cases to have had a population of more than 1,000 inhabitants (cf. infra 139).

The overall conclusion seems to be that, in the eyes of the Greeks, every polis town was the centre of a polis state, and every polis state was centred on a polis town. This conclusion is valid for the Classical period, and especially for C4. To a large extent it is valid for the Archaic period too, as appears from section (3) supra and from the information assembled in the Inventory below.58 However, it must be remembered that, although the archaeological evidence about Archaic settlements grows rapidly every year, the collected data are still much too scanty to allow of any firm conclusion.

The approach of the Polis Centre and the method we have used to collect the evidence and build up the Inventory are, of course, endorsed by all members of the team. But they are not approved of by all scholars in the field. Quite the contrary. A trend among modern ancient historians is to dissociate the concept of state from the concept of town and to further dissociate both concepts from the concept of polis. One of the most prominent of these historians is John Davies. Under the heading “town formation, state formation and polis formation”, he writes:

The separation of these processes in ancient Greece is probably the most difficult, and yet the most essential, of all the disjunctions that need to be made. They overlap in every possible way: yet not all states were, or became, poleis (e.g. Thessaly), not all towns became the centres of poleis (e.g. Acharnai, Gonnos), not all poleis were towns [for example, Eutaia in Mainalia (Xen. Hell. 6.5.12)], and so on.59

A closer look at the examples adduced in support of the separation seems to point in the opposite direction. (a) Thessaly was not a state; it was, in some periods, a confederation (Hdt. 5.65.3, 4.78.3) consisting of the largest number of poleis in any Greek region (Xen. Hell. 6.1.14, 19; nos. 393–470).50 (b) Acharnai was not a town, it was a demos, i.e. a local community. It may have had a nucleated centre, but not necessarily (see 626 infra). If it had, it may have been a mere village, not a town, and so far no trace of a town of Acharnai has been found (Travlos 1988 1). (c) Gonnos (no. 463) was indeed a town, and it was certainly the centre

55 Excavations of the urban centre of Epitalion have, so far, disclosed remains of the Hellenistic and Roman periods. It cannot be precluded that future excavations will lead to the discovery of Classical material, or that the urban centre of Epitalion was moved to its present site in the Hellenistic period. It is perhaps more surprising that no remains of an urban centre have been found at Delphi, which twice in our sources is referred to as a polis in the urban sense (Hdt. 8.36.2; Ps. Skylax 37).

56 For the view that both Sparta and Mantinea were poleis in the urban sense, see Hansen (1997b) 35–37.


58 The presumption is that there were fewer cities in the Archaic period than in C4, but there may have been fewer poleis too. Around 600 many of the C4 poleis may not yet have been recognised as poleis and may not yet have had an urban centre.

59 Davies (1997) 29. The text in square brackets is n. 25 in which Davies also refers to Kolb (1984); Murray and Price (1990); Hansen (CPC Papers 1) and Hansen and Raaflaub (CPC Papers 2).

60 There is one source in which, perhaps, Thessaly is called a polis, i.e. schol. Eur. Rhes. 307 = Arist. fr. 498 (Rose) or fr. 504.1 (Gigon): . . . καθάπερ φοίτη Αμαστοτέλους ἐν Θησαλίαι πολιτεία γράβων ὀδύν ήδον ἐν τῇ πόλις Αλεύας ἄνωθεν κατά τῶν θησαμίων παράκλησιν, ἵππες μὲν τεσσάρων, ἄνδρας δὲ δίδοικηνετέαν (“As Aristotle says in the Constitution of the Thessalians where he writes: ‘subdividing the poleis Aleuas laid down that each district should provide 40 men cavalry and 80 hoplites’”). Larsen (1968) 17 believes that Aristotle here refers to all of Thessaly as one polis. That is not impossible, but it is unlikely. First, the text is emended by the editors: τὰς πόλεις (Arist. fr. 498, Rose) or τῆς πολιτείας (Schwartz, Arist. fr. 504.1, Gigon, who does not note that he prints a conjecture). Even if we accept the text of the manuscripts, we cannot be sure that Aristotle refers to all of Thessaly. The reference may be to Larisa (no. 401), which was a polis in the usual sense. This is the view advocated by Helly (1995) 170–91. That the reference must to be Thessaly is based on the assumption that Aristotle’s κοινή θησαλίαι πολιτείαι (fr. 502) was a description of the Thessalian federal constitution. But that may well be a misinterpretation of the title. Like the Cretan politeia, the Aristotelian constitution of the Thessalians may have been an ideal type, a description of a polis constitution, constructed from information drawn from a number of Thessalian poleis.
of a polis. It is explicitly called a polis in the urban sense by Herodotos (7.128.1, 173.4), referring to п/o. It is attested as a polis in the political sense in a decree of c.300 (SEG 36 566), and it struck coins in C4. (d) Eutaia (no. 270) is attested as a polis at Xen. Hell. 6.5.12, and we are told that the settlement had a defence circuit. The site (Lianos) has not been excavated, but the abundance of sherds and minor architectural members found in the fields fit Xenophon’s description of Eutaia as a polis in the urban sense.

From these examples and all the evidence assembled in this Inventory it follows that in Archaic and Classical Greece the concept of a state was interlocked with the concept of a town, and both concepts must be closely connected with the concept of polis.

6. Barbarian Poleis

Not only Greek but also barbarian towns are called polis by Greek authors; forty-seven named barbarian towns are labelled polis in Herodotos, seven in Thucydides, and twenty-one in Xenophon.

Sometimes these towns were actually urban centres of city-states. Thus, the Phoenician city and city-state Sidon is called a polis by Herodotos at 3.136.1, and in an Attic honorific decree for King Straton of Sidon the Sidonians are called citizens of Sidon (IG 11+ 141 = RO 21). Similarly, in Thucydides some Etruscan city-states are referred to as being poleis (6.88.6; cf. Arist. Mir. 837)”32), and so are the Elymean cities of Eryx and Egesta (6.2.3). Rome is classified as a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 5, and in C4 Rome was actually a polis in the political sense too.

Sometimes the Greek historians and geographers seem—erroneously—to have believed that barbarian towns were poleis in the political sense and that the political structure of, e.g., the Persian Empire was not essentially different from that of Hellas. In his description of the battle of Salamis, for example, Herodotos tells us that Xerxes ordered a scribe to record the name, patronymic and polis of any captain who distinguished himself in the fight (8.90.4); Herodotos seems to assume that every Persian captain belonged to a polis and could be identified by his city-ethnic. Similarly, in 7.96.2 he ends his list of all the contingents of the Persian forces with the remark that he will not bother to give the names of all the leaders, first because the leaders of the individual peoples (ethne) were not worth mentioning, and second because, in each people, there were as many leaders as there were poleis (Hdt. 7.96.2). Again, the political structure of the Persian Empire is represented as a plurality of ethne, each consisting of a number of poleis.

In most cases, however, the Greek authors must have applied the term polis to a barbarian urban centre knowing that, on the one hand, it was a nucleated settlement and, on the other hand, it was not a political community like a Greek polis. Herodotos says that there were 20,000 poleis in Egypt (2.177.1). He may have believed that there were 20,000 nucleated settlements, but we should not take him to believe that there were 20,000 self-governing polities. Again, in the Anabasis (1.2.14) Xenophon describes the Phrygian town Tyrieion as a polis in the urban sense (πόλις οἰκουμένη), but a recently found inscription shows that only in C2m, by royal rescript, was Tyrieion granted the right to be a fully Hellenised polis in the political sense (SEG 47 1745).

This observation, however, does not invalidate our investigation, which concerns exclusively the term polis used about Greek towns. The Greeks used their own term polis about barbarian towns, no matter whether they were self-governing communities or not. It would be unwise to reverse the line of thought and infer from the frequent use of polis about barbarian towns which were not city-states that it must have been used in the same way when applied to Greek towns classified as poleis. Let us illustrate this point by an ancient parallel and a modern analogy.

The Greeks were notorious for reading their own names, terms and concepts into foreign cultures. Thus, they readily equated foreign divinities with the gods of their own pantheon. In Herodotos’ account of Skythia we hear that Tabiti was Hestia, Papaios was Zeus, Apis was Ge, Goitosyros was Apollo, Argimpasa was Aphrodite, and Thagimasadas was Poseidon (4.59). We may find some common characteristic which can explain why, e.g., Argimpasa was called Aphrodite, but it would be a gross mistake from what we may know about Argimpasa to argue backwards and suppose that that must have applied to Greek Aphrodite as well.

The modern analogy concerns the European concept of a state. Since the nineteenth century, Europeans have been in the habit of referring to, e.g., the Bantu-speaking kingdoms in Uganda as “states” (Steinhart (1978)). Before 1967 these kingdoms were indeed political communities, and in some sense it is not wrong to call them states; but they were radically different from European states; the Europeans knew that they were applying their own concept of a state to a very different type of community, and it would be misguided in an analysis of the European concept of a state to take the labelling of these communities as states as an indication
that the term “state” was used in the same way in European politics and political thought. It would be equally misguided from the Greek habit of calling barbarian towns poleis to deduce that the Greeks must have used the term polis in the same way in relation to Greek towns.

The conclusion is that two separate investigations of the meanings and uses of polis must be conducted, one for Greek communities and one for barbarian, and only afterwards can a comparison be made in order to study similarities and differences. It must be added, however, that it is not always easy to distinguish the Greek from the barbarian poleis, and some poleis were mixed: e.g. the five poleis in Athos (Thuc. 4.109.4) and some of the poleis in the Thermaic Gulf, viz. Therme (Hecat. fr. 146), Pella and Ichnai (Hdt. 7.123.3). In other cases there are reasons to doubt that some poleis in border districts were at all Greek, e.g. Kadyanda, Pinara and Tlos in Lykia (SEG 36 1216.4). Our method has been to include in our Inventory both mixed poleis and poleis for which the sources leave room for doubt.
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Meaning and Reference of the Word *Polis*

It is the aim of this investigation to study what the Greeks themselves thought a *polis* was. Consequently, a survey of the term *polis* and the concept behind the term has to be an essential part of the study. The following is a summary of the investigation published in Hansen (1998) 17–34, where the sources are quoted both in Greek and in English translation.

Roughly speaking, the word *polis* had four different senses: (a) “stronghold” or “citadel”, (b) “nucleated settlement”, (c) “country” or “territory”, and (d) “political community”.

These four different meanings of the word *polis* have been established with reference to the modern terms we use: viz. stronghold, settlement, country, community, etc. This is what in linguistics is called a *lexical contrastive analysis* (Ascher (1994) 738). It is an indispensable method for modern historians who want to study ancient societies. But it must be supplemented with the question: were the ancient Greeks themselves conscious of a plurality of meanings of the term? Or is the attestation of four different meanings of the word *polis* just a result of the fact that we analyse an ancient concept through a modern language?

1. The Multiple Meanings of *Polis*

Of the many thousand occurrences of the word *polis*, there are in fact a few in which an author explicitly states that *polis* is a word with several meanings.

(1) In *Politics* 3.3 Aristotle discusses the identity of the *polis* and points out that *polis* is a word used in many different senses, of which two are specified in the passage: a topographical sense (a fortified place) and a personal one (the people inhabiting the place) (Arist. *Pol*. 1276a17–27).

(2) In the Platonic *Definitions* the *polis* is defined partly as a settlement (*oikesis*) of a number of persons (*anthropoi*) living under common decisions (*koina dogmata*), and partly as a number of persons (*anthropoi*) under the same law (*nomos*) (Pl. *Def.* 415C). Again, a topographical sense is distinguished from a purely personal one.

(3) According to the early Stoic philosopher Kleanthes, the *polis* is a habitation where people seek refuge for the purpose of administration of justice. Thus, *polis* is used in three different meanings: (a) about the settlement (*oiketerion*), (b) about the community of inhabitants (*systema anthropon*), and (c) about a combination of (a) and (b) (Stob. *Flor.* 2.7.11i p. 208, Wachsmuth). Similarly, the Stoic philosopher Chrysippos (SVF fr. 528) claims that *polis* has two different meanings: (a) a settlement (*oiketerion*) and (b) a community of inhabitants (*enoikountes*), together with the citizens (*politai*).

(4) The *Etymologicum Magnum* is a Byzantine lexicon based on a wide reading of the Classical literature, and its entry *polis* (680.1–4) corroborates the distinction pointed out by the other three sources: “*polis* has two meanings: the buildings, as in ‘Lead this unfortunate man to the *polis*’ (Hom. *Od*. 17.10, quoted from memory), but it signifies also the multitude and the people, as in ‘The whole *polis* of Trojans has come forth against them fearlessly’” (Hom. *Il*. 16.69–70).

All four sources oppose a local and a personal sense of the word *polis*. The two principal meanings, however, are not “town” and “state”, but rather “settlement” and “community” (or “multitude of human beings”). Yet Aristotle’s reference to walls and Kleanthes’ mention of people who take refuge in the *polis* show that what they have in mind must be a *nucleated* settlement; furthermore, that *polis* designates a *political* community is indicated by the references to men living under the same laws and to the administration of justice in the community.

2. Synonyms for *Polis*

If we want to go further than the opposition between the two basic senses of “settlement” and “community” and investigate the various connotations of the word *polis* recognised

---

1 Hansen (1996) 25–39. In this provisional listing of the four senses we have been careful to avoid the terms “city” and “state”.

2 For a judicious analysis of the Kleanthes fragment, see Schofield (1991) 130–35.
by the Greeks, we must make a new approach and study the words used synonymously with *polis*.

1. In the sense of stronghold and/or small hill-top settlement, *polis* can be used synonymously with *akropolis* (Thuc. 2.15.6, Athens (no. 361); IG xxi.1 677.13–19, Ialyssos (no. 995), c.300).

2a. In the sense of nucleated settlement, *polis* is used synonymously with *asty* (Dem. 18.215–16; Hdt. 4.201.3, Barke (no. 1025)) or *polisma* (Thuc. 1.107.2; Aen. Tact. 2.2, Sparta (no. 345)).

2b. In the sense of nucleated settlement, *polis* is occasionally used synonymously with *emporion* (Xen. Anab. 1.4.6; Ps.-Skylax 2, Emporion (no. 2)) or *teichos* (Hdt. 7.108.2, Mesambrie (no. 647)) or *phrourion* (Thuc. 8.62.3, Sestos (no. 672)). For a rare attestation of *polis* used synonymously with *kome*, see SEG 37 340.3–9 = RO 14, Helisson (no. 273).

3. In the sense of territory, *polis* is used synonymously with *ge* (Din. 1.77 compared with Lycurg. 1.89) or *chora* (Thuc. 2.72.3 compared with I.Prusias ad Hypium 135). For *polis* used synonymously with *chora* in the sense of country as a geographical rather than a political concept, see Poll. 9.27: “We must not pay attention to the poets who use the word *polis* even about countries (*chorai*), as for example Euripides in the *Temenidai*: ‘all of Peloponnesos is a prosperous *polis*’” (Eur. fr. 730, Nauck).

4. In the sense of community, *polis* is often used synonymously with *anthropoi* (Pl. Def. 415C), or *andres* (Thuc. 7.77.7; Alc. fr. 426), or *politai* about the population of a *polis* (Arist. Pol. 1274b4; IG iv 839 = Syll. 3 359.3–5 compared with IG iv 841.12, Kalauria (no. 360), C4–C3). Two frequent variants of this usage, both attested in Epidauros (no. 348) in C4, are (a) *polis* used synonymously with *demos* in the sense of people (*IG iv 1.51.1–2*), and (b) *polis* used synonymously with a city-ethnic in the plural denoting the citizenry (*IG iv 1.47.1–2*), both to be compared with SEG 26 445.

5. In the sense of community, *polis* often denotes the governing body of the *polis* in question, especially the popular assembly, and is used synonymously with, e.g., *ekklesia* or *demos* or *halia vel sim.*, see *IPArk*. 5.22–24, Tegea (no. 297), 324/3; SEG 43 310.1–4, Skotoussa (no. 415); C4–C3; *IG iv 1.615.1–2*, Epidauros (no. 348), C4. For an example of *polis* denoting the people’s court in Athens, see Dem. 43.72. When *polis* denotes the supreme body of government in an oligarchy, the reference is, e.g., to a *gerousia* (SEG 27 631.1, Lykto (no. 974), c.500).

6a. From *polis* used synonymously with a body of government there is only a hair’s breadth to the more abstract use of *polis* as a designation of the political community as such (*Syll. 3 172.1–3*, Histiaia (no. 372), 363/2; *Syll. 3* 278.5–7, Priene (no. 861), 334/3; *Syll. 3* 279.14–15, 25, Zeleia (no. 764), 334/3; *L.Lokris* 2.6–7, Lokris Epizephyrioi (no. 59), C4s. In this more abstract sense of the term, Aristotle describes the *polis* as a *koinonia politai* (Pol. 1276b2) or a *koinonia politikη* (Pol. 1252b7), see the following section.

6b. In the sense of community, *polis* is used synonymously with the general term for community or society, *viz. koinonia* (Arist. Pol. 1252a1–7). This usage is best attested in Aristotle and seems, in any case, to be restricted to philosophical texts, see also Pl. Resp. 371B, or the Stoic idea of a divine *polis* reflected in Dio Chrys. 36.23.

6c. In the sense of one’s country or fatherland, *polis* is often used synonymously with *patris* (Dem. 21.145; Pl. Cri. 51C; Thgn. 947, Megara (no. 225)); cf. infra.

7. In the sense of community, *polis* is, exceptionally, used synonymously with *ethnos* about a people inhabiting not just a town with its hinterland but a whole region or a part of a region (*SEG* 15 397, a C4 Chaonian *polis* in Epeiros compared with Theopomp. fr. 382 and Ps.-Skylax 28, the Chaonians settled in *komai*).

3. Synonyms for *Polis*

Distinguished from *Polis*

The investigation of the synonyms for *polis* can be taken one step further by investigating whether, in other contexts, the synonyms listed above are distinguished from *polis* or sometimes even opposed to *polis*.

Re 1: *akropolis*. In the sense of nucleated settlement, *polis* is normally distinguished from *akropolis*, which is the citadel lying inside the *polis* and sometimes protected by a separate defence circuit (Hyp. 6.17, Thebai (no. 221) 335; Xen. Hell. 4.4.15, Phleious (no. 355), C4e).

Re 2a: *asty* and *polisma*. To the best of our knowledge, there is no clear example of *polis* in the sense of a nucleated centre being distinguished from or opposed to either *asty* or *polisma*. *Polisma* seems almost always to be used synonymously with *polis* (in the sense of nucleated settlement);\(^3\) and whenever a distinction is made between *polis* and *asty*, it is *polis* in the sense of either country (Lycurg. 1.18) or

\(^3\) The only recognisable distinction is that *polisma* is mostly used about barbarian towns, towns in a remote past and towns in the border districts. The reason may be that such towns could be urban centres without being political centres as well. See Flensted-Jensen (1995) 129–31: Appendix: *Polisma*.  
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community (Thuc. 6.44.2; Diod. 7.16) that is distinguished from *asty* in the sense of town.

**Re 2b:** *emporion*, *teichos*, *phrourion* and *kome*. Almost all attested *emporia* of the Classical period were, in fact, *poleis* that possessed an *emporion*, in which case there is a clear difference between *polis* and *emporion* (Thuc. 1.13.5, Corinth (no. 257); Theopomp. fr. 62, Byzantium (no. 674)); but if this *emporion* was a prominent feature of the *polis*, it was common usage to say that the settlement was an *emporion* rather than to say that it had an *emporion* (Dem. 56.6, Athenai (no. 361); Thuc. 4.102.4 and Hdt. 7.113.1, Eion (no. 630)). Similarly, some *poleis*, especially dependent *poleis*, were essentially garrison towns and in such cases, too, it is only to be expected that the settlement was classified sometimes as a *teichos*, and sometimes as a *polis* (Hdt. 1.149.1, Neon teichos (no. 824); Dem. 3.4 and Hdt. 4.90.2, Heraion teichos (no. 676)).

Describing the effects of the Spartan occupation of Dekeleia, Thucydides notes that Athens became a *phrourion* rather than a *polis* (Thuc. 7.28.1).

**Kome**, however, is different: like village and town today, *kome* and *polis* are almost always mutually exclusive site-classifications, see Pl. Resp. 475D. The overlap between the two terms seems to occur principally when *kome* is used in a political sense about a subdivision of a larger *polis*, as in the case of Helisson (no. 273), which remained a *polis* in the urban sense but also in the political sense by acquiring the right to provide a chief magistrate, like the other *poleis*, i.e. the other *poleis* dominated by Mantinea (no. 281) (SEG 37 340 = RO 14 (C4f)).

**Re 3:** *Chora* and *ge*. The two pairs of words: *polis/chora* (SEG 37 340.3–9 = RO 14 (C4f), Helisson (no. 273)) and *polis/ge* (SEG 9 72.4–5 (C4f), Kyrene (no. 1028)) are essentially two pairs of antonyms, just like city/country in the modern world. However, by a common kind of participatory opposition, which linguists sometimes call semantic marking, both *polis* (Aen. Tact. 15.9–10) and *chora* (Arist. Pol. 1326b26 and 27a3–5) are attested as the generic term for the totality of town (*called polis*) and hinterland (*called chora or ge*). The use of the terms can be illustrated in the following way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>polis</em> (community or country)</th>
<th><em>chora</em> (hinterland)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>polis</em> (town)</td>
<td><em>chora</em> (hinterland)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a generic term, *polis* is attested far more frequently than *chora*. By accident, we believe, no single passage seems to have survived in which *ge* is used both as a generic term in the sense of country and in the specific sense of hinterland, being opposed to *polis*.

**Re 4:** *politai*. Sometimes the *politai* are distinguished from the *polis* in the sense of town (Xen. Hell. 3.1.21; IG 1° 40.4–6, Chalkis (no. 365) 446/5). Mostly, however, the distinction is between *polis* in a more abstract sense, denoting the political community as such (see 6a supra), and the *politai* as a physical manifestation of the community, i.e. “the people” (Thuc. 8.72.1; SEG 38 662.3–7, Poteidaia (no. 598), C4m). It is worth noting that *polis* and *politai* never occur as mutually exclusive terms in phrases like “the *polis* did this, but the *politai* did that”.

**Re 5:** *ekklesia* vel sim. The numerous attestations of a distinction being made between *polis* and *ekklesia* vel sim. should cause no surprise since, in such cases, *polis* refers to the community in a more abstract sense, whereas *ekklesia* specifically denotes the popular assembly (SEG 30 990.4–10, Corinth (no. 227), 325–275).

**Re 6a:** *koinonia* (politike). As already noted, *polis* is distinguished from the citizens (*politai*) or from the political institutions whenever it occurs in the more abstract sense of political community and designates a kind of public power above both ruler and ruled: see *Syll.* 359.3–8, Kalaureia (no. 360), C4.

**Re 6b:** *koinonia*. Aristotle claims that the political community is the supreme form of community and comprises all other forms of community, of which some are social, some are religious, and some are commercial, etc. (Arist. Eth. Nic. 1160b8–30). Thus, the *polis* is one specific type of *koinonia* distinguishable from other types, see, e.g., Pol. 1252a30–31: “consequently, every *polis* exists by nature, as much as the original *koinoniat*”. Yet, although *polis* is one of several types of *koinonia*, there is no trace in the sources of an opposition between *polis* and *koinonia* corresponding to our opposition between state and society.

**Re 6c:** *patris*. There is no attestation of *polis* and *patris* being used as antonyms; but from a Panhellenic perspective, Hellas could be described as the *patris* and contrasted with the individual *poleis* (Isoc. 4.81). Lysias severely criticises the cosmopolitan view that one’s *patris* is not one’s *polis* but wherever one happens to live and own property (Lys. 31.6).

**Re 7:** *ethnos*. Like *polis* and *chora*, *polis* and *ethnos* are

---

4 Quoting an oracular response of c. 500 allegedly given to King Perdikkas of Makedonia, see Hatzopoulos (1996) i. 464–65.


6 For a full discussion of *polis versus chora* or *ge*, see Hansen (1997a) 20–25.

7 Lyons (1977) i. 307–8. As an example, consider the antonyms *νύξ* and *νύκτα*. Like the English word “day”, *νύξ* can denote both the 24-hour period and the daytime as opposed to the night hours, whereas *νύκτα* invariably means “night”.

The synonymous use of *polis* and *ethnos* is, in almost all cases, due to the fact that *polis* could be used as a generic term for “political community”, comprising not just the small *poleis* which we today call city-states but also other types of political community, such as whole regions which were not (yet) split up into *poleis* (e.g., Aitolia), or federations often composed of *poleis* (e.g., Boiotia), or large kingdoms (e.g., Makedonia). This usage is particularly common in headings (Hansen (1997b)), and is found both in documents and in literary sources: the list of members of the Second Athenian Naval Confederacy is headed by the phrase: “these *poleis* were allied to the Athenians” (IG 11 43,78); but in addition to forty-four *poleis* in the strict sense, the list includes three rulers, two federations and at least one splinter community (Dreher (1995) 174–81). Thucydides opens his account of the Peloponnesian War with a survey of the allied *poleis* of, respectively, the Lakedaimonians and the Athenians: “Each of the two parts went to war having the following *poleis* as their allies” (Thuc. 2.9.1); but then he lists peoples like the Boiotians, the Lokrians and the Phokians side by side with proper *poleis* such as Megara, Ambrakia, Leukas and Anaktorion. Since *ethnos* was commonly used to designate any form of political community that was not a *polis* in the proper sense, the opposition between *polis* and *ethnos* is, essentially, an example of the same kind of semantic marking as in the case of the antonyms *polis/chora* and it can be illustrated in the following way:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{polis} & \text{poleis} & \text{ethnos} \\
\end{array}
\]

In references to an individual political community, on the other hand, attestations of *polis = ethnos* are few and far between, see Hansen (1998) 124–32.

4. The Relative Importance of the Different Meanings

To sum up: a study of the sources that avoids a contrastive lexical analysis leads to the conclusion that *polis* is attested in the following different senses: (1) *akropolis*, (2) *asty* or *polisma*, (3) *chora* or *ge* (especially when *polis* is used as a generic term for *polis + chora*), (4) *polites* or *anthropoi*, (5) *ekklesia* or some other supreme body of government, (6) *koinonia* (*politike*) or *patris*, and (7) *ethnos* (especially when the plural form *poleis* is used as a generic term for *polis + ethne*).

The senses are listed here in what is generally believed to be their historical sequence, but they are all attested in sources of the Archaic period so that the sequence is a reconstruction behind the sources we have. On the other hand, they are not equally important and some hardly ever occur.

(a) It is well known that the original sense of stronghold (*akropolis*) is rare in Archaic texts and, apart from some frozen formulas, it disappears in the course of the Classical and Hellenistic periods. A study of the relative frequency with which the different senses occur shows that, apart from the frequent occurrence of *polis = akropolis* in early Attic inscriptions, attestations of *polis* in the sense of stronghold amount to fewer than three per thousand of all attestations.

There are in particular two passages in Thucydides which illustrate that even in Athens, where the formulaic use of *polis* in the sense of *akropolis* was widespread, an Athenian would not have the meanings “stronghold” or “citadel” springing to his mind when he heard the word *polis*, except, of course, when it was applied in one of the frozen formulas. In all other cases the word *polis* would not be used synonymously with, but rather distinguished from or even opposed to, *akropolis*.

When Thucydides tells us that the Acropolis was called *polis* by the Athenians, he points out that the reason for this usage is that the Acropolis was once the centre of the urban settlement (Thuc. 2.15.6; cf. also Phokylides fr. 4, Diehl). Again, when Deceleia was fortified and all grain had to be brought by sea to Athens, Thucydides makes the comment that Athens had become a fortress (*phrourion*) instead of a *polis* (Thuc. 7.28.1). This would be a strange comment if *polis* had been commonly used as a synonym of *akropolis*.

---

9 On the sequence of the senses of (a) “nucleated settlement” and (b) “political community”, see Hansen (1997a) 37–42.
11 In Attic inscriptions there are, at present, some 120 occurrences (many of them restored) of *polis* designating the Acropolis. For 394/3 as the terminus ante quem, see Henry (1982). But in the sacrificial calendar of Erechia, dated to c.375–350, there are eight occurrences of *polis*, two designating the Acropolis in Athens, and six the local acropolis in Erechia.
polis in the sense of stronghold or fortress. On the contrary, the comment suggests that a polis was, essentially, different from a phorourion, i.e. a town, not a fortress.

(b) Passages in which “country” or “territory” is the principal sense of polis constitute fewer than 2 per cent of all occurrences (infra 44). It must be added, however, that in numerous passages “territory” or “country” is a connotation that goes with the principal sense of (nucleated) settlement or (political) community or both, cf., for example, Lys. 3.10: “I was so much in doubt about what to do in face of my opponent’s lawless behaviour that I decided to leave the polis.” The context shows that the plaintiff preferred to leave not just the city of Athens, but also Attika.

Again, the territorial sense of polis is intertwined with the urban and the political sense when polis is used in the generic sense of community comprising a nucleated settlement (polis) and its hinterland (chora or ge), see Lycurg. 1.38: “To such a pitch did he carry his treason that, so far as his decision went, the temples were abandoned, the posts on the wall unmanned and the polis (town) and the chora (hinterland) left deserted. And yet in those days, gentlemen, who would not have pitied the polis (community)?” Or when polis is used in the generic sense of settlement comprising a nucleated settlement (plethos oikion) and its hinterland (chora or ge), see Arist. Oec. 1343a10–11: “a polis is a mass of houses (oikiai), of hinterland (chora) and of possessions sufficient for a good life”.

Thus, in the overwhelming majority of all passages polis is used either in the sense of nucleated settlement or in the sense of political community. But, as noted by Kleanthes (supra 39), the two senses of settlement and community are often combined and indistinguishable, as is attested, for example, at Thuc. 4.49.1: “At the end of the summer the Athenians and Akarnanians in Naupaktos waged war against Anaktorion, a Corinthian polis, and took it by treason.” The description of Anaktorion as “the Corinthians’ polis” indicates that it was a dependent polis, i.e. a political community; but the piece of information that they “took it by treason” shows that the polis was also a fortified town which the Athenians conquered because it was betrayed to them by some traitors behind the walls.

To sum up: the ancient definitions indicate that polis was used in two basic meanings: (1) a settlement, and (2) a community. The study of synonyms, on the other hand, shows that, in the sense of settlement, a polis was almost invariably a nucleated settlement, i.e. an asty, and only exceptionally an akropolis. In the sense of community, the polis was almost invariably a politike koinonia, i.e. what we call a “polity” or a “state”, sometimes identified with its territory (consisting of a polis with its chora), sometimes with its population (especially its body of politai), sometimes with its political institutions (especially its ekklesia), and sometimes conceived as an abstract public power above the citizens and their political institutions.

Furthermore, when used as a generic term denoting a number of named political communities, polis comprised not just poleis in the meaning of the word described above (a polis with its chora organised as a koinonia politon politias), but all types of community which in other contexts were usually classified as ethne or koina.

The rare attestations of polis denoting a chora in the geographical sense without being a political community (see section 3 supra re 7) are best explained as an extension of the much more frequent use of polis to denote the territory of a political community. And the exceptional attestations of polis denoting an individual ethnos should be seen in the light of polis used as the generic term for poleis plus ethne. Both usages are so marginal that further discussion can safely be relegated to appendix I in Hansen (1998) 124–32.

5. The Classification of the Different Meanings in this Inventory

The above analysis covers both occurrences of polis used in general about any polis or all poleis, and occurrences of polis denoting one or more named poleis. As stated above, in this Inventory references to the polis in general are irrelevant, and the focus is on attestations of polis applied to one or more individual poleis. For all practical purposes they can be included under one of the three following principal meanings: “territory”, “city” and “polity”. There are, of course, numerous overlaps, i.e. occurrences of polis where one of the three senses is the principal meaning and one or both of the others are connotations. To illustrate how we distinguish between the different senses, we find it expedient to list some examples which show that it is possible to isolate occurrences of polis (a) used in the urban sense without the political, (b) used in the political sense without
the urban, (c) used in the territorial sense without either of the other two senses, and (d) used in two or three senses simultaneously.

Re (a): polis in the urban sense is attested, e.g., when a polis is opposed to its hinterland (called choror ge);14 when one walks from the polis into the fields, or returns from the fields into the town;15 when the distance from a polis is measured in stades;16 when a road leads towards the polis;17 when a house is lying in the polis;18 or the reference is to the higher-lying part of the polis;19 or to the water supply of the polis;20 when a cult festival is celebrated outside the polis;21 when a defence circuit is built around a polis;22 when a polis is besieged,23 or set on fire,24 or destroyed;25 when, during a civil war, the state is split up into one faction in control of the town while the other faction is driven out of the town.26

Re (b): polis in the political sense is attested when a polis

---

14 Dem. 18.203 speaks about the Athenians in 480, οί καὶ τὴν χώραν καὶ τὸν πόλιν ἐξελπίζοντας καὶ τὰς τρίμεθες ἐμβατεῖς (“who endured to go on board the ships and leave their chora and polis”).

15 Dem. 47.6: ὅ δ’ Ἐφρογος αὐτοῖς ἔδωκε ἐν τῇ πόλεις . . . ἐθνίων ἐς ἀγορή (“but this Euergos went straight from the polis to the field (agros)”). Xent. HELL. 5.4.4: the Theban liberators in 799 πρὸς τὰς πόλεις ἠλέων, ὡς δὴ ἐς ἀγορά ἀπέκδωσαν . . . ἐνεῖ ἐνδώλῃ ἐς τὴν πόλις (“they came to the gates as if they came back from the fields (agros) . . . but when they had entered the polis”).

16 Ρε-Σκλαξ 33: Ἴμβρωνα πόλις Ἑλληνίδος, ἀνέλικη δή αὐτῇ ἀπὸ παλαιτίς σφάλμα τ’ (“Ambrakia is a Hellenic polis situated 80 stades from the sea”).

17 IG Ιv.1 116.20: ἐν τῇ ἀκολούθου ἐς πόλιν ἀγοράς[να] (“on the road that leads to the polis”).

18 SEG 43 713.35–36: τὴν ὀικίαν τῆς πόλεως φαίνει ὡς πόλις, (“the house in the polis”).

19 I.Cret. ιβ11.32: τέγανς ἑπὶ τῆς ἐν τῇ πόλει . (“the houses in the polis”).

20 Thuc. 1.93.1: οἱ Θεσποι τῆς πόλεως ἐπέκτωσαν (“The Athenians fortified the polis”).

21 Thuc. 1.116.2: ἐπαύγωσαν τὴν πόλιν ἐς Ἀγοράς (“They (the Athenians) laid siege to the polis (Samos) by means of three walls and at the same time they besieged it from the sea”).

22 Hdt. 8.50.2: ἡ γῆ δὲ Βαυσίων χαλκεούσα συντήρησε ἄρα . . . ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ θεσσαλίου (“The Phokians were annihilated and their polis burnt”).

23 Dem. 18.36: τὰ τῶν συνέχας μετά ταίρων ἐδόθην ὡς καὶ μεταξύ τῶν συντήρησεν τῶν πόλεως αὐτῶν (“What happened immediately hereafter? The Phokians were annihilated and their polis pulled down”).

24 Syll. 141.4: τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλις (“Having returned the inhabitants of the polis”).

25 Thuc. 116.2: ἐπαύγωσαν τῆς πόλεως ἐς Ἀγοράς (“They (the Athenians) laid siege to the polis (Samos) by means of three walls and at the same time they besieged it from the sea”).

26 Hdt. 8.50.2: ἡ γῆ δὲ Βαυσίων χαλκεούσα συντήρησε ἄρα . . . ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ θεσσαλίου (“The Phokians were annihilated and their polis burnt”).

27 ML 2.1: δ’ ἔδαχε πόλις (“Thus it was decided by the polis”) (Drexos (no. 956) C7).

28 I. Locr. (Costabile) 2.6: ἐγρήγορο ὁ πόλις πώς τοίς θεοῖς (“The polis bowed to the God”).

29 IG Ιv.1 112.77: ἐδώσε τὰ πόλις ἐς Ἀγοράς ἀποστέλλει χρησμοῦνως . . . (“It was decided by the polis to send messengers to Delphi to ask . . .”).

30 Hdt. 6.74.2: ἐν τῇ πόλις ἐξέκοψαν πολέμου καὶ τηλείου (“They cast lots for the war”).

31 Hdt. 7.38.2: ὅ δ’ ἔδωσε συντήρησιν . . . ἐξελπίσα τὴν ἱδίου διὰ τῆς Χερσο-

32 ἱονίων . . . διὰ μέσης δὲ παρακολουθημένος πόλις τῆς ἐν τῇ αἱτία τῆς ἁγήρας (“The land made its way through the Chersonesians . . . and marched through a polis called Agore”).

33 Xen. Hell. 5.4.49: ἐν τῇ πόλις τῶν Θεσποι τῶν πόλεως ἐν τῷ ἔδωσε συντήρησιν (“The Arkadians say that the waters of Styx are in that polis”).

34 Hdt. 8.50.2 ὁ δ’ ἔδωσε συντήρησιν . . . ἐξελπίσα τὴν ἱδίου διὰ τῆς Χερσο-

35 ἱονίων . . . διὰ μέσης δὲ παρακολουθημένος πόλις τῆς ἐν τῇ αἱτία τῆς ἁγήρας (“The land made its way through the Chersonesians . . . and marched through a polis called Agore”).

36 Xen. Hell. 5.4.49: τὸ πρῶτο ἔδωσε συντήρησιν τῶν Θεσποι τῶν πόλεως ἐν τῷ ἔδωσε συντήρησιν (“The Arkadians say that the waters of Styx are in that polis”).
πόλεις τὰς μὲν ἄλλας κεκλείσθαι, μένω δὲ ἀνεώχθαι (“When a polis is in a state of terror the following precautions too are needed. Keep all gates closed except one” (trans. Whitehead)). The polis stricken by fear is a community of citizens, but the reference to the gates indicates that it is also a walled settlement. Hdt. 8,35:1 καὶ γὰρ τῶν Πανοπέων τὴν πόλιν ἐνέπρησαν καὶ Δαυλίων καὶ Αἰολιδέων (“They (the Persians) set fire to the polis of the Panopeans, and to those of the Daulians and Aiolideans as well”). The polis set on fire is, of course, a town, but the identification of the polis by the city-ethnic instead of the toponym shows that it is also a political community.34

Polis used in the urban and territorial senses simultaneously is attested in, e.g. I.Cret. IV.144,9–11 τοῖς ἐμ ἀρχὶ ἄριστῳ διόκονται τοῖς (τοὺς ἐκλευθέρους καὶ τοὺς δώλοις (“Those who live in the polis, both free and slaves”). The reference must be to all free and slaves who live in the polis of Gortys, i.e. the urban and rural population combined. Xen. Hell. 6,5,12 καὶ καταλαβὼν πόλιν ἄμορφον οὕσαν Ἐνταίαν . . . ἀμος οὖν ἠδόησε τὴν πόλιν (“Having conquered the polis of Eutaia, which bordered [on Mantinea], he [Agesilaos] did no harm to the city”). When Eutaia (no. 270) is described as bordering on Lakedaimon, polis is used in the territorial sense, but from the following description it is clear that the polis taken by Agesilaos is the urban centre inhabited by the old, the women and the children while the adult males of military age are on campaign.

Polis used in the political and territorial senses simultaneously is attested in, e.g. SEG36 750,14–16: αἱ μὲν κεῖ τις δίκαια γεγονόμαι καὶ τὸν νόμον φύγῃ ἐκ τὰς πόλεις ἢ ἀπεθάνῃ . . . (“If one in a trial in accordance with the law is sentenced to exile from the polis or to death . . .”). (Mytilene, c.340–330). A sentence of exile from the polis applies specifically to the territory but in a wider sense to the community as such. Xen. Hell. 4,4,6: αἰσθανόμενοι ἀφαιρεσίνην τὴν πόλιν διὰ τὸ καὶ ὅρους ἀναστάθαι καὶ Ἀργος ἀντὶ Κορίνθου τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ ὄνομάζεσθαι (“They (the Corinthians) felt that their polis was being wiped off the map by the removal of the boundary stones and by their fatherland being called Argos instead of Corinth”). Here the community as such is being destroyed by the removal of the stones marking the boundary of the territory.

Of all the numerous occurrences of polis used in all three senses simultaneously, it suffices to quote one non-Athenian and one Athenian example. (a) Hdt. 7,22,3–23,1: ἐν δὲ τῷ ἱσθμῷ τοῦτῳ, ἐὰς τὸν τελευτᾶ ὁ Αθω, Σάνη πόλεις Ἐλλάς οἰκήται, αἱ δὲ ἐκτὸς Σάνης, ἐςω δὲ τοῦ Ἀθω οἰκημέναι, τὰς τότε ὁ Πέρσης νησιώτιδας ἀντὶ ἄσιοτριών ὄργανον ποιέων, εἰς αἰὲ, Διὸν, Ὄλυμπος, Κρόνιος, Θάσας, Κλεωνᾶι. πόλεις μὲν αὐτὰ αἱ τὸν Ἀθῶν νέμονται (“In this neck of land where Athos ends is built a Hellenic polis: Sane, and those built in Athos south of Sane—which the King of Persia then planned to turn into island poleis instead of mainland poleis—are the following: Dion, Olophyxos, Akrothoon, Thyssos and Kleonai. These are the poleis that inhabit Athos”). When Herodotos lists the six poleis which are situated on Athos, he thinks of them as towns with territories, but the verb οἰκεῖσθαι (“to be inhabited”) connected with polis suggests the town more than the territory, whereas the verb νέμεσθαι (“inhabit”) suggests as its subject the inhabitants of a town rather than the town itself; moreover, the reference to Sane as a Hellenic polis indicates that the six settlements are conceived as polities as well; thus the word polis is probably intended to convey all three meanings simultaneously: town, territory and state. (b) Xen. Hell. 2,2,9: Ἀλσιάδροσ δὲ ἀφικόμενος εἰς Αἴγιναν ἀπέδωκε τὴν πόλιν Ἀγινήταις (“When Lysandros came to Aigina, he gave the polis back to the Aiginetans”). In this case it does not make sense to distinguish between the various meanings. What Lysander gave back to the Aiginetans was the city, the island and the political community as such.

Finally, it must be admitted that it is not always easy to determine when a named locality is specifically called polis. Sometimes one named town is classified as a polis, e.g. Aen. Tact. 18,13: Τέως πόλις εἱμεγέθης; sometimes a number of named towns are classified collectively as poleis, e.g. Hdt. 1,144,3: διὰ ταῦτα τὴν αὐτὴν αἱ πέντε πόλεις, Λίνδος καὶ Ἡλισός τε καὶ Κάμιρος καὶ Κῶς τε καὶ Κνίδος, ἔζεξικλήσαν τὴς μετοχῆς τὴν ἐκτην πόλιν Ἀλκαρχησίον (“For this reason the five poleis, Lindos, lalysos, Kamiros, Kos and Knidos, excluded the sixth polis Halikarnassos from membership [of the Dorian Hexapolis]”). This passage is unproblematical. We learn that there were altogether six poleis, and there are six toponyms to match the site-classification. But if the classification takes the form of, e.g., αἱ δὲ πόλεις followed by a number of toponyms, we cannot always be sure that all the toponyms listed were actually intended to be understood as poleis.35 In some passages polis is used as a generic term or a heading, and in such cases whole peoples—e.g. ἑθνη which are never called polis when referred to individually—may be listed alongside communities which are frequently classified as poleis in other sources.

34 Three further examples are Hdt. 7,154,2, Xen. Hell. 5,2,3 and Hell. Oxy. 21,5.

35 This point is especially relevant in the case of Ps.-Skyx, see Hansen (1996) 30–32 and Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 140–43.
(Hansen (1997b), supra 7). To illustrate this problem, let us adduce four examples, two from literary and two from epigraphical sources.

Herodotos’ list of poleis fighting in the battle of Salamis is sandwiched between the phrases πολλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ πλεύνες νέες ἢ ἐπί Αρτεµισίων ἑναμάχεοι καὶ ἀπὸ πολλῶν πλεύνων (“Many more ships were gathered than those involved in the naval battle of Artemision and from many more poleis”) (8.42.1) and ὡς δὲ ἐς τὴν Σαλαµῖνα συνήλθουν οἱ στρατηγοὶ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰρήμενων πολιῶν (“When the generals from the above-mentioned poleis had convened at Salamis”) (8.49.1). All the twenty-two communities listed as poleis in 8.42.8 happen to be poleis in the sense of city-states. But in Thucydides’ list of Athenian and Spartan allies in the Peloponnesian War, the heading πόλεις δὲ έκάτεροι τάδε ἔχοντες ξυµµάχους (2.9.1) includes a number of ethne, none of which was a poleis in the usual sense, e.g. the Boiotians, the Lokrians and the Phokians.

In the Delphic accounts of contributions to the rebuilding of the temple of Apollo of the year 361/60, all seven communities listed under the heading Πλεύνων πόλεις καὶ ἰδιώται ἐπάρξαντο (CID 11 4.1.1–11.29) were actually city-states. But in the so-called Charter of the Second Athenian Naval League, the heading Αθηναίων πόλεις ἀιδε σύµµαχοι (IG II 43.79) is followed by a list of forty-three city-states, three dynasts, two federations and one splinter community (Dreher (1995) 181, 189–91). From the use of poleis as a heading it would be a mistake to conclude, e.g., that the three monarchies and two federations listed in IG II 43 were poleis; but it would equally be a mistake to take the heading as decisive evidence that the forty-three other communities were actually poleis. For each and every community this piece of information must be established from other sources in which poleis is applied specifically to the community in question. From poleis as a heading we can infer that most of the communities listed were believed to be poleis, and sometimes they all were, but we must always be aware of the universal custom: under a term used as a heading to subsume some instances that do not fit the term to perfection (Hansen (1997b) 9–11).

The conclusion is that each occurrence of poleis must be studied in context. There is no way of laying down a general rule for how to handle this problem, but we have decided that, in the Athenian tribute lists and in the list of members of the Second Athenian Naval League, poleis must be treated as a mere heading. Thus, if an ethnic or a toponym is recorded in these lists, we cannot take it as evidence that the community in question was called a poleis in the political sense; we can only infer that the community must have been a political unit.
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Meaning and Reference of the Words Asty and Polisma

In Archaic and Classical Greek texts *polis* is by far the most common word for what we call a “town” or “city”. But the Greeks had a number of other words, viz. *asty*, *polisma*, *polismation*, *polichne* and *polichnion*. The three last words can be ignored in this context. They are frequently found in texts from the Hellenistic and Roman periods, but hardly ever attested in older sources. *Asty* and *polisma*, however, are important site-classifications in sources from all periods.

(1) *Asty*. It is a well-known fact that the two most common meanings of the word *polis* in Classical sources are “town” and “state”, and that the word *asty* is used synonymously with *polis* in the sense of town, but never in the sense of state. It has also been noted that *asty* is a fairly common word in the *Iliad* and in other Archaic texts, but becomes more and more rare in the Classical period and is gradually replaced by *polis* (Lévy (1983)).

To these generally accepted truths we have added two further observations: (a) that there are passages in the Archaic sources where *asty*, like *polis*, denotes the community and not just its urban centre, and (b) that the derivative *astos* never has the sense of “city-dweller” or “town-man” but invariably designates a person of citizen birth (whereas *polites* usually designates a person with citizen rights). Thus, the distinction between *asty* in the sense of urban centre and *polis* in the sense of political community is not quite as sharp as sometimes believed, and it is further reduced by a study of attestations in Archaic and Classical sources of *asty* applied to named urban centres. The collection of these attestations in Index 6 shows that the term *asty* is not used about any urban centre, but exclusively about a town which in the same source or in other sources is called *polis* and is known to have been the urban centre of a *polis* in the political sense. Although *asty* does not mean an urban centre of a political community, it invariably denotes such a centre.

The Index comprises references to named Hellenic towns of the late Archaic and Classical periods. We have omitted references in poetry to mythical towns, such as Troy or Tiryns in the Heroic Age, as well as references to barbarian towns, such as Sardes or Babylon. Due to the Athenocentric nature of our evidence, the majority of all references to the term *asty* in Classical sources are to the city of Athens, often opposed to its port, the Peiraieus. And this imbalance—well known in all studies of ancient Greek society—is in this particular case further aggravated by the general custom in all sources to refer to the two parts in the civil war of 404–403 as οἱ ἐκ Πειραίεως (i.e. the democrats) and οἱ ἐξ Ἀστεώς (i.e. the oligarchs). Yet there is still a fairly substantial number of scattered passages in which the word *asty* is used to express the concept of town in general or to designate named towns other than Athens; and the attestations show that all the urban centres described with the term *asty* are *poleis* in the political sense. The only problematical site is Eion, for which, however, see Hansen (2000) 197–98. Finally, it is worth noting that the word *asty* held its ground in poetry longer than in prose, and that it was used not only about large *poleis*, such as Athens and Thebes, but also about *poleis* which the Greeks themselves considered to be very small, viz. Plataiai and Tenos.

(2) *Polisma*. Like *asty*, *polisma* signifies a city in the urban sense, and like *asty* it is commonly used in poetry as well as in prose about mythical and/or barbarian towns. Unlike *asty*, however, *polisma* occurs almost exclusively in literary sources. The only attestation in inscriptions is in a 5th century decree from Kos in which Halasarna is called a

---

1. Asty and *polisma*, however, are important site-classifications in sources from all periods.
3. Polisma (Ephor. fr. 27); πολίχνη (Thuc. 7.4.6); πολίχνιον (Isoc. 5.145, 12.89; Pl. Resp. 370D). However, three Classical *poleis* were named *polichne*, viz. no. 789 in Troas (Strabo 13.1.45), no. 860 in Ionia, and no. 982 on Crete (Steph. Byz. 532.4–5). It is worth noting that only the city-ethnics are attested in Classical sources. The toponyms of nos. 789 and 982 are attested in late sources only, that of no. 860 is not attested at all, but reconstructed from the city-ethnic. Finally, Polichna was the name of the settlement to which the Klazomenians moved their urban centre in Cyl (Thuc. 8.14.3; 8.23.6) and the name of a settlement in the territory of Chios (Hdt. 6.26.2).
7. Sardes: Hdt. 1.80.1; Babylon: Hdt. 1.178.2.
9. E.g. Lys. 12.56; Xen. Hell. 2.4.7.
meaning and reference of the words astu and polisma

There are not many occurrences of *polisma* in Archaic and Classical sources. The word is much rarer than *polis* in the urban sense, and it is also less common than *asty*. But in prose it is not only used in a mythological context or about barbarian towns, it is also found in descriptions of Greek cities of the Archaic and Classical periods. It is sometimes erroneously believed that *polisma* means a small city or town. That sense is connected with the diminutive *polismation*, unattested in Archaic literature and extremely rare in Classical sources. When applied to a named town of the Archaic and Classical periods, *polisma* once again resembles *asty* in that it is used synonymously with *polis* in the urban sense and seems invariably to denote a town which was the urban centre of a *polis* in the political sense. There is not one unquestionable attestation of *polisma* being used about a second-order urban settlement.

---
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If asked what his “fatherland” is, a citizen of a modern state would hardly be in doubt about the answer. His fatherland is the “community of laws and institutions with a single political will” of which he is a member. This community is, as the family metaphor implies, “something to which one is naturally tied” and it has the emotional power to “inspire love, and often profoundly self-sacrificing love” as well as the right to ask for sacrifices.

In ancient Greek πατρίς and πατρα are, of course, words with similar implications, derived as they are from the same stem as πατρίς, “father”; the exact meaning is “fatherland” (see Index 7). It is noteworthy, moreover, that patris often occurs in contexts which link it to other kinship terms such as “mother”, “parents”, “sister”, “brother”, “children”, “son”, “wife”, “husband”, “ancestors”, “relatives”, and genos. This suggests that the family implications of the term patris were very much alive and of significance. Since the Greeks took family relations to be based on love, it follows that patris is a term with highly positive emotional associations.

A number of texts contain variations on the theme that the patris is the thing dearest to a man. To be separated from the patris is, as the Theognidea point out (783–88), “without joy”, and to die and lie buried “far from the patris” is even more miserable as attested in many sepulchral inscriptions. The right and proper thing is to die and lie buried in one’s patris, and in the passionate epilogue of Dem. 57 the speaker envisages the possibility of suicide simply in order to ensure that he will be buried by his relatives “in the patris”. Going into exile is another way of losing the patris, and mentions of exile often trigger mentions of patris, thus emphasising that the concept of exile involved the idea of loss of patris.

In a political context the most important single aspect of the patris is probably the requirement to sacrifice one’s life for one’s fatherland. Modern states have persuaded colossal numbers of citizens to lay down their lives in wars, and dying for one’s country has assumed a moral grandeur. Similarly, the theme of death “for the patris” is a recurrent one in Archaic and Classical Greek texts, and that death in defence of the patris was considered of moral grandeur is clear from, e.g., Tyrtaios’ famous verses: τεθνάμαι γάρ καλὸν ἐνί προμάχοισα πεσόντα / ἀνδρὶ ἀγαθὸν περὶ ἵππα πατρίδι μαρνάμενον (fr. 10.1–2, West).

There cannot, then, be any reasonable doubt that a Greek of the Archaic and Classical periods could think of his patris almost as a next of kin, as the sweetest thing on earth; it was the proper place for him to be buried, it was what he was buried in one’s patris (CEG II 659 (C4)) and mentions of exile often trigger variations on the theme that the patris is the thing dearest to a man. To be separated from the patris is, as the Theognidea point out (783–88), “without joy”, and to die and lie buried “far from the patris” is even more miserable as attested in many sepulchral inscriptions. The right and proper thing is to die and lie buried in one’s patris, and in the passionate epilogue of Dem. 57 the speaker envisages the possibility of suicide simply in order to ensure that he will be buried by his relatives “in the patris”. Going into exile is another way of losing the patris, and mentions of exile often trigger mentions of patris, thus emphasising that the concept of exile involved the idea of loss of patris.

The Concept of Patris

This chapter is by Nielsen and is essentially a summary of Nielsen (2004).

1 Smith (1991) 10; (2000) 8–9. 2 Anderson (1991) 143. 3 Ibid. 141. 4 Ibid. 144. 5 Isoc. 19.23; Pl. Cri. 51a; I.Knidos I 625.1 (C4). For πατρίς itself, see Lys. 21.24; Dem. 18.205; BCH 83 (1959) 358 B.3; IG IX.2 249.3 (after 338); IG V.2 412.6 (C4–C3); Mauiri, NS 510 (C4l). 6 Gorgias fr. 114; Xen. An. 3.1.3; Aen. Tact. Proleg. 2; CEG I 171 (c.475–400); BCH 83 (1959) 158 A.6 (321). 7 Isoc. 19.23; IG II 789.5 (C4l). 8 Eur. Tro. 458; ML 4 (625–600). 9 Lys. 12.69–12.97, 21.24; Xen. Hell. 2.4.17, An. 3.1.3; Lycurg. Loc. 2, 101; Aen. Tact. Proleg. 2. 10 Hom. II. 5.687. 11 Lys. 12.69, 21.24; Xen. Hell. 2.4.17, An. 3.1.3; Lycurg. Loc. 2. 12 Eur. Tro. 107. 13 Gorgias fr. 114; Aeschin. 2.23; Klio (1918) 66, 94.2, 345–310; CEG II 717 (C4l Cje). 14 Pl. Leg. 696C; Xen. An. 7.1.29; Anaximenes, Ars rhetorica.7.4. 15 Soph. Phil. 222; IOSPE I 179.12 (C4l). 16 So much alive that e.g. military service in support of the patris may be described as “paying back the patris is trophera”; Lys. 2.70; Isoc. 6.108; Lycurg. Loc. 53. 17 Pl. Leg. 754B; Arist. Eth. Nic. 116b18–19, cf. 116b2; Xen. Oec. 7.24; Isoc. 12.125; Dem. 25.65. On familial love, see further Golden (1990) 80–140, esp. 89–91. 18 Theognidea 783–88; Eur. Phoen. 406; Xen. Hier. 4.3. 19 Hex. Saut. 1, 12; Hdt. 1.169.1; IG I 1903 (450–431); I.Knidos I 625.1 (C4). 20 ML 4.5–6 (625–600); IG I 1903.4 (450–431); CEG II 716 (C4l Cje); Th. Cal. 8.X; CEG I 171 (c.475–400), cf. Wagner (1973) and Masson (1974); IG II 11345 (c.400); CEG II 723 (C4). The text may, as in these examples, explicitly draw attention to the fact of death abroad but sometimes it is simply implied by the naming of a patris which is different from the location of the burial, e.g.: Σύμπαν μὲν πατρίς ήταν, ἐν οἴκυφορωσι Αθήναις / ἴθανθα, δενίῳ δὲ λαθήδε μοι ἑκατερία (IG XII.9 286 (C6)); κεῖµαι τε τυχεῖν θαυμασία, πατρίς[;] δε μοι ἐπεί Κόρινθοι, | οἱ χθονικοὶ πρόπολος, τόπῳ Μυτιλήνης (CEG II 720 (C4); cf. SEG 27 298, 30 579 (with suggestion of a slightly earlier date), found in Pella); ἐνδέχεται Ανάφρυντος κεῖται Λίμνας δέ πατρίς ἵππας δέννῃ ἤ ἰδίκαιον ἰδίαν (SEG 31 585 and CEG II 639 (C4)); found in Pherai. 21 To die away from one’s patris (CEG II 631 (C4a); Anacr. fr. 193, Gentilis). To be buried in one’s patris (CEG II 44–44 Anth. Graec. 7.25.2, Xen. Ages. 11.16, public funerary epigram preserved in Dem. 18.289 (for which see Wankel (1976)); IG II 6243–4 (C4a); L.Bhod.Per. 412.2 (C4). 22 Hom. Il. 15.695–96; Od. 15.228 (see further Seibert (1979) 276–80); Pind. Od. 12.16; Hdt. 1.150.1; Gorgias fr. 114; Isoc. 11.39; Pl. Alc. 145B; Xen. Hell. 1.4.15, An. 1.3.3; Aeschin. 1.172; Dem. 21.115. 23 Anacr. fr. 75.2, Gentilis; Simon. Anth. Graec. 7.254.3–4; Pind. Isthm. 7.27; Gorgias fr. 114; Steinsimbrots (ForHist 107) fr. 9; Isae. 5.42; Lycurg. Loc. 107; IG V.2 412.2 (C4–C3) from Arkadian Thelphousa.
lost when going into exile or regained by his return, it was something for which he would lay down his life; indeed, it was an object of his love.  

Re (1) There is only a single possible example of a community below polis level (i.e. kome, deme, etc.) that is called patris in a Classical source. Paus. 7.17.7 reports the text of an inscription reportedly to be found on a monument erected at Olympia in the 80th Olympiad (460–457):

Οἰνία Οἰβώτας στάδιον νικῶν ὅδ᾿ Ἀχαιὸς πατρίδα Πάλειαν θῆκ᾿ ὀνομαστοτέραν.26

There was no polis in Achaia by the name of Paleia. Pausanias claims that Paleia was the ancient name of Dyme (cf. Strabo 8.7.5), “for it is the custom of Greek poets to use ancient names instead of more modern ones” (Loeb); if that is taken at face value, Dyme should be added to the list of poleis called patris (infra) and that seems perfectly possible. However, Dyme is reported to have been created by (an undated) synoecism of eight demoi (Strabo 8.3.2), and modern scholars are inclined to believe that Paleia was one of these demes.27 If that is the case, we have an example of a local community below polis level being called patris. However, it should be noted that according to Pausanias the monument commemorated a victory won in 756; it is thus not a contemporary source that applies patris to Paleia, and it cannot be excluded that the author of the epigram did not know anything about the status of Paleia in 756 or even that he thought of it as a polis.28 But the important observation here must be that this text, enigmatic as it is, is the only source that possibly applies patris to a community below polis level.

1. Entities Called Patris

But which entity did an ancient Greek consider to be his patris? To this question there are presumably four conceivable answers: (1) his local community of residence, such as a kome or demos vel sim.; (2) his polis; (3) the region in which he resided, e.g. Phokis, Thessaly, etc.; and (4) Hellas itself. It is, in fact, a man’s polis that is regularly conceived of as his patris, as will be clear from consideration of each of these four entities.

Re (3) It is slightly more common to find regions such as Phokis and Thessaly described as patris; in six sources the concept of patris is applied to nine different regions:

Arkadia: Dem. 18.95–96 (295–96).
Euboia: Dem. 18.95–96 (295–96).
Messenia: Thuc. 6.4.6.29
Peloponnes: Xen. Hell. 7.1.23.30
Phokis: CEG II 799 (c.300).
Pontos: IG II1 10108 (C4m); cf. CEG II 528; AM 66 (1941) 53–54.31
Thessalia: Dem. 18.95–96 (295–96).

Of these nine regions, five are called patris in passages where they are listed as instances under the general heading πατρίδες vel sim.

(1) At 6.127.1–4 Herodotos lists the suitors of Agariste, the daughter of Kleisthenes, the tyrant of Sikyon. Herodotos indicates the origins of the twelve suitors in various ways: by city-ethnics, a regional ethnic, or by prepositional phrases, and the origin indicated for each suitor amounts to a statement of his patre; in ten cases the patre is a polis,32 but in two it is a region (Aitolia and Molossia). What seems to have happened here is that Herodotos, in a list of entities of which the majority (the ten poleis) can properly be called patre, has included two (Aitolia and Molossia) which the designation fits less well. This is a procedure which is not unknown, and it resembles the way in which states that are not proper poleis may be listed with poleis in a list prefaced by the heading πόλεις.33 Moreover, Herodotos could presumably indicate the origins of these suitors only by stating contemporary terms; cf. Hansen (2000) 59–60 on Troy, Messene and Krisa, all three described as poleis by Classical authors.

29 Thuc. 6.4.6: τοὺς δὲ Σάμων Ιονίας Ἑλλήνων τούμανοι αὐτὸς πολλὰ ἐντερον ἐκβάλικαν καὶ τὴν πόλιν αὐτὸς ἐγκατέστησε τὴν Μεσσηνίαν ἀντωνόμασεν ἀπὸ τὴν ἐαυτοῦ τὸ ἄρχον τοὺς πατρίδες ἀντωνόμασεν.
30 Xen. Hell. 7.1.23: ἐγερέγειοι δὲ τε Αιλωνικὸς Μαντινεύς, γένει το ὀδὸν τὸ ἀρχαῖον χρῆμα τα περισσότερα ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀλλὰ φιλότιμον, ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἐν πατρίδοις, λέγειν ὡς μόνον καὶ αὐτοῖς πατρίς Πελοπόννησον εἶναι μόνον γὰρ αὐ νότατον ἱερόν πάλιν ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντως ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, πληθυνής δὲ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν ἄρχον τὸ ἄρχον τὸ ἄρχον ταύτα ἐντερον ἐκβάλλει πατρίς.
31 AM 66 (1941) 53–54: πάτριδα μὲν Πάντων Ἐδώρος Κύπρος κατέχει, ἐμέ δὲ Αρκτείς / κράσι πρὸ ἑλληνικῆς Δωρίδος πάντως τάφοι.
32 Sybaris (no. 70), Siris (no. 69), Epidamnoi (no. 79), Argoi (no. 347), Trapezous (no. 303), Paion (no. 288), Elsi (no. 251), Athens (no. 361), Eretria (no. 370), and Kranon (no. 400).

25 Hdt. 6.126.3; Philemon Comicius fr. 109, Kock.
26 On the reliability of Pausanias’ epigraphic quotations, see Habicht (1985) 64–94.
27 See Dyme (no. 234).
28 Greeks of the Classical period regularly thought of earlier periods in
their regional affiliations, since neither Molossia nor Aitolia was subdivided into poleis in C6f.

(2) In the Speech for the Crown Demosthenes has a long list of men who have betrayed their patris to Philip II (Dem. 18.295–96). His list of traitors is very similar to the Herodotean list except that the “heading” patrides is appended to, not prefaced to, the list. Again, it is a list indicating the origins of various men, and again this origin amounts to statement of their patris. In a list containing seven poleis that can properly be called patris are included three regions (Thessalia, Arkadia and Euboia) which, though each subdivided into poleis, are not themselves poleis and for which the designation patris fits less well than it does for poleis proper.

(3) The application of patris to the Peloponnese may perhaps be explained from the context in which it occurs. The description of the Peloponnese as patris occurs in a speech by the Arkadian federal politician Lykomes of Mantinea, who urges the Arkadian federal assembly to attempt an independent line in foreign policy instead of following Thebes blindly. He is reported by Xenophon to have stated that the Arkadians were the only ones for whom the Peloponnesian was the patris since they were the only autochthonous people on the peninsula. So, the application here is clearly propagandistic and prompted by the well-established Arkadian tradition of autochthony.

(4) The epigram that describes Phokis as the patris of a Pythionikes (CEG 11 799 (c.300)) may profitably be compared to another contemporary monument that celebrates a Magnesian Pythionikes (CEG 11 855 (C4l)):

Φωκεύς μὲν γένος εἰμί, πάλην δ’ με Πύθια παιδᾶσι
νικῶντα ἐστεφάνω[σι] εἰκόνιν [τῇ] ἱδιοὶ πατρι[ῖς].
(CEG 11 799).

Μάγνης μὲν γενεάς, στάδιον δέ με Πύθα παιδᾶσι
νικῶντα ἐστεφάνω[σι] εἰκόνιν τῆιδο πόλις.
(CEG 11 855)

Obviously, in these two very similar epigrams the first two syllables of the hexameters were employed to state the origin of the athlete. In the Magnesian case it works well since the city-ethnic of Magnesia is exactly disyllabic. However, of twenty-eight attested Phokian city-ethnics only a single one is disyllabic (Δελφοῦς). So unless the victor originated from Delphi itself the author of the epigram had to come up with an alternative proposal. His choice was the regional ethnic instead of a city-ethnic, and so Phokis was described as patris since he also preferred πατρίς to πόλις for the last two syllables of the pentameter. His reasons for this preference can only be conjectured. Perhaps polis was felt to sit less well with a regional ethnic such as Φωκεύς than was πατρίς. Possibly so, but it should be noted that one rare usage of polis was in fact to apply it to larger regions such as Thessalia or Sikelia or to multipolate islands such as Keos, Cyprus or Euboia, and in particular in verse “where poetical expression matters more than terminological precision”.

So polis would have been possible and perhaps patris was not preferred for any particular reason but simply because in many contexts it served as an emotional substitute for polis.

(5) According to Thuc. 6.4.6, Anaxilas of Rhegion (reigned 494–476) renamed Zankle “Messene” ἀπὸ τῆς ἀντικεῖος τῶν ἀρχαῖων πατρίδος, i.e. after the region of Messenia in the Peloponnese. There were poleis in Messenia prior to the partial liberation from Sparta in 369, but only four (Aithaia (no. 312), Asine (no. 313), Mothone (no. 319) and Thouria (no. 322)) can be confidently identified, and if Anaxilas traced his Messenian ancestry back to the time of the Messenian wars of the early Archaic period, there were probably not even four poleis in Messenia. It seems, again, that a regional description was the only way to identify Anaxilas’ “fatherland of old times”. There is the further possibility that Anaxilas was an alternative nameclass for a polis in the Black Sea area or an otherwise unknown polis, the description of Pontos as patris is a clear case of the application of the term to a named entity which was not a polis, though it is the only such unambiguous use.

(6) Unless “Pontos” was an alternative name for a polis in the Black Sea area or an otherwise unknown polis, the description of Pontos as patris is a clear case of the application of the term to a named entity which was not a polis, though it is the only such unambiguous use.

To sum up: most of the applications of patris to regions larger than a single polis may be explained from their context as not wholly proper or slightly forced uses of the term, but not all. However, even if we accept all six sources, the number is still small when compared to the eighty-five poleis described as patris.

Re (4) The cosmopolitan view that a man’s patris is where he wants to live is rare prior to the Hellenistic period though not unattested. But to think of Hellas as one’s patris is equally rare and runs equally counter to the traditional view that the patris is the polis where you were located.

---

34 Argos (no. 134), Elis (no. 251), Messene (no. 318), Sikyon (no. 228), Corinth (no. 227), Megara (no. 235) and Thebes (no. 221).
38 For Messenians in Rhegion in the early Archaic period: Herac. Lemb. 55; Strabo 6.1.6, Paus. 4.23–6.
39 Cf. CEG 11 528 ad loc.
40 Cf. Hansen, forthcoming, n. 1, citing Eur. fr. 774, 1034 (cf. fr. 1047); At. Plat. 1151; Isoc. 4.81. See also the vehement denunciation of this view at Lys. 31.6.
born and raised. The thought occurs most prominently in Isokrates’ Panegyrikos 81, where the crusading rhetor claims—contrary to all the facts—that the Greeks of the Hellenic League who defeated the Persians had realised his own ideal in ὄνα μὲν ἄστη ὡς αὐτῶν πόλεις ἵπποι Μαρτυροντες ἐνιαί ("regarding their own πόλεις simply as their individual cities, and being of the opinion that Hellas was their common πατρίς"). But even in Isokrates this is unique, and his normal view is the traditional one which regards each individual πόλις as the πατρίς of its citizens.44

Re (2) Of the πόλεις included in this Inventory eighty-five45 are called πατρίς in Archaic and Classical sources.46 It should be immediately clear that in comparison with other entities sometimes called πατρίς this number is significant, and that the regular and traditional use of πατρίς is in reference to a man’s πόλις, and πατρίς may indeed be said to be a positive emotional substitute for πόλις.47

To conclude: Greeks of the Archaic and Classical periods thought of their πατρίς almost as a next of kin; it was the sweetest thing on earth; it was the proper place to be buried; it was what they lost by going into exile or regained by their return; it was something for which they would lay down their lives. It was, in short, an object of their love and Greeks took pride in their πατρίς. Though other entities were very occasionally described as πατρίς, the πατρίς was in the overwhelming majority of all cases the man’s πόλις, and the term πατρίς may be said to function almost as a synonym of πόλις. So, to a Greek the πατρίς was his πόλις, and for his πόλις he was expected to be ready to lay down his life. Let it finally be noted that this conclusion is derived not only from Athenian sources (which admittedly predominate in this as in any discussion), but also from a wide range of non-Athenian sources.48 The view of πατρίς presented above was, then, in all probability one shared throughout the Greek world.49
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42 It may also be present in Aesch. Pers. 186, 403, but not emphatically so. Cf. also Lycurg. Loc. 104.
43 See the excellent comments of Buchner (1958) 89 on this extraordinary passage.
44 Ibid.
45 All πόλεις of type A, except four of type [A] (Phigaleia (no. 292); Kranon (no. 400); Phalanna (no. 488); Kallatis (no. 686)); four of type B ((Thelphousa (no. 300); Samos the klerouchy (no. 865); Astypalaia (no. 476); Pholegandra (no. 513)) and one of type C (Trapezous (no. 303)).
47 See further the discussion of the different uses of πατρίς as a synonym for πόλις, ibid.
48 Aeneas Tacticus of Stymphalos (?), Anaximenes of Lampsakos, Aristotle of Stagira, Gorgias of Leontinoi, Herodotos of Halikarnassos, Hesiodos of Thebes, Pindar of Thebes, Simonides of Keos, Steimbrotos of Thasos, and Theognis of Megara, and inscriptions from the Black Sea area, Boiotia, Cyprus, Delphi, Egypt, Eretria, Kalymna, Knidos, Korkyra, Pella, Pharsalos, Pherai, Thelphousa and the Dorian islands.
This Inventory comprises 1,035 communities, each certainly or probably or possibly a polis in the Archaic and/or Classical periods. But not all were poleis at the same time. Some early poleis had disappeared for good already in the Archaic period, e.g. Arisba on Lesbos (no. 768) swallowed up by Methymna, presumably in C6, or Megara Hyblaia in Sicily (no. 36), destroyed by Gelon in 484. Other poleis were founded in the course of the period covered by our investigation, e.g. Megalopolis (no. 282) synoecised in 368, or developed to become a polis, e.g. Kassopa (no. 100) in C4m, or took on board so many aspects of Hellenic civilisation that they became Hellenised or at least partly Hellenised poleis before the end of the Classical period, e.g. Xanthos (no. 943). A reduction in the number of poleis in some parts of the Hellenic world was counterbalanced by an increase in other parts. In C6–C5 Euboia had about a dozen poleis, but in C4m only four were left. Although it cannot be proved, it is a fair guess that several small Arkadian poleis disappeared or at least lost their polis status when Megalopolis was synoecised in 368. Along the coasts of the Adriatic Sea numerous new poleis were founded in C4f by Dionysios I, but in the same period several of the neighbours of Syracuse were destroyed and disappeared as poleis for a shorter or longer period. And many of the Sicilian communities included in this inventory became Hellenised poleis only in the wake of Timoleon’s campaigns. Of all the seventy-two Karian poleis recorded below, only a handful were Hellenic colonies. The rest were indigenous communities which, in C4s, had become sufficiently Hellenised to count as poleis. But before Hellenisation gathered momentum under the Hekatomnids in C4m, many of these communities were Karian cities and city-states, not Hellenised poleis, and they would not have deserved inclusion if this inventory had stopped in c.400. Nor would many of the poleis in Epeiros.

Furthermore, we cannot be sure that all the communities included in the Inventory were actually poleis. Some of those classified as a polis type C would undoubtedly be struck off the Inventory if we had had perfect sources. And even some of the poleis type A are not beyond doubt: some remote sites in the Pontic region, for example, are recorded in Ps.-Skylax as a polis or even a polis Hellenis, but several are presumably ghost-poleis, see 27 supra.

Conversely, we must take into account what the Germans call a Dunkelziffer, i.e. the difference between a number actually attested in the scattered sources we have and the estimated total number we would be able to record if we had had perfect sources. There can be no doubt that a considerable number of Archaic poleis have disappeared without leaving any trace of their existence. Lesbos, for example, may in C7 have had more than the six poleis mentioned by Herodotos; cf. 1018 infra. The tradition was that there had once been 100 poleis in Lakedaimon.1 With the sources we have, a maximum of twenty-four can be described.

Because of the constant transformation of the political map of the Hellenic world, the list of all poleis in the Archaic and Classical periods must be supplemented with a list of poleis in a given year, and the year we have chosen is 400. It would be interesting to have a similar list for 480, i.e. the year we have chosen is 400. Nor would many of the poleis before 400 as well as all poleis that were colonised or synoecised or Hellenised in the course of the period 400–323. As the evidence stands, 862 of the 1,035 poleis were certainly or presumably or at least possibly Hellenic poleis in the year when the 10,000 mercenaries had to fight their way back to Greece, when Elis was forced by Sparta to surrender many of its dependencies, and when Sokrates was about to stand trial in Athens. Of these 862 poleis, 437 are explicitly attested as poleis in sources of the Classical period (type A), 221 are known to have performed a number of activities characteristic of a polis (types [A]B and B), and for 204 there are indications but no proof that they were poleis both in the political and in the urban sense of the term (types [A]C and C).

A total of 862 poleis is a minimum figure, but the presumption is that, including a Dunkelziffer, the total number

---

1 Strabo 8,4,11; Steph. Byz. 46,4, 87,16, etc. The source is probably Polemon’s treatise: Περὶ τῶν ἐν Λακεδαίμονι πόλεων, Suda Π 1888.
of poleis in any one year can hardly have passed 1,000, and 1,500 poleis altogether, as we guessed when we started the project in 1993, must be considered a maximum: i.e. the number of all poleis from the beginning of the colonial period in C8m down to the death of Alexander the Great in 323.

The approach of the Polis Centre has been to find out what the Greeks thought a polis was. Consequently, it is pertinent to ask: did the Greeks c.400 know how many poleis there were in the Hellenic world? If Agesilaos in 371 had asked Epameinondas how many poleis there were in Boiotia, the Theban statesman might not have known the exact number by heart, but we are convinced that there was a right answer and that in a few minutes he would have been able to come up with it. If you had put the same question to an ordinary citizen in one of the Boiotian poleis, he might not have been able to name the exact figure, no matter how long he was given to state his answer; but he would have known for sure of which polis he himself was a citizen, and he would have known about all its neighbours and about the major Boiotian poleis. If you had asked him how many Hellenic poleis there were altogether, he might have missed the total indicated here by 100 per cent or more.4 The scholars in Aristotle’s Lykeion are probably the only Greeks who could have come up with an educated guess, and who may perhaps have asked the question. In some respects this is not so different from what we experience in the modern world. A Member of Parliament in a modern state would probably know that in 2002 there are close to 200 states in the world, 192 to be exact. An ordinary citizen, even an educated one, would not know and might miss the right figure by 100 per cent. A majority of the citizens of the members of the EU are probably ignorant of how many states there are in Europe. The difference between the Greeks and us is that any citizen in a modern state can look it up in a book or find it on the internet in a few minutes, whereas we believe that no count was ever made of the number of poleis in the Hellenic world until the Roman Imperial period when, probably, the administrators would know how many poleis there were in each of the Greek-speaking provinces and new poleis were created by decree of the emperor.5

2 According to Xenophon, the Thrakian Chersonesos was settled with 11 or 12 poleis c.400 (Hell. 3.2.10). There are 15 in the Inventory, of which, however, one was not a polis in 400 and 5 are type [A]C. According to Demosthenes, Philip II had 22 Phokian poleis diœcised in 346 (Dem. 19.123), to which we must add Abai and Delphi. The Inventory comprises altogether 29 poleis of which 2 seem to have disappeared in 480 and 2 are classified as poleis type C. In these and in several other regions all or almost all poleis are still identifiable.

3 For the (anecdotal?) exchange of words between Epameinondas and Agesilaos in 371, see Paus. 9.13.2 and Plut. Ages. 28.1–3.

4 The only adding up of poleis found in the sources, is Bdelykleon’s claim that there were 1,000 poleis in the Delian League (Vesp. 707), but that is a deliberate exaggeration.

5 Pallantion was made a polis by Antoninus Pius (Paus. 8.43.1). Hadrian sent a letter to the citizens of Naryka in East Lokris in which he acknowledges the polis status of Naryka (unpublished bronze stele in the Louvre).
While the LGPN edited by Peter Fraser and Elaine Matthews has revolutionised the study of Greek personal names, toponyms and ethnics have not been systematically and comprehensively investigated since 1911, when G. E. Benseler published the 3rd edition of W. Pape’s *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*. Since the name of a community, *in casu* a *polis*, is an important aspect of its identity, each entry in the inventory begins with information about what the *polis* was called and to what extent attestations of the name can contribute to the identification of the community as a *polis*. One characteristic of ancient Greek political communities is that they were called sometimes by the toponym, sometimes by the ethnic, and the study of the toponyms is inextricably bound up with the study of the related ethnics. As argued most clearly by Gschnitzer (1955), there are basically two forms of ethnics: those derived from an older toponym (*Kóρινθος* derived from *Kόρινθος*) and those from which a new toponym is derived (*Ἀρκάς* generating *Ἀρκαδία*). Most of the toponyms generating ethnics denoted a nucleated settlement, whereas toponyms derived from ethnics denoted a region.

This important observation must be modified in one respect: the chronological sequence of the word-formation is far from universal. The toponym *Μαντινέα*, for example, must have been derived from the ethnic *Μαντινεύς*. If it had been the other way round, the toponym *Μαντινέα* would have generated the ethnic *Μαντινέατης*, cf. *Τεγέα* > *Τεγεάτης*, *Ἀσέα* > *Ἀσεάτης*, etc. Conversely, the Bottiaians lived originally in Bottia in Macedonia but emigrated and settled down in western Chalkidike in a region called Bottike. In this case the sequence was probably *Βοττία* > *Βοττική*.4

Even though the sequence of the word-formation is not as clear-cut as stated by Gschnitzer, it is still true and important to note that some ethnics are related to a toponym denoting an urban settlement, others to a toponym denoting a region.

Now, the nucleated settlement corresponding to the ethnic was often the urban and political centre of a *polis*, but it could also be a small town or a village lying in the territory of a *polis*, cf. Tamynai on Euboia or Tripodiskos in Megaris. It is impossible linguistically to separate a toponym denoting a *polis* from a toponym denoting a village or a town lying in the territory of a *polis*. However, the distinction can be ascertained by a number of other criteria, see 88 infra, and it is this distinction that enables us to subdivide the related ethnics into city-ethnics—i.e. ethnics corresponding to a toponym denoting a *polis*—versus those sub-ethnics that correspond to a toponym denoting a civic subdivision of a *polis*, typically a *demos* or a *kome*. See 59—60 infra.

This chapter is about toponyms denoting a *polis*. That is a topic not much debated in books and articles about the concept of *polis*. In most accounts it is briefly stated that the *polis* as a political community was named after its people, and called by the city-ethnic in the nominative plural, whereas the toponym was used exclusively about the urban centre of the *polis*. That is largely true, but there are important exceptions, so important in fact that they modify the prevailing picture.

It is true that the toponym often signifies the nucleated centre, i.e. the *polis* in the urban sense; but the *polis* town had a hinterland and there are numerous attestations of the toponym denoting the town plus its hinterland, i.e. the territory of the *polis*? sometimes the toponym may even denote the hinterland to the exclusion of its urban centre.

Even more important is the fact that, contrary to the al-

---

1 One exception is Zgusta (1984).
2 There is no need in this context to discuss other ethnics not related to toponyms, e.g. the ethnics of the three Dorian *phylai*: *Hyileis*, *Dymanes*, *Pamphylai*.

---

5 Cf. *Τομόνοι* (Aeschin. 2.169), an Eretrian deme inhabited by the *Τεμονιάες* (IG II 3 11.11.241); *Τριποδίσκοι* (Steph. Byz. 637.1), a Megarian *kome* inhabited by the *Τριποδίσκοι* (Plut. Mor. 295B).
7 Alope (no. 378), Thuc. 2.26.2; Ambrakia (no. 111), Ps.-Skylax 33; Chairenia (no. 201), Lycurg. 1.16; Elateia (no. 180), Theophr. *HP* 8.8.2; Epidauros (no. 348), Thuc. 5.3.1; Haliartos (no. 206), Xen. *Hell.* 3.3.17; Kinyras (no. 107), Hdt. 4.198.1; Corinth (no. 227), Dem. 20.51; Lebadeia (no. 215), Xen. *Mem.* 3.5.4; Mantinea (no. 283), Thuc. 5.64.4; Mytilene (no. 798), SEG 36 750.37; Orchomenos (no. 213), Thuc. 1.133.2; Panopeis (no. 190), Hdt. 8.34; Plataiai (no. 216), Xen. *Hell.* 5.4.48; Potidaia (no. 598), Xen. *Hell.* 5.2.39; Sikyon (no. 228), Hdt. 1.145; Tanagra (no. 220), Thuc. 1.108.1.
8 Apollonia (no. 545), Xen. *Hell.* 5.1.3; Argos (no. 347), Thuc. 4.133.2; Erechos (no. 181), SEG 27 143; Oropos (no. 214), Hyp. 3.16; Phleious (no. 355), Xen. *Hell.* 4.4.15; Tanagra (no. 220), Thuc. 4.91, 7.29.2; Thbes (no. 221), Xen. *Hell.* 5.2.25.
most universal modern orthodoxy, the toponym was often used synonymously with the city-ethnic to denote the community, i.e. the polis in the political sense.\footnote{Which I shared myself until 1992; cf. Hansen (1991) 58.}

In treaties poleis identified by toponym are not commonly found, but there are some examples: in the C6l treaty between the Sybaritai and the Serdaiai the polis Poseidonia is recorded as a guarantor of the agreement (Staatsverträge 120); in the Peace of Nikias six members of the Delian League have the conditions for their membership defined in the political sense.\footnote{Hansen (1995) 29 nn. 139–40 (the political sense); (1996) 38–39 (a brief account of the political and the territorial senses); Whitehead (1996) (a full account of the political sense).} The picture changes when we move from documents to historians and philosophers.\footnote{For the category of documents to cover speeches delivered in the assembly and the court, see Hansen (2001).}

In all historians the toponym is frequently used in a political sense. According to Herodotos, the Dorian pentapolis comprised Lindos, Ialysos, Kamiros, Kos and Knidos (1.144.3). Thucydides tells us about stasisin Kerkrya (3.69.2), Rheidion (4.3.1) and Akragas (7.46), not stasis among the Akragantians, etc. In his paraphrase of the King’s Peace of 386, Xenophon lists Lemnos, Imbros and Skyros as poleis exempted from the autonomia clause (Xen. Hell. 5.1.31 = Staatsverträge 242). For a long list of attestations from the three major historians, see Whitehead (1996), to which can be added examples from fragments of other historians: Ephoros mentions the tyrants of Pherai, not the Pheraians (fr. 95), and the Oxyrhynchus historian (=Theopompos?) uses a mixture of ethnics and toponyms in his description of the Boiotian federal constitution: of the eleven Boiotian districts, one consisted of the Haliartioi, the Lebadeis and the Koroneis, another of Akraiphnion, Kopiai and Chaireneia (Hell. Oxy. 19.3). The shift from city-ethnic to toponym is just a stylistic variation which shows that the difference between the ethnic and the toponym must not be overemphasised.

Perhaps unexpectedly, philosophers offer the proportionately highest number of examples. Admittedly, toponyms and ethnics do not abound in Plato’s dialogues, but there are numerous passages in which the Athenian and Spartan states are identified by the toponym, not by the city-ethnic.\footnote{Lakedaimon used about the polis in the political sense: Cris. 52E; Alc. 121A; Hp. maj. 284A; Resp. 590D; Minos 320B; Leg. 628E, 636E, 683D, 712D. Athens: Hipp. 229B; Ep. 336D. For Sparta and Athenai juxtaposed, see Leg. 753A.}

In Aristotle’s Politics book 5, which all the way through treats the polis as a political community, the most common way of naming a polis is by the phrase év+toponym in the dative; thus, Aristotle mentions ἦ ἐν Ἡρακλείᾳ στάσις (1306\textsuperscript{37}) or ἦ ἐν Χίῳ ὀλιγαρχία (1306\textsuperscript{5}), and he has ἐν Ῥώδη δήμοις (1302\textsuperscript{32}) instead of ἐν Ῥωδίων δήμοις as one would expect (cf. Dem. 15.15, 28). In the book the use of the toponym to denote a polis in the political sense outnumbers the use of the city-ethnic by at least two to one.

Finally, examples from poetry are less significant because every attestation may be treated as an instance of metonymy or poetic personification.

To conclude: the use of toponyms to signify sometimes the town, sometimes the territory and sometimes the polity
matches the use of the term polis to signify either the town or the territory or the polity. And the three different senses in which toponyms are found puts into perspective three aspects of the polis that we find important and want to emphasise throughout this inventory: (1) the emphasis on the urban centre as the heart of the polis, (2) town and community as almost indistinguishable aspects of the polis, and (3) the close connection between the urban centre of the polis and its hinterland which, together, constitute the territory of the polis.
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A prominent aspect of the Greek polis was its name, and the huge onomastic material preserved in literature and on stone is probably the richest source we have for the fragmentation of the Hellenic world into poleis. Whenever citizens from different poleis gathered together, the obvious way of identifying an individual was to call him by his polis and to use an adjectival form of the name of his polis as a kind of surname to be added to his name. Moreover, since the polis in the sense of “state” was a community of citizens rather than a country, the usual way of naming a polis was to use the nominative plural of an adjectival form of the name of the city as the official name of the community itself and to use the toponym as the name of its urban centre. Thus a citizen of Ambrakia was called Ἀμπρακιώτας,1 and the name of his polis was (ὁ) Ἀμπρακιός,2 whereas the toponym Ἀμβρακία was mostly used about the urban centre of the community.3 Although the collective use of the adjective is the more important in a historical investigation of political communities, most problems of classification and identification are connected with the individual use, and therefore the first and longer part of this chapter will be devoted to personal names.4

1. The Ethnic Used Individually as the Name of a Citizen

A. Name, Patronymic and Ethnic

The full name of a Greek citizen living in a polis consisted of his own name (onoma), his father’s name (in scholarly practice: patronymikon),6 and the name of his polis (in scholarly practice: ethnikon) or a subdivision of his polis (in scholarly practice: demotikon).7 In the strict sense the name of an adult free Greek citizen was just his onoma and the addition of patronymic and/or ethnic/demotic was dictated by the context.8 In cases of homonymity, to avoid mistaken identity when a citizen’s name appeared alongside those of fellow citizens, his father’s name was often added to the name itself, and in some poleis membership of a civic subdivision could be added to his name and patronymic.9 When a citizen’s name appeared alongside those of citizens from other poleis, his polis affiliation was added to the name (and patronymic),10 and in poleis that internally recorded a citizen’s membership of a civic subdivision, the polis affiliation usually replaced the civic subdivision.11 In some cases, however, his affiliation with a region was added to,12 or replaced,13 his polis affiliation. For non-Greeks there was a fourth possibility, namely to be named after a whole nation.

---

1. Πολυμήδης Τέλλυος Ἀµπρακιώτας (CID 11 411.27–28).
2. With the article: Thuc. 4.6.3–2; without the article: ML 27.31.
3. Ἀμβρακία πόλις Βιόλεσ, ἀνέγερσις δ’ αὐτή ἀπὸ θαλάσσης στὸδος π’ (Ps.-Skylax 31). For the numerous exceptions, see §§5–57 supra.
4. For a brief but penetrating survey, see Fraser (1995).
5. In this section, as in the others, we try to restrict the treatment to the Archaic and Classical periods. We have, however, to discuss some Hellenistic inscriptions as well because they have often—and sometimes with good reason—been used retrospectively as evidence of Archaic and Classical institutions and naming habits.
6. At Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 3.48.2 πατρωνυμικῶς refers to the Roman family name. In Ἐνυμ.Μαγν. 165.38 πατρωνυμικὸς is used about names such as Λεύκεδης, not about the father’s name in the genitive case.
7. For a discussion of the problem to what extent the ethnic was part of the name, see Hansen (1996) 176–78.
8. Ibid. Name: Χαριστίνη (IG i 1328 bis); name and patronymic: Μικὼν Ἡρακλείδης (IG i 1327); name and demotic: Ἱεροκλῆς Καισαριάς (IG i 1331); name, patronymic and demotic: Αὐτός Ἀδριανὸς Ἀλκιβίας (SEG 34 199); name and city-ethnic: Ἡλείας Ζιούς (IG i 1345); name, patronymic and city-ethnic: Λυκὴος Φιλίκως Καβάς (IG i 1346); name and regional ethnic: Νέπολος Θεσσαλός (IG i 1373); name, patronymic and regional ethnic: Ναυμάχος Ἡρακλείδης Βοιωτίας (IG ii 8419).
9. AJP 56 (1935) 358–72 is a CAl list of many hundred Kolophonians contributors to the rebuilding of the walls. All have a patronymic added to their name, and a handful or so have a name indicating their added to their name and patronymic, e.g. Ἀρτεμίδωρος Γερασίτης (642), Ἀρτεμίδωρος Ἑκατονύμου (661), Ἀρτεμίδωρος Ἐκατονύμου (869–66), cf. the note on page 372 and infra n. 15.
10. Cf. the CAl list of Karthaian proxenois (IG xii 5.542). The preserved fragment contains the names of some 50 citizens from 27 poleis, and each proxenos is recorded by name, patronymic and city-ethnic.
11. The Athenian statesman Aristophon appears with his demotic in the decree he moved in 343/2 (IG i 1224.6–7: Ἀριστοφόρος Ἀριστοφόρου Μητροπόλιτου) but as an Athenian in the Karthaian list of proxenos (IG xii 5.542.43–44: Ἀριστοφόρος Ἀριστοφόρου Μητροπόλιτου).
12. See the CAl Delphic list of contributions to the rebuilding of the temple of Apollo, CID 11 12.1.67: Ἀρκαδιών Ἀθηναίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων Χαλκιδών Ἀρρηνος, Παντοκράτορος Καλλικράτης, Λυκήνας, Φιλίκως, Καβάς (11.1–31: Διονύσιος Καλλικράτης Κέλας Ἀρρηνος).
13. In the CAl list of victors in the Lykaia in Arkadia (IG v.2 549–50) all Arkadians are called by their regional ethnic (Ἀρκαδοὶ) whereas all foreigners are called by their city-ethnic, e.g. Ἡθνοῖς, Ἱληνοῖς.
and patronymic are unattested. There are only a few exceptional attestations of the grandfather's name being recorded after the patronymic. The common way of indicating a person's lineage was in the form of a partitive genitive in the plural and not as an integral part of the name itself; cf., for example, one of the ostraka from the Athenian Agora cast against a member of the Alkmaionidai: Καλλικράτης, υἱός Πατρίδος (Hesperia 19 (1950) 389 no. 30) or Herodotus' mention of a member of the Skopadai: τῶν Σκοπάδων Ἀδριανίης Κραννών (Hdt. 6.127.4).

To conclude: in addition to the patronymic, we have basically three types of appellation added to the name itself, namely: one denoting a subdivision of a polis, one denoting the polis itself, and one denoting units larger than the polis.

B. Sub-Ethnics

Orthodox terminology is restricted to two terms: demotikon and ethnikon. This is, in our opinion, unsatisfactory. Demotikon is a term invented by modern historians and it is too narrow by being restricted to names related to one specific type of civic subdivision only, viz. the demos; the ethnikon, on the other hand, is too broad in meaning because it covers names related to poleis as well as names related to regions. The ethnikon must be subdivided into two different types, and in addition to the demotikon, we must invent a more general term that denotes all names related to units smaller than the polis.

Demotics in the strict sense, that is names derived from toponyms which denote demos, are found only in Attika, Euboia, Rhodes and a few other places. But side by side with demotics, we must study the common habit in many parts of the Hellenic world of supplementing a name with a name denoting a village (kome), a "brotherhood" (phratria), a "tribe" (phyle), or other artificial subdivisions, like a pentekontostys, a hekatostys, or a symmoria. As a comprehensive term to denote all such names,

22 See e.g. Εγνώσις Παπακώστα Αθάνατου inscribed on an ostrakon from Kerameikos (Mdl 106 (1991) 153). The παπακώσιος (cf. Suda A 1276) is more frequently attested in later periods.

including demotics, we suggest sub-ethnic, whereas the term demotikon, or demotic in English, should be restricted to names indicating membership of a deme proper.

What is common to the various types of sub-ethnic is first that they are based on some kind of civic subdivision, and second that they are restricted to citizens. It is characteristic that the sub-ethnics, all designating a group smaller than a polis, were invariably applied to politai, that is to full members of a polis, and furthermore, to citizens operating within their own polis. As far as we know, there is no attestation of a name signifying a phratria or a phyle or a demos, etc. being applied to a slave; and examples of Athenian women identified by a demotic in the nominative case are few and so late that the notion of citizenship had lost its original meaning. 24 Rhodian women of citizen status are regularly recorded with a feminine demotic but, again, all attestations are Hellenistic or later. 25 Also, a citizen would only use his sub-ethnic when he was at home; there are scattered attestations of citizens identified by ethnics within their own polis 26 or by sub-ethnics outside their own polis, 27 but as a rule, whenever a citizen was abroad, the sub-ethnic was commonly replaced by an ethnic denoting his polis. 28

C. The Regional Ethnic versus the City-Ethnic

The traditional term ethnikon is commonly used to cover two very different categories: first the ethnikon proper, i.e. an ethnikon denoting one or more persons belonging to a people inhabiting a region (Bouaiotis, Akrakis, Phoikes), or a part of a region (Maaiklos, Aproadotos) 29 or a geographical unit much larger than a region (Peleponnisos, Xikeliottis), etc., and second the ethnikon which denotes one or more persons inhabiting a polis: Athnaios, Korhos, Theasios, Tanganaios.

The ancients, and Stephanos of Byzantium in particular, made no distinction between the two different types and used the term ethnikos indiscriminately about e.g. the Boiotians (Steph. Byz. 174.3) and the Akraiophians (Steph. Byz. 63.5). The modern practice of applying the term to the people inhabiting a region as well as to the citizens of a polis is probably borrowed directly from Stephanos’ lexicon and has no other authority. But the word ethnikos is late and rare, and Stephanos’ use of it is rather idiosyncratic. The first attestation of ethnikos is in Strabo, who uses the term in a very different way, namely to distinguish bárbaros from Ἑλλήνες (Strabo 14.2.28).

Both for our understanding of the use of personal names and for an investigation of the nature of the Greek polis it is extremely helpful to distinguish between the two different types of ethnic. 31 First, as pointed out by Dittenberger (1906) 167–68, the distinction is borne out by a linguistic observation. Some ethnics he designates as prívite Volksnamen, such as Akrakis, Lekros, Ῥαξ; others, however, are Ableitungen von Ortsnamen such as Megareis and Αθηναίοι. An ethnic designating a citizen of a polis is typically von einem Ortsnamen abgeleitet and becomes the name of what Gschinzer has called an Ortsgemeinde. 32 The city-ethnic was typically an adjective or a substan-
under Dyme (Meyer 1949)). Furthermore, all the evidence we have for demes in Achaia comes from Strabo and Pausanias, and in this and other cases it is illegitimate to project their site-classifications back into the Archaic period. For a list of the ethnic Athnaios recorded on gravestones found outside Attika, see Hansen (1982) 187–88.

28 IG II 2. 116 (Cf): Μαμώδης Ἀγαίος, Ἑλεώσμαχος, Ζευσφω (Arkadian sub-tribe); Thuc. 5.300.1: Υἱοῦ τῶν Ακραίων (Aitolian sub-tribe).

29 CID 11. 32. 44 (326/5): Αρκάδημος Πελοποννήσιος, in fact a Sicyonian (CID 11. 100. 4–5) who in the Amphiktyonic Council filled one of the two seats assigned to the Dorians: IG II 10. 1263 (Cf): Παύλως Ἐλεόσων Ἑλεώσμαχος.


32 IG IV 1. 11.18 (Cf): Μαμώδης Ἀγαίος, Ἑλεώσμαχος, Ζευσφω (Arkadian sub-tribe); Thuc. 5.300.1: Υἱοῦ τῶν Ακραίων (Aitolian sub-tribe).

33 CID 11. 32. 44 (326/5): Αρκάδημος Πελοποννήσιος, in fact a Sicyonian (CID 11. 100. 4–5) who in the Amphiktyonic Council filled one of the two seats assigned to the Dorians: IG II 10. 1263 (Cf): Παύλως Ἐλεόσων Ἑλεώσμαχος.


28 IG II 2. 116 (Cf): Μαμώδης Ἀγαίος, Ἑλεώσμαχος, Ζευσφω (Arkadian sub-tribe); Thuc. 5.300.1: Υἱοῦ τῶν Ακραίων (Aitolian sub-tribe).

29 CID 11. 32. 44 (326/5): Αρκάδημος Πελοποννήσιος, in fact a Sicyonian (CID 11. 100. 4–5) who in the Amphiktyonic Council filled one of the two seats assigned to the Dorians: IG II 10. 1263 (Cf): Παύλως Ἐλεόσων Ἑλεώσμαχος.


28 IG II 2. 116 (Cf): Μαμώδης Ἀγαίος, Ἑλεώσμαχος, Ζευσφω (Arkadian sub-tribe); Thuc. 5.300.1: Υἱοῦ τῶν Ακραίων (Aitolian sub-tribe).

29 CID 11. 32. 44 (326/5): Αρκάδημος Πελοποννήσιος, in fact a Sicyonian (CID 11. 100. 4–5) who in the Amphiktyonic Council filled one of the two seats assigned to the Dorians: IG II 10. 1263 (Cf): Παύλως Ἐλεόσων Ἑλεώσμαχος.


native derived from a toponym, i.e. the name of a polis, e.g. 
Mεγαρεύς derived from Mεγαρa, Ναυκρατής derived from Ναυκράτης, Κόρωνος derived from Κόρωνος, Λυμ-
ψαχνός derived from Λάμψακος, and Ρηγίνος derived from Ρήγιον. The toponym from which a city-ethnic
could be derived was mostly the name of a town, but it
could also be, e.g., the name of a river44 or a mountain,35 or
a valley36 or a whole region.37 The ethnic denoting a whole
region, on the other hand, is mostly of the primitive Volks-
namen type, and becomes the name of what Gschnitzer and
others call a Stammesgemeinde, so that we are faced
with the reverse phenomenon: in the Stammesgemeinde it
is the name of the region that is derived from the name
of the people inhabiting the region. For exceptions to the
chronological sequence, see supra 55.
Second, that the Greeks were conscious of this distinction
between two forms of ethnic is apparent from the fact that,
sometimes, the two different types are combined to form
a fold name so that the full name consists of onoma,
patronymikon, ethnikon denoting a region and ethnikon de-
noting a polis.38
Therefore, we suggest that we distinguish between two
types of ethnic: the regional ethnic or ethnic proper denoting
an ethnos, that is either a people or a tribe inhabiting either a
whole region (e.g. Άρκαδες, Λίτωλοι, ‘Έπεφριτοί) or a part
of a region (e.g. Παρράσιοι, Ισοδοτοί, Άρκτάνες)39 and, on
the other hand, the city-ethnic denoting the polis to which
the named person belonged.40 In contradistinction to sub-
ethnics and city-ethnics, both invariably connected with
bodies which were administrative and political entities, the
regional ethnics sometimes designated areas, particularly
islands, which were divided between several poleis, each
with its own city-ethnic (e.g. Λέσβοι, Κέφαλαι) and
sometimes inhabited by people who did not even belong
to the same ethnos (e.g. Σικελιώτης, Εὐθονεύς, cf. Meyer
(1967) 398).
Sub-ethnics are attested in a few poleis only.42 In most
Hellenic poleis the name of a citizen inside his polis seems
to have consisted of an onoma to which, especially in public
documents, was often added a patronymic,43 but hardly ever
a sub-ethnic. The use of sub-ethnics was virtually unknown
in the Archaic period, and in the Classical period it was
commonly used in a few poleis only, principally Athens, Eretria
and Argos. There are haphazard occurrences from other
poleis, but at least sometimes their purpose is just to distin-
guish between otherwise homonymous persons44 and not
universally to record the citizens’ membership of a civic sub-
division. In the few poleis in which sub-ethnics were used,
the civic subdivisions from which the sub-ethnics were de-
derived are often attested in inscriptions of the Archaic and,
especially, the Classical periods, while the sub-ethnics are
found only in Hellenistic and Roman inscriptions, and the
presumption is that, in many cities, the use of sub-ethnics
was often a convention introduced in the Hellenistic period.

33 Substantives end in -έος or -ης (-της); adjectives in -ος, -ης or Ίος. See Dittenberger (1906) 168; Risch (1997); Gschnitzer (1983).
34 Instead of an adjective derived from a toponym the city-ethnic could take the form of a prepositional group, typically εξ plus the name of the polis in the genitive case. In almost all cases the two forms are used synonymously, sometimes even about the same person when mentioned in different contexts; cf. e.g. Nikisahares of Plataiai, who is called Νικασιχάρης Πλαταιεύς when listed as Ναοποιος (CID 11 122 col. 2.7) but Νικασιχάρης Βοιώτου in a proxeny decree (F.Delphes iii.113.16). Or compare two almost contemporary Athenian sepulchral inscriptions commemorating citizens from the small Boi-
oitian polis of Skaphitai (no. 204), of which one has Συνομολόγοι (IG ii 11202 (C4f)) and the other Συνομολόγοι (IG ii 11654 (Cami)). In this chapter all examples illustrate the use of the adjectival form and we cite no further examples of εξ Ιη τoponym.
36 The ethnic Πέλιος (Thuc. 6.4.4) is derived from Πέλια, the name of a river, and the polis Πέλια was named after the river, as stated by Thucydides at 6.4.3 and confirmed by the coins which have the legend ΠΕΛΙΑΣ, the name of the river-god (jenkins (1970) 165). But even in this case the presumption is that the ethnic Πελιώτος was derived directly from Πέλια, the name of the community (Thuc. 7.80.2) and the town (Hdt. 7.153.2), and thus only indirectly from the name of the river.
37 The ethnic Λάρισας (Ap. Rhod. Argon. 4.57) is derived from ό Λάρις, the mountain in Karia (Hecat. fr. 239–Strabo 14.1.8), beneath which was ό Λάρις, the homonymous polis (SEG 47 1563.7–8 (C4f)) whose citizens were called Οι Λάρισας (SEG 47 1563.14).
38 The ethnic Ηλείας is derived from Ηλεία, the valley (Γάλια), a toponym designating both the entire region between Achaia, Arkadia and Triphylia and the town of Elis (synoecised in 471). In this case both the ethnic Ηλείος (ML 27.9) and the name of the town Ηλεία must be derived from the name of the region, and the ethnic is probably older than the name of the town, see Gschnitzer (1995) 125–26.
39 e.g. Λυκέαδαμίων derived from Λυκεόαδημιων, undoubtedly because in this case a whole region had been united to form one polis. Λυκέαδαμιων, however, denotes not only the region, but also its urban centre (Hdt. 1.82.1). Note that alongside Λυκέαδαμιων (Pl. Resp. 599D) and Λυκέαδαμιων (Thuc. 5.33.1) the toponym Σπάρτα (St. Ar. 814–15; Hdt. 7.234.2) and the city-ethnic Σπαρτακιδα (Thuc. 1.132.1) were also used as names of the Spartan state.
39 The term “city-ethnic”, see Fraser and Ronne (1957) 93, 95–96. In CPhCacts 2: 63 n. 189 we coined the term politikon to replace ethnikon denoting a polis. On reflection, we prefer to use an existing term instead of adding to the confusion by creating a new one.
40 For the view that there was some kind of a Lesbian federation, see Robert (1966) 806–26.
41 The evidence for sub-ethnics is reviewed in Hansen (2004).
42 See the selection of lists of magistrates, pronomen and naturalised citizens in Michel 645–68 and the list of priests and theoroi nos. 857–78. The chapters comprise 46 inscriptions from all parts of Greece and, with the exception of no. 861 (=IG iv 537, see supra) the patronymic is invariably recorded.
42 The gene of Kolophon and the use of unidentified sub-ethnics in Styra.

ETHNICS AS EVIDENCE FOR POLIS 61
The restrictions on the use of the sub-ethnics were the same everywhere: they were almost invariably used inside the polis and only by fellow citizens, not by foreigners, and they are hardly ever attested outside the polis itself.45

D. City-Ethnics

The most common form of ethnic used in Greek inscriptions of all periods and from all places is the city-ethnic, i.e. an ethnic derived from or at least related to a toponym which denotes a polis. Occasionally the city-ethnic is identical with the toponym and in such cases it is difficult, sometimes impossible, to decide whether an occurrence of the form is the toponym or the city-ethnic.46

The ubiquitous use of city-ethnics is dictated by—and testifies to—the political subdivision of the Hellenic world into poleis and the constant communication between citizens from different poleis. Resident foreigners, often from other poleis, constituted an important element in the population of the standard Greek polis.47 Furthermore, the incessant interaction between the poleis in diplomacy, in trade, in religion and in sports entailed that citizens from different poleis all the time had to be mentioned side by side in documents of various kinds. In such cases it was customary all over the Greek world to use city-ethnics for identification, and accordingly, even in regions where the prevailing habit was to use name and patronymic only, there is some evidence of city-ethnics being applied both to citizens and to foreigners.48

A citizen was identified by his city-ethnic when he was abroad on public mission,49 or represented his polis in one of the Panhellenic games50 or when, in his own polis, he had to be recorded side by side with citizens from other poleis, e.g. as a member of a board of officials composed of representatives from several poleis,51 or when he was the victor in games arranged by his own polis but open to foreigners as well as to citizens,52 or when he had a dedication put up in a sanctuary which was frequented by foreigners as well as by locals.53 Conversely, in almost every polis foreigners are recorded with their city-ethnics, e.g. in proxeny decrees,54 in lists of foreigners to whom the polis in question had awarded proxenia,55 in lists of persons who had consulted an oracle or a health resort,56 in dedications of votive offerings in foreign sanctuaries,57 in lists of contributors to an epidosis comprising citizens and metics alike,58 in sepulchral inscriptions commemorating metics,59 etc. By adding up all this evidence it is possible to find attestations of most, if not all, city-ethnics and thus to come up with a rough estimate of the total number of poleis in the Classical Greek world.60

How easy is it to identify city-ethnics? Because of lack of sources for the settlement pattern of Archaic and Classical Greece, we are sometimes in doubt whether a name indicating membership of a group is a sub-ethnic denoting a subdivision of a polis, or a city-ethnic denoting a polis, or a “regional ethnic” denoting a whole region or a part of it. Let

45 For Rhodes, see Fraser (1995) 75: for the exceptional recording of Eretrian demes outside Eretria, see e.g. IG ii2 230 with W. Wallace’s comments in Hesperia 16 (1947) 145.

46 E.g. Delphi (no. 177), Σαμοθράκας (no. 188), Παραστάτης (no. 188), Παρασιδάς (no. 190), Περίος (no. 359) in Lel. Delph. 65 (no. 33) in Sicily and θεόποιες (no. 74) in Italy. Passages in which it is particularly difficult to distinguish between toponym and ethnic include Thuc. 2.30.2 (the four poleis on Kephallenia (nos. 125, 132, 135, 136)), Xen. Hell. iii. 2.25, 30 (Margarion); Hell. Oxy. 21 (Pedieis) and SEG 48 1027 (Labrys (no. 701)).

47 Arist. Pol. 1326b18–20. Even the minute inscription of Koresia on Keos had legal requirements concerning metics and manumitted slaves (IG xii. 5.547.9–11).

48 City-ethnics were not commonly used as part of the name in Boiotia, but are attested in, e.g. dedications from Ptoion: SEG 30 478: [ονομαζόμενους α’ Υφιστάμενος και Επικάρως θεοποίοις (C6–C5)], see p. 54 ff.

49 Xen. Hell. 6.3.2: Πολιούχοις Φωσφόροι addressing the assembly of the people in Sparta; IG ii2 105–8: στωικὸς θεοποίοις καὶ οἱ μετ’ αὐτῶν . . .

50 E.g. see the lists of Olympic victors in P. Oxy. 222 and 2381. For the view that a participant “represented” his polis at the games, see Dem. 58.66, and the provision that victors at the four Panhellenic centres were granted free meals in the prytaneion for the rest of their life (IG i1 151.11–15).

51 See, e.g., ναοποίοντος Συμφόνιου Δήλοι in a Delphic account (CID ii 32.1).

52 See, e.g., the Elean recorded as Olympic victor in 396: Εὐπόλεμος Ηλλήνος στάλη (P. Oxy. 2381; Paus. 6.3.7).

53 See, e.g., a dedication to Asklepios set up in Epidauros by an Epidaurian: Προσκυνήσας Ἀριστοκράτῳ Ἐπιδαυρίων Ἐκκλησίας (IG iv. 1 238), cf. also 200, 204, etc.


55 IG xii.1 251 (C4), Anaphe; IG xii.1 542 (C4m), Karthaia; PEP Chios 59 (Chios).

56 The Ca4 curse inscriptions set up at the Asklepieion in Epidauros record 20 different city-ethnics (IG iv.1.121–24).

57 IG iv.1 255–67 are dedications by foreigners set up in the Asklepieion in Epidauros.

58 See, e.g., the late Ca4 list of all who have contributed to the building of the walls of Kophol on which a number of foreigners. AJP 56 (1935) 358–359, ii. 123–98. Of the foreigners, the “big spenders” have an ethnic added to their name and patronymic (ll. 150ff). The “little spenders” have just the word μέτοικος added after the patronymic (ll. 37ff).

59 There seems to be some connection between the use of sub-ethnics (in names of citizens) and city-ethnics (in names of foreigners). In sepulchral inscriptions foreigners with city-ethnics are well attested in poleis whose citizens use sub-ethnics (Athens, Rhodes, Chalkis, Eretria), whereas in poleis in which sub-ethnics are not used the sepulchral inscriptions are mostly confined to the name without the patronymic and with very few attestations of city-ethnics (Central Greece and the Peloponnese). For the common use of the name without patronymic and ethnic, see Fraser and Rörne (1957) 92–101 and Fraser (1995) 77–78.

60 The city-ethnic is attested for 877 of the 1,035 communities included in this Inventory. For 738 communities it is attested in Archaic and/or Classical sources, see Index 8. For 139 communities it is attested in Hellenistic or, in a few cases, Roman sources, see Index 3.
us adduce two examples. (a) Ἀσκραῖος is an ethnic which in literary sources is applied to Hesiod and his brother Perse (Hermesianax quoted by Ath. 697D; Steph. Byz. 134,1–2). If it is a genuine ethnic and not a late invention it is difficult to decide whether it is a sub-ethnic denoting a kome or a city-ethnic denoting an early polis.61 (b) In 464 the Olympic victor in the pankration was Εφοινίκης Μαυάλιος (schol. Ar. Vesp. 1191 = ISE no. 253). Was he a citizen of the Arkadian polis Mainalos, in which case Μαυάλιος is a city-ethnic? Or did he belong to the Mainalian tribe (Thuc. 5.77.1), in which case it is a regional ethnic? There is no obvious answer (Nielsen (2002) 274 n. 21).

In the great majority of cases, however, we can easily distinguish city-ethnics from both sub-ethnics and regional ethnics, and in all these cases the attestation of a city-ethnic is a crucial criterion for establishing polis identity. To sum up: if the toponym from which the ethnic is derived designates an urban centre, and if it can be demonstrated that this settlement was not the urban centre of a civic subdivision, such as e.g. a kome or a demos, then it is almost certain that the toponym designated a polis and that the ethnic was used to denote a polites, i.e. a citizen of the polis in question. It is for this type of ethnic that we propose to use the more specific term “city-ethnic”.

E. Ethnics as Evidence for Political Status

Regional ethnics and city-ethnics are all related to toponyms, and so are those sub-ethnics that designate a village (kome) or a municipality (demos) and some of those that designate a phyle.62 All the toponyms behind the ethnics can, of course, be placed on a map, and so we must address the question of whether the “message” conveyed by the ethnic is primarily topographical or political. The tradition of naming a person after the place of birth and/or habitation is known in many countries.63 Now, is the ancient Greek way of using ethnics basically “topographical” or is the message conveyed political? This problem is best treated separately for sub-ethnics, city-ethnics and regional ethnics.

(A) Sub-ethnics Since the sub-ethnics are related to civic subdivisions, and since civic subdivisions apply to “citizens and only citizens” (Jones, POAG 1), there can be no doubt that sub-ethnics associated with toponyms mirror the political rather than the geographical structure of the society in question. Furthermore, membership of a civic subdivision was ultimately hereditary; thus, sub-ethnics derived from toponyms can have indicated the bearer’s place of birth or residence for only a few generations after the system was introduced; thereafter their significance, if any, must have been purely political.

(B) City-ethnics The city-ethnic is derived from a toponym designating a polis. But the polis was both an urban centre and a political community. Was the message conveyed by the city-ethnic an affiliation with the polis as an urban centre or as a political community? The accepted view is that such ethnics are restricted to citizens and thus (like the sub-ethnics) political in character (Dittenberger (1907) 15). Basically we share this view, but it requires some elaboration and a slight modification.

(a) An early C4 law from Oropos prescribes that every person who consults the oracle must have his name and the name of his polis recorded by the nekoros.64 On a strict interpretation of this law we should expect all the consultants to be politai, their “surnames” to be city-ethnics, and the oracle to be accessible only to Greeks who were citizens of a named polis. But a C3 inventory record two regional ethnics (Ἄινωλάος and Ἀκαρνάν) alongside two city-ethnics: Καρυστία, Κορίνθιος (IG vii 303,60–65), and an early C3 manumission shows that the oracle was consulted by Μόσχος Μοσχίανος ᾿Ιουδαῖος (SEG 15 293,10). On the assumption that the Classical law was still in force, the inference is that the phrase τὸ ὅνομα...τῆς πόλεως covered not just city-ethnics in the strict sense but other types of ethnic as well, including ethnics of non-Greeks. Thus the message is not strictly “political”. Polis is here used as a generic term which comprised types of community other than poleis in the sense of city-state.

(b) Persons from poleis that had been destroyed con-

61 Both by Hesiod (Op. 639–40) and by Ephoros (fr. 1), Askra is classified as a kome lying in Thespian territory and once destroyed by Thespiai (Arist. fr. 580). Thus, Ἀσκραῖος may be a sub-ethnic but, if so, it would be the only sub-ethnic in all of Boiotia (Hansen (1995) 45–51). Alternatively, Askra may once have been a polis conquered by Thespiai but with a city-ethnic that survived the conquest. In that case Ἀσκραῖος would be the oldest of all city-ethnics. A third solution seems preferable: the ethnic Ἀσκραῖος is unattested in inscriptions and known from late literary sources only; furthermore it is used exclusively about Hesiod and his brother. The presumption is that it is neither a city-ethnic, nor a sub-ethnic, but invented by Hellenistic literary critics who had to mention Hesiod from late literary sources only; furthermore it is used exclusively about Hesiod (Hermesianax quoted by Ath. 697D; Steph. Byz. 134.1–2). If it is a genuine ethnic and not a late invention it is difficult to decide whether it is a sub-ethnic denoting a kome or a city-ethnic denoting an early polis.61

62 Jones, POAG 4 distinguishes between two main categories of civic subdivisions: “territorial” and “personal”. Demoï and komai were invariably territorial. Of the phylai, some were territorial (e.g. the three phylai on Rhodos) but some were purely personal (e.g. the 4–6 Ionian phylai).

63 Hirzel (1962) 51–62; Hanks and Hodges (1988) xxv (England), xxx (France), xxxi (Spain), etc.

64 IG 7 ii 277.39–43 (C4b): τὸ ὅνομα τοῦ ἔγκαθετοῦ ὅπην ἵμβάλλει τὸ ἄργυρον γράφεται τῆς πόλεως καὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς πόλεως καὶ ἕνωσις ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ γράφωνται ἐν ἑκάστη τοιούτῳ σκοπεῖν ἕνα ὀλοκληρωμένα.
continued to use their city-ethnic in spite of the fact that there was no longer any political community of which they were members. One example is Olynthos, demolished by Philip II in 348. Nevertheless, numerous Hellenistic inscriptions provide us with attestations of Olynthians, the latest dating from C1.  

(c) If city-ethnics were purely political we would expect that, like sub-ethnics, they were attested in the masculine but hardly ever in the feminine. True, women were to some extent citizens, and in female names a frequent habit was to use the kteikon instead of the ethnikon: thus Πλαταεύς Τολµίδης versus Τολµίδης Πλαταεύς. This expectation squares with the evidence of public documents in which, with a few exceptions, 67 women are conspicuous by their absence, but private inscriptions present a different picture, and the sepulchral inscriptions in particular provide us with numerous attestations of city-ethnics in the feminine nominative. In C4 Attic inscriptions no fewer than forty-two city-ethnics are attested in the feminine (Hansen 1996: 196); and that reveals an important difference between sub-ethnics and city-ethnics, viz. that feminine city-ethnics are far more common than feminine sub-ethnics. But, on reflection, that is only what we should expect. As stated above, sub-ethnics are almost invariably used within the polis, whereas city-ethnics are mostly found outside the polis. They are especially well attested in sepulchral inscriptions where they commemorate persons who lived as free foreigners in a polis in which they had no political rights. If they stayed on for many years, perhaps even generations, with their own polis must have weakened, and they must have thought of it as their city of origin rather than as the polis in which they could exercise their political rights if they returned. 68 Accordingly, their use of the ethnic in sepulchral inscriptions would no longer be felt as an indication of their status as citizens; and under such circumstances it would be only natural to apply the ethnic to women as well as to men. It is worth noting that on tombstones wives normally retained their own ethnic when it differed from that of their husband.

(d) In Delphic manumissions the origin of the manumitted slave is often recorded, but if the slave came from a polis the regular form used is not the city-ethnic but τὸ γένος ἔξι plus the toponym in the genitive case, e.g. σῖὼμα | γνατακείον ἢ δὲ ὅρμα Σοῦσι, τὸ γένος ᾿Ικ Δεῖλης, presumably because it was the prerogative of a citizen to be called by an ethnic. 69 But even slaves could sometimes have a city-ethnic added to their name. One example is a C2 funerary inscription commemorating twenty-two slaves with ethnics but without patronymics. Two of the names recorded are Βιθος Ἰστριανὸς and Δαμᾶς Ἰστριανὸς (IG 1x.1 1778). Now, Ἰστριανὸς is the city-ethnic derived from Ἰτρος, the Milesian colony near the estuary of the Danube. It is still a moot point how to interpret this ethnic, but the prevailing view is that, in this and similar cases, the city-ethnic indicates the location of the slave market in which the slave in question was sold. 70

(e) The city-ethnic Ναυκρατίτης is attested in several documents of C3 and C4. Those who refuse to believe that Naukratis was a polis before Alexander the Great hold that the ethnic in this case must indicate the city where a person lives and not the community of which he is a member. 71 But Ναυκρατίτης is attested, e.g., in an Athenian proxeny decree and in a Delphic list of contributions to the rebuilding of the temple of Apollo. 72 The context as well as other evidence indicates that Naukratis was a polis in C5–C4 and that Ναυκρατίτης is used as a city-ethnic.

These modifications must not obscure the basically correct view that city-ethnics were primarily political. The view can be further corroborated by two observations:

First, it is true that the ethnic Λακεδαιμόνιος used collectively might comprise perioikoi as well as Spartiates (Hdt. 9.28.2), but there is no attestation of Λακεδαιμόνιος being used individually as the surname of one of the perioikoi. 73 Nor is there any attestation of Ἀθηναῖος been used as the

65 SEG 19 595: Ἡρακλείδωμος Πλαταεύς Ὁλόθος, C4–C3 (Thasos); SEG 18.254, C3–C2 (Delphi); IG ii 10021, C2–C1 (Athens); IG xi.2 202, C1 (Mytilene); see Zahrnt (1971) 115 with nn. 7 and 8. See also Ἑχίλαος Φιλωνίδου Πλαταεύς in a Troizenian citizenship decree of 369 (Syll. 162.2–3); and Skaphlai may provide us with a similar example, see Hansen (1995) 28.

66 IG 673, a C4 sepulchral monument from Oropos. See further, e.g., Μαντιναίος (IG ii 9421; Pl. Synd. 221D); Χαλκεβική (IG vii 1753); Θεσπική (IG vii 372b1), etc. Cf. Dittenberger (1907) 17–18.


68 See SEG 27 571, 37 850 (found in Chalkis, undated): Λακεδαιμόνιος ἢ Λακεδαιμόνιος ἢ Λακεδαιμόνιος; IG ii 662, 221D; IG vii 1753; Θεσπική (IG vii 372b1), etc. Cf. Dittenberger (1907) 17–18.

69 F.Delphes ii 111.2 226.2–3 (Cas). For a list of examples, see Dittenberger (1907) 19.

70 Varro, Ling. 8.21. See Pippidi (1966) 232–35; Fraser (2000) 152–53. We would like to thank Prof. Alexandru Avram for drawing our attention to this problem. For a similar example, see SGDI 2350.3: πώμα γυναικίων ἢ άνδρα πιστῶν τῷ γένος Ἰστριανοῦ, cf. Robert (1960) 73. The alternative interpretation is, of course, that the named persons were enslaved citizens of the polis in question.


72 IG ii 1106 (Athenian proxeny decree of 349/8 for Θεόγένης ὡς Ναυκράττης); CID ii 11 (list of contributors in 360, including Ναυκράττης ἢ Λιβνάτου (col. 1.37), Εὐδῆς Ναυκράττης (col. 3.21) and Τύρις Ναυκράττης (col. 3.24)).

73 I have asked the compilers of the Oxford Lexicon of Personal Names, and they have confirmed the statement made in the text on the basis of the evidence at present available.
surnames of a metic or a slave who came from Athens or lived in Athens. The enormous amount of evidence we have indicates that to be called Ἡθνικός was the prerogative of an Athenian citizen.74

Second, in societies in which names are derived from a toponym and used to indicate the person’s place of birth, the toponyms designate every type of settlement ranging from farmsteads and hamlets to major towns and even whole regions.75 If the Greek ethnics had been invented and used in personal names primarily to indicate the person’s place of origin, names of hamlets and villages would have developed ethnics as well as the administrative units of the poleis and the towns which were the urban centres of the poleis. But whenever we hear about inscribing persons with their full names, the reference is to their poleis,76 or to an administrative subdivision of the poleis.77 Furthermore, our sources show that in many regions the only attested ethnics are derived from names of poleis, that is from communities which are either directly attested as poleis in our sources or from communities which share so many characteristics with the attested poleis that they undoubtedly would have been attested as poleis themselves had we better sources. Arkadia (Nielsen (2002) 39–40), Boiotia (Hansen (1995) 45–51) and Crete (infra 1144) may serve as examples.

(C) Regional ethnics By the term regional ethnic we understand—as stated above—an ethnic associated with a toponym which denotes a larger area than a poleis and often subdivided into poleis. Two different types are discernible: (a) as pointed out above, many regional ethnics are primitive Volksnamen, e.g. Ἀγάμη, Ἐχαίος, Βουστός, Κρής, Λοκρός, Φωκεύς, but others (b) resemble the city-ethnics in being Ableitungen von Ortsnamen, e.g. Εὐβοιεύς, Λέσβιος, Σικελιώτης. When used for personal identification the regional ethnic is either added to the city-ethnic so that the person has a fourfold name, or the regional ethnic replaces the city-ethnic and is often used in the same contexts.

Is the message conveyed political or topographical? To answer this question we must distinguish between (a) the ethnics from which toponyms are derived (e.g. Ἡθνικός derived from Ἡθνικός) and (b) the ethnics which are derived from toponyms (e.g. Εὐβοιεύς derived from Εὐβοια). Almost all the regions associated with the ethnics in group (b) were islands, and none of them was a political unit. In every case the island was split up into a number of poleis, and with one or two exceptions these poleis were not united to form a league or a federal state. Thus, ethnics like Εὐβοιεύς, Κεῖος, Λέσβιος and Σικελιώτης must be primarily topographical. They testify to a certain feeling of belonging to the same people. But they do not denote a political community in the same way as city-ethnics do. The Keians, for example, were split up into four poleis and formed a federation for a few years only during the fourth century.

The ethnics subsumed by Dittenberger under the heading “primitive Volksnamen” (type a) are more difficult to interpret. In this case the region denoted by the toponym is traditionally assumed to have been a (loosely organised) political community before it was broken up into poleis, and again many of these regions formed federations of poleis. Thus the regional ethnics may have had some political significance. But what is the message when regional ethnics, type (a) and (b) alike, occur side by side with city-ethnics, as they often do? Let us adduce some examples.

(a) Olympic victors were almost invariably designated by their city-ethnic,78 but occasionally we come across a victor designated by a regional ethnic only. Cretan victors are just called Κρήτες and we have no information about the poleis to which they belonged.79 (b) Victors in the games in honour of Zeus Lykaios are called by their regional ethnic, Λυκαίοι, if they come from one of the Arkadian cities, but by their city-ethnic if they come from other parts of Greece (i.e. Ἡθνικοί, Ἀλειοί, Ἀργείοι, Λικεδαμίοι and Μιλήσιοι). The only exception is an Akarnanian victor who, like the Arkadians, is called by his regional ethnic: Ἀκαρνανίοι.80 (c) The Epidaurian cure inscriptions from the Asklepieion record sometimes a city-ethnic, sometimes a regional ethnic, and sometimes no ethnic at all.81

In these and similar cases regional ethnics are recorded...
side by side with city-ethnics. The presumption is that a person identified by a city-ethnic was a citizen of the polis in question. Are we allowed by analogy to assume that persons identified in the same document by regional ethnics must have been citizens too? Was Diogenetos, the Olympic victor of 488, a Cretan who preferred his ethnic or, rather, island identity to his political status as a citizen of one particular Cretan polis? In the list of Lykaian victors the regional ethnic Αρκάς strongly emphasises the Panarkadian nature of the games and there is no reason to doubt that all the fifteen Arkadian victors recorded in the preserved part of the list were citizens of Arkadian poleis who in this context were called by their regional ethnic instead of their city-ethnic.

In western Greece in particular, tribal ethnics were used to indicate citizen status and not just habitation. The Molossian Federation, for example, founded in C4e, was composed of ten(?) territorial “tribes” and in public documents the tribal ethnic was regularly added to a citizen’s name, cf. e.g. Εἰδύµµας Αρκτάν (SEG 15 384.7–8 (C4f)) or Δροάτας Κέλαι[θος] (SEG 23 471.2 (C4s)).

The use of regional ethnics has been adduced as evidence of federal citizenship, especially when combined with a city-ethnic; but the name Θαρριάδας Φρονήµονος Κρής Θαρριάδας (IG II2 9087 (C3)) is engraven on an Attic sepulchral monument, is enough to show that a fourfold name is not necessarily evidence of federal citizenship, and in Arkadia the regional ethnic—either alone or in combination with one of the city-ethnics—is attested both before the formation and after the dissolution of the Arkadian Federation.

To conclude: sub-ethnics are strictly political, city-ethnics are primarily political, whereas regional ethnics form a mixed group: those derived from toponyms (type a) are primarily topographical, whereas those designating a people (type b) may signal a feeling of ethnic identity, but not necessarily membership of a political community. The political connotation became prominent only in regions organised on a tribal basis or if the region formed a federa-

So far we have treated the problem of how we can use ethnics as sources for polis identity without addressing the question of why the ethnic could be used in this way. So let us ask the question: what did it mean to the Greeks in certain contexts to have sub-ethnics or city-ethnics as part of their name? A person’s name is part of his identity, and to many persons it matters by what name they identify themselves and are called by others. In our culture the prevailing pattern is to have one or more first names and a hereditary surname designating the family to which one belongs, and many persons take pride in belonging to a specific family and bearing its name. In numerous cases a person’s nationality has to be recorded but it never becomes a part of the name itself. The name of the cyclist who won the Tour de France in 1996 was Bjarne Riis. On the rostrum it was proclaimed that he was Danish but his name is not Bjarne Riis Dansker. That the ancient Greeks used sub-ethnics and city-ethnics as part of their personal names is significant in several respects.

First, in Western civilisation the Greeks seem to have been the only people to use inherited names as an indication of political status. In all other European countries toponyms used as names or names derived from toponyms denote habitation or place of origin without conveying any information about the political status of the named person. The closest we can get to the Greeks’ political use of surnames is perhaps the habit in some countries of using a preposition plus a toponym as a name indicating aristocracy, e.g. de Montesquieu, von Bismarck or van Velde. The ancient Greeks’ use of personal names reveals how much it meant to a Greek to be a member of his polis (supra 13), and the fact that the use of sub-ethnics and city-ethnics was a prerogative of the citizens to the exclusion of foreigners and slaves reminds us to what extent the polis as a political community was a community of the citizens only. In any Greek city one could only tell the insider from the outsider by his full name.

Second, to use a word indicating membership of a political community as part of a name is possible only if people from many different communities live together, and if each group is fairly small. In a modern nation with millions...
of citizens it would make no sense to use a term indicating nationality as a part of a name, except when one or a few persons settled somewhere in a foreign country and there were called by their country of origin, e.g. French or Welsh. Thus, a pre-condition for the standard Greek way of distinguishing people by their city-ethnic was the large number of *poleis* combined with the constant interaction between citizens from different *poleis* and the widespread migration from one *polis* to another.

2. Ethnics Used Collectively about a State or its Citizens

A. Unnamed Citizens

When used individually and (mostly) in the singular, the ethnic was part of a citizen’s full name. When used collectively it signified one or more unnamed members of the community in question or the community as such. A usage halfway between the individual and the collective is attested in some lists of officials, or *epheboi*, or *proxenoi*, or mercenaries in which personal names are grouped according to city-ethnics. In such lists the ethnics are used collectively, each as the heading of a number of names. On the other hand, the usage is individual in so far as the named persons are further identified as members of a specific community, be it their civic subdivision, their *polis* or their *ethnos*. Since the ethnics used as headings are not part of personal names, we prefer to emphasise the collective aspect of the usage.

B. States

For our purposes the most important collective use of the city-ethnic was as the name of the *polis* itself. It is used mostly without, but sometimes with the definite article. A not infrequent variant is the genitive plural depending on the noun *ἡ πόλις* or *ἡ δῆμος*. As is well known, the Greek *polis* was conceived as a community of citizens rather than a territory ruled by a government. One result of this way of viewing the *polis* was the habit of calling it by the city-ethnic in the plural rather than using the toponym itself. Admittedly, there are quite a few attestations of the toponym being used as the name of the *polis* (supra 56), but they are outnumbered by the prevailing habit of using the city-ethnic in the plural: the monument dedicated to Apollo from the booty won in the battle of Plataiai is inscribed with thirty-one city-ethnics (ML 27). Almost all treaties are concluded between parties identified by ethnics (*Staatsverträge* vols. 2 and 3). In the C5 Athenian tribute lists and assessment decrees recording the members of the Delian League, most entries have the form of an ethnic, and toponyms are used only occasionally (*IG* vii. 71, 77, 100, 259–90; see *infra* 112). The Charter of the Second Athenian Naval League records forty-five city-ethnics, two regional ethnics and three names of rulers (Dreher (1995) 189–91). The recipients of grain from Kyrene during the corn crisis of the 320s are recorded in the form of forty-one city-ethnics in the dative plural plus two names of rulers (*SEG* 9 2 = RO 96). In the C4 Delphic accounts 109 different city-ethnics in the plural are used to designate *poleis* as donors or as *poleis* who provide amphiktyonic officials (*CID* 11 pp. 300–5). Finally, if an Archaic or Classical Greek coin has a legend, it is usually the city-ethnic in the genitive plural, often abbreviated (Guarducci (1969) 615–705, *infra* 144).

In all these documents and on the coins as well, sub-ethnics are conspicuous by their absence. Some of the documents above list city-ethnics only, others mix city-ethnics with *daimōn* and *epheboi*.
with a few regional ethnics, which conforms with the habit
of using a regional ethnic as the name of a political com-
community comprising a whole region, typically a federation.98

To conclude: every polis seems to have used the plural
of the city-ethnic as the name of the state and, conversely,
whenever the plural of an ethnic can be identified as a
city-ethnic and is used as the name of a political commu-

...
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1969. Opera Minora ii (Amsterdam).

tizens Commemorated in Sepulchral Inscriptions”, ClMed 43:
5–21.
According to the Greek conception, most clearly formulated by Aristotle, a *polis* was “a community (κοινωνία) of citizens (πολιτεία) with regard to the constitution (πολιτεία)”.¹ It is at once apparent that Aristotle picks up only two of the three elements that comprise the modern juristic idea of a state (CPC Acts 5: 36–40), the people and the constitution; the territory is left out altogether, and that is not by chance. For Aristotle asserts that no one is a citizen by mere domicile in a particular place (Pol. 1275b7), and that a common space to live in is not the essential aspect of a *polis* (Pol. 1280a30). Thus, Aristotle hits upon one important difference between the *polis* and the modern state. We nowadays tend to equate a state with its territory—a state is a country (CPC Acts 5: 38, 117); whereas the Greeks identified the *polis* primarily with its population—a *polis* is a people (CPC Acts 5: 56–64).

This is well known and basically true. But it must not lead to the inference that the territory was not an element in the concept of the *polis*. Aristotle’s definition of the πόλις as a κοινωνία πολιτῶν πολιτείας (Pol. 1276b¹) is proposed in connection with the problem of the identity of the *polis*, and Aristotle discusses three different criteria for deciding when a *polis* has changed so much that it has become a different *polis*: (a) change of place (topos), (b) change of people (anthropoi) and (c) change of constitution (politeia).² He rejects (a) and (b) as superficial and prefers (c), but it is important to note that the territory is discussed as one of the three relevant parameters. Similarly, in book 2 of the *Politics* Aristotle asserts that the *polis* is a community, and that its first and most fundamental aspect shared by the members is the place where they live (1260b40–61²). A common space to live in after all, is a necessary condition for a *polis* (1280b31–32).

Of course the Greeks knew all about the territory of a *polis*: the frequently used penalty of exile³ consisted precisely in the right of anyone to kill the outlaw if found within the territorial bounds,⁴ and we know of laws and verdicts which prescribed that the corpse of an executed criminal be thrown over the border of the *polis*.⁵ So the Greeks were perfectly capable of saying “the *polis* stretches to this-and-this point and not beyond”. The borderline of a *polis* was often marked with boundary stones (horoi);⁶ we are told that territorial disputes had to be settled by international arbitration⁷ and might result in wars between *poleis*.⁸

Next, the term *polis* is sometimes used in the sense of territory, denoting both the *polis* (in the sense of town) and its hinterland: Herodotos tells us that Xerxes’ army in 480 marched straight through a *polis* called Agore; and Xenophon reports that Agesilaos pillaged “the eastern part of the *polis* of Thebes right up to the *polis* of Tanagra”.⁹ In both these passages *polis* is used to denote the territory of a *polis*: Xerxes’ army did not march through the gates of the city of Agore, and Agesilaos did not pillage “the countryside east of the city of Thebes up to the city of Tanagra”. There are some four score other examples of territory as the principal meaning of *polis*,¹⁰ and they show that the territory in question almost always is a town and its hinterland. Attestations of *polis* in the sense of country

---

¹ Arist. Pol. 1276d¹; for an interpretation and a defence of the text in the MSS, see CPC Acts 5: 133–34.
² Place (topos) and people (anthropoi): Pol. 1276b¹8–22, 34–40; constitution: Pol. 1276b¹ff.
³ Lys. 6.15; IG ii¹ 2484–6 (Athens); IG xii.2 526c26–28, 626–28 (Eresos); Llaos i.3–6 (Llaos); ML 32.32–37 (Halikarnassos). See Seibert (1979) 355–59.
⁴ Andoc. 1.96; Dem. 23.37, 37ff; Philoch. fr. 30 (Athens); Syll. 194 (Amphipolis); Nomima 1 ιυβ (Teos and Abdera). See Swoboda (1903); Hansen (1970) 75–76.
⁵ Din. 1.77: τὸν τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀλιτήριον ἀποκτείναντας ἐξόριστον ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ποιῆσαι (“you must put to death the man who has ruined Hellas and throw his body over the border of the *polis*”).
⁶ Xen. Hell. 4.4.6: “the Corinthians perceived that their *polis* was being eclipsed both by the removal of the *horoi* and by their fatherland being called Argos instead of Corinth . . .” See Rousset (1994). IG xii.5 541 (Karthaia); IG vii 2792–36 41 (Boiotian *horos* marking the border between Akraiphia and Kopai); Syll. 132.22–23 (Miletos and Myous); IP Ark 14 (Orchomenus).
⁷ Arbitration between Miletos and Myous, c.395–388 (Syll. 1 134–40 B.6 C 1995); Orchomenos, 369–361 (IP Ark 14); the Delphic Amphiktyony judges a border dispute between Amphissa and Delphi c.350? (BCH 27 (1903) 140–53, Ager (1996) no. 1); Alexander the Great calls for a boundary settlement between Aspendos and a neighbour, perhaps Side in 333 (Ara. Anth. 1.27.4, Ager (1996) no. 6).
⁸ Dem. 15.17; Thuc. 5.79.4 (treaty between the Lakadaimonians and the Argives in 418).
⁹ Hdt. 7.58.2; Xen. Hell. 5.4.49, 44 supra. Both passages are quoted and interpreted in Hansen (1998) 54 with nn. 237 and 238.
and used about large regions (e.g. Thessaly, cf. Lys. 6.6) or multipolate islands (e.g. Keos, cf. Lys. fr. 90) are few and far between (CPCActs 5: 124–32).

Similarly, a toponym could be used to designate a polis not only in the senses of nucleated settlement or political community but also in the sense of territory (supra 55). Thus the name Θηβαῖοι designated not only the urban centre (Hdt. 1.92.1); it could also be used synonymously with the ethnic Θηβαῖοι to denote the Theban political community (Dem. 19.325), or synonymously with Θηβαῖοι (Hdt. 9.65.1) to denote the hinterland (Xen. Hell. 5.2.25), just as the term polis was used to designate either the Theban political community (SEG 28 465, 3–4 (C4m)), or the town (Dem. 18.216), or the territory (Xen. Hell. 5.4.49).

To sum up: of the three aspects of the concept of polis, the territory mattered less than the people and the government, but it was still an important element which the ancient Greeks did not ignore. It is true that a people thrown out of their territory could still persist as a polis. Thus, Themistokles claimed that Athens—or rather the Athenians—were still a polis although the Persians had occupied Attika (Hdt. 8.61.2; Aesch. Pers. 347–50). But in a similar situation Nikias told his army that they were strong enough to become a polis, as soon as they chose to settle down somewhere.11 So, although “the polis is its men” (Thuc. 7.77.7), a polis is also a settlement in a given place.

Apart from such exceptional cases as the Athenian army in 480, every polis had a territory and the concept of the Polis ohne Territorium, coined by Franz Hampl (1939), should be abandoned as a fallacy. Yet, following Hampl, some historians still seem to believe that a polis could be completely deprived of its territory but nevertheless persist as a self-governing community of citizens, i.e. as a polis.12 The concept of a Polis ohne Territorium, however, has been rejected by other historians, mostly on general grounds.13 Let us add that all Hampl’s examples of Poleis ohne Territorium testify to the existence of dependent poleis (ὑπήκοοι πόλεις), and he points out quite correctly (16–17) that a city which lost its autonomia could persist as a polis. But that does not amount to evidence of “Poleis ohne Territorium” (CPCActs 5: 55). Just as an Attic deme had a territory marked with ἱόραι inside Attika which was the territory of the Athenian polis, so, at a higher level, we have dependent poleis whose territories were part of the territory of a larger polis (see infra 87–88).

One main characteristic of the territory of the polis was its small size. That is well known and often emphasised, albeit mostly in vague terms. In the only study specifically devoted to this issue, Ruschenbusch (1985) 259 concludes that “die Normalpolis” had a territory of 25–100 km². His findings are confirmed by this inventory. Of the 1,035 communities included in our inventory, 166 are unlocated. But for 635 of the remaining 869, i.e. close to three-quarters of the total, it is possible to assess the size of the territory, at least roughly, and to place it in one or, at most, two of the following five categories: 25 km² max., 25–100 km², 100–200 km², 200–500 km², 500 km² minimum. The distribution is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Range</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 or 1? (25 km² max.)</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or 3? (25–100 km²)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 5? (100–200 km²)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or 6? (200–500 km²)</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or 7? (500 km² min.)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, some 60 per cent of the poleis had a territory of max. 100 km², and close to 80 per cent had a territory of max. 200 km². Only 10 per cent had a territory of over 500 km². Both the mode and the median fall between 25 and 100 km². The mean, however, is c.150 km². This shows that a mean can be a dangerous simplification and that the “Normalpolis” may be a misleading concept. A more nuanced picture emerges if we select a number of regions for further study. The following four confirm the accepted view of c.25–100 km²:

- Thracian Chersonesos: c.950 km², c.15 poleis = c.65 km² per polis
- Phokis: c.1,600 km², c.25 poleis = c.65 km² per polis
- Triphylia: c.600 km², 8 poleis = c.75 km² per polis
- Pallene, Sithonia and Akte: c.1,100 km², 20 poleis = c.55 km² per polis

But other regions testify to much larger territories:

- Arkadia: c.4,700 km², c.39 poleis = c.120 km² per polis
- Crete: c.8,200 km², c.49 poleis = c.167 km² per polis

11 Thuc. 7.77.4: λογίζεσθε δὲ ὅτι αὐτοὶ τε πόλεως εἰσῆκαν ἄστι γὰρ ὅπου ἀν καθῆκατε (“consider that you immediately become a polis yourselves wherever you choose to settle down”).
Lesbos: c.1,600 km², 6 later 5 poleis = c.266 later 320 km² per poleis
Euboia: c.3,600 km², 14 later 4 poleis = c.257 later 900 km² per poleis

On the whole, colonies had larger territories than poleis in the Greek homeland, see Index 9 infra, often separated by areas settled with indigenous communities. And while some very small islands were the smallest of all poleis, viz. Delos (3 km²), Belbina (8 km²), Rheneia (14 km²) and Leukai (2.5 km²), at least some of the multipolate islands were settled with poleis that, on average, were much larger than the so-called Normalpolis, viz. Euboia, Kephallenia, Crete, Lesbos and especially Cyprus.

Almost all poleis, however, came within the ideal maximum size we have suggested for city-states in general:

Essentially, a city-state's territory is the immediate hinterland of its urban centre, and a city-state which extends its frontiers beyond its immediate hinterland begins to lose one of its characteristics. Given the simple means of transportation in former times, and given the fact that a city-state is a community whose members are in close contact with one another, the maximum extent of the immediate hinterland can, ideally, be fixed at one day's march from the urban centre = c.30 km.14 The inference is that the territory of a city-state may cover c.3,000 km² max. Larger city-states are indeed attested, but then they are no longer city-states to the same extent as their smaller neighbours. (*Thirty City-State Cultures* 17)

In the great majority of poleis it was even possible to get from the border to the urban centre and back again in one day. And there were just four which exceeded the suggested maximum size of 3,000 km²: viz. Syracuse, Sparta, Pantikapaion and Kyrene. How were they organised? It seems worthwhile to shift the attention from the smallest to the largest poleis and study not only these four oversized poleis but also other poleis with territories of over 1,000 km². No more than thirteen such poleis are known, viz.

Argos (c.1,400 km² in C4l)
Athenai (c.2,500 km²)
Byzantion (c.1,500 km²)
Elis (c.1,500 km² in C4)
Eretria (c.1,500 km² in C4)
Kyrene (c.1,750 km²)
Megale polis (planned as poleis of c.1,500 km², perhaps over 1,000 km²)
Miletos (perhaps c.2,000 km²)
Pantikapaion (over 3,000 km²)
Rhegion (1,000–1,300 km²)
Rhodos (1,400 km²)
Sparta/Lakedaimon (c.8,400 km² before 371)
Syarakousai (c.12,000 km² in C4)

These super poleis had emerged in one of four different ways: some had subjected neighbouring poleis and turned them into municipalities (Argos, Eretria). Some had subjected neighbouring poleis but kept them as dependent poleis (Elis, Pantikapaion, Sparta/Lakedaimon, Syarakousai). Some had expanded over a large territory where, apparently, there were no other poleis (Athenai, Byzantion, Kyrene, Miletos, Rhegion). Two were created by synoecism but in, probably, both cases it was a partial synoecism in which the participating communities persisted as dependent poleis side by side with the new central poleis (Rhodos, Megale polis).

In their fully developed form the big poleis were of two different types. While small poleis were so small that they had just one urban centre—the poleis in the urban sense—the big poleis all had a number of second-order nucleated settlements scattered over their territory. In some cases these villages or towns were just municipalities, in other cases they were polities, i.e. dependent poleis. It is interesting to note that Athens is the obvious example of the first type, Sparta of the second.

**References**


---

14 A different approach leads to a similar result. The Italian word for “local patriotism” is *campanilismo*. The explanation is that, traditionally, the immediate hinterland of a città was believed to be as much land as one could see from the top of the campanile in the urban centre. If the view is not obstructed by mountains *vel sim*. the visual range from the top of a campanile is something like 25–30 km


There are two basic forms of settlement: nucleated and dispersed.\(^1\) The opposition is clear in principle; the crucial question is where to draw the line in practice, and that is a problem which stands out clearly as soon as we move from an abstract to a more concrete form of analysis. In modern studies of the settlement pattern of ancient Greece and its colonies a distinction is usually made between three forms of habitation:\(^2\) first-order sites (called towns or cities), second-order sites (called villages or hamlets) and third-order sites (called farmsteads or homestead farms).\(^3\) In all investigations, towns and villages are grouped together as nucleated settlements and opposed to isolated farmsteads, which are seen as the characteristic form of dispersed settlement.\(^4\)

The next problem is, of course, where to draw the line between a town and a village, and again between a hamlet and a farmstead. Farmsteads are often described as “isolated” but there are in fact attestations of clusters of farmsteads,\(^5\) and sometimes it can become a matter of definition how to distinguish between the two forms of settlement.\(^6\) For the distinction between a town and a village, three different parameters are used: (a) the function of a settlement within a region, (b) the physical size of the settlement, and/or (c) the number of inhabitants. Re (a): in a region with a number of nucleated settlements, one is usually larger than the others and serves as the principal urban centre of the whole region.\(^7\) Such an urban centre is sometimes called a central place,\(^8\) undoubtedly a translation of the German term Zentralort.\(^9\) The hierarchy can be observed at different levels. Sometimes the central place is called a city and the smaller centres towns;\(^10\) but often the central place is a town and the smaller centres are classified as villages.\(^11\)

In this case the first-order site is defined in relation to the surrounding smaller nucleated settlements and no absolute figures in hectares or population size are needed in order to establish a distinction between first- and second-order sites. Re (b) and (c): as to size of habitation area and number of inhabitants, there are considerable variations and I will here restrict myself to two examples. In the monumental investigation of southern Argolis the authors propose to classify all sites of 5 ha or more as towns;\(^12\) whereas the size of the population is the preferred parameter in Frank Kolb’s judicious introduction to Die Stadt im Altertum, where he states a minimum population of 1,000 inhabitants as one of his criteria for accepting a site as a Stadt.\(^13\) In both cases the authors admit that the limit is very arbitrary, but it is perhaps not a coincidence that the two criteria seem to correspond: in the southern Argolis survey the authors suggest that towns in the Classical period had a population density of 250 persons per ha,\(^14\) i.e. a total population of 1,250 persons for a town so small that it was almost a village.

The recent settlement pattern studies have changed our understanding of ancient Greek society in many respects, but the two most important insights have been (a) that we can now, in some instances at least, trace the people who lived in the countryside and assess the relation between the urban and the rural population,\(^15\) and (b) that in some parts of Archaic and especially Classical Greece many of those who inhabited the countryside lived dispersed in iso-
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\(^{3}\) Jameson, Runnels and van Andel (1994) 249. Sometimes a distinction is made between smaller towns and larger cities (Shipley 1992 222–23). A similar distinction can be made between smaller hamlets and larger villages (Jameson, Runnels and van Andel 1994 252).


\(^{5}\) For possible clusters of farms of C6 and C5, see Catling (2002) 187–93.


\(^{7}\) Shipley (1992) 223.


\(^{9}\) Christaller (1933), translated into English in 1966 with the title Central Places of Southern Germany. See also Whitley (1972).

\(^{10}\) Shipley (1992) 222–23.

\(^{11}\) Cherry, Davis and Mantzourani (1991) 473–77.


\(^{13}\) Kolb (1984) 15.


lated farmsteads and not nucleated in villages.¹⁶ Both these major conclusions have been obtained by archaeological surveys of selected stretches of the Greek countryside, and in their analysis of the evidence the archaeologists have deliberately preferred modern concepts—such as town, village and farmstead—whereas a discussion of ancient Greek terms is either avoided or confined to a historical section. If, however, we shift the focus from the archaeological to the written sources and ask how the ancient Greeks perceived their own settlement pattern, we are faced with a whole range of problems which concern both the terms used for first-, second- and third-order settlements and the Greeks’ understanding of the distinction between nucleated and dispersed settlement. First, the terminology.

1. First-order sites present no serious difficulty. They are called polis, and in literary and epigraphical sources alike this term is applied over and over again to 447 named urban centres which were also the political centres of the poleis in question (supra 34–35). If the emphasis is on the urban aspect of the settlement, the words asty or polisma are sometimes used synonymously with polis (in the sense of town) (supra 47–48). Moreover, like polis in its urban sense, both polisma and asty are exclusively used about towns which were political centres of poleis in the political sense (supra 47–48). Thus the principal incongruity between the ancient and the modern terminology is that, even when the polis is seen as an urban centre, the ancient Greeks had the political aspect in mind, whereas modern analysis emphasises the cohabitation itself, irrespective of the political status of the site.

2. It is much more difficult to understand the ancient Greek terminology used to describe villages and hamlets. The principal term used is, of course, kome, which does indeed designate what we would call a village or a hamlet,¹⁷ although it is also sometimes found in the sense of a quarter of a town.¹⁸ The problem is that, although most historians believe that komai must have outnumbered poleis many times,¹⁹ our Archaic and Classical sources provide us with the names of fewer than thirty named localities which are explicitly classified as komai²⁰ as against 491 named communities classified as poleis.²¹

One might object that it should not cause any surprise that philosophers, orators and historians use the term polis much more frequently than the term kome since in accounts of politics and wars it is only natural to mention “states” rather than “municipalities” or “villages”. But this observation, though it contains a core of truth, is not quite to the point. It is true that many battles were fought outside a polis, e.g., in Boiotia, the battles of Plateiai in 479, the battle of Tanagra in 457, the battles of Koroneia in 447 and 394, and the battle of Chaironeia in 338. But just as many battles were fought near what we would call villages, e.g. the battle of Keressos c. 520, the battle of Oinophyta in 457, the battle of Delion in 424, the battle of Tegyra in 375, and the battle of Leuktra in 371. Whereas Plateiai, Tanagra, Koroneia and Chaironeia are explicitly described as poleis in our sources, none of the others is ever referred to in Archaic or Classical sources as being a kome. The epigraphical sources tell the same story: although many inscriptions concern local administration and the infrastructure of the polis, the term polis occurs much more frequently than the term kome. Furthermore, a collection of the few attestations we have reveals an interesting geographical pattern: we hear about komai in the Dorian Peloponnesse, in some parts of central and western Greece, in Macedonion and Thrace and along the west coast of Asia Minor.²² But, Mantinea excepted, kome is hardly ever used about villages in the non-Dorian Peloponnesse, Attika, the north-eastern part of Hellas, the islands in the Aegean, and all the colonies.²³

The reason for the uneven distribution of attestations of komai is believed to be that the term kome was Dorian, whereas the term demos was used in the non-Dorian parts of Hellas, cf. Arist. Poet. 1448θ35–37: ο ου [the Dorians] μὲν γὰρ κώµας τὰς περιοικίδας καλείν φανειν, Λθηναίοις δε δήμους.²⁴ But again, demes are attested in a few poleis only.²⁵

²² See the lists in Hansen (1995) 63–68.
²³ The only attested kome in Italy and Sicily is one in the territory of Lokris (FrHist 577 fr. 2). In Attika Archontes komes are attested for Phaleron (IG iii 1988.9, 18; cf. IG iii 2803). On the islands komai are attested in the territory of Histiaia (Hdt. 8.23.2) and the only attested village on Tenos was called Kome (IG x1i.5 872.19 (C3001)). According to Aristotle (fr. 566), many Naxians were settled κατὰ κώµας. But the fragment stems from a late source (Ath. 348B) and we cannot be sure that Aristotle used the term kome. In Thessaly the inhabitants of Pheri are referred to as κωµηταί in one of Euripides’ tragedies (EUR. 476).
²⁵ See Jones, POAG. Outside Attika and the Athenian klerouchies, demoi of the Archaic and Classical periods are known from Euboia (ibid. 73–79), Kalyymna (ibid. 231), Kos (ibid. 256F) and Rhodos (ibid. 243–49). In later periods demoi are also attested in Amorgos (ibid. 214), Elis (ibid. 145), Miletos (ibid. 332F), Naxos (ibid. 231), Stratonioukia (ibid. 335) and Thessalonike (ibid. 268). Strabo 8.3.2 states that Mantinea, Tegea, Heraea, Aigion, Patrai and Dyne were synoniced from various numbers of demoi. We have no source to confirm that...
and, moreover, although *demos* often denotes a village, the word does not mean village, but rather “municipality” or “local community.” In this sense it is applied to a territorial division of the *polis* and most *denvoi* were undoubtedly centred on a village. Some *demoi*, however, were not villages but quarters of a town or a city and, moreover, there is some evidence that a *demos* could be a district with dispersed settlement and no nucleated centre at all.

To sum up: *kome* means village and is applied to small nucleated settlements. It is mostly used in a socio-economic context without relation to the political structure of the *polis* to which it belongs; and there seem to be only two unquestionable attestations of *kome* used about the civic subdivisions of a *polis*, namely in sources relating to Megara, and in the C4 *sympolitria* by which Helisson became a *kome* of the Mantinean *polis* (*SEG* 37.340.7–8 = RO 14). *Demos*, on the other hand, means municipality, not village, but mostly denotes a civic subdivision which was centred on a village. In any case it is a gross exaggeration for the Classical period to claim that, by and large, *poleis* were subdivided into either *denvoi* or *komai*. In the Hellenistic and Roman periods, on the other hand, *komai* are copiously attested both in literary sources, especially in Strabo, and in inscriptions.

3. It is even more difficult to find out how the Greeks designated the third-order sites, and the evidence we have reveals that the ancient Greek language has no word that specifically and indisputably conveys the sense of “farm” in English.

all these Peloponnesian *poleis* were synoecised from *demos*. On the contrary, other sources show that Mantinea was organised into *koma*, not *demos*.

26 See, e.g., Hdt. 3.55.2: “I met Archias in Pitane (the *demos* to which he belonged)”; Isoc. 7.46: “they [the ancient Athenians] divided the *polis* into *koma* and the *chora* into *demos*”.

27 See, e.g., Hdt. 9.73.2: “The Tyndaridai invaded Attika and expelled the *demos* (*dieron*—*vooi*/*dikaios*). In the sense of “make (people) migrate” (*LSI* A 1.11.2), the object of *avestyn* is always one or more persons, see *infra* 123, and in this passage “villages” would be a mistranslation of *dikaios*.

28 Jones, POAG 4–7.

29 The best example is the centre of Halai Aixonidai at Palaichori near Ana Voulia, see Lohmann (1993) i 129–34 and *infra* 626.

30 In Athens KolLytos, Kydatheanaio, Skambonidai, Melite, Koile and Keiriadai were strictly urban demes lying inside the walls (Traill (1986) 126, 129, 130, 134, 136). Lindos, on the other hand, was probably a town made into one single deme whose members were called *Aupomolitai* (RE Suppl. 5 7.46).

31 Atene may have been a deme with dispersed settlement and without a nucleated centre, see Lohmann (1993) 126–36. Halimous is another example of a third-order site, see Hansen (1997) 22–23, *infra* 126 and Cohen (2000) 120–22, who, in our opinion, goes too far by almost denying that demes could have, and in many cases must have had, a nucleated centre.

32 The Megarid settled in 5 *komai* (Plut. *Quest. Graec. 17); Megara organised into *komai* of which one is Aigosthena (*IG* VII 1.18 (c.300)). Pace Charneux (1984) and Jones, POAG 114–15, there is no evidence that Classical Argos was organised into *komai*, see Pfeart (2000) 300.

33 For a judicious treatment, see Schuler (1998) 22–32.

34 For terms designating real property and thus sometimes a farm, see Pritchett (1959) 261–69. See now the meticulous discussion in Schuler (1998) 73–100.

35 Finley (1985) 124 no. 14: ὅροι οἰκίας και χωριῶν και οἰκείας τῆς ἐν ἐστίν. *IG* ii 1241 (300) is a lease of a *chorion*. The ensuing contract includes detailed regulations concerning the cultivation of the land, and it appears that lease of the *chorion* includes a house, a strong indication that the whole estate is a farmstead and not just a plot of land. See now Jones (2000).

36 The word *choria* is used about Naupaktos, which was a *polis* (Thuc. 3.102.4), or about the Acharnai, which was a *demos* (Thuc. 2.19.2, only some MSS) or about an empty part of Korkyra (Thuc. 1.52.2).

37 Men. *Dysc*. 5.7; Dem. 53.6, 57.10.

38 Syll. 169.40ff (Iasos, c.350); Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom. 6.50.3.*

39 Dio. 12.43.1: he pillaged the so-called Aktē and set fire to the *epaulia*.

40 Syll. 344.98: ὅσα δ’ ἐν κόμαις ὄρα τούτων ὡσα ἐξ ἐν τῆς πόλεως ὕμην (“as many *komai* or *epaulia* as there are outside your *polis*”).
habitation in villages from habitation in isolated farmsteads. Let us adduce some examples.

From Thucydides’ description of the evacuation of Attika in 431 it is clear that more than half of the Athenians had lived in the countryside for centuries, until they were forced by the Peloponnesian War to move into the city of Athens. But the passage does not reveal whether the homes they were forced to leave were villages or isolated farmsteads.41

Euripides’ tragedy Orestes includes a report of a meeting of the ekklesia in which several Argives address the assembly. One of them is described as an honest and courageous farmer who does not often visit the city and attend its political meetings. Again we would like to know whether this admirable person lived alone on his farm or in a small village with other farmers of the same disposition.42

In the Laws Plato envisions a settlement pattern in which a central asty is surrounded by twelve komai. Here every citizen is supposed to own one house in the asty and one in the chora (Pl. Leg. 745B–E), and the presumption is that the house in the chora was in one of the twelve villages and not in the countryside,43 but Plato’s account is notoriously vague and some scholars have preferred to believe that the citizens had their country houses scattered over the countryside.44

In Politics book 1 Aristotle states that the polis emerged by a synoecism of komai, each of which, again, emerged from an aggregate of scattered oikiai.45 The polis is the key theme of the rest of the work; the oikia is analysed in book 1 and referred to occasionally in the later books, but the concept of komos is never treated properly. It is just mentioned at the beginning of book 1 as the link between oikia and polis, and in the later books it is referred to only twice and in passing.46

In books 2–8 the principal opposition is between the polis (or asty) and the chora, as is apparent from the following example: in the description of democracy in book 6 we are told that the peasants live scattered over the countryside and are therefore prevented from frequenting the ekklesia, but nothing is said about whether they live nucleated in villages or dispersed in farmsteads.47

Finally, in several sources dispersed settlement (σποράδικη) is opposed to settlement in poleis, and in these sources there is either no mention of settlement in komai or, if there is, settlement in komai is linked with dispersed settlement and opposed to settlement in the polis.48

Thus, for modern historians and archaeologists the settlement pattern is in focus, and therefore the nucleated settlements are subdivided into towns and villages and opposed to (isolated) farmsteads. For the ancient Greeks themselves the social and political aspects of community life mattered more than the settlement pattern, and when they thought about how the population of a polis was settled, they focused on the opposition between polis and chora instead of the opposition between nucleated settlement in town and villages versus dispersed settlement; therefore they separated those who lived in the countryside (in villages or farms) from those who lived in the urban centre, and they devoted almost all attention to the polis itself. To live in komai without any urban centre was seen as an old form of habitation (Xen. Hell. 5.2.7), which antedated the polis (Arist. Pol. 1252b10–30) or, in contemporary society, as an old-fashioned form of habitation surviving in marginal and backward regions of Hellas (Thuc. 3.94.4).

Even though the Greeks showed little interest in second-order settlements, it is still important to assess their number, their distribution and their character, at least in the Greek homeland. Admittedly, the study of the settlement pattern of ancient Greece is still in its infancy and a reliable picture can be drawn only for the few regions that have been surveyed during the last three decades. Also, for the regions settled with Greek colonies, it would be impossible to present a survey of the entire settlement pattern, comprising both the Greek and the indigenous settlements. Here the study must be restricted to the settlement pattern in the immediate hinterland of each polis. But for every region in the Greek homeland described in this inventory, the introduction to the chapter includes a list of attested non-polis settlements, first those mentioned in ancient sources, and then those known exclusively from their physical remains, brought to light by excavations and/or surveys. Of those settlements which are attested in ancient sources, many have been identified with archaeological sites, but some are still unlocated.49

One major result of the investigation is that there seem to have been two basic types of region: some with a fairly small

---

41 Thuc. 2.16.2, see the interpretation supra 12.
45 Arist. Pol. 1252b9–24; the synoecism is indicated by the verb συνείλθων (‘20, cf. infra 157 n. 16), and the dispersed settlement with the adjective σποράδικς (‘23).
46 Arist. Pol. 1265b27–9; 1280b40–81b.
47 Arist. Pol. 130b28–32: “Besides, people of this class can readily come to the assembly, because they are continually moving about in the city (τοί δὲ διοικήματι κατὰ τὴν χώραν) and do not meet or feel the same need of assembling together.”
48 Isoc. Hel. 55; Pl. Prt. 322A–B; Philoch. (FGrHist 328) fr. 2a.
49 Some of the unlocated settlements known from written sources are undoubtedly identical with some of the unidentified archaeological sites. So the total number of attested non-polis settlements must be lower than the sum of (a) the settlements known from written sources and (b) settlements known exclusively from excavation and surveys.
number of comparatively large poleis and a large number of second-order settlements within each polis, and some with a high number of fairly small poleis, each with very few second-order settlements within its territory or none at all. The first type is found in the eastern part of the mainland where the polis emerged early, in Euboea, Boiotia, Attika, the Isthmos and Argolis. For very different reasons a similar settlement pattern is also found in the westernmost regions where polis formation took place as late as in the Classical period: Epeiros, Akarnania and Aitolia. In these regions the population was long settled in komai apart from all the colonies along the coasts founded by Corinth and Elis. The second type prevails in the rest of Greece and on the Aegean Islands. In Asia Minor there were apparently many second-order settlements in Ionia, whereas the poleis outnumbered the other settlements in Mysia, Troas, Aiolis and on Lesbos. Thus, regions settled in poleis with few villages between the poleis seem to be the rule rather than the exception. In this respect there is a very sharp contrast indeed between ancient Greece and Greece of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries with its five-digit number of villages and hamlets as against a comparatively small number of towns.

Moreover, the rapidly growing number of archaeological surveys of the Greek countryside shows that the majority of the population lived in the urban and political centre of the city-state, the polis town, and a minority only was settled in the countryside either in villages or in farmsteads. And this settlement pattern is found not only in the regions with many poleis and few second-order settlements but even in some of the regions with a relatively high number of settlements in the countryside, i.e., in Boiotia and in Argolis. Only in very large poleis, such as Athens, did the extra-urban population outnumber those who lived in the polis centre. Attika was exceptional in having several score, perhaps more than 100 nucleated centres, only one of which was a polis. In Classical Greece the degree of urbanisation seems to have been inversely proportional to the size of the polis. The smallest poleis had the highest degree of urbanisation, whereas the few large poleis had a higher percentage of its population settled outside the polis town.

The inference is, on the other hand, that the Greeks had a skewed view of their own settlement pattern, one that favoured the urban centre, sc. the polis, at the expense of settlements in the countryside, either nucleated or dispersed. On the other hand, on the Greek mainland villages were probably not as numerous as an Athenocentric view of Greek history has made us believe. In the Hellenistic and Roman periods, however, the picture changed. There is a much larger number of settlements classified as komai, especially in the eastern part of the Greek world, and they occur both in the epigraphical and in the literary sources, especially in Strabo and Pausanias.

The overall conclusion is that there is no ancient Greek set of terms that fits the very neat modern archaeological tripartition into towns, villages and farmsteads. The Greeks focused on the political aspects of community life rather than on the settlement pattern. They distinguished the polis from the chora and did not pay much attention to whether the chora was settled in villages or in farmsteads.


See the impressive study by Schuler (1998) with a survey of the epigraphical evidence on pp. 29–97.
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The *polis* had a government, i.e. a set of political institutions (*politeia*) manned by citizens (*politai*) in charge of political decision making and enforcement of the legal order. The meaning of these three key terms—*polis*, *polites*, *politeia*—and their interconnection is most clearly expounded by Aristotle in *Politics* book 3: *polis* is clearly defined as a community (*koinonía*) of citizens (*politai*) about their political institutions (*politeia*). A *politeia* is defined as a person who is entitled to participate in government (*arche*) and administration of justice (*krisis*); and *politeia* is defined as the structure of a *polis*’ political institutions (*archai*) and in particular of the supreme body of government (*kyria panto*). That this is not just an idiosyncratic Aristotelian conception of what a *politeia* was appears both from literary sources and from the preserved documents, e.g. the so-called Charter of the Second Athenian Naval League of 378/7 (IG ii1 43.20) and, to cite a non-Athenian source as well, the oath on the League of Corinth taken in 338/7 by all *poléis* that joined the League (*Staatsvertrage* 401 4.34–35 and 9.29–30). In both cases *politeia* designates the structure and organisation of the political institutions of the members, cf. *infra*.

The word *politeia* means literally "citizenship", and that is by far the most common meaning attested all over the Greek world in hundreds of decrees by which a named person is awarded citizenship (*politeia*) in the *polis* that passed the decree. In the ancient Greek world citizenship was, essentially, what it has become once again in our times, i.e. the legally defined hereditary membership of an individual in a state whereby the member (in the modern world called a citizen or a national) acquires political, social and economic privileges that a non-citizen member of the community does not enjoy, or enjoys only partially. As a rule, a person is a citizen of one state only (Pierson (1996) 27–30). In the Middle Ages and in the Early Modern period citizenship was restricted to (some of) those who lived in the cities, and in its full sense it survived only in city-states, but since the French Revolution citizenship has been dissociated from the connection with the urban centres and has recovered its connection with political participation at state level.6

In ancient Greece the corresponding terms used were *politeia* to denote citizenship itself, and *polites* to denote the citizen if the emphasis was on a citizen’s exercise of his political rights,7 whereas *aste* (masculine)8 and *asts* (feminine)9 were commonly used to denote a person of citizen birth. As a rule, a person was a *polis* of one *polis* only.10 Again, Aristotle concurs with this double aspect of citizenship, saying that, in practice, citizenship is defined as being born from citizens (1275a22–24), whereas, functionally, citizenship is defined by participating in the running of the political institutions of one’s *polis* (1275a22–33). Citizenship was not restricted to (some of) those who lived in the urban centres, and neither *polites* nor *astos* was used in the sense of "townsman" and opposed to *agroikos* in the sense of "countryman",11

\[\text{6} \text{ Riesenber} g (1992) 106–17, 140–66 (citizenship in the medieval cities); 253–66 (revival of participatory citizenship during the French Revolution).  
\[7 \text{ IG iv} 841.12, \text{see L} \text{évy (1985)).} 
\[8 \text{ Solon fr. 4.6; Anac. Anth. Gr. 6.143.3–4; Dem. 57.46. Polites and astos juxtaposed in Arist. Ath. Pol. 26.4.} 
\[9 \text{ For aste, see Syll.1 1015.6–7 (Halikarnassos (C3)); Egypt. J. Metr. 33.1 (Naukratis). The feminine form} \text{politis} \text{is sometimes used of females of citizen birth, see Arist. Pol. 1275b33, 1278a28; IG xii.7 386.21 (Aigiale (C3)); IG v.2 268B.31 (politis apoa genous, Mantinea (C1)); I. Kos 178.6 (Kos (C3)). For Athens, see Moss (1985) 77–79. There is, we think, no attestation of} \text{politis} \text{signifying a female citizen exercising citizen rights.} 
\[10 \text{ Citizens of a} \text{polis} \text{that founded a colony acquired citizen rights in the colony but lost} \text{politeia} \text{in their} \text{polis} \text{of origin; see Graham (1964) 111, 117. Most persons were citizens of one} \text{polis} \text{only, but double citizenship was not unknown; see Busolt (1920) 229–30 and CPCActs 5:15 with n. 586. To have double citizenship became extremely common in the course of the Hellenistic period.} 
\[11 \text{ Although the ancient Greeks showed a tendency towards clustering together in urban centres, it is a curious fact that they never coined a word to} \]
From the primary sense of citizenship, politeia developed two secondary meanings: (a) in a very concrete sense politeia designated the body of citizens as opposed to all non-citizens;12 (b) in a more abstract sense it designated the structure of the body of citizens13 and is traditionally and in our opinion correctly rendered “constitution” or “form of government”.14 Thus, in 378/7 the Athenians stipulated that each member of the Second Naval League was entitled to have the politeia, i.e. the type of constitution it preferred (IG ii 4.32–21); and in 338/7 all members of the Corinthian League agreed under oath that they would not interfere with the politeia, i.e. constitution, of any of the other members (Dem. 17.10 = Staatsverträge 405).

It is apparent from both sources that different polis had different forms of politeia,15 and in Greek political theory politieia were divided into types according to how many people constituted and manned the principal organs of government. Basically, there were three constitutional types: the rule of the one, the few and the many. Pindar is the first we know who distinguished between rule by a tyrant, or the wise, or the whole army.16 About a generation later, Herodotos has a debate about the three basic types of constitution, here described as demos, oligarchia and monarchia.17 In C4e Plato called the three forms tyrannis, aristokratia und demokratia.18 In C4f the theory was further developed and extended by giving each of the three main types a positive and a negative variant (i.e. one a Good Thing and the other a Bad Thing). That theory can be found in nuce in Xenophon’s Memorabilia and fully developed in Plato’s Statesman,19 but it received its classic formulation in Aristotle, in book 8 of the Nicomachean Ethics and especially in book 3 of the Politics.20 He distinguished between a good and a bad form of monarchy (basileia versus tyrannis), minority rule (aristokratia versus oligarchia) and majority rule (politeia versus demokratia).

To what extent does Aristotle’s systematic classification of politeiai match the polis world in which he lived? If we move from philosophy to history, the basic tripartition is found in both literary and epigraphical sources. Thucydides presents as the Thebans’ view in 428 that there are three types of constitution: demokratia, oligarchia and tyrannis, but oligarchia is attested in two forms: a positive one called isonomos oligarchia and a negative one described as dynasteia oligarchia.21 A speech delivered before the Athenian jurors in 400/599 distinguishes between demos, oligarchia and tyrannis.22 In a treaty of 362/1 between the Athenians, the Arkadians, the Achaians, the Eleas and the Phleasians, the three types are called demos, oligarchia and, probably, tyrannis.23 In 345 and again in 330 Aischines stated that any community had one of three politeiai: either tyrannis, or oligarchia or demokratia.24 In a contemporary treatise Isokrates refers to the three types as monarchia, oligarchia and demokratia.25

Admittedly, the classification of constitutions is best attested in Athenian sources. Yet, Pindar was from Thebes, Herodotos from Halikarnassos, Thucydides claims to report a Theban view, and the tripartition is found in three East Greek documents of the early Hellenistic period: a C3e law from Ilion regulates how demokratia can be protected
against oligarchia and the rule of a tyrannos; a C4–C3 decree from Erythrai was passed after the restoration of democracy (demos) in order to prevent future attempts to instal a tyrant (tyrannos) or an oligarchia; and a civic oath from Kalymna from the same period makes the citizens swear that they will not install a tyrant (tyrannos) or an oligarchia or any other constitution (here called politeuma) except demokratia.

So, the tripartition of types of constitution was not just a philosophical idiosyncrasy, nor was it an invention of Plato and Aristotle to classify the forms of constitution according to the number of rulers. The numerical classification is clearly attested in many other and sometimes older sources: both basileia and tyrannis are characterised as forms of monarchia. The term oligarchia means the rule of the few. In democratic ideology demos is identified with the whole of the citizen body, and idioms like the rule of to plethos or hoi polloi are used synonymously with demokratia.

On the other hand, what is attested in all sources is the basic tripartition into tyrannis, oligarchia and demokratia. The division of each of the three basic types into two subtypes seems to have been peculiar to the Athenian philosophers. Aristotle had it from Plato, and since it is found both in Plato and in Xenophon’s Memorabilia, it may go back to Sokrates.

From a theoretical point of view, that of Plato and Aristotle, basileia was primarily the positive form of monarchical tyranny and demokratia its perversion. In a historical perspective, prominent in other sources, basileia was an old form of constitution, known from Homer and echoed in Attic tragedy. It had survived in Sparta, in remote regions and among the barbarians (infra), but in the period best covered by our Classical sources, c.450–323, it was no longer a constitution practised in the Greek world of poleis. It is worth noting that Aristotle shares the historical view when he moves from the more theoretical approach in book 3, chapters 7–8, to a more political analysis in chapter 14. Also, the 158 Aristotelian politeiai were subdivided into four categories: democratic, oligarchic, tyrannical and aristocratic constitutions. Basileia is notoriously absent.

Apart from Plato and Aristotle, praise of aristokratia as the positive form of rule of the few is attested in a few sources only, and then in a dubious context: in Thucydides, moderate aristokratia is held up as a suspicious political slogan for what he in other contexts calls oligarchia, and in Aristophanes’ Birds the verb aristokratieithai is supposed to denote an attractive form of government but is used as a punning joke on Aristokrates the son of Skellias who a few years later was one of the 400 oligarchs. In the comic poet Heniochos, aristokratia is juxtaposed with demokratia and both are derided as bad forms of constitution.

In Isokrates, aristokratia is a characteristic not of the rule of the few but of the Athenian democracy as instituted by Theseus. On the other hand, both the noun aristokratia and the words derived from it occur frequently in Plato and abound in Aristotle to describe the positive counterpart of oligarchia; according to Xenophon, Sokrates used aristokratia in this sense, but it is extremely rare in other literary sources of the Classical period and unattested in inscriptions.

Finally, the systematic subdivision of popular rule into two variants is peculiar to Plato and Aristotle. Admittedly, Aristotle disclaims responsibility for having invented the use of the word politeia as a term for a positive form of popular

26 L.1 Ion 520–22: ἦν δὲ ἀναβολή τῆς δυνάμεως ἢ τῆς διάθεσιος τῆς κάθε ἄνδρος εἰς τὴν ἐπανάληψιν τῆς δυνάμεως ἢ τῆς διάθεσιος τῆς κάθε ἄνδρος (here called politeuma) except demokratia.

28 L.1 Aristotle disclaims responsibility for having invented the use of the word politeia as a term for a positive form of popular
rule. He may have been influenced by the Attic orators’ use of the term politeia as a synonym for demokratia. In any case, the only epigraphical attestation of politeia as a specific form of constitution is almost completely restored.

To conclude, the sixfold model of constitutions and the classification of basileia and aristokratia as the positive forms of tyrannis and oligarchia seem to be the invention of the followers of Sokrates, primarily Plato and Aristotile, and it is undoubtedly due to their influence that aristokratia became established as a specific type of constitution and received an important after-life from Polybios in the Hellenistic period lasting to the present day.

Even if we restrict the analysis to the basic tripartition of constitutions, there is an important difference between the philosophers and all other contemporary sources: in Plato and Aristotile tyrannis, oligarchia and demokratia are the perverted variants of the rule of the one, the few and the many. In other sources denominatio is singled out as the good form of constitution, whereas tyrannis and oligarchia in the Classical period almost invariably are criticised as bad constitutions. The last one to treat tyrannis as an acceptable form of constitution was Isokrates, in speeches composed in C4e, and by then he was the only author to take that view. In his constitutional debate Herodotos makes Megabyxos speak in praise of oligarchia; in Thucydidēs the Thebans describe their present constitution as an oligarchy based on equality (oligarchia isonomos). Isokrates admits that oligarchia, like democracy and monarchy, can be a good form of constitution if only the best citizens are placed in positions of power. And in the so-called Rhetoric to Alexander, usually ascribed to Anaximenes of Lampaskos, there is an analytical and unbiased passage about legislation in oligarchies, probably the most important impartial account of oligarchia, although it is mostly overlooked.

These four scattered sources make up the neutral or positive references to oligarchia. Yet the rule of the one and the rule of few were rather common forms of constitution in the age of Plato and Aristotile (infra). Apart from Sparta and some peripheral regions of the Hellenic world, there is no evidence that a monarch who ruled a polis would call himself basileus. Nor would he call himself a tyrannos. We are in fact ignorant of how a monarch of the Classical period would describe himself or be described by his subjects. The Deinomenid monarch Polyzēlos had himself inscribed as anax of Gela on the bronze charioteer in Delphi, and the Bosporan princes of Pantikapaion used the title archon.

Similarly, there is no compelling evidence that the few who in many poleis had monopolised the government would call themselves hoi oligoi and their constitution oligarchia, nor would they commonly use the terms hoi aristoi and aristokratia. We are deplorably ignorant of the ideology and organisation of tyrannies and oligarchies. Most of what we know, we owe to Plato’s and Aristotile’s negative accounts. We conclude that what we really lack in order to understand the types of constitution in the Greek poleis in C5–C4 is not a positive account of democracy—there are plenty, cf. Raaffa (1989)—but positive or at least neutral descriptions of the constitutions that are classified as oligarchies and tyrannies.

Thus, in the Inventory, when we classify the constitution of a polis, we distinguish between basileia, tyrannis, oligarchia and demokratia, but we ignore variants of the two latter types, and all attestations of basileia belong in the Archaic period. Monarchies of the Classical period are classified as monarchies (Mon.) if we do not know that they were considered to be tyrannies. Assigning a polis constitution to one of the basic four types is often impossible, and even when we have some relevant information it is not always easy. The technical terms—tyrannis, oligarchia, demokratia and their derivatives—are only occasionally used in our sources, and in many cases the classification has to be based on an interpretation of how the attested political institution works and what the decision-making stratum of the citizen population is called. If major decisions are left to a general assembly, it is an indication of democracy, whereas major decisions made by a boule or by magistrates point to an oligarchy. If those in power are called plousioi or pacheis or hoi oligoi, the constitution is registered as an oligarchia, whereas a democracy is suggested by the use of hoi aperoroi, to pantes or demotikoi, etc. In a few cases of serious doubt, we

43 Dem. 15.20; Isoc. 4.125, cf. Harp. II 77.
44 IG II 11.112.30–31.
45 Aeschin. 1.4, 3.6; Tit. Cal. xii 21–22; PEP Erythrai 34.2–6; Lillian 25.19.22. In Thuc. 3.62.1 demokratia and a democratic variant of oligarchia are opposed to tyrannis and a tyrannical variant of oligarchia (supra n. 21).
47 Hdt. 3.81; Thuc. 3.62.1; Isoc. 12.132; Rhet. ad Alex. 1424.39–40, cf. 1446.24–26.
48 Kings of Cyproite Salamis (Tōd 194.4; Hdt. 5.104.3; Isoc. 2.3); kings of the Molossians (Thuc. 2.80.6); of Makedonia (Dem. 1.9); Barke (Hdt. 4.164.4); Kyrene (Hdt. 4.153; Pind. Pyth. 4.2).

49 LSAC p. 286; Γάνης Δημήτριος Ευφροσύνη.
50 RO 65 Ἀρχοντεὶς Πολιτείας καὶ Θεοκράτοις, καὶ Ἑλληνικῆς Συνόφυες καὶ ΜαΙνικῶν στάτων. It is worth noting that Pairides uses the title archon in relation to the Greek poleis but basileus in relation to the indigenous tribes.
51 For a discussion of the terms used to designate the ruling class in an oligarchy, see Schulz (1981) and Stein-Holkeskamp (1989) 8 and passim.
52 For oligarchy, see Ostwald (2000); for tyranny, see Berve (1967).
have used Mix. to describe a polis with an unidentifiable mixture of characteristics, and that leads to the next major problem: what about the “Mixed Constitution”?

In actual fact, all polis constitutions were mixed. As noted by Aristotle, each constitution was composed of a number of elements, and each element could be essentially democratic (e.g. sortition of magistrates from among all citizens) or essentially oligarchic (e.g. election of magistrates by and/or from among citizens who fulfilled a census requirement) (Pol. 1298b10–1301a15). But in an oligarchy some officials might be selected by lot. In democracies some major magistracies were filled by election, and for others eligibility depended on a census requirement. Both in tyrannies and in oligarchies, there could be a general assembly in which major decisions were made or at least ratified by acclamation. It was the overall character of a constitution that was taken into account when a politeia was classified as a tyrannis or an oligarchia or a demokratia. As appears from all the sources cited above, the generally accepted view was that every constitution would belong to one of the three basic types. The mixed constitution appears as a specific type of constitution alongside the three types in late sources only.

Furthermore, the mixed constitution was a theoretical construction, much discussed by the philosophers, but with very few attested echoes outside their schools. As pointed out above, the basic tripartition of constitutions into the rule of the one, the few and the many, i.e. tyrannis, oligarchia and demokratia, is found in all sources: both in documents and in all literary genres (poetry, history, rhetoric and philosophy), and it is known from both Athenian and non-Athenian sources. To the end of the Classical period the mixed constitution is known exclusively from Athenian political philosophy. It is unattested in inscriptions, in speeches delivered before the assembly or the court, and in historians with one single exception: Thucydides’ description of the constitution of the 5000 in Athens in 411–410 as “a balanced blending of the few and the many” (8.97.2). The picture changes somewhat in the Hellenistic period, and the oldest document in which we may find an echo of the mixed constitution is, we believe, in Kyrene’s constitution of c.321 (SEG 9 2).

What picture do we get of the basic types of constitution if we turn from the general descriptions of the types to what we know about the constitution of individual poleis? As appears from Index 11, we have some information about the constitution of close to 200 poleis, but often the information covers a few years only of the three centuries covered by this investigation. A full analysis of the material is impossible in this context. Two short comments must suffice to show its potential value.

(1) According to Aristotle, oligarchia and especially demokratia were overwhelmingly the commonest constitutions in Greece in his own time; basileia had virtually disappeared; furthermore, like kingship, tyrannis was more widespread in the earlier period and was no longer, says Aristotle, a common form of constitution. Aristotle is right about basileia, but the evidence we have contradicts his views about tyrannis. A survey of Index 11 shows the following distribution of the three basic types of constitution in C4: tyrannis thirty-nine, oligarchia forty-seven, demokratia fifty-nine. Furthermore, tyrannis was not found only in remote regions such as Sicily or the Pontos. After a nadir in the Greek homeland in C5, tyrannies reappeared in C4 all over the Hellenic polis world, and in Aristotle’s lifetime poleis were ruled by tyrants in the Peloponnese, in Euboia, in Thessaly and in Lesbos, etc. Again, oligarchy was still a very common type of constitution, especially in C4, and it is first in the age of Alexander that democracy becomes the predominant type of constitution.

(2) In modern peace research a popular theory is that democracies do not fight one another, and if all states in the world become democracies, there will be peace in the world. Since the Western democracies are young and even today constitute a minority among states, historical investigations have been adduced in support of the theory, and ancient Greek history in particular has been in focus. It is held that in the Greek world there is only one example of a democracy fighting a democracy, namely the war between Athens and Syracuse in 415–413, and advocates of the democratic peace

53 Oligarchies with an assembly include Sparta (Plut. Lyg. 6) and Thebes (Hdt. 5.79.1). The typical Cretan polis seems to have had an ekkleia with restricted powers (Arist. Pol. 1272a10–12). In Athens meetings of the assembly continued under the tyranny of Peisistratos (Arist. Ath. Pol. 16.8 with Rhodes (1981) 218–19). Meetings of the assembly in Syracuse were still convened under the tyranny of Dionysios I (Diod. 14.64.5; Arist. Dec. 1349b3a).

54 Stob, Flor. 2.7.26, 2: 150–51, Wachsmuth; cf Polyb. 6.3.7.

55 Aalders (1968); Nippel (1980).
theory often hold that, after all, Syracuse was not a true democracy.\textsuperscript{58}

The theory does not stand up to scrutiny.\textsuperscript{59} First, Syracuse (no. 47) was a democracy in C5s. Second, a more careful examination of the historical record reveals that there are in fact numerous examples of wars between democratic city-states. In C5s Taras (no. 71), then a democratic polis, had a dedication sent to Delphi in which the Tarentines commemorated a victory over Thourioi (no. 74), colonised in 444/3 and issued with a democratic constitution allegedly written by Protagoras. In 424 Athens attacked the democratically governed polis of Herakleia Pontica (no. 715). In 373 democratic Thebes (no. 221) conquered and destroyed democratic Plataiai (no. 216). In the 360s Athens made several attempts to reconquer Amphipolis (no. 553), probably a democracy at the time. The Social War was fought in 357–355 between Athens and four members of the Second Athenian Naval League: Byzantion (no. 674), Chios (no. 40), Kos (no. 497) and Rhodos (no. 1000); of these, Byzantion, Kos and Rhodos were democracies and only Chios had an oligarchic constitution. In all these cases the war must have been decided by a vote taken among the people in assembly. Other examples can easily be added\textsuperscript{60} and they indicate that the people as a whole seemed to be just as militant and bellicose as a ruling upper class or a single ruler, whether hereditary or elected.

\textsuperscript{58} Judiciously discussed and countered in Robinson (2001a).

\textsuperscript{59} Focusing on the Peloponnesian War, Russett (1993) 43–71, in this chapter assisted by W. Antholis, has a whole list of wars between democracies. Their findings disprove the democratic theory, but the investigation is based on Rex Warner’s translation of Thucydid’s combined with a somewhat superficial knowledge of the constitutions of the poleis in question; as a result the analysis is far from always convincing. Thus, the contention (57–58) that democratic Thourioi fought democratic Athens in 412/11 (Thuc. 8.35.1) overlooks the fact that Thourioi (no. 74) in 413 had exiled 400 Athenians and probably introduced an oligarchic constitution. For a much more professional criticism of the theory, see Robinson (2001a).

\textsuperscript{60} Robinson (2001a) 603–4 correctly points to the war between Syracuse (no. 47) and Akragas (no. 9) c.445.

\section*{References}


Busolt, G. 1920. \textit{Griechische Staatskunde i} (Munich).


Graham, A. J. 1964. \textit{Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece} (Manchester).


Types of constitution

Typenbegriffe im alten Griechenland und ihr Fortleben in den Sprachen der Welt (Berlin) iii. 67–155.

A Typology of Dependent Poleis

One of the objectives of the Polis Centre has been to dissociate the concept of polis from the concepts of independence and autonomia, and to introduce the concept of the dependent polis.¹ This concept, however, is very complex: dependent poleis existed in many different shapes and sizes, and certain types of dependent poleis were common in some regions but virtually non-existent in others. We have isolated the following fifteen different types of dependent polis.

(1) A polis situated inside the territory of a larger polis, e.g. Mykalessos inside Tanagra (Boiotia).

(2) A polis in the peraia controlled by an island, e.g. the Aktaian poleis controlled by Mytilene.

(3) An emporion organised as a polis dependent on a larger polis, e.g. the Thasian emporia on the coast of Thrace, or on a barbarian overlord, e.g. Naukratis.

(4) A colony being a polis dependent on its mother city, e.g. the Corinthian colonies, of which Ambrakia may serve as an example.

(5) An Athenian klerouchy and/or colony, e.g. Hephaistia and Myrina on Lemnos.

(6) A perioikic polis in Lakonia, e.g. Kythera.

(7) A polis that is a member of a federation, e.g. Orchomenos, which regained its autonomia in 395 when it broke away from the Boiotian Federation.

(8) A polis that is a member of a hegemonic league (symmachia) which has developed into an “empire” (arche), e.g. the hypekooi poleis in the Delian League.

(9) A polis that persists as a polis after a sympoliteia with another polis, e.g. Helisson after its sympoliteia with Mantinea.

(10) A polis that persists as a polis after a synoikismos, e.g. lalysos, Kamiros and Lindos after the foundation of Rhodes in 408/7.

(11) A polis that, together with other poleis, makes up a “tribal state”, e.g. the Mainalian polis Pallantion in Arkadia.

(12) A polis that is controlled by an empire/kingdom, e.g. the polis in Ionia ruled by the Persian king from c.540 to the 470s and again from the King’s Peace of 386 to Alexander’s conquest of Asia Minor in 334.

(13) A polis founded as a fortress, e.g. Mesambrie, a Samothracian teichos on the Thracian coast, or Kasmenai, a Syracusan fortress west of Akrai.

(14) A major port of an inland polis, e.g. Notion, the port of Kolophon.

(15) A polis that is at the same time a civic subdivision of another polis, e.g. Koreia on Keos, which is a phyle of Ioulis; Helisson, which is a kome of Mantinea; and Dion, which is a demos of Histiaia.

First, there is, of course, a considerable overlap between the different types.

The Thasian emporia (3) were situated in the peraia (2) and were thus poleis inside the territory of a larger polis (1).

Naukratis was an emporion (3) controlled by the Pharaoh (12).

The Lakonian perioikic communities (6) were all situated in the territory of the Spartan polis (1).

Notion, the port of Kolophon, may have been an emporion (3) and was in any case situated inside the territory of Kolophon (1); furthermore, after the King’s Peace of 386 both Kolophon and Notion were ruled by the king of Persia (12).

An emporion (3) might be a colony dependent on its mother city (4), e.g. Olbia, which kept up close relations with Miletos even in C4.

In the sympoliteia treaty between Helisson and Mantinea (9) it is explicitly stated that Helisson became a part of Mantinea (1).

Poteidaia was both a Corinthian colony controlled by the mother city (4) and a dependent member of the Delian League (8).

---

Kythera was both an island controlled by a mainland polis (2) and a periokic community (6).

Helisson became a dependent polis in consequence of a sympoliteia (9), but was also a kome of Mantinea (15). Kamiros, lalysos and Lindos persisted as dependent poleis after the synoecism of Rhodos in 408/7 (10) but, by the same event, they became phylai of the new Rhodian polis (15).

Second, each type allows of a whole range of relations between larger and smaller poleis so that the line between independent and dependent poleis is fairly easy to understand in principle, but almost impossible to draw in practice.

All the information we possess about member states of federations being deprived of their autonomia concerns the Boiotian Federation and the Chalkidic Federation, which were both hegemonic in type and dominated by, respectively, Thebes and Olynthos. The relation between the poleis and the federal institutions may have been different in, e.g., the Phokian and the Arkadian federations, neither of which seems to have been dominated by one of the constituent poleis. In these two cases, and in others as well, the member states may have retained their autonomia unimpaired. Similarly, leagues, and even hegemonic leagues, were in principle alliances between independent poleis, and the members were reduced to dependencies only if the hegemon succeeded in turning the symmachia into an arche.

Some of the periokic communities were obviously dependent poleis, but others seem to have been komai, e.g. Oion in Skiritis (Xen. Hell. 6.5.25–26).

Third, having established the concept of the dependent polis, and having disposed of independence as the essential criterion for distinguishing a polis from a municipality, we have to address the question: if many poleis were dependencies, what was then the difference between a dependent polis and a civic subdivision, such as a demos, a kome, a phratria, a phyle, etc.?2

Like a polis (dependent or independent), a civic subdivision could have its own temples, including a theatre, its own territory, called komai (no. 766), a phratria, a kome, a phylai, etc.3

1. Evidence for the Examples

1.1. Evidence for the Examples

Adduced Above

Re (1) Mykalessos (no. 212) is called a polis both in the urban and in the political sense by Thucydidides at 7.29–30; the city-ethnic (in its collective and external use) is attested by Thuc. at 7.30.3; and Mykalessos struck coins on the Aiginetan standard from c.500 to 480 and from 387 (or earlier) to 374 (or later) (Head, HN3 346; cf. Hansen (1995a) 63). In the Hellenistic and Roman periods Mykalessos was located in the territory of Tanagra (no. 220) (Strabo 9.2.11; Paus. 9.19.8), and that seems to have been the case already in C5e (Fossey (1988) 83–84, 222–23; Hansen (1995a) 36–37).4 Within the Tanagraian territory, however, Mykalessos had its own territory, called Mykalithas (Xen. Hell. 6.5.25–26), which seems to have stretched as far as the Euboian Gulf (Paus. 9.19.5; Bakhuisen (1970) 20–21, 148–49).

Re (2) The Aktaion poleis were a cluster of poleis on the coast of Asia Minor north and east of Lesbos, possessed by the Mytilenaions (no. 798) in C6–C5 (Thuc. 3.50.3, 4.52.3). As listed in the assessment decrees of 425 and 421, the group consisted of Α[χ]ιλίαν [α]υν [β]χρον [θ]έσσαρ [ις] (no. 766), άνατο[ς] (no. 767), ἵ[μ]αχος (no. 778), Τ[ί]λυρις (no. 779), Α[λ]μπ (no. 780).
784), ‘Ο[φρόν]ειον (no. 786), ‘Ρούτειον (no. 790), Νάξος Ποροδοσέλενε (no. 831) and several others (IG v 1 71.111.124–40, 77.11.14–27). They belonged to Mytilene but passed to the Athenians in 427 after they had suppressed the Mytileneans’ revolt (Thuc. 3.50.3). In 424 several of them were reconquered by Mytilenian refugees (Thuc. 4.52.3), but at least Antandros was soon recovered by the Athenians (Thuc. 4.75.1). They are called poleis by Thucydides at 4.52.3, where polis is used in the urban and political senses combined, and that they were poleis in the political sense can be further corroborated, e.g. in the case of Antandros. The city-ethnic Αντάνδριοι is used at Thuc. 8.108.4; from c.440 onwards Antandros issued coins inscribed ΑΝΤΑΝ (Head, ΗΝ5 541); and in 410 the Antandrians voted to give politeia to the Syracusans (Xen. Hell. 1.1.26).

Re (3) In his description of Xerxes’ march through Thrace, Herodotos refers to a number of poleis belonging to the Thasians (no. 526) (Hdt. 7.108.2, 109.2). The same part of the Thracian coast is described by Thucydides in his account of Thasos’ revolt against Athens, and the Athenian possessions on the coast are here referred to as being emporia (Thuc. 1.100.2, cf. also Dem. 50.47). Three of them, viz. Galepsos, Oisyne (no. 635) and Phagres (no. 636) are mentioned by name in Ps.-Skylax 67, where they are listed under the heading πόλεις Ἑλληνίδες αἱδε and further described as ἐμπόρια (Hansen (2004 a)).

In Herodotus Naukratis (no. 1028) is described both as a polis and as an emporion (Hdt. 2.178.1, 179.1). That Naukratis was a dependency is apparent, e.g., from the royal rescript by which Nectanebo I (378–60) imposed a 10 per cent tax on all gold, silver and manufactured goods in Naukratis (quoted in Lloyd (1975) 28). That it was also a polis is strongly indicated by the following three observations: (a) Herodotus’ consistent use of polis to denote an urban centre which was also a polis in the political sense; (b) the reference to a prytaneion in Naukratis in a work by, presumably, the C4 historian Hermeias of Methymna (Ath. 149D = FHG 11 80 fr. 2; (c) the use of the city-ethnic Ναυκρατίης in proxeny decrees, Delphic accounts and Attic sepulchral inscriptions (cf. no. 1028 and supra 64).

Re (4) Ambrakia (no. 113) was a Corinthian colony (Thuc. 2.80.3). Like many other Corinthian colonies it retained very close relations with its mother city, and was in fact a Corinthian dependency from its foundation to the end of the Classical period: in the Archaic period Ambrakia was ruled by members of the Kypselid family (Arist. Pol. 130.4 §31–33, 1311.40), its coins had Corinthian types, and some were in fact struck in Corinth (Graham (1964) 121–22); as late as 341 Ambrakia is still described as a Corinthian possession (Dem. 9.34). Thus, Ambrakia was a dependency, but there can be no doubt that it was also a polis: it is repeatedly referred to as a polis both in the urban sense (Thuc. 3.113.2, 4, 5) and in the political sense (Thuc. 3.113.6). After the expulsion of the tyrants Ambrakia had a democratic constitution (Arist. Pol. 1304 §31–33), and the Aristotelian collection of constitutions included an Ambraikoton politeia (fr. 481.1). Ambrakia is listed as a polis providing seven ships to the Greek fleet in 480 (Hdt. 8.42.1, 45.1, 49.1); in 426/5 Ambrakia concluded a peace with Akarnania and Amphilocheian Argos (Thuc. 3.114.3); and c.330 a theorodokos was appointed to host the theoroi announcing the Heraia at Argos (SEG 23 189.1.10).

Re (5) In 499 Lemnos was settled with Athenians (Hdt. 6.137–40; IG v 1 522 bis, 1164–65; IG xii Suppl. 337, cf. Figueira (1991) 253–56; Salomon (1997) 31–37), in C5n probably supplemented with klerouchs (Graham (1964) 178–84). Whether the Athenians were full citizens is still in dispute (Salomon (1997) 31–66), but nobody disputes that Lemnos was an Athenian dependency. Yet the two cities on the island, viz. Myrina (no. 502) and Hephaistia (no. 503), are classified as poleis in one of the subheadings in the Athenian tribute lists: [πόλ]εις αἰδε στραταί μιαθόν ἐτελεσαν . . . Ἐφαιστιᾶς, Ἐμβρίων, Μυριναίοι vacat (IG v 1 285 col. 1.107–11). Furthermore, the inhabitants are recorded with their own ethnics (cf. Hdt. 6.140.2) and not recorded as “Athenians living in . . .”. In C4 the Lemnians were klerouchs (Agora xix L3.33–34: Cargill (1995) 60) and Athenian citizens (Dem. 4.34). It is a moot point whether it is possible to distinguish between Athenian klerouchs and Athenians permanently settled on the island as argued by Salomon (1997) 91–154. Yet in the King’s Peace of 386, the Athenian possessions Lemnos, Imbros and Skyros are explicitly described as poleis exempted from the autonomia clause (Xen. Hell. 5.1.31) and both cities on Lemnos are called poleis in the political sense by the Athenian Lykophron, who had served two years on Lemnos as hipparchos (Hyp. 2.18). Both Myrina and Hephaistia struck bronze coins from C4 onwards (Kroll and Walker (1993) 179).

Re (6) Kythera (no. 336) was a perioikic community, ruled by a kytherodikes—a Spartan official elected for one year—and controlled by a garrison of hoplites (Thuc. 4.53.2); but like many other perioikic communities it is called a polis (Thuc. 4.54.1–2; Ps.-Skylax 46), and the inhabitants are referred to by the name Κυθήριοι, which is probably a
city-ethnic and thus indicates their status as citizens. Other sources refer to the Lakedaimonian periökoic communities as being poleis: Pherekydes (FGrHist 3) fr. 168; Hdt. 7.234.2; Thuc. 5.54.1; Xen. Hell. 6.5.23; Ages. 2.24; Lac. Pol. 15.3; Ps.-Skylax 46; Isoc. 12.179; Strabo 8.4.11; Paus. 3.2.6; Polemon, Περὶ τῶν ἐν Λακεδαιμίᾳ πόλεως, p. 50 Preller (C3–C2), cf. Shipley (1997).³

Re (7) Orchomenos (no. 213) was a member of the Second Boiotian Federation (Hell. Oxy. 20.3), but in 395 the Orchochomians joined Sparta and defected from the federation (Xen. Hell. 3.5.6). During the peace negotiations in 392/1 the Boiotians were prepared to renounce their claim to Orchomenos and allow the city to retain the autonomia it had obtained by breaking away from the Federation (Andoc. 3.13, 20).⁴ Similarly, the Spartans obviously believed that the members of the Boiotian Federation had been deprived of their autonomia (Xen. Hell. 3.5.18, 5.1.36, 6.4.3). The Plataians (and other Boiotian poleis as well) believed that they had been deprived of their autonomia (Isoc. 14.10, 17). The Athenian view, as expressed by Andokides (3.13, 20), Isokrates (14.10, 17) and Autokles (Xen. Hell. 6.3.9), seems to have been that Thebes had deprived the other Boiotian cities of their autonomia. And according to Xenophon, even the Thebans had to admit that the other Boiotian poleis were no longer autonomoi (Hell. 4.8.15, 5.1.32–36). See the Appendix infra.

Re (8) On hypekooi versus autonomoi poleis in the Delian League the principal source is Thucydides, and especially his list of Athenian allies at 7.57.3–5. At 57.3 he starts by making a clear-cut distinction between those who are ὑπήκοοι (=φόρον υποτελεῖς) and those who are ἀπὸ εξαιρέσεως αὐτόνομοι (7.57.3). According to the traditional interpretation of the passage, Thucydides mixes up the two categories in 4–5, but by taking proper note of the μέν . . . δὲ opposition in 4, it can be shown that Thucydides does respect the basic distinction between ὑπήκοοι and αὐτόνομοι σύμμαχοι all the way through the passage, and that, apart from the Chians and the Mytilenaians, all other members of the Delian League were enslaved and subjected: the Chians and the Mytilenaians were the only autonomoi symmachoi left (cf. Hansen (1995b) 32–33; cf. also Thuc. 1.67.2, 1.139.1. 3; 1.140.3–4, 144.2, 3.10.5, 6.84.2–3). Being autonomos, however, was perfectly compatible with membership of a league as long as the conditions were not imposed unilaterally by the hegemon, and as long as the hegemon did not interfere in the domestic affairs of its allies; see Thuc. 1.97.1: ἠγούμεθα δὲ αὐτόνομόν τὸ πρῶτον τῶν ξυμμάχων καὶ ἀπὸ κοινών ξυμμάχων βουλευτόν τοσοῦτο ἐπήλθον (“exercising then what was at first a leadership over allies who were autonomoi and took part in the deliberations of common assemblies, the Athenians achieved the following results”, Loeb trans., modified); and the Peace of Nikias quoted by Thuc. at 5.18.5: τὰς δὲ πόλεις φερούσας τὸν φόρον τὸν ἐπ’ Ἀριστείδοις αὐτόνομος εἶναι (“The poleis shall be autonomous paying the phoros as it was under Aristeides”).

Re (9) The C4e synopoliteia between Helisson (no. 273) and Mantinea (no. 281) includes the following provisions: τός Ἐλισὸς Μαντινᾶς ἦναι Ἑλίσος καὶ Ημιός . . . φέροντας τὰν χώραν καὶ τὰν πόλιν ἤμεν Ἐλισόν [καὶ] Μαντινῖς αὐτόνομοι αὐτόνομοι ἐπείξας τὸν φόρον τὸν πάντα τὰν χρόνον, κοίμα, εἶναι τόν Ἐλισόν τὸν Μαντιναῖον—θέαρον ἦναι Ἐλισόν [καὶ] Μαντινῶν, κατακέραυνας τὰς ἄλλας πόλεις (“The Heliswasians are to be Mantineans, with the same and equal rights . . . incorporating their chara and polis into Mantinea, while the polis of the Heliswasians remains as it is, for all time, the Heliswasians being a kome of the Mantineans. There is to be a theaoros from Helisson, as there is from the other poleis”) (SEG 37 340.3–9 = RO 14). In this document the term polis is used three times about Helisson: twice explicitly and once implicitly. (1) In the phrase φέροντας τὰν χώραν καὶ τὰν πόλιν ἤμεν Ἐλισόν [καὶ] Μαντινῖς αὐτόνομοι αὐτόνομοι αὐτόνομοι, the emphasis is on Helisson as an urban centre rather than as a political community, cf. DGE 147.3–7 (= Syll. 1 141); IOSPE ii 401.7–7 (= Syll. 2 360); Syll. 3 647.8–9. (2) In the phrase μνώνας τὰς πόλεις τῶν Ἐλισαπίων ἀπαθανέται ἐπείξας τὸν πάντα χρόνον, it is impossible to decide whether the reference is to Helisson as a town or as a political community. But, as noted supra, the term polis is almost exclusively applied to a town which was also the centre of a polis in the political sense. (3) Finally, we believe that Helisson is implicitly described as a polis in the clause θέαρον ἦναι Ἐλισόν [καὶ] Μαντινῶν, as if it was a theaoros like the other communities (which are poleis), but this mostly poetic use of the pronoun ἄλλος, though attested (cf. e.g. Pl. Grg. 473D), is not often found in Classical prose, and the rendering “like the other poleis” is much more common and straightfor-

---

³ The polis status of the periökoic communities has been called in doubt by Mertens (2002). For a reply to Mertens, see Hansen (2004b).

⁴ It must, however, be taken into account that Andoc. 3 is spurious, see Harris (2000).

ward. It follows that Helisson was a *polis* in the sense of political community like the other *poleis* that sent *theaoroi*. Next, in Arkadia the *theaoroi* were chief magistrates, and to allow Helisson to provide a *theaoros* (like the other *poleis*) is in itself an indication that Helisson was still a *polis* in the political sense.

*Re (10)* In, presumably, 408/7 (Diod. 13.75.1) the new Rhodian *poleis* (no. 1000) was built and populated by citizens from the three old *poleis* on Rhodos: Ialysos (no. 995), Kamiros (no. 996) and Lindos (no. 997). Yet, in describing events of 390, Xenophon refers to the Rhodian *poleis* in the plural, and the passage shows that Ialysos, Kamiros and Lindos were still considered to be *poleis* at least in the urban sense (Xen. *Hell.* 4.8.25, cf. *CPC Acts* 2:111 n. 23). Hellenistic and later inscriptions describe Ialysos as a *polis* both in the urban sense (*IG* xii.11. 677.16 (c.300)) and in the political sense (*IG* xii.11. 58.21 (Roman)), and there are several other indications that all three old Rhodian communities kept their status as (dependent) *poleis* throughout the period from the synoecism in C51 to C3 AD (Gabrielsen (2000) 192–95). (a) The assembly, called ἐκκλησία, is attested in *Tit. Cam.* 105.26–27 (C4f). (b) A council, called οἱ μαστροὶ, is attested after the synoecism both in Kamiros (*Tit. Cam.* 105.6 (C4f, restored)) and in Ialysos (*IG* xii.11. 677.16 (c.300)). (c) In c.394, citizens of Ialysos were appointed *proxenoi* by Athens as their father had been (Walbank (1978) no. 72; SEG 28 48; cf. Gabrielsen (2000) 192 with n. 91). (d) The existence of a system of demes and the practice of using demotics as the third part of personal names were upheld throughout the Classical and Hellenistic periods. Sub-ethnics are attested for Lindos c.325 (*LLindos 51; IG* xii.1761), for Kamiros (*Tit. Cam.* 110.1–2) and for Ialysos (*IG* xii.11.166) in the Hellenistic period. Both *ekklesia* and *boule* are institutions characteristic of a *polis* and unattested in civic subdivisions. So to have an *ekklesia* and a *boule*, to have citizens appointed *proxenoi*, and to be organised into demes and use sub-ethnics are strong indications of *polis* status, and all three institutions corroborate the attestations of Ialysos, Kamiros and Lindos as (dependent) *poleis* after the synoecism in C51.

*Re (11)* In southern Arkadia there were in the Classical period four “tribes”: viz. the Eutresians, the Kynourians, the Mainalians and the Parrhasians (Nielsen (1996a) 100–3, (1996b) 132–41). They were political communities on a par with the large *poleis* such as Tegea, Mantinea and Orchomenos: we hear that the Parrhasians were made *autonomoi* in consequence of a war between Sparta and Mantinea c.423–421 (Thuc. 5.33.3). In 368, when Megalopolis was founded, the Parrhasians and the Mainalians provided two *oikistai* each, while the others came from Kleitor, Mantinea and Tegea (Paus. 8.27.2). And of fifty *damoungoi* listed in an Arkadian federal decree of the 360s, three were Mainalians and five were Kynourians (*IG* v.2.11.6–19, 40–45). Each tribe was composed of a number of communities, which are often called *polis* in contemporary sources (e.g. the Mainalian city of Eutaia, which is called *polis* by Xenophon at *Hell.* 6.5.12), and that they were *poleis* in the political sense of the term is apparent from, e.g., the case of Pallantion (no. 289). The Mainalian city of Pallantion (Paus. 8.27.3) had its own coinage (Head, *HN*² 451). Pallantion furthermore had its own Delphic *theorodokos* in C51 (*REG* 62 (1949) 6.1.1), and in 370 Pallantion handed over to the Confederacy some Tegean refugees, presumably without reference to the Mainalian tribe (Diod. 15.59.3). In C41 Pallantion concluded a treaty of friendship with Argos (*SEG* 11 1084) without reference to the tribe which, however, may well have been no longer in existence (Nielsen (1996a) 102–3).

*Re (12)* In the King’s Peace of 386 it is explicitly stated that all the *poleis* along the west coast of Asia Minor were to lose their *autonomia* and be ruled by the king of Persia: Ἀρταξέρξης βασιλεὺς νομίζει δικαίως τὰς μὲν ἐν τῇ Λαῖα πόλεις ἔαυτοῖο εἶναι καὶ τῶν νήσων Κλαζομένας καὶ Κύπρον τὰς δὲ ἄλλας Ἑλληνίδας πόλεις καὶ μικρὰς καὶ μεγάλας αὐτονόμους ἄφεναι πλὴν Λήμνου καὶ Ἰμβροῦ καὶ Σκύρου. ταύτας δὲ ὀσπερ τὸ ἄρχαντα ἦν Αθηναίων (“King Artaxerxes finds it just that the *poleis* in Asia shall belong to him and, of the islands, Klazomenai and Kypros. The other Hellenic *poleis*, small and large alike, shall be left *autonomoi* except Lemnos, Imbros and Skyros. They shall belong to the Athenians, as of old”) (Xen. *Hell.* 5.1.31). Thus, all the *poleis* became dependencies and their status is well illustrated by, e.g., three decrees passed by Mylasa (no. 913) in the period 367–354 (RO 54). The decrees acknowledge the supremacy of the Persian king, Artaxerxes II, and his satrap, Maussolos (1–2, 17–18, 32–33), but they are decisions made by the people in assembly (2–4, 19–20), and the community is repeatedly described as ἡ πόλις ἡ Μυλασέως (7, 10, 23, 46). Conversely, when Alexander “liberated” the Asian *poleis* from Persian rule, they were considered once again to be *autonomoi*; see the decree passed by the people of Priene in the autumn of 334 (I.Priene 2 = Tod 186.1–4).

*Re (13)* Mesambrie (no. 647) was one of the fortresses situated in the Samothrakian *peraia* west of Doriskos, but not (yet) located; see Hdt. 7.108.2: “On his march from Doriskos Xerxes first passed the Samothrakian fortresses, of which
the westernmost is a polis called Mesambrie.” Kasmenai (no. 29) was a secondary colony founded by Syracuse in 643 (Thuc. 6.5.2), explicitly described by Herodotos as a polis (Hdt. 7.155.2), admittedly in the urban sense but presumably denoting a community which was a polis in the political sense as well (Hansen (1996a) 39–54, (2000) 198–99). For Kasmenai as a frontier fortress, see Di Vita (1990) 350.

Re (14) According to Aristotle, Notioi (no. 858) and Kolophon (no. 848) were two parts of one polis, but they are adduced in the fifth book of the Politics as an example of how the shape and nature of the territory (chora) can make it difficult to keep a polis united and result in stasis (Arist. Pol. 1303b7–10); and other sources show that Notioi had developed into a (dependent) polis. Notioi may have been classified as a polis by Hecat. fr. 233; in the Athenian tribute lists the Notioi never pay together with the Kolophonians but are always recorded separately (IG 1 iii 270.1.8, 272.1.24–25, 280.1.39, 283.111.23, 285.1.95), and the city-ethnic, Νοτιεῖς, is still attested in C4 sources (IG 1 ii 1.48–49; Arist. Pol. 1303b10). According to Thucydides, Notioi belonged to Kolophon (Thuc. 3.34.1–4), but it had its own theorodokos to host the theoroi who announced the Heraia at Argos (SEG 23 189.11.7 c.330), and only towards the end of C4 did Notioi enter into a sympoliteia with Kolophon (Robert (1969) 1244–45).

APPENDIX

Autonomia and the Poleis of the Boiotian Federation in C4

Following Keen (1996) against Hansen (1995b, 1996c), Rhodes (1999) argues that the member poleis of the Boiotian Federation may have preserved their autonomia. Summarising the principal sources, Rhodes concludes:

For Hansen, there is no problem: membership of the Boeotian federation was incompatible with autonomia (except for the dominant polis, Thebes). . . . Now, there is no doubt that that is how the Spartans saw the matter. . . . It may be that they [the Thebans] believed and the other Boiotians who were happy that their poleis should be members of the Boeotian federation also believed, that membership of the Boeotian federation was not incompatible with autonomia. We think this possibility is rejected too easily by Hansen.

We note that Rhodes does not discuss the sources which show that, on this issue, the Athenians agreed with the Spartans (Andoc. 3.13, 20; Isoc. 14.10, 17; Xen. Hell. 6.3.9). He mentions Andokides, but takes him to favour the Spartan view without pointing out that he is stating an Athenian view. Even if we follow Harris (2000) in believing that Andoc. 3 is spurious, the passages in Xen. and Isoc. still show that the Athenians sided with the Spartans on this issue and believed that the Thebans had deprived the other Boeotian poleis of their autonomia. Similarly, Rhodes cites Xen. Hell. 4.8.15 and 5.1.32–33 and 36 as evidence of the Spartan view without discussing that, as written, these passages show that the Thebans themselves shared the Spartans’ view of autonomia, perhaps unwillingly, but that is no wonder. At the peace conference in 392/1 the Thebans feared that they might be forced to restore the autonomia of the Boeotian poleis (Xen. Hell. 4.8.15). That is a strange way of putting it if everybody but the Spartans believed that the Boeotian poleis were in fact autonomoi. Again, at the peace conference in 386 Agesilaos demanded that the Theban envoys include the autonomia clause in their oath on the peace (Xen. Hell. 5.1.32–33). If the Thebans and the other Boiotians had believed that the Boeotian Federation respected the autonomia of the smaller member poleis, it would have been easy for the envoys to take the oath just as requested by Agesilaos. Yet they refuse and say that they have not been commissioned to
do that. It has been objected that Xenophon, being pro-Spartan and anti-Theban, presents a distorted view of what happened and consistently favours the Spartan interpretation of *autonomia* (Keen (1996) 119). But Tuplin (1993) has shown that Xenophon is often critical of the Spartans, and Christensen (2001) has added to this that he often draws a favourable picture of the Thebans. Finally, Rhodes (1999) 39 agrees with us ((1996c) 134–36) against Keen ((1996) 15–16) that the Spartan perioikic *poleis* were not *autonomoi*. But the exchange of words between Agesilaos and Epameinondas in 371 as reported by Plut. Ages. 28.1–3 is based on the belief that the Boiotian and the Lakedaimonian *poleis* possessed the same or at least a similar degree of *autonomia*. Now Plutarch’s story may be no more than an anecdote, but if we take it seriously, it shows that Epameinondas did not believe that the Boiotian *poleis* were *autonomoi*. To conclude, we note that, to counter the evidence set out above, Rhodes does not cite one single source that directly supports his view that the Boiotian *poleis* were still *autonomoi* under the Federation. Everything is circumstantial evidence, and Rhodes cautiously says that the Thebans and the Boiotians may have believed, etc. Over the years, Rhodes and I have come to agree, by and large, on most of the important issues about *autonomia* and dependent *poleis*, but on this particular issue we still disagree.

**REFERENCES**


“Civic subdivisions” is a modern term which in this context denotes the subdivisions of a polis or, rather, of its citizenry.\(^1\) They were civic in the sense that membership was open to citizens and only citizens. Foreigners and slaves were excluded, and women too:\(^2\) the civic subdivisions testify to the Archaic and Classical polis as an association of the adult male citizen population. They were subdivisions in the sense that, at any level, every citizen belonged to one and only one of these units. They were public administrative units. Thus, households (oikiai),\(^3\) some kinship groups (such as gene)\(^4\) and some religious groups (such as thiasoi) were not normally civic subdivisions. They were private organisations, sometimes in the borderland between the private and the public, and only exceptionally do they appear as genuine public organisations.\(^5\)

There were two basic types of civic subdivision: some were territorial, some personal. The main territorial subdivisions were the demos and the kome; but phylai too could be territorial units.\(^6\) By far the most important purely personal subdivision was the phyle. Other important forms were the phratria, the patria and various groups designated by numbers: the chiliaestys, the hekatostys, the pentekostys, etc. (see Index \(^13\)). But even the territorial subdivisions were to some extent personal because membership of a subdivision, be it territorial or personal, was hereditary in the male line. Therefore, by migrations, territorial subdivisions were slowly transformed into personal ones, unless they were reorganised at intervals.

Some poleis could have as many as five or six different sets of civic subdivisions. Older subdivisions were often allowed to persist alongside new ones, though now deprived of their political importance, and several poleis had two incongruent systems of phylai, one that probably preceded the emergence of the polis and one created by the polis (see infra). Some civic subdivisions formed a system, like a nest of Chinese boxes;\(^7\) others were incongruent and cut across one another.\(^8\) A survey of civic subdivisions from all parts of the Hellenic world shows that they had three main functions: (1) to control admission to citizenship; (2) to serve as wards when the polis had to fill a board of officials so that each ward supplied one or more members of the board; (3) to serve as units of the army.

It is no wonder that modern states are organised into municipalities or some other type of smaller unit; but why were civic subdivisions needed in states as small as the Greek poleis? In small and middle-sized poleis all citizens could meet whenever they wanted, and it would never be difficult for the magistrates to get in touch with any of the citizens. One answer is that all Greek poleis had an immensely elaborate and complicated set of political institutions, and to have a whole set of criss-crossing civic subdivisions was just one aspect of the complicated political morphology of any Greek polis. Another answer is that civic subdivisions are known principally from the large poleis such as Athens or Argos or Eretria, where they were indispensable because the polis, and especially Athens, was too big to be a proper face-to-face society. They are unattested in many small and middle-sized poleis, and the presumption is that there were none. In Boiotia there is no trace of phylai, demoi and komai, and the evidence of phratriai is late. The epigraphic record is so rich that the absence of evidence in this case

---

1. The study of civic subdivisions has been revolutionised by the fundamental study of Nicholas Jones, *Public Organization in Ancient Greece* (1987) POAG. Much of what follows is a summary of his findings.

2. The exclusion of women is not explicitly mentioned in Jones, POAG, but is evident from the material he has collected. In Athens (no. 361), the polis we know best, women were excluded from the demos, trittyes and phylai but could, of course, be priestesses as they could at polis level (Jones (1999) 123–33).

3. CPCActs 5:135–37. Karthaia (no. 492) is, so far, the only one attested as civic subdivisions.

4. As usual, the best evidence for gene concerns Athens and by far the best recent treatment is that of Parker (1996) 56–66, 284–327. He concludes that the gene had no political importance in C4 (57). In the Archaic period, on the other hand, every public priesthood seems to have been filled by the members of a designated genos (65). There are two possible interpretations of the evidence: (a) in the Archaic period the gene were civic subdivisions of the Athenian polis; (b) in the Archaic period the gene were private or semi-private organisations and the appointment of priests had not yet been taken over by the polis.

5. In Jones, POAG, gene are registered as civic subdivisions in four poleis only: Erythrai (no. 845), Kolophon (no. 848), Pygela (no. 863) and Samos (no. 864). The evidence for Samos is Hellenistic and not included in this inventory.

6. Cf. the Kleisthenic phylai in Attika and the three phylai in Rhodos (no. 1000) after the synoecism.

7. Like the Athenian phylai, trittyes and demoi (no. 363), or the Eretrian phylai, districts and demoi (no. 370), or the Argive phylai, phratriai and pentekostyes (no. 347).

8. In Epidauros (no. 348) 4 phylai and 39 territorial units cut across one another in a way not yet fully understood. In Athens (no. 361) the subdivision into phratriai was completely unrelated to the subdivisions into demoi.
can be taken as evidence of absence: apparently, the Boiotian poleis had no civic subdivisions of any consequence. Similarly, no civic subdivisions are known on Lesbos and in Aiolis and the phylai attested in Thessaly are all Hellenistic and may have been introduced in C4–C2. There were no Aiolian phylai to match the three Dorian and the four to six Ionian, and it seems reasonable to infer that civic subdivisions were unknown in the Aiolian-speaking regions of Hellas. But Boiotia bordered on Attika, subdivided into 139 demoi, and on Euboea, where demes were very important in three of the four major poleis (Chalkis (no. 365), Eretria (no. 370) and Histiaia/Oreos (no. 372)) and may have been in Karystos (no. 373) as well. However, subdivisions were not confined to the larger poleis. Here as in all other contexts, generalisations are deceptive: Delos (no. 478) was one of the smallest of all poleis. Nevertheless its population was organised into four phylai, further subdivided into trittyes.

Apart from Athens, almost all the evidence we have comes from inscriptions. There is a heavy concentration of information from the late Classical and early Hellenistic periods. Jones's magisterial study comprises some 200 poleis (POAG 2). For over half of these, all the information we have is Hellenistic or Roman. We have restricted our investigation to the Archaic and Classical periods, and consequently the number of attested poleis drops to about 100, including a dozen not covered by Jones's study.

The history and origin of the civic subdivisions has become one of the most controversial issues in Greek history since 1976, when Denis Roussel published a major monograph about the phylai and phratriai, and Felix Bourriot one about the gene. Independently of one another they argued that the civic subdivisions we know of were created by the polis and did not predate the emergence of the polis, as hitherto believed by almost all ancient historians. Roussel’s and Bourriot’s theories were widely accepted, but they were based on a selection of the available sources only and have to be revised, especially in the light of the much broader study of Jones, POAG.

It is true that direct evidence is scarce and cannot be traced further back than C7: there is no doubt that the Spartan army in C7 was organised into the three Dorian phylai: the Hyleis, the Dymanes and the Pamphyloi (Tyrtaios fr. 19.8, West). Also, in C7 Athens the phratria was an important unit, as is indisputably attested in Drakon’s law on homicide (IG i2 104.18, 23).

The indirect evidence of an early origin, on the other hand, is substantial: the attestation of the Dorian phylai in, for example, Korkyra, though late, indicates that they go back to at least C8m, and their presence in Argos, Megara, Corinth, Sikyon, Epidaurus and Troizen points in the same direction. It seems reasonable to presume that the four to six Ionian phylai were important civic subdivisions in many Milesian colonies and can be traced back to the C8 (Pi§eart (1983) 4). Admittedly, phylai, phratriai and similar groups were not true kinship organisations. But the same observation applies to tribes of all periods all over the world: the first thing to be remembered is that the consanguinity that binds all the members of a tribe together is not a factual but a presumed consanguinity. By contrast with a family and a lineage, a “tribe” is not a kinship group in the literal sense of that term.

Next, we must remember what is often forgotten, that Roussel’s theory about the late development of phylai and phratriai is no more than an ingenious theory based on an argument from silence, and it is strange that so many historians in this particular case have accepted an argumentum e silentio at face value. We know for sure that phylai and phratriai in many poleis were transformed during the Archaic and Classical periods and that the new subdivisions were often purely artificial, without the slightest claim to being kinship groups even in a remote sense. But they replaced earlier organisations which were, allegedly, kinship groups. When these older phylai and phratriai were introduced and how they were organised is a moot point. Especially after Nicholas Jones’s study it is hard to deny that both the Dorian and the Ionian phylai must go back to the period before the colonisation, i.e. before C8. Some of the civic subdivisions seem to have predated the polis or, rather, they were converted into a system of civic subdivisions in connection with the emergence of the polis. Others, however, were deliberately created by the polis and those that were

---

10 Apart from phratries, attested in the late Hellenistic period only (Knoepfler (1981) 148–49), we know of no civic subdivisions in Boiotia (Jones, POAG 79). Similarly, no civic subdivisions are known from all the Thessalian poleis apart from a few attestations of phylai, presumably introduced in the Hellenistic period (ibid. 79–81). Lesbos, apparently, had no civic subdivisions either, and remarkably few (all Hellenistic) are found in Aiolis. It seems reasonable to infer that civic subdivisions were unknown in the Aiolian-speaking regions of Hellas.
12 As duly noted by Roussel (1976) 5, this view was advocated already by Max Weber in 1920, see Weber (1999) 180–83.
14 Jones, POAG xvi–xviii, mentions Roussel’s work without taking issue with his theories. For a critical appraisal of the whole issue, see Gehrke (2000).
earlier than the polis were transformed, sometimes beyond recognition.

Another moot point is how much and how often the civic subdivisions were transformed in the course of the Archaic and Classical periods. Jones argues that the civic subdivisions show a high degree of permanence (1), and that almost all innovations took place during the Age of the Tyrants (12–13). Yet a closer look at the attested reforms indicates that civic subdivisions were subject to constant transformations and with the passage of time became more and more artificial—yet another instance of the Greeks’ conscious and continuous remodelling of their society and institutions.15 Reforms and revisions of civic units are so frequently attested that in most cases it is unwarranted to assume that a system attested in Hellenistic sources can be retrojected back into the Classical period. There are, of course, exceptions: when the six old Ionian phylai are attested in colonies founded by Ionian poleis, they probably go back to the foundation of the colony. Again, in the case of Crete it seems reasonable to assume that the phylai known from Hellenistic sources were civic subdivisions in the Archaic and Classical periods as well (1148 infra).

c.400. In Mantinea (no. 281) the system of dependent komai/poleis is attested for Helisson (no. 273) in 4Cm. It is unlikely that it goes back to C6. In Ioulis (no. 491) the phylai were reformed in 4C4 and Koreisia (no. 493) became a phyle of Ioulis. In, probably, 4C4 the Dorian phylai in Kalymna (no. 485) were replaced by or supplemented with 7 phylai and 5 demois; in Herakleia Pontike (no. 715) the 60 hekatostyes seem to belong to 4C4; the Samian hekatostyes (no. 864) cannot be traced further back than 322, etc. Furthermore, civic subdivisions were created or reformed whenever there was a synoecism and, similarly, stasis and revolutions often entailed a reorganisation of the citizen body and the civic subdivisions.

R E F E R E N C E S


Proxenoi as Evidence for Polis Identity

A proxenos is commonly defined as “one city’s official friend in another city”.¹ Proxenia is indeed an institution inextricably connected with the polis (see Index 14),² but it is neither co-extensive with the polis nor as old as the polis. The earliest epigraphical attestations of proxenoi date from, probably, C6f³ and the earliest references in literary sources are found in Pindar.⁴ Apart from a few possible harbingers, the proxenia grew up in C6s, and in C5m it was a well-established institution (Wallace (1970) 189–94).

The origins of the institution are obscure and, of course, a matter of controversy. Especially in western Greece the proxenos seems originally to have been a witness to or a guarantor of a transaction involving two interested parties.⁵ Thus, some gods and the polis of Poseidonia are listed as proxenoi of a treaty concluded c.510 between Sybaris and the Serdaians (Staatserträge 120.5–8). In Archaic Greece, on the other hand, and later all over the Greek world, the proxenos is attested as the protector of somebody in need of assistance. What binds the two meanings together is that in both cases the servicerendered by the proxenos concerns one or more foreigners (xenoi) (Gauthier (1972) 57–59).

The etymology of the noun πρόξενος and the verb προξενεῖν does not help us to settle the question about the origin of the institution: “the prefix προ- may mean ‘on behalf of’ or ‘instead of’; ξενός may mean ‘guest friend’ or, more generally, ‘foreigner’.”⁶ Thus the original meaning of πρόξενος is either (a) a person who acts in the interest of a foreigner or (b) a person who replaces a guest-friend (and hosts a foreigner).⁷ It is worth noting that the first etymology matches proxenoi in both senses whereas the second fits proxenoi in the sense of “public guest friend”, but not in the sense of “witness” or “guarantor”.

Irrespective of the origin of the institution and the etymology of the term, there can be no doubt that the classical proxenia, as attested in the entire Hellenic world, was a privilege and an honour bestowed by polis A on a citizen of polis B who thereby officially was assigned the task of furthering the interests of polis A in his own polis⁸ and, in particular, the task of hosting and helping citizens of polis A when they came as visitors.⁹ The literary sources adduced here concern Athens. The best epigraphical evidence in support of this description of the proxenia is a standard formula which with variations is found in proxeny decrees from all parts of the Greek world: a person who for some time has assisted visitors from a polis, and has shown himself as a friend of that polis in general, is now appointed proxenos by the polis in question.¹⁰ He is still supposed to show the same loyalty towards the polis and hospitality towards its citizens, but now he is publicly recognised as the official xenos of the polis in question.¹¹

The proxenia has been compared, in some ways rightly, to the modern consulate but with certain reservations: the proxenos was officially appointed by the polis whose citizens he served but not by his own polis.¹² A corollary of this was that a polis might have more than one proxenos in another

---

³ CEG 141 – ML 4 (C2f) = Nominae 34 (C6m); SEG 11 1180a (C6f-C5c) = LSAG 190 no. 15 (C6f).
⁴ Pind. Ol. 9.83; Isthm. 4.7–8; fr. 94 b 41, and Pindar may himself have been proxenoi of the Molossians (Nem. 7.6); see Wallace (1970) 205–6.
⁷ (a) is preferred by Marek (1984) 387; (b) by Gschnitzer (1974) 632.
⁸ Thuc. 3.2.3; Aesch. 3.138. See Perlman (1958); Gerolymatos (1986).
⁹ Xen. Symp. 8.39; Hell. 4.4.22; Dem. 18.82; Poll. 3.59; Suda II 2540.
¹⁰ IG xi2.7 6; Ἑπιπτετοῦ ἀνὴρ φιλότιµος ἐστὶν περὶ τῆς πόλεως τῶν Ἀρκεσινῶν καὶ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ κόην Θύμας πολιτείᾳ ἐν ἀγαθῇ καὶ λόγῳ καὶ ἄρμῳ, διὸ αὐτῷ παραδίδομαι τὸ καλοῦσθαι ταῖς δήμοις ἑαυτοῦ ἤπειρον τοῦ καλλιγνωτοῦ Θύμαν πρόξενον τῆς πόλεως τῶν Ἀρκεσινῶν . . . (Since Epiphtes is loyal to the polis of Arkesine and in word and deed does whatever good he can towards those who come to Thera, it has been decided by the people that Epiphtes the son of . . .) (Arkesine, C4); IG II 860 (Athens, C5f); ντ 206 (Athens, C4m); F.Delphes 111.3 157 (Delphi, C4f); IG v.2 265 (Mantinea, C2-C3); IG xi1.5 110 (Paros, C4); IG xi1.5 1092 (Les, C4-C5). IG xi4.564 (Delos, C4f); IG xi1.5768 (Teos, C4); SEG 31 711 (Olbia, C2); IG xi2.7 315 (Samothrace, C4f); I.Ephesos 1428 (Ephesos, C4).
¹¹ That is apparent from, e.g., IG II 176.16–24 (C4f), a rider to an Athenian proxeny decree in which the proposer explains that the purpose of awarding proxenia to some Kyreniains is to ensure that the Athenians also in future can have some Kyreniains to assist them when they come to Kyrene. See also IG xi1.5 528 (Karthaia, C4m) and IG xi1.8 267 (Thasos, C4f) in which a proxenos because of his continued loyalty and hospitality towards the polis and its citizens is promoted to citizen.
¹² Hasebroek (1942) 157; Gauthier (1972) 25, 49. Sparta was unique in that it was one of the king’s prerogatives among the Spartiates to appoint the proxenoi who assisted foreign visitors in Lakedaimon (Hdt. 6.57.2). Since grants of proxeny to Lakedaimonains by foreign polis are attested (IG II 106.14 (Athens, 368/7)) we must infer that Spartan proxenoi were officially appointed both by their own polis and by the polis they served.
Proxenoi as Evidence for Polis Identity

In C4m the small polis of Karthaia on the island of Keos had at least fifteen different proxenoi in Athens (IG xii.5.542). Furthermore, proxenia was sometimes awarded to a citizen who did not reside in his own polis but in the polis that had appointed him proxenos. He was accordingly prevented from performing the functions normally connected with proxenia, and in such cases proxenia was first of all an honour bestowed on a meritorious foreigner.

There is a broad agreement among scholars that proxenia was an institution of the polis (supra n. 2), but poleis were not the only communities awarding proxenia to loyal foreigners. The authority responsible for a proxeny decree is almost invariably identified by an ethnic found either in the preamble of the decree, e.g. 

Dελφοι ἐδῶκαν τῷ δεῖνι προξενίαν (F.Delphes iii.11.146) vel sim. or as an adnominal genitive: πρόξενον ἐμὲν Βοιωτῶν τὸν δείνα (IG vii.2407). Exceptionally, a proxeny decree was issued by a monarch or prince, usually one who ruled a Hellenised but still semi-barbarian community. Apart from monarchs, the issuing authority, usually referred to by ethnic, was (a) a tribe, or (b) a federation, or (c) a polis, or (d) some private or semi-private organisation.

Proxeny decrees issued by private or semi-private organisations are rare and unattested before the Hellenistic period. It is not always easy to distinguish between (a) and (b), but that is of consequence for this investigation. The important issue is whether we can distinguish (c) from (a) and (b), and that is in fact possible by inspecting the type of ethnic used. Ethne and koina are identified by regional or sub-regional ethnics, poleis by city-ethnics and, as argued above (61), it is only exceptionally a problem to determine whether an ethnic is a regional ethnic or a city-ethnic. So, whenever we have an ethnic derived from the name of an urban centre, we can infer, a priori, that the decree must have been passed by either a polis or a civic subdivision centred on a nucleated settlement (a demos or a kome, etc.). Among the hundreds of proxeny decrees of the Archaic and Classical periods there is not one single securely attested example of an award by a civic subdivision. Therefore, the ethnic used to identify the issuing authority must in all such cases be a city-ethnic, not a sub-ethnic, and the community responsible for the decree must be a polis.

A similar—but not identical—line of reasoning applies when we move from the community issuing the decree to the person awarded proxenia. It is usually taken for granted that he is a citizen of the community to which he belongs, but how do we know? It is not explicitly stated in the proxeny decree, but it can be inferred implicitly from the fact that he is identified by an ethnic which, provided it can be recognised as a city-ethnic, shows that he is a citizen of the polis in question.

A complicating factor is that occasionally the honorand is identified by a sub-ethnic. But in all such cases the sub-ethnic appears alongside the city-ethnic, and there is not one single unquestionable attestation of a proxenos identified by sub-ethnic alone.

Another problem is that not all proxenoi are identified by city-ethnics and/or sub-ethnics. In some cases the proxenos is a monarch or a tyrant, in others he is identified by a regional ethnic. The Aitolian base in Delphi, for example, was inscribed in C2m with thirteen proxeny decrees

Rhodes (1995) 103, 107. The observation covers all types of civic subdivision: phylai, phratriai, patrai, gene, komai, demos, hekataystes, etc. The important point in this context is to distinguish between city-ethnics denoting poleis and sub-ethnics denoting civic subdivisions with an urban centre (komai and demos). For communities that were dependent poleis but at the same time civic subdivisions of another polis, see supra 92. Pue Marek (1984) 11, there is no reason to believe that the honours listed in a decree passed by Mykene c.200 may have comprised proxenia (SEG 3.112).

D.Helg. i.2.74 (C3): Ἀθηναίοι Βοιωτίκαι Κυνηγός Μακεδόνιος, ἰδίως Πολιτείας, δήμου Αἰγιλιέως . . . προξενίαν . . .

One possible example is the proxeny decree issued by Pairisades and his sons for [. . .] Ἀιτωλίας (IOSPE 11.1 (C4s)), recorded as an Athenian in LGPN 632. However, at Syll. 217 n. 2 Dittenberger suggests that the honoree was a citizen of Amisos (no. 712, Theopomp fr. 389) rather than an Athenian from the deme of Peiraeus. By letter, M. Osborne has informed us that Dittenberger must be right and that the classification in LGPN of the son of Dionysios as an Athenian is a mistake.

D.Helg. i.2.392: the sons of Kersseleptes, the king of the Odyrians in C4m, is appointed proxenos of the Delphians; Syll. 187 = I.Knidos 66c: Iphaiades, the tyrant of Abydos in C4f, is appointed proxenos of the Knidians; Syll. 168: Mauulos of Melysa, the tyrant of Halikarnassos in C4f, is appointed proxenos of the Erythraians.

Proxenoi identified by regional ethnic: F.Delphes iii.11.146: Αἴολος (C4m); BCH 70 (1946) 401: Φαρσάλος (C4f); Syll. 267: Μακεδόνιος (C4s); F.Delphes iii.11.412: Λυκαρίος (C4f); PEPCChios 59.6: Βασιλεύς (C4f); IG xii.3 251.3: Θεσσαλός ἐκ Φαρσάλου (C4)}
The evidence we have shows that *proxenia* was found not only in large *poleis* but also in middle-sized and small *poleis*. Almost every *polis* seems to have had a network of *proxenoi* in other *poleis* and, conversely, many of its citizens served as *proxenoi* for citizens coming from other *poleis*. A large proportion of the *proxeny* decrees stem from Athens, an oversized *polis*, and are from Delphi, a small *polis* but a Panhellenic centre. But *proxenia* is epigraphically attested not only in decrees but also in lists. Many *poleis* seem to have kept a central record of their *proxeny* decrees and sometimes published on stone a list with the name and *polis* affiliation of all their *proxenoi*. Small and large fragments of such lists are preserved. Most are Hellenistic, but there is a C5 list from Lousoi (IG v 2.387) and C4 lists from Anaphe (IG xii 1.3 251), Chios (PEPChios 50) and Karthaia (IG xii 1.5 542). The most impressive is the one from Karthaia. It shows that this small *polis* in C4m had some 140 *proxenoi* in approximately thirty to forty different *poleis*. In most cases there were one or perhaps two *proxenoi* from a *polis*, but some fifteen of the *proxenoi* were Athenians. The preserved bottom of a list of *proxenoi* from the small *polis* of Anaphe is inscribed with the names of seven *proxenoi* from seven different *poleis*. We do not know how many names were inscribed on the missing upper part of the stele.

Both the literary and the epigraphical evidence shows that the enormous network of *proxenoi* that grew up in the late Archaic and Classical periods was of the utmost importance both collectively in the political relations between *poleis* and individually in the social and economic relations between citizens from one *polis* who had dealings with citizens from another *polis*.

However, especially in Hellenistic honorific decrees, *proxenia* is listed as one honour among many others in a way which suggests that in such cases it had become an empty title. These examples have influenced the interpretation of many other attestations of *proxenia* in sources where it is impossible to assess the importance of the institution. Scholars are divided over the issue and it is

---

25 Another example is the Athenian *proxenos* Euesour (supra n. 13). In the *proxeny* decree he is called an Akarnanian (IG ii² 374.13).

26 IG iχ² 396 (τῶν ἱερῶν τῶν Σηχείων Λυσίας...προς ἔπεμεν δίδομεν (c.400); IG xii.5 24: προς ἔπεμεν [ὁ] Λυτόπον Σωμαδήλου [Πέ]ριον τῆς πόλεως τῆς Σκίνῳν [ονάνα]... (C4/C3e). Cf. IG xii.5 114+ addd. (Paros, C4); IG xii Suppl. 245 (Andros, C4f); IG xii.7 5–6 (Arkesine, C4m).

27 E.g. Makne (no. 149); Prochis (no. 154); Achei (no. 232); Phellou (no. 242); Kyphe (no. 335); Oinou (no. 338); Pellana (no. 341).

28 Walbank (1978) publishes 94 Athenian *proxeny* decrees from before 480 to c.400; Lambrechts (1958) lists 141 Athenian awards of *proxeny* covering the period 482–333.


30 Both types of record are referred to in IG vii 1–6 (Megara (C4)). Chios had a στήλη προξηνική inscribed with the names, patronyms and city-ethnics of the *proxenoi* of Chios (PEPChios 12.31, 42–43 (C4)).


sometimes presented as an alternative: proxenia was either a service or an honour, or rather it was originally a service that over time deteriorated into an empty honour. We prefer a both . . . and to an either . . . or and suggest that proxenia as a service always co-existed with proxenia as an honour, only the scales tipped so that, eventually, honorific proxenia became the more prominent aspect of the institution. In this respect proxenia and politeia are similar. Right from the Archaic period proxenia was an honour bestowed on meritorious foreigners; often it implied the continued performance of services to the polis in question and to visitors from the polis, but sometimes it was a mere title awarded because of earlier services but not implying further services in the future. Similarly, politeia, naturalisation, was an honour by which the honoree sometimes became a full citizen of the polis in question, but sometimes became an honorary citizen. From C4m it became common in honorific decrees to combine proxenia with politeia and bestow both privileges on the same person. But from a functional point of view the two privileges were mutually exclusive: if the honoree took advantage of the citizenship and became a full citizen of the polis in question, he could no longer host foreigners in his old polis, and if he stayed in his own polis and performed his services as proxenos he could not take advantage of the citizenship he had obtained.

The services expected from a proxenos in return for the honour bestowed on him by the patron polis were sometimes rendered to individual citizens but sometimes to the polis as such. The two aspects are aptly covered by the formula which, with variations, was used in proxeny decrees from all over the Hellenic world: “NN of polis X is honoured because of his unfailing loyalty towards polis Y and because, in word and deed, he does what good he can towards those citizens of Y who visit polis X” (see n. 10).

Most proxenoi seem to have been upper-class and one well-attested way of being appointed proxenos was, during a shortage of grain, to send cheap grain to a polis and hope to be rewarded with the honours of proxenia and/or politeia. In the economic sphere, other services expected from the proxenos were usually for the benefit of individual citizens from the patron polis (Dem. 52.5, 9, 10, 24).

While services rendered to individuals were often private, the help a proxenos offered his patron polis was usually of a political nature. Since a proxenos usually had some influence both in his own polis and in the polis whose proxenos he was, it was natural that proxenoi were used in diplomacy. They were often sent as envoys to their patron polis (Xen. Hell. 6.3.2–4; Aeschin. 3.338), and they hosted and assisted envoys coming from the patron polis (Xen. Symp. 8.39). It was an Argive strategos and a Spartan proxenos in Argos who on behalf of their polis negotiated a truce with the Spartans in 418 (Thuc. 5.59.5), and it was an Argive proxenos in Sparta who told the Argives about the Spartan conditions for peace after the Argive defeat at Mantinea (Thuc. 5.76.3). The use of proxenoi in interstate affairs could take many other forms: in a list of contributions to the Boiotian Federation to support its conduct of the Third Sacred War appears, alongside a number of poleis, the Boiotians’ proxenos in Tenedos. He is put down for 1,000 drachmas, obviously a political gesture of a semi-public kind (IG vii 2418.15–16 = RO 57 (C4m)). Again, when in 382 Brasidas marched his army from Lakedaimon to Chalkidike he was guided through Thessaly by five Thessalians, of whom one was the Chalkidians’ proxenos in Pharsalos (Thuc. 4.78.1; cf. Hornblower (1996) 257–58). Given that the purpose of Brasidas’ expedition was to break up the Chalkidian federation, the proxenoi’s assistance to the Spartans points to an internal conflict in the federation, and that leads on to a different aspect of the political role of proxenoi.

In addition to their official assistance in diplomacy, the proxenoi often played a more secret and sinister role in interstate relations. The bonds of guest-friendship between a proxenos and the polis that had made him proxenos often resulted in a case of divided loyalties. Given that the citizens of many poleis were split into opposed factions which often had close connections with sympathising factions in other poleis (infra 124), a proxenos might easily be involved in espionage and treason (Gerolymatos (1986)), and to be a proxenos of one of the hegemonic poleis might in troubled times be a dubious honour and a dangerous job. During the Delian League and again during the Second Athenian Naval League, the Athenians used their network of proxenoi to control the members; and Athenian proxeny decrees often included a clause protecting the Athenian proxenos in a member polis against being molested or even murdered by
his fellow citizens. Such clauses were not just empty words: in the 360s a stasis in Ioulis between a pro-Athenian and an anti-Athenian faction entailed the murder of the Athenian proxenos in Ioulis and, subsequently, an Athenian sentence of death was passed on his murderers (IG 11 2 111.27–45 = RO 39).

This and other examples show that there was a close link between proxenia and stasis in Classical Greece. Proxenoi provided their patron polis with political information (Gerolymatos (1986)). One example is what Polydamas, the Spartan proxenos in Pharsalos, told the Spartans about the political aspirations of Iason of Pherai (Xen. Hell. 6.1.2–16).

More subversive was the role a proxenos could play in a stasis in which one of the factions in his own polis relied on help from his patron polis to overthrow the regime and come to power. Thus, in collusion with the Spartans, the Spartan proxenos in Elis planned in 399 to overthrow the Eleian democracy. However, in the initial phase he and his followers did not succeed in murdering the leader of the democratic faction in Elis and the coup failed (Xen. Hell. 3.2.27–30; Paus. 3.8.4). Again, in the 430s the Corinthians brainwashed the Korkyreans they had taken prisoners in the naval battle of 435. Then, in collusion with their proxenoi in Korkyra, the Corinthians had them ransomed and sent back to Korkyra, where they began to agitate against Athens. The result was the disastrous stasis that broke out in 427 (Thuc. 1.55.1, 3.70.1).

R E F E R E N C E S
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Theorodokoi as Evidence for Polis Identity

In the course of the Classical period it became standard procedure that Panhellenic festivals were announced by theoroi sent out from the community responsible for the festival to all the communities which could be expected to participate in the celebration (Boesch (1908) 7–11). The technical term for the theoroi’s announcement was epangelia (Thuc. 5.49.2–3; 8.10.1; SEG 12 373.28 = Rigsby (1996) 26.11 (242/h)). The sources we have show that the theoroi were sent to all parts of the Hellenic world and it became customary in each and every community visited by the theoroi to have an officially appointed person whose duty it was to host and assist the theoroi (Perlman (1995), (2000)). Such a host was called a theorodokos and he was appointed sometimes by the community in which he lived, but sometimes by the community that sent out the theoroi (Perlman (2000) 60–62). The theoroi were normally sent out the year before the festival was celebrated, and the purpose of their mission was to invite the various communities to participate in the festival, to bring sacrifices in the name of their community, and to respect the sacred truce that was proclaimed in connection with the festival (Isoc. 4.43–44; Perlman (1995) 118).

In the Classical period theorodokoi are attested in connection with the Olympic Games (Syll.2 171 = IV O 36 (365–363 = Perlman (2000) O.1)), the Pythian Games (Syll.2 90 with SEG 25 576 (C5l); SEG 24 379), the Nemean Games (SEG 36 331 = Perlman (2000) N.1 (C4l)7), the Asklepieia at Epidaurus (IG IIv 2.1 94–95 (C4m) = Perlman (2000) E.1)), and the Heraia at Argos (SEG 23 189 = Perlman (2000) A.1 (C4s)). Our principal sources for the C4 theorodokia are substantial fragments of long lists of theorodokoi living in the places to be visited by the theoroi (see Index 15). The lists were drawn up by the communities responsible for the festivals and were organised as itineraries of the theoroi. The lists that are relevant for this investigation are two from Epidaurus covering the years 359 (IG IIv 2.1 94) and 355 (IG IIv 2.1 95), and two from Argos both of C4l, one concerning the Nemea (SEG 36 331) and one concerning the Heraia (SEG 23 189). Finally there is a short list from Delphi, the oldest of them all, probably to be dated to C5l (Syll.2 90).4

From the term itself it has been deduced that the principal duty of the theorodokos was to host the theoroi, to accommodate and feed them, and to guide them to their next destination. But, to issue the invitation and obtain a recognition of the sacred truce, the theoroi must get access to the rulers of the community, either an assembly or a council or some magistrate or, perhaps, a monarch, and, being foreigners, they might need the collaboration of a citizen of the place they visited. According to several scholars, in particular Robert, Daux and Perlman, the presumption is that, inter alia, the theorodokos acted as an intermediary between the theoroi and authorities of the place they visited.5 A different view has been advanced by Kahrstedt (1936), followed by Cook (1973, 1988) and Cabanes (1976). The places visited by the theoroi were just settlements, and from the lists of theorodokoi recording all the toponyms of the places visited by the theoroi, no inference can be made about the political status of the community.6

Thus, the problem remains: was the theorodokia a kind of political office so that the attestation of a theorodokos in a particular place can convey information about the political status of the community in question? Or was the theorodokia a semi-private institution essentially unrelated to the political institutions?

In favour of a political interpretation of the institution it has been adduced that the theorodokia was often connected with the proxenia (Monceaux (1886) 259–66). The proxenia was unquestionably a political institution, especially in the

---

1 That it was Elis that was responsible for the epangelia of the Olympic Games is proved by Thuc. 5.49.2–3; that the Pythian Games were announced by Delphi may be inferred from SEG 24 379; for Argos as the responsible authority for the Nemean Games, cf. infra.
2 If Aristonous (listed without toponym in B 24 as the last of the Makedonian theorodokoi) is identical with the son of Alexander the Great (Perlman (2000) 251–52) it follows that the list must be dated to the years after 320 (Perlman (2000) 236) rather than to 323/2 as suggested by Miller (SEG 36 331).
3 So far, there is no evidence for the Istibia and the evidence for the Hemerasia in Lousoi is Hellenistic (C4l–C3e); cf. Perlman (2000) L.1–5). The list of Nemean theorodokia could date either from 331/0 . . . 10 323 B.C. or from post 324 B.C. to 313 B.C.” (Perlman (2000) 109). Perlman prefers the later date but does not exclude the earlier one.
4 The longest of all the lists and the first to be found and published is a Delphic list of C5l published by Plassart in BCH 45 (1921) 1–85.
Classical period, and the link between the two institutions indicates that the *theorodokia* was a political institution too.

As an argument dissociating the *theorodokia* from the pro Henikia it has been objected that the *theorodokia* served the god of the sanctuary connected with the festival while the *proxenoi* served the *polis*.\(^7\) But it would be wrong to infer that it was the sanctuary which appointed or authorised the *theorodokia*. Especially the evidence from Argos shows that *theoroi* were sent out and *theorodokia* were appointed and/or authorised by the *polis* that administered the sanctuary and organised the festival (SEG 11 1084 = Perlman (2000) A 3 (C4l)), not by the sanctuary itself. The C4l list of Nemean *theorodokia*, for example, was drawn up by Argos, not by Nemea, which was a sanctuary without being a *polis* (SEG 36 331; cf. Perlman (2000) 131–52).

Another argument dissociating the *theorodokia* from the pro Henikia has been that the *proxenoi* are identified by ethnics, the *theorodokia* by a toponym, and that this testifies to an essential non-political character of the *theorodokia* since the Greeks invariably used ethnics to identify political communities (Charneux (1966) 160–62, 167–68). This observation can be countered by two other observations: (a) the lists of *theorodokia* are itineraries reflecting the routes followed by the *theoroi* and the topographical organisation of the lists is the reason for the toponym being preferred to the ethnic (Perlman (2000) 29); (b) the orthodoxy that political communities are invariably identified by ethnics is a gross exaggeration. The legends on coins are often toponyms instead of ethnics; in the Athenian tribute lists the toponym is sometimes used to denote a member of the Delian League which indisputably was a *polis*; and in all major Greek authors the toponym is not infrequently found in places where a modern teacher of Greek prose composition would have marked it as an error and replaced it with the corresponding city-ethnic. Thus, given the context, there is nothing anomalous about using a toponym to denote a political community (infra).

The next argument adduced against the political character of the *theorodokia* concerns the status of the *theorodokia*. If they had been officials of some kind, they would all have been citizens of their community. But the lists show that some were women and some foreigners (Charneux (1966) 160–62). However, in the Classical lists there is only one woman, viz. Kleopatra, and she was a queen (SEG 23 189.11). The other attestations of women belong in the Hellenistic period and, in all cases, the women served alongside men, as was then usual in a number of contexts. All the examples of non-citzen male *theorodokia* are Hellenistic, and some of these persons, perhaps all, were Ptolemaic officers in charge of the city visited by the *theoroi* (Perlman (2000) 38–39).

But even assuming, for the sake of argument, that the duties incumbent on a *theorodokos* were purely private and without political overtones, there can be no doubt that the visit of the *theoroi* was political. If the purpose of their announcement of the forthcoming festival was to ensure that the community they visited would send a delegation to the festival and respect the sacred truce, then they must have stopped where they could get in touch with the authorities. Thus, the places they visited must have been the political centres of the communities in question, and therefore the list of *theorodokia* can be used as evidence of the political status of these localities irrespective of the extent of the duties of the *theorodokia*. Of course, that does not amount to proof that the place was a *polis*. It may have been the centre of an *ethnos* or a large monarchy (Gauthier (1979) 126; for examples, see infra).

Third, the debate over the nature of the *theorodokia* has been obscured by the orthodoxy that a *polis* must be in possession of full independence and, accordingly, that dependent status is incompatible with being a *polis*. The recognition of the fact that there were a large number of dependent *poleis* (ὑπήκοοι πόλεις) has changed the character of the controversy. Thus, in 359 there were Epidaurian *theorodokia* in Koroneia, Lebadeia, Orchomenos, Thebes and Thespiai. Now, Koroneia, Lebadeia, Orchomenos and Thespiai were member states of the Boiotian Federation and, in 359, they were in fact dependencies of Thebes. Gauthier (1979) 126–27 infers that this part of the Epidaurian list cannot be used as a source for the political status of the places in which there were *theorodokia* to host the *theoroi*. If one takes the concept of the dependent *polis* into account, the inference is rather that the loss of independence did not necessarily entail that the Boiotian cities lost their status of being *poleis* or the right to be visited by Panhellenic *theoroi* and to have a *theorodokos*. Similarly, Naulochon, the port of Priene, and Notion, the port of Kolophon, were both dependent *poleis* in C4, and in c.330 both had *theorodokia* to host *theoroi* from Argos.

In the preserved lists of *theorodokia* the places visited by the *theoroi* are almost always identified by a toponym apparently denoting a settlement. In two cases only the place where a *theorodokos* resides is indicated by a regional e-
nic (Thesprotioi, Molossioi), and in a further four cases by the name of a region (Chaonia, Epeiros (bis), Makedonia). Thus, there are altogether six attestations of peoples and regions as against 135 attestations of toponyms which probably denote urban centres. The problem is: were these towns invariably poleis? Or could some of them be mere urban centres lying in the territory of a polis or in a community organised as a tribe or a monarchy, as suggested by Gau-thier (1979) 126? A survey of the evidence may provide us with an answer to this question. Of altogether 135 toponyms recorded in the C4 lists of theorodokoi, ninety-three are explicitly attested as poleis in Archaic and Classical sources (poleis type A),10 and seven others, though not called polis individually, are attested in lists of communities under the heading πόλεις αὖσε vel sim. (poleis type [A]).11 For twenty-two more toponyms there is additional evidence strongly suggesting that they denoted poleis, e.g. coins, proxeny decrees, defence circuits (poleis type B),12 and so we are left with thirteen communities for which polis status can seriously be called in question (poleis type C).13 It is worth noting that eleven of the twenty-two toponyms classified as poleis type B and eight of the thirteen classified as type C belong in the regions of Epeiros, Akarnania and Aitolia. The high number of Bs reveals how inadequate our sources are for these regions: polis status in C4m is strongly indicated by, e.g., a C4 mint and polis status in the last decade of C4 combined with remains of impressive defence circuits enclosing nucleated habitation. It is probably just because of the paucity of the evidence that we have no direct contemporary attestation of these communities as poleis in the political and/or urban senses. The high number of Cs, however, may suggest a different explanation: apart from Greek colonies along the coasts, polis formation in these regions often took place as late as C4. Thus, it is a moot point whether these eight toponyms can be expected to denote proper poleis in the urban and political senses.

Let us adduce Kassopa as an example illustrating the problems we are facing. Kassopa lay in Epeiros where polis formation took place as late as in C4m and sometimes perhaps even later.14 In Ps.-Skylax three sections are devoted to the Epeirote tribes: the Thesprotioi (30), the Kassopoii (31) and the Molottoi (32). Ps.-Skylax’s treatise has been compiled from many sources and was revised several times. Therefore it is impossible to date the work; but there seems to be a case for taking c.330 to be the terminus ante quem for the treaty as a whole and for some chapters to assume a date of C4e while others may even go back to C5 (Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 137–38). In each of the three chapters describing Epeiros, the author states that the people (ἐθνός) lived κατὰ κώμας, and no πόλις is mentioned between Korkyra described at 29 as a πόλις Ἑλλήνης and Amphilochoaian Argos called πόλις at 33. But in the Epidaurian list of theorodokoi of, probably, 356, Kassopa is recorded between Pandosia, a colony of Elis, and the Thesprotioi, still recorded as a tribe (IG iv.1.95.24–6). The presumption is that the chapter in Ps.-Skylax antedates the Epidaurian list of theorodokoi and the shift from the ethnic Κασσωποί and the toponym Κασσωπία found in Ps.-Skylax 31 to the toponym Κασσώπα found in the Epidaurian list of theorodokoi strongly suggests that Kassopa was by now a polis, a presumption which has been supported by the recent excavations of the site. They have revealed that the city of Kassopa must have been founded around the mid-fourth century (Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994) 114–79); the excavators consider the circuit to belong to the period immediately after the synoikism and suggest a date c.350 (ibid. 123 with n. 298). The earliest attestation of Kassopa as a polis in the political sense is a C4l–C3e dedication on a statue base (SEG 34 589; cf. Diod. 19.88.3: Κασσωπίαν πόλιν (τρÇ4l)), but, combining the literary, epigraphical and archaeological evidence, we have reason to assume that Kas-

---

8 Theoropoi (IG iv.1.95.26); Molossi (IG iv.1 95.31).
9 Χαονία (IG iv.1 95.29); Ἀπείρος (IG iv.1 95.23; SEG 23 189.11); Μακεδονία (IG iv.1 94.6.9). In a number of cases the name of a region is recorded without the name of a theorodokos, i.e. as a heading of several toponyms denoting towns within the region and each matched with the name of a theorodokos.
14 The following section is a slightly revised version of Hansen (1995) 61.
sopa was a polis created in C4f and probably by some kind of synoikism of komai.

For several of the other communities in Epeiros and Akarnania, the entry in the list of theorodokoi is the only source we have: the toponym denotes an unlocated settlement, the person serving as theorodokos is otherwise unknown, and the information we possess cannot be linked to archaeological evidence. In all these cases we must simply suspend judgement and leave the toponym as being possibly the name of a polis (type C), but we cannot preclude the possibility that it was the name of the urban and political centre of some ethnos or koinon.

To conclude: to send theoroi to the major Panhellenic sanctuaries and to participate in the Panhellenic festivals was one of the characteristics of a polis (SEG 22 444, cf. 27 106 (C5f)), and in C4 to have one or more theorodokoi to host the theoroi sent out to announce the festival can be taken as an important indication that the community in question was a polis; but it was not a sine qua non for being a polis. Once again Kassopa is a relevant example. The Epidaurian list of theorodokoi in Epeiros in 356 records Epeiros, Pandosia, Kassopa, the Thesprotoi, Poionos, Chaonia, Artichia, the Molossosoi and Zmaratha (IG iv.1 95.23–30, 73–77). But in the Argive list of theorodokoi of c.330 the only entry left is [Ἀπε]ροια. Κλεοπάτρα (SEG 23 189.1.11). Following Cabanes (1997) 81–87 we can assume that the various tribes, regions and poleis recorded in 356 were now united in a single political community called Epeiros. But that does not mean that the urban communities had lost their status of being poleis. Kassopa is explicitly attested as a polis in C4f–C3e (supra), and for the other urban centres recorded in the Epidaurian list, viz. Artichia, Pandosia, Poionos and Zmaratha, polis status is a possibility that must be taken into account. Pandosia is recorded as a polis in the 340s (Dem. 7.32; Theopomp. fr. 206) and may still have been a polis c.330. For the other towns we have no evidence and must suspend judgement.

Let us end this chapter with a warning: all the lists of theorodokoi are fragmentary, and even the completely preserved parts show surprising gaps. To mention just one example: in the Epidaurian list of 359 the theoroi visiting Boiotia south of Lake Kopais stop at Thespiai and Koroneia. Why is Haliartos missing from the list of theorodokoi? We know of no answer to this question and many others like it. We can only conclude from the material we possess that it is illegitimate to apply an argument from silence and infer that Haliartos was not a polis in 359. Thus, the absence of a theorodokos says nothing about the political status of a community, whereas the attestation of one testifies to one aspect of the political organisation of this community, and if the location in which the theoroi were hosted by a theorodokos was a town, the presence of a theorodokos indicates that it was the centre of a political community, i.e. a polis.
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Victors in Panhellenic Games as Evidence for Polis Identity

In the Classical period athletic contests were arranged by numerous communities throughout the Greek world, e.g. by Pellene (no. 240) and by Pheneos (no. 291) in the Peloponnesian. Some of these festivals, e.g. the Asklepia at Epidaurus (no. 348), were of Panhellenic stature and developed systems of epangelia and theorodokia. However, the four truly Panhellenic festivals were those at Olympia, Nemea, Isthmia and Delphi, arranged in an institutionalised circuit (periodos) from C6. The four Panhellenic sanctuaries acted as important centres for polis interaction and information about activity at these sanctuaries (oracle consultation, communal dedications, athletic participation, etc.) is included in the descriptions of the individual poleis in order to illuminate such interaction (see Index 16).

Even more important, however, is the fact that participation and victory in one of these four games are a very strong indication that the community to which the athlete belonged was a polis. From C6 onwards, participation in the Panhellenic games provides us with evidence of polis status. Since we know most about the organisation of the Olympic Games, and since the best-known participants in the games are the victors, the discussion will centre around Olympionikai; but, the assumption is that the Nemean, the Isthmian and the Pythian Games were all organised in basically the same way as the Olympic Games.

An athlete who wanted to compete at the Olympic Games not only had to be a Greek; he also had to be a citizen of a recognised Greek state, i.e. he had to belong to a community which had accepted and respected the sacred truce proclaimed by the Eleian theoroi. This is evident from the events of 420 as narrated at Thuc. 5.49.1–50.4. In 420, the Eleians excluded Sparta from participation in the Olympics. The Spartan exclusion was based on the fact, as the Eleians would have it, that the Spartans had violated the sacred truce by sending hoplites into territory which Elis claimed as its property. A fine was imposed on the Spartans under Olympic law. Since Sparta refused to pay the fine, the city was excluded from the Games. This ban on Spartan participation meant that no individual Spartan could compete in the Games. Accordingly, the Spartan aristocrat Lichas, son of Arkesilas, entered his hippic team not as Spartan but as Theban (or Boiotian). The inference is that an athlete was allowed to compete only if he belonged to a community which had accepted the Olympic truce announced by the Eleian theoroi and respected the truce to the satisfaction of the Eleian authorities. It was shown in the section on theorodokia that the duties of the Panhel- niaoi. Lichas had handed the team over to the Thebans (or Boiotians). Thuc. 5.50.2 says that Lichas' team—which was victorious—was announced by the Eleian theoroi supra 103–6.

On these events, see Roy (1998) and Nielsen, forthcoming. 10

8 A scholion in Syrius says: νόμος τοῦ ἕλησιν ἐν Ὀλυμπιᾳ μὴ ἀγωνίζεσθαι (Rhetores Graeci, ed. Walz, 4.546.25–26). No Archaic or Classical source explicitly states such a rule, but the following discussion will demonstrate that de facto a similar rule must have regulated Olympic participation at least in the Classical period.

9 On the sacred truce, see Lämmer (1982–83).

10 See the chapter on theorodokoi supra 103–6.

11 On these events, see Roy (1998) and Nielsen, forthcoming.

12 Ἀκακοδαίμων τοῦ ἑλησίου ἐν Ὀλυμπιᾷ ἐρχθεσαν ἀπὸ τῆς ἑλησίου κατὰ τὸν ναόν ἑλησίου ἐν τοῖς Ὀλυμπιαναῖς ἑσθερείσες ἐν τοῖς ἑληλευαῖς μνημείοις (Thuc. 5.49.1).

13 Ἐπὶ τῆς ἑλησίου τοῦ ναοῦ ἐν Ὀλυμπιᾷ ἐρχθεσαν ἀπὸ τῆς ἑλησίου ἑσθερείσες ἐν τοῖς ἑληλευαῖς μνημείοις (Thuc. 5.49.1).

14 Thuc. 5.49.1.

15 Thuc. 5.50.2.

16 Thuc. 5.50.4 says that Lichas’ team—which was victorious—was announced as Boiotian (Βοιωτίων ἀθλητῶν); however, Xen. Hell. 3.2.21 says that Lichas had handed the team over to the Thebans (Ἄληθεα παροικίας Θεσσαλίων ἔδωκεν τοῦ ναοῦ) and Paus. 6.2.2 says that Lichas entered the team ἐπὶ ἄνδρας τῆς Θεσσαλίας ἐν τοῖς ἑλησίους μνημείοις and states that the Eleian victory records the name not as Lichas but as the Theban demos. So, Thucydides may be a little imprecise here (so HCT ad loc. suggests that “Thucydides may have made a mistake in writing Βοιωτίων”).

17 Supra 104.
lenic theoroi were political and that the places visited by the theoroi were the political centres of poleis, ethne or monarchies. When an athlete of a given community is attested as an Olympic victor, the implication is that the community to which he belonged had been visited by the Eleian theoroi and was thus a political centre. If it can be shown that it was not the centre of an ethnos and not a monarchy, then we can assume that it was a polis.

The framework of the Panhellenic festivals was thus highly politicised, in the most literal sense of that word.\(^\text{18}\) The epangelia was conducted by the poleis in charge of the sanctuary celebrating the festivals, the polis of Elis (no. 251) in the case of the Olympics;\(^\text{19}\) the polis of Delphi (no. 177) in the case of the Pythian Games;\(^\text{20}\) in the case of the Nemean Games it was the polis of Argos (no. 347)\(^\text{21}\) after it had taken over the presidency of the Games from the minor polis of Kleonai (no. 351); and in the case of the Isthmian Games it seems a fair inference from Thuc. 8.9.1–10.1 that a system of epangelia was administered by the polis of Corinth (no. 227) by C5\(^\text{22}\).

The theoroi who conducted the epangelia did so at centres which were in the overwhelming majority of the cases poleis,\(^\text{23}\) and the theorodokoi who assisted the theoroi were appointed either by the epangelic poleis themselves or by the poleis of which they were citizens.\(^\text{24}\) Poleis which met the requests of the epangelia sent sacred delegations of ambassadors (also called theoroi)\(^\text{25}\) to the festival, and “the theoroi of each polis conducted ritual acts in the Panhellenic sanctuaries in the name of that polis”,\(^\text{26}\) and the sending of such embassies was obviously a polis concern.\(^\text{27}\)

Moreover, the athletes competed not only on their own behalf; they represented their poleis as well: mention of a victor commonly includes the recording of the polis to which he belonged.\(^\text{28}\) Isocrates makes Alkibiades Junior say of his father that “although in no way untalented nor weak of body, he held the gymnics in contempt since he knew that some of the athletes were lowborn and from small city-

states . . .”;\(^\text{29}\) the clear implication is that the (lack of) prestige of a given polis reflected back on its athletes who were thus in a certain sense representatives of their poleis.\(^\text{30}\) Conversely, an athlete’s success in its turn reflected back on his polis.\(^\text{31}\) Poleis bent on international glory might buy a victory from a successful athlete as Ephesos did in 384,\(^\text{32}\) an incident which demonstrates that the Olympics were also thought of as a competition between poleis.\(^\text{33}\) Classical poleis took great pride in the victories of their citizens: in 412, Exainetos of Akragas, victor in the Olympic stadium race, was escorted into the city by all Akragantine chariots, a clear testimony to the public importance attached to such a victory.\(^\text{34}\) Conversely, poleis were greatly concerned if their athletes were ‘dishonoured’ by the Olympic authorities: according to Xenophon, a contributing reason for the Spartan war on Elis in C5\(^\text{l}/\text{C4e}\) was the whipping of Lichas at the Games of 420;\(^\text{35}\) and in C4\(^\text{l}\), when the Athenian athlete Kallippos had been convicted of having bribed his opponents, the Athenians sent no less a figure than Hypereides to have his fine lifted; when that proved impossible, the Athenians boycotted the Games.\(^\text{36}\)

In other words, in the Classical period there was no sharp distinction between athletics and politics, and the attestation of a Panhellenic victor in this period is a good indication that the community of the victor was a polis. But presumably we cannot place quite the same significance on all Archaic victors. For instance, Lousoi (no. 279) is said to have produced an Olympionikes in 708;\(^\text{37}\) nobody would seriously claim that Lousoi was a polis at that date.\(^\text{38}\) There is thus a dividing line somewhere which is difficult to pin down, quite apart from the fact that the historicity of the earliest recorded victories may be questionable.\(^\text{39}\) However, it does seem a reasonable position to assume that by C6 Panhellenic athletics had been politicised in the sense outlined above, or was in the process of becoming so.

It does, for instance, seem likely that by C6 the athletes were identified with the poleis to which they belonged: thus, in the list of Olympionikai as compiled by Moretti, if we

---


\(^{19}\) Thuc. 5.49.2–3.

\(^{20}\) Sourvinou-Inwood (1990) 299; cf. CID i 10.45–46 (380) with pp. 118–19; SEG 24 379 (C4m).

\(^{21}\) Perlman (2000) 132; Supra 103.

\(^{22}\) See also Xen. Hell. 4.5.3: ἴν ἐὰν ἐὰν ἡ Ἡσαΐα γέγενται καὶ οἱ Αργεῖοι αὐτοὶ ἐγράφων τότε ποιούσε τὴν τιθεμένην τῷ Ποσείδιον ἐς Ἀργοὺς τῆς Κορίνθου ἄντος. Cf. Morgan (1990) 214.

\(^{23}\) Supra 105.

\(^{24}\) Perlman (2000) 15 n. 15.


\(^{28}\) My italics; Miller (2000) 280; Isoc. 16.33 (καὶ μιμρες πόλεοι οἰκοῦνται).


\(^{30}\) Nielsen (2002) 205 n. 267. Cf. CEG i no. 386 (c.490); Κλεοντέρας πόλεως ηγεμόνας ηγεμόνας τινὰς καὶ τὰ ταῦτα ἀπὸ τινὸς τινὸς τινός ἑλλάδος ἑκοσκιμοτέρων ποιεῖν.

\(^{31}\) Paus. 6.18.6; Nielsen (2002) 205 n. 268.

\(^{32}\) Lys. 33.1–2; Nielsen (2002) 205 n. 269.


\(^{34}\) Perl. 3.2.21. See further Nielsen, forthcoming.


\(^{36}\) For the development of poleis in Arkadia, see Nielsen (2002) 159–228.

look at the victors assigned to C6,\(^{40}\) in all but four cases\(^{41}\) Moretti is able to indicate their local community/polis and not merely their regional affiliation \textit{vel sim.} \(^{42}\) True, this is possible mostly on the basis of later sources, but it does probably imply that there was an identification of athlete with polis by C6.\(^{43}\) Also, according to Paus. 6.18.7, the practice of erecting victory monuments began in C6m when wooden statues of Praxidamas of Aigina\(^{44}\) and Rhexibios of Opous\(^{45}\) were erected; Pausanias saw these statues and was able to identify them, presumably from inscriptions as he does elsewhere.\(^{46}\) If he did identify them from inscriptions, these probably used city-ethnics to describe the athletes, and this would confirm the impression that by C6 athletes were identified with their polis.\(^{47}\) \textit{SEG} 11 1227 (c.500) describes an \textit{Olympionikes} as \textit{Λακεδαιμόνος}\(^{48}\) and thus confirms that city-ethnics were used in commemorations of Archaic victors.\(^{50}\)

That Archaic polis coveted Panhellenic victories is indicated by a possible instance of a public hippic team as early as 672\(^{51}\) and by the report, if historical,\(^{52}\) that Solon legislated on the amounts of money to be paid to Athenian Panhellenic athletes.\(^{53}\) But the best source is probably Xenophanes’ critique of the honours paid to \textit{Olympionikai}.\(^{54}\) Possibly composed prior to 520\(^{55}\) but certainly reflecting the later Archaic period, its evidence is highly relevant in the present context. The poet criticises the high standing of successful athletes in the eyes of the \textit{astoi}; that is, \textit{politeia}.\(^{56}\) The issue addressed is thus that of the relation between athlete and polis, and indeed the term polis appears four times in the poem (9, 19, 20, 22) alongside such terms as \textit{δηµόσιων κτείνων} \((8)\) and \textit{εὐνοµία} \((19)\). The poet clearly knew of such rewards for victory as \textit{proedria} \((7)\), public entertainment \((8–9): \alphaίτωρ\)

\(^{40}\) \textit{Olympionikai} nos. 77–166.
\(^{41}\) No. 116 (Keos, a 4-polis island); no. 128 (Thessaly); no. 158 (\textit{patris} unknown); no. 165 (Thessaly).
\(^{43}\) See also Mann (2001) 61–62.
\(^{44}\) \textit{Olympionikai} no. 112.
\(^{45}\) \textit{Olympionikai} no. 119.
\(^{46}\) E.g. 6.35.8.
\(^{48}\) \textit{Olympionikai} no. 160 on whom see Hodkinson (1999) 173–76.
\(^{49}\) On the external individual use of \textit{Λακεδαιµόνος} as the city-ethnic of Sparta, see \textit{Sparta} (no. 345).
\(^{51}\) Entered by Dysponention (no. 250); cf. \textit{Olympionikai} no. 39.
\(^{52}\) The historicity of the report is accepted by Mann (2001) 68–80.
\(^{53}\) Plut. Sol. 23.
\(^{54}\) Xenophon fr. 2, West. On this fragment see Bowra (1938); Morvick (1978) 16–26; Kurke (1993).
\(^{55}\) So Bowra (1938) 238; but see Morvick (1978) 22–23. Tytaioi fr. 12. West also implies that athletic success was highly regarded by Archaic \textit{polis}.
\(^{56}\) \textit{Astos} is a synonym of \textit{polites}, see Hansen (1997) 10–11.

\textit{ε卮 δηµοσίων κτείνων \(\epsilon\) \(\kappa\) \(\sigma\) \(\nu\) \(\\Lambda\) \(\pi\) \(\lambda\) \(\epsilon\) \(\beta\) \(\omega\) \(\\theta\) \(\iota\) \(\nu\) \(\kappa\) \(\iota\) \(\sigma\) \(\iota\) \(\nu\) \(\lambda\) \(\iota\) \(\nu\).} It would then, not be unreasonable to infer that already in C6 \textit{poleis} exulted at Panhellenic victories, that athletic success reflected back on the \textit{polis} of the victor, and that \textit{polis} identified with their athletes who (were) in their turn identified with their athletes.

Most importantly, a newly found inscription of c.525–500 from Olympia\(^{57}\) indicates that by that time \textit{polis} played a significant role in the formal organisation of the Olympic Games. The inscription twice (4–5, 5–6) refers to a particular group of polities, “the Eleians and their \textit{symmachoi},”\(^{58}\) which seems to have held a peculiar position in the formal arrangements concerning the Games. The text furthermore refers generically to a \textit{theoroi}, an official envoy of a polis.\(^{59}\) The general tenor of the text led the editors to the important observation that the traditional view that an athlete was on his own in Olympia is in need of serious modification;\(^{60}\) and the information about \textit{theoroi} in C6l indicates that an athlete did not participate independently of his \textit{polis}.\(^{61}\) In short, this c.525–500 inscription confirms that by C6l the formal organisation of the Olympics was already politicised or in the process of becoming so.\(^{62}\)

It seems, in conclusion, that in C6 and in the Classical period the attestation of a Panhellenic victor from a given community is a strong indication that this community was a \textit{polis} (if it was not an \textit{ethnos} or a monarchy) and in actual fact most communities with attested victors \textit{were polis}.\(^{63}\)
It is not proof of polis status, though, and the Inventory excludes communities whose polis status is suggested solely (no. 401); Pharsalos (no. 413); Andros (no. 475); Kos Meropis (no. 499); Melos (no. 503); Peparethis (no. 51); Thasos (no. 526); Pola (no. 543); Maroneia (no. 66); Byzanzion (no. 674); Mytilene (no. 798); Chios (no. 840); Ephesos (no. 844); Klazomenai (no. 847); Kolophon (no. 848); Magnesia (no. 852); Miletos (no. 854); Samos (no. 864); Smyrna (no. 867); Halikarnassos (no. 886); Ialysos (no. 995); Rhodos (no. 1000); Barke (no. 1025); and Kyrene (no. 1028).

Our sources sometimes describe victors not by city-ethnics but by regional ethnics, e.g. Θετταλός (e.g. Olympionikai nos. 291, 316, 384); or sub-regional ethnics such as Μαυάδος (e.g. Olympionikai nos. 377, 393, 408); or by the attestation of a Panhellenic victor, except in very special cases.

ethnics of multipole islands such as Κεῖος (Olympionikai nos. 156, 203, 288) or Κρής (e.g. Olympionikai nos. 297, 367b, 390). Such areas were all subdivided into poleis but in default of more detailed evidence it cannot be determined to which polis such victors belonged or why ethnics other than city-ethnics were preferred in describing them.

64 See Mabulos in the list of pre-Hellenistic settlements in Arkadia (infra 507).

65 Two communities of the wider region of Elis, Dyspontion (no. 250) and Lenos (no. 257), are included as poleis of type C in the chapter on Elis, primarily on account of some early Archaic Olympionikai. However, Elis is known to have contained a plurality of poleis (cf. Ps.-Skylax 43; Diod. 11.54.1) in particular prior to the synoecism of 471 (on which see Roy (2002)). It is extremely difficult to identify these Eleian poleis and so the attestation of Olympionikai from two local communities of wider Elis carries somewhat more weight than they would otherwise and leads to the classification of these communities as poleis of type C.

All poleis of type A: Kaulonia (no. 55); Terina (no. 73); Aigion (no. 231); Dyme (no. 234); Patrai (no. 239); Heraia (no. 274); Phigaleia (no. 292); Kranon (no. 400); Pedi-némon (no. 409); and Skotoussa (no. 455).

Some were poleis of type A: Kaulonia (no. 55); Terina (no. 73); Aigion (no. 231); Dyme (no. 234); Patrai (no. 239); Heraia (no. 274); Phigaleia (no. 292); Kranon (no. 400); Pedi-némon (no. 409); and Skotoussa (no. 455).

A few were poleis of type B: Pisa (no. 262) but here the victor is very early and without influence on its classification as a polis type B which is valid only for the mid-4th c.; Dipaia (no. 268); Lousoi (no. 279); Methydrion (no. 283); Pheneos (no. 291); Kleonai (no. 351); Tiryns (no. 356); and Astypalaia (no. 476).
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The Delian League was by far the largest of all the Hellenic symmachiai and the one whose members we know best thanks to the preservation of a substantial part of the Athenian tribute lists (IG i 3 259–90) and assessment decrees (IG i 3 71, 77, 100). The names of some 330 members are still preserved in the fragments (see Index 18).1 We can infer that each of these members was a political community, but not necessarily an independent community. Over the years the Delian League was transformed from an alliance into an “empire” in which only very few of the members were independent and in possession of autonomia. The great majority had become what Thucydides called ἱπτήκοοι πόλεις—dependent poleis.2 They were all dependent on Athens, but within the League there were other forms of subordination too: it appears from the lists that Erythrai possessed a number of satellites which, however, in some years are recorded as individual payers.3 The Aktaiai poleis in Troas were part of the peraia of Mytilene (no. 798),4 and Galepsos on the coast of Thrace (no. 631) was a Thasian emporion.5 So, all members were polities in some sense, but how many were actually poleis? And how many were Hellenic poleis?

The headings of all the tribute lists are so fragmentary that we cannot say whether they included the term polis.6 On the other hand, in the assessment decree of 425/4 the heading of the list of the members is preserved and it does contain the term polis (IG i 3 71.58). Furthermore, the allies are collectively referred to as poleis in all the Athenian decrees which regulate the Delian League. One example suffices in this context: polis occurs eight times in the preserved parts of the coinage decree referring collectively to each and every member of the League (IG i 3 1453 pp. 898–99); for the other attestations, see Schuller (1995) 165 with nn. 2–14.

In all these documents, however, polis is a generic term, and when a term appears as a heading, it is often used less precisely than when applied to individual members of the class subsumed under the term (cf. Hansen (1997a) 9). Even on the reasonable assumption that all the headings of the tribute lists included the term polis, we cannot be sure that the Athenians would apply the term polis individually to every polity recorded in the lists.

We are on safer ground when we find polis used in the tribute lists as a subheading in the so-called rubrics followed by a list of, at most, a dozen names of allies.7 But even here polis is just a heading, and although these rubrics in their present state do not include any community which can be recognised as a tribal community or a dynast ruling a territory, we cannot infer without further evidence that each and every polity listed in the rubrics was believed to be a polis.

An attempt in the lists to distinguish poleis from other types of polity was made at the Polis Centre symposium in 1995. Both in the tribute lists and in the assessment decrees the recording of the allies is mostly by ethnic but sometimes by toponym, and sometimes the recording alternates between ethnic and toponym. On the assumption that the Greeks used ethnics to designate poleis and toponyms to designate other types of community, Avram and Schuller suggested that the allies recorded by ethnic were poleis, those recorded by toponym were not poleis, and those that changed from toponym to ethnic were primarily polities whose phoros was initially paid by private citizens (the idiotai rubrics in the lists) whereas they were recorded by ethnic when, later, the phoros was paid by the polis.8 This very neat explanation of the occurrence of toponyms among the ethnics does not stand up to detailed examination.

First, the general assumption that poleis in the political

---

1 322 members are recorded by toponym and, presumably, city-ethnic; some of these are multipopulate islands, cf. n. 14. 6 members are recorded by, presumably, regional ethnic; 5 Karian dynasts are recorded of whom 3 ruled poleis (also recorded among the 322 allies); and 1 ruled some Karians (also recorded among the regional ethnics). Furthermore the names of 19 members have been unconvincingly restored by the editors of ATL (infra 1960). Some members are not recorded in the inscriptions, viz. Chios (no. 888), Delos (no. 498), Lesbos (5 poleis) Samos (no. 864) and Skyros (no. 521). For a list of Athenian allies which were not members of the League, see Ste Croix (1972) 103.


4 See supra 88 no. 2.

5 See supra 89 no. 3.

6 The occurrence of τοῦ ἱπτήκοου πόλεως in the postscript to the first list is almost completely restored (IG i 3 259, postscriptum 5–6), and [μονήκεί] is completely restored in the heading of IG i 3 287.7 and 289.6.


sense are not normally called by toponym has to be modified considerably; see supra 56.

Second, in the inscriptions altogether eighty-four allies are recorded by toponym; of these thirty-two are listed sometimes by toponym, sometimes by ethnic; in almost all cases there is no detectable reason for the variation, nine of which are explicitly called polis in other classical sources (type A), seventeen were probably poleis (types [A]B and B), and six may have been poleis but we have no evidence (types [A]C and C). Of the fifty-two allies recorded by toponym only, twenty-four are directly attested as poleis in other classical sources (type A), eleven are known for important activities typical of a polis (type [A]B and B), for thirteen we have no further information (types [A]C and C), and four have not got an entry in the inventory. The result is that most of the communities recorded by toponym were certainly or probably poleis. For a dozen or so the answer is that we have no evidence to settle the issue. The members in Lykia and Kilikia were probably indigenous polities, and some positive evidence which may indicate that allies recorded by toponym were not poleis is restricted to two communities, viz. Leros and Teichioussa, see infra 114. For unknown reasons toponyms occur much more frequently in the assessment decrees than in the tribute lists.10

Instead of distinguishing between toponyms and ethnics, we must compare the lists of allies with the information we have about the polis status of all the members, and for this purpose we have subdivided the entries in the lists into three groups: (1) allies recorded by toponym and/or by what is or seems to be a city-ethnic; (2) allies recorded by what is or seems to be a regional ethnic; (3) allies recorded by the name of a ruler.

Re (1) This group comprises the great majority of the allies, altogether 324 members. Of these 165 are explicitly called poleis in other classical sources (type A), eighty-one are known to have performed activities characteristic of a polis (types [A]B and B), e.g. striking coins, sending envoys to other poleis, getting a citizen appointed proxenos by another polis, having a prytaneion etc.11

We are left with seventy-eight allies for which the entry in the Athenian lists is the only evidence that the ally in question was a political unit. Seven of these are not included in this Inventory,12 and two have broken names so that it is impossible to decide whether they are recorded by ethnic or by toponym. The remaining sixty-nine allies fall into three groups: for thirty-three we know both the ethnic and the toponym from which the ethnic was derived. Such a community was apparently centred on a nucleated settlement designated by the toponym; so the ethnic is a city-ethnic, and the presumption is that these communities were poleis. For fifteen allies we know only the toponym, and in the light of the above observations we are inclined to hold the reverse view of that of Avram and Schuller: the registration in the tribute lists indicates that these allies were polities; that they are registered by toponym indicates that they were centred on a nucleated settlement, i.e. that they were poleis rather than tribal communities of some sort. For twenty-one allies we know only the ethnic. There is no evidence to show that the ethnic was derived from the name of a nucleated settlement. Thus, it may have been a regional ethnic and the polity designated by the ethnic may not have been a polis, but some kind of “tribal” community, cf. e.g. the Amyndaeis (no. 873), the Erineis (no. 884), the Hymisseis (no. 890) and eight other Karian members of the alliance. Alternatively, it may have been a sub-ethnic designating a civic subdivision and not a polis. Here some of the Rhodian members of the Delian League may serve as an example. In addition to the three well-attested poleis—Ialysos, Kamiros and Lindos—the tribute lists record four Rhodian allies: the Brikindarioi (no. 993), the Diakrioi (no. 994), the Oiatai (no. 998) and the Pedieis (no. 999). The first three were certainly, and the fourth possibly, situated in the Lindian territory. The Oiatai are twice recorded as Oíaítais Λινδίων.13 Like Tanagra and Erythrai and several other poleis, Lindos was presumably a polis with dependent poleis inside its territory. Alternatively, we have to assume that these four communities were just civic subdivisions which for unknown reasons were treated as individual members of the Delian League and recorded by their sub-ethnic. Of the seven members not included in the Inventory five were indigenous communities (see n. 12). For Leros and Teichioussa, see the appendix infra. That is as far as we can get. To conclude: of all the 323 in this group, 245 were certainly or probably poleis14 and for forty-eight of

9 Ionis: Leros, Teichioussa; Lykis: Hiera; Kilikis: Sillyon.
10 Unpublished MA thesis by Bjørn Paarmann.
11 Coins: Dikaia (no. 568); envoys: Eiaious (no. 663); proxenos: Kallatis (no. 686); prytaneion: Sigeion (no. 791).
12 The Ionian settlements Leros (probably no longer a polis in C5), Teichioussa, see infra, and 5, probably non-Greek allies: the Polkhnaioi Kares in Karia, Hiera, Telemessos and Tymmessos in Lykia, and Sillyon in Pamphylia.
13 IG ii 259.111.26; 261.111.28, cf. ATL i 953.
14 The number of poleis members is in fact 19 higher. 9 poleis are never recorded in the lists (Chios, Delos, Lesbos (5 poleis), Samos and Skyros), and on some multilate islands the poleis paid together and were registered by the name of the island: Amorgos: 3 poleis; Keos: 4 poleis (Koreas once recorded
the remaining seventy-seven allies the chance that they were poleis seems to outweigh the chance that they were tribal communities of some kind. For the remaining twenty-nine there is no evidence.

Re (2) In addition to all the allies recorded by city-ethnic and/or toponym there are in the lists some communities listed not by city-ethnic but by regional ethnic: viz. the Bottiaians,\(^{13}\) the Lykians,\(^ {16}\) some Karians,\(^ {17}\) and three communities recorded by an ethnic which may be a city-ethnic denoting a polis but may also have been a regional ethnic denoting a people: the Maiandrioi,\(^ {18}\) the Markaioi,\(^ {19}\) and the Mysoi.\(^ {20}\) The Bottiaians are known to have formed a federation composed of poleis.\(^ {21}\) All the other peoples are located in the northern or southern part of the west coast of Asia Minor: the Mysoi lived on the south coast of the Propontis, the Markaioi in Troas, the Maiandrioi in Karia. We do not know the precise identity and location of the Karians ruled by Tymnes. The Lykians formed a syntely and in 446/5 they paid 10 talents.\(^ {22}\) At that time most of Lykia was ruled from Xanthos by Kuprlli and it is a reasonable assumption that the ten talents were paid by Kuprlli on behalf of that part of Lykia he ruled.\(^ {23}\) The Lykians are not recorded in later lists, but some Lykian cities appear in other lists and in the assessment decree of 425/4.\(^ {24}\) The three remaining peoples may have been tribes of tribal communities, but they may also have been poleis. In ATL the Maiandrioi are associated with a polis called Maiandros; Mysoi too have been interpreted as a city-ethnic and associated with the toponym Mysia. About the Markaioi there is no further evidence.

Re (3) Finally there are a few names of persons. They are obviously rulers and are traditionally described as “dynasts”. Altogether five appear in the inscriptions and they are all Karian: Paktyes Idymeus,\(^ {25}\) Pikres Syangeleus,\(^ {26}\) Sa[- - -] Killareus,\(^ {27}\) Sambaktyς and Tymnes.\(^ {29}\) Three of them, i.e. Paktyes, Pikres and Sa[- - -], were probably rulers of poleis, viz. Killareis (no. 901), Idyma (no. 893) and Syangela (no. 931), and they were not essentially different from the tyrants who ruled poleis in other parts of the Greek world. Only one of the five, Tymnes, is explicitly described as the ruler of a people rather than a polis. To conclude: The Delian League was unquestionably a League of poleis. The positive evidence for non-polis members is restricted to Leros\(^ {30}\) and Teichioussa, to the Bottiaians, the Lykians and some Karians, and to one ruler, Sambaktyς who may or may not have been the ruler of a polis. For the rest the evidence is a non liquet.

On the other hand, not all the poleis were Hellenic poleis. Quite a few were mixed communities (marked β) and for many of the Karian, Pamphylian and Kilikian members of the League the other evidence indicates that these poleis were basically barbarian city-states in a Hellenic context and with a thin varnish of Hellenisation (marked γ). They did not become proper Greek poleis until the Hellenistic period. Especially Lykia seems in C5 still to have had its own indigenous culture and political organisation. The Lykian alphabet and coinage betray Greek influence, but it would be wrong to see Lykia as part of the Greek world before the Hellenistic or at least the Hekatomnmid period (Marksteiner (2002)). Therefore, the Pamphylian polis Sillyon and the Lykian poleis have been kept out of the inventory except the Greek colony Phaselis (no. 942). Also, some of the Karian, Pamphylian and Kilikian polities, included in the Inventory and recorded as poleis γ, have been given the benefit of the doubt and would probably have been removed from the Inventory if we had had better sources.

---

13 Bottiaioi: IG i 266.11.39
16 Λακεύς (IG i 266.11.30; 262.4.33; 266.11.34) ATL i 513–14. It appears from the third reference that the Lykians formed a syntely.
17 Viz. those ruled by Tymnes, see supra.
18 Μαρκαῖοι (IG i 71.1.133; 259.1.19; 261.4.5; 267.4.19) ATL i 514–15, Barr. map 61, lat. 37.45, long. 27.25, identified with a city which in Steph. Byz. 425.20–22 is called Maiandropolis or Maiandros.
19 Μαρκαῖοι (IG i 100 – Krateros fr. 23). Μαρκαιοί (Steph. Byz. 433.14, MS B, MSS A and V have Μαρκαϊοι or Μαρκαίοι; conj. Meineke). Steph. Byz. describes Markaios as a mountain in the Troas near Gergis whose inhabitants are called Markaios (or Markaiassioi). On the assumption that Stephanos’ source is Krateros who again copied the assessment decree of 410/9, IG i 100 records the Μαρκαῖοι [- - -] (fr. 23) as if they appeared on the stone.
20 Μονοι: IG i 71.1.69–70; 259.4.18.
22 Λακεύς καὶ σωλεὺς (IG i 266.3.34).
24 Λέρος (IG i 71.1.153–54); Telemessos (IG i 266.11.33, restored at 261.1.29 and 262.4.32); Tymnessos (IG i 71.1.141).
25 Πακτής Ιδυμαίος (IG ii 260.1.6, cf. 262.4.20).
26 Πίπερας Σωλεύς (IG i 259.4.16); Σωλεύς ἐπὶ ἄρχει Πίπερας (IG i 284.7–8, cf. 261.1.14–15; 260.1.66–67; 282.4.48–49).
28 Σαμβακτύς (IG i 261.4.12); [Σαμβακτ]ύς (IG i 259.4.27).
29 Κάρες ἐπὶ Τήμεως ἄρχει ΙΓ i 71.1.133–14; 267.3.25; 270.4.10 (completely restored); 271.1.8.4; 272.1.79.
30 Leros may have been a polis in the Archaic period, see no. 504.
APPENDIX

Leros and Teichioussa

The ethnic Leros is attested in C6, presumably as a city-ethnic, but in the Hellenistic and Roman periods it was a demotic designating one of the Milesian demes. Thus Leros (no. 504) seems to have been a polis in the Archaic period but a civic subdivision in the Hellenistic period. What was its status in C5? And what was that of Teichioussa? The evidence we have comes from the Athenian tribute lists. In the first list, that of 454/3 (IG i² 259), Miletos, Leros and Teichioussa are recorded, the Milesians separately in the third column (19), Leros and Teichioussa together in the sixth: 19–20: Μιλέσιοι [έξ] Αέρω : ΗΝΗΗ. 21–22: [Με]λέσιοι [ἐκ] Τειχίσσας [ές : ---]. In the 420s Μιλέσιοι, Αέρωσ and Τειχίσσας appear side by side; sometimes they pay together (IG i² 285.1.88–90; 289.36–38, cf. 71.1.121–22), sometimes separately (IG i² 284.15–17). Why were Leros and Teichioussa recorded together alongside Miletos? With the improved reading of IG i² 259, the Milesians in Leros and Teichioussa who were loyal to Athens.

On the other hand stasis in Miletos and Athenian intervention is attested in [Xen.,] Ath. pol. 3.11 and IG i² 21 (450/49 or 426/5). Apparently, we have a choice of three interpretations: (a) By
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The Emergence of Poleis by Synoikismos

The topic of this chapter is the voluntary or enforced relocation of communities (see Index 21). The Greek terms most commonly used are the noun συνοικισμός with the verbs συνοικίζειν and συνοικεῖν.1 They are frequently found in sources of the Hellenistic and Roman periods, but the noun συνοικισμός is unattested in Archaic and Classical texts,2 and the verbs are not common in pre-Hellenistic sources either. Furthermore the verbs are used in our texts not only about the relocation of neighbouring communities3 but also about the foundation of distant colonies which we treat separately but also about the relocation of neighbouring communities4 and, by excluding colonisation, we are applying a modern delimitation of the concept of synoecism whereas, apparently, the Greeks did not draw a sharp line between the two phenomena.

Synoikismos means “moving together” and can be used of any kind of joint settlement, including matrimonial cohabitation.5 When used in the specific sense of relocation of peoples, it denotes the relocation of one or more communities either to a new-built settlement where the immigrants become merged with one another, or to a pre-existing settlement where the immigrants become merged with the inhabitants. An example of the first form is the synoecism of Rhodos (no. 1000) in 408/7 whereby communities coming from the poleis of Lindos, Ialysos and Kamiros founded a new urban centre and gave it the name of the island: Rhodos. An example of the second form is the synoecism of Attika was called συνοικία (Thuc. 2.15.2; IG 244.C.16).

1 In Hellenistic sources the verb μετοικίζειν is often used synonymously with συνοικίζειν, cf. Diod. 13.75.1 (Rhodes 408/7), 15.21.1 (Megalopolis 368).
2 The oldest occurrence of συνοικεῖν is Polyb. 4.33.7, where it is used retrospectively about the synoecisms of Messene and Megalopolis in C4. Thuc. 3.3.1 uses συνοικεῖν about the synoecism planned by Mytilene in 428 and IBtkr 15.2, 55–65, 74–75 (= Staatsverträge no. 297) has συνοικία about the synoecism of Euiremon and Orchomenos in C4m. Similarly the Athenian festival celebrating the synoecism of Attika was called συνοικία (Thuc. 2.15.2; IG 244.C.16).
3 συνοικίζειν: Thuc. 2.16.1 (Athens in the age of Theseus); Thuc. 3.2.2 (Mytilene 428); Hell. Oxy., 20.3 (Thebai 431); Dem. 19.183 (Olynth 370s); Aeschin. 3.113 (Kerina in C6e); Lycurg. 1.62 (Messene 370s). Used about synoecism in general: Thuc. 1.10.2; Isoc. 15.82. συνοικεῖν: Thuc. 2.68.5 (Argos Amphiklinon 440s) Arist. Ath. Pol. 39.3 (Eleusis 403).
4 συνοικίζειν: Thuc. 1.24.2 (Epidauros) Thuc. 3.93.1 (Herakleia Trachinia); Thuc. 6.3.1 (Himera); Arist. Ath. Pol. 15.2 (Rhaielos); συνοικεῖν: Arist. Pol. 140.2 (Sybaris).
5 Hdt. 2.121; Mem. Apol. 133.
6 They were left ‘officially’ to tend immovable shrines. Therefore we use the verb μετοικίζειν to describe the relocation of Pydna (Diod. 13.40.2) and of Oropros (Diod. 14.17.3), but at 15.41.1–3 this verb is used synonymously with συνοικεῖν to describe the synoecism of Megalopolis. The best-known examples of short-distance relocations are: Lilia (no. 185) C5; Oropros C5 (no. 214); Pydna C5 (no. 544); Abdera C4m (no. 640); Chersonesos C5 (no. 695); Klimomenai C4m (no. 847); Scepsis C6 (no. 792); Kolophon C5 (no. 848); Magnesia 400 (no. 852); Priene C4 (no. 861); Kariania in Cafl (no. 896); Knidos in C4 (no. 903); Latmos in C4m (no. 910); Myndos in C4 (no. 914); Syangela in C6m (no. 931).
7 According to Davies (1992) 28, an act of colonisation is described as a synoecism only if the colony was a joint foundation of several poleis. That is often the case, cf. Thuc. 1.12.2 about Epidamnos as a joint colony of Korkyra and Corinth, but in our sources the terms συνοικισμός and συνοικεῖν are also applied to the sending out of colonists from one polis only; e.g., Raikelos (Arist. Ath. Pol. 15.2); colonies founded by Eretrea or by Chalkis (Arist. fr. 681); Amphipolis (Diod. 12.32.3); “Porneropolis” (Theopomp. fr. 110); Abydos and Prokonnesos (Strabo 13.12.12); Chalkidians in Chalkidike (Strabo 7 fr. 11). Examples of long-distance relocations are Alalie C6m (no. 1), Kolophon C7m (no. 848) and Phokaia C6m (no. 861).
8 According to Davies (1992) 28, an act of colonisation is described as a synoecism only if the colony was a joint foundation of several poleis. That is often the case, cf. Thuc. 1.12.2 about Epidamnos as a joint colony of Korkyra and Corinth, but in our sources the terms συνοικισμός and συνοικεῖν are also applied to the sending out of colonists from one polis only; e.g., Raikelos (Arist. Ath. Pol. 15.2); colonies founded by Eretrea or by Chalkis (Arist. fr. 681); Amphipolis (Diod. 12.32.3); “Porneropolis” (Theopomp. fr. 110); Abydos and Prokonnesos (Strabo 13.12.12); Chalkidians in Chalkidike (Strabo 7 fr. 11). Examples of long-distance relocations are Alalie C6m (no. 1), Kolophon C7m (no. 848) and Phokaia C6m (no. 861).
9 Diodorus uses the verb μετοικίζειν to describe the relocation of Pydna (Diod. 13.40.2) and of Oropros (Diod. 14.17.3), but at 15.41.1–3 this verb is used synonymously with συνοικεῖν to describe the synoecism of Megalopolis. The best-known examples of short-distance relocations are: Lilia (no. 185) C5; Oropros C5 (no. 214); Pydna C5 (no. 544); Abdera C4m (no. 640); Chersonesos C5 (no. 695); Klimomenai C4m (no. 847); Scepsis C6 (no. 792); Kolophon C5 (no. 848); Magnesia 400 (no. 852); Priene C4 (no. 861); Kariania in Cafl (no. 896); Knidos in C4 (no. 903); Latmos in C4m (no. 910); Myndos in C4 (no. 914); Syangela in C6m (no. 931).
but does not stand up to scrutiny. In 408/7 it was not the intention to evacuate Lindos, Lysos and Kamiros and make Rhodes the only urban centre of the island. Rhodes city (no. 1000) was settled by three contingents of citizens each coming from one of the three poleis, but the three founding cities persisted after the synoecism both as nucleated centres and as dependent political communities, and they were still referred to as being poleis. Similarly, the three communities which contributed to the synoecism of Kos (no. 497) in 366/5 did not disappear after the emergence of the new city, and Arkadian Euaimon probably persisted after its synoecism with Orchomenos (no. 286) in C4m. Not one single Arkadian poleis is known to have disappeared in consequence of the synoecism of Megalopolis (no. 282) in 368. And a glance at the index of synoecisms shows that it was the exception to relocate a community in its entirety. As a rule a synoecism was both planned and performed as a relocation of a part of the population of the settlements involved.

A different and, we think, preferable criterion by which one can distinguish between colonisation and synoecism in the strict sense is the distance between the old and the new settlement. By contrast with colonisation, a synoecism in the strict sense entailed a relocation of populations over short distances only. The communities involved in a synoecism were neighbours and, in Hellas, they belonged to the same region, e.g. Achaia, Elis, Arkadia, etc. The establishment of a colony entailed an opposition (though not necessarily a confrontation) between the colonists and the indigenous population. After a synoecism the relocated people continued to live in their own region and with the same neighbours. Another difference is that a synoecised poleis did not have a metropolis (though it could have one or more oikistai).9

A synoecism which involved the foundation of a new city had a number of aspects of which some were urbanistic and some were political. By the synoecism of Megalopolis a new urban centre was created with defence circuit, agora, temples, theatre, stoa and habitation quarters. But at the same time was created a polity whose citizens were ruled by their own assembly, council and magistrates. A new poleis had emerged both in the urban and in the political sense.

The two aspects were often combined, but the prevailing view among ancient historians is that they could appear separately: there were ‘political synoecisms’ which did not entail any relocation of communities10 and ‘physical synoecisms’ which consisted in relocation of communities unaccompanied by political reforms.

It is true that there were synoecisms which did not lead to the creation of a new poleis, e.g. those of Olynthos (no. 588) in 432 and the 370s. But purely political synoecisms are unattested, apart from one which is mythological, viz. the synoecism of Attika as described in Thuc. 2.15.1–2: originally Attika was divided between a number of poleis; but Theseus closed down the prytaneia and bouleuteria of all the other poleis, he had their magistrates discontinued and created instead one centralised poleis with one bouleuterion and one prytaneion. The settlement pattern continued unchanged; nevertheless Thucydides describes the reform as a synoecism: Θησεύς ἔκτηνέ τε ἡ συνοικίαν πάντας. In other sources, however, the unification of Attika is described as a proper physical synoecism.11 In Classical Athens Theseus’ synoecism of Attika was celebrated at a festival called Synoikia.12 The name of the festival indicates that what the Athenians celebrated was not just the political unification of Attica but the foundation of Athens. Thucydides seems to have kept the traditional terms but reinterpretated the event.

Apart from Theseus’ synoecism of Attika, which even the Greeks themselves placed midway between myth and history, there is one other similar example of a so-called political synoecism, viz. Herodotos’ description of the Ionians’ abortive attempt to unite and become one poleis (Moggi, Sin. 95–99). After the sack of Sardis by Kyros c.547/6 the Ionian cities convened a meeting in which, according to Herodotos, Thales the philosopher proposed that the Ionians should set up a common bouleuterion for all the Ionian poleis in Teos (no. 868), whereby all the other poleis, though kept as urban centres just as before, would change their status and become demes instead of poleis (Hdt. 1.170.3).

Thus, the political unification of a number of poleis by the creation of a common central place for political decision making seems to be an abstraction just like the social contract in later political philosophy. Of the two examples we have of a ‘purely political synoecism’ one is mythological and interpreted differently by Thucydides and our other Athenian sources; the other is a proposal that came to nothing and is not even called a synoecism by our only source. As far as we know the history of Greece, there is no example of a synoecism, whereby a new poleis in the political sense was set up through an agreement between a number of settlements by which each surrendered (some of) its self-government to a set of political institutions convened in

9 Megalopolis had 10 (Paus. 8.27.2), Messene 1 (Paus. 4.26.7).
10 Kahrstedt (1932) 1435; Demand (1990) 10; Davies (1992) 28 type v; Rhodes (2001) 1161; Moggi, Sin. nos. 12, 16, 35, 36, 37, 39, 44, 47.
11 Isoc. 10.35; Diod. 4.61.8; Plut. Thea. 24.1.
12 Thuc. 2.15.2; IG i² 244C.16; Parker (1996) 14.
one of the settlements, while the settlement pattern was left intact. We know of formation of federations, called koina or sympoliteiai, but they did not entail any political eradication of the poleis involved; the poleis of a federation persisted as member states of the new common organisation. Again we know of one polis being incorporated into another polis and transformed into a civic subdivision or a dependent polis of a larger and more powerful polis, but such purely political annexations did not entail the creation of a new common political centre.

All well-attested examples of polis formation by synoecism seem to have involved the relocation of one or more communities. As suggested by the terminology, it was the physical and not the political aspect of a synoecism that was the more important. A synoecism seems invariably to have involved relocation of people from one or more settlements to one settlement which thereby was founded or reinforced. But usually only a part of the population of the communities involved was transferred to the new or reinforced settlement. The dissociation of the political aspect from the essential physical character of several synoecisms has been further substantiated by a number of recent investigations.

(a) The evidence we have about the political reforms of Demonax of Mantinea strongly suggests that Mantinea (no. 281) was a polis before the synoecism described by Strabo. So this synoecism was probably the reinforcement of a pre-existing polis not the creation of a new one (Nielsen (2002) 192).

(b) The synoecism of Elis (no. 251) in 471 was not the creation of a new polis but the reinforcement of an existing one. There is ample evidence that Elis was a polis in C6l, both in the urban and in the political sense, and that the synoecism of 471 was principally demographic and urbanistic (Hansen (1995) 58–60; Roy (2002)).

(c) The political unification of Rhodos was a protracted process and the formation of the Rhodian polis in the political sense should not be reduced to the political aspect of the synoecism in 408/7 which, according to our source, consisted in the creation of an urban centre (Gabrielsen (2000) 180–90).

(d) A recent study of the coinage of Kos (no. 497) demonstrates that the Koan mint, traditionally connected with the synoecism of 366/5, must have started striking coins already in the 390s (Ingvaldsen (2002)).

If we focus on the urbanistic aspect of the synoecism, we can say that, in principle, there are the following four forms of synoecism: (a) a polis is created by merging a number of komai or demois; (b) a polis is created by merging two or more poleis; (c) a polis is reinforced by absorbing one or more neighbouring komai or demois; (d) a polis is reinforced by absorbing one or more neighbouring poleis; (e) possible variants are a combination of (a) and (b) and a combination of (c) and (d).

Re (a) This is Aristotle’s model of the emergence of the polis in Politics book 1: a number of komai were united to form a fully fledged polis. That Aristotle has a synoecism in mind is clear from the term he uses, viz. συνῆλθον (Pol. 1252b20). This verb is found again in several other descriptions of synoecisms and is almost a technical term. Aristotle’s model is a very likely explanation of how many poleis must have developed, but it is not well attested historically. The best-known case is the synoecism of the polis of Mantinea in 370, created by the relocation of the population of five komai; but since it was a refoundation of a polis split up into komai only 15 years earlier, this synoecism is not a good example of how poleis developed from scratch. More relevant in that context are Megara and Tanagra. We learn that both poleis were originally settled in komai, but in both cases the source is probably one of the Aristotelian politeiai, and the synoecisms must have taken place so early that Aristotle and/or his pupils cannot have had access to explicit and reliable information. Therefore we cannot know whether they tailored the evidence they had to fit their model or whether they built their model on the evidence they had. A third example is a whole series of synoecisms mentioned by Strabo in connection with the synoecism of Elis in 471. Mantinea was synoecised from five demes, Tegea from nine, Heraia from nine, Aigion from seven or eight, Patrai from seven, and Dyme from eight. All these Aristotelian synoecisms may be historical but they are very difficult to place in time and they are unsupported by older and more reliable sources. Better examples are probably the C4m synoecisms of Metropolis in Thessaly (no. 403), known from Strabo 9.5.17 and, especially, Kassopa in north-western Greece (no. 100) where polis formation took place as late as the mid-

---


14 Cf. the incorporation of Styra (no. 377) and Gryneia (no. 371) into Eretria in, probably, C5l (Moggi, Sin. 227–35) and the incorporation of Poseidonion (no. 376) and Dion (no. 368) into Histaia/Oreos in C4e (Moggi, Sin. 236–37, 242–50).

15 Hansen (1995) 57–58. Writing about komai, Swoboda (1924) 956–60 concentrates on (a) and (c) which he further subdivides by distinguishing between whether the entire population in the komai is removed to the polis or whether the komai are allowed to persist as villages side by side with the polis.

16 Arist. Eth. Enul. 1242b40–41; Isoc. 3.6–15.954; Anonymous Hemiobii 6.1; DK Strabo 7, fr. 11; 8,3,2; schol. Thuc. 2,16; Demand (1990) 26–27.

17 The source is in both cases Plat. Quaest. Graec. For Megara, see no. 17 (Mor. 295b-C); for Tanagra, see no. 37 (Mor. 299c-E). For the view that the ultimate source of Plat. Quaest. Graec. is the Aristotelian collection of politeiai, see Giesen (1901) 464 and Hansen (1995) 53.

18 Strabo 8,3,2; Moggi, Sin. 15 (Patrai), 20 (Dyme), 21 (Aigion), 23 (Tegea), 24 (Mantineia), 41 (Heraia); cf. Demand (1990) 61–72.
fourth century. In Ps.-Skylax three sections are devoted to
the Epeirite tribes: the Thesprotioi (30), the Kassopoi (31)
and the Molotoii (32). In each chapter the author states that
the people (ἦνος) lived κατὰ κώμας, and no polis is men-
tioned between Korkyra described at 29 as a πόλις Ἑλληνίς
and the Amphilochoia Argos called πόλις at 33. But in the
Epidaurian list of theorodokoi of, probably, 356 Kassopa
was recorded between Pandosia, a colony of Elis, and the Thes-
protioi, still recorded as a tribe (IG iv2.1 95.24–26). The shift
from the Kassopoi in Ps.-Skylax to Kassopa in the list of
theorodokoi strongly suggests that Kassopa was by now a
polis and that is confirmed by recent excavations of the
site. They have revealed that the city of Kassopa must have
been founded around the mid-fourth century (Hoepfner
and Schwandner (1994) 114–79). The excavators consider
the circuit to belong to the period immediately after the
synoecism and suggest a date around C4m (ibid. 123 with
n. 298). Kassopa is probably the best-attested example of the
emergence of a polis by a synoecism of komai, the model

Re (b) To create a new polis by the relocation of people
from a number of neighbouring poleis is remarkably well
attested and here belong three of the most famous synoe-
cisms of the classical period: those of Rhodos in 408/7, of
Megalopolis in 368 and of Kos in 366/5. It is worth noting
that in all three cases the synoecism was partial: the polis
which contributed to the founding of the new polis persisted
after the synoecism and probably all were still poleis, though
now dependent poleis and, in some sense, civic subdivisions
of the new polis they had founded.

Re (c) There are surprisingly few attestations of the re-
forcement of an existing polis by the relocation of people
from second-order settlements within the territory. When
Histiaia (no. 372) was moved to Oreo in C5m, the polis was
reinforced by relocation of the population of Oreo, until
then a Histiaian deme, and a century later the tyrant Philis-
tides had the Elopieis relocated from the territory into the
town. In C5m Salmakis seems to have been incorporated into
Halikarnassos (no. 886), and in the same period Lep-
reon (no. 306) was reinforced by absorbing what was left of
northern Pylos.

Re (d) The most common type of synoecism seems to
have been a large polis’ incorporation of smaller neigh-
bouring poleis, sometimes one at a time, sometimes several
simultaneously.

As was the case with the other three types, the synoe-
cism could be arranged by mutual agreement, or at least
peacefully. In this category belong the synoecisms of Elis in
471 (no. 251), of Olynthos in 431 (no. 588), of Halikarnassos
C370 (no. 886), of Orchomenos in Arkadia in C4m (286),
of Thebes in Achaia Phthiotis in C4s (no. 444), and of Lat-
mos in C4l (no. 910). Sometimes the small poleis persisted
(e.g. Halikarnassos C370 and Orchomenos C4m), sometimes
they disappeared but then reappeared shortly afterwards:
the small poleis incorporated into Olynthos disappeared in
431 but were apparently refounded by the Peace of Nikias
ten years later.

But the synoecism could also be the result of a war,
whereby a large polis conquered a small polis and had its
population relocated and amalgamated with its own popu-
lation. The two best-known examples are the synoecisms
carried out by Syracuse (no. 47) and Argos (no. 347). In both
cases the smaller poleis were conquered one by one, and the
growth of the population of the larger polis was achieved by
a whole series of successive enforced synoecisms.

Finally, the small settlements involved in a synoecism
did not have to be either poleis or second order settlements
(komai or demoi). Of the six small communities synoe-
cised into Thebes (no. 221) in 431, four were poleis, but two
were presumably second-order settlements, viz. Aulis and
Schoinos. We cannot be certain that all the communities sy-
oecised into Halikarnassos C370 were poleis. One or more
may have been towns without the status of polis and, for
lack of supporting evidence, Side is here recorded among
the non-polis sites in Karia. Similarly, polis status cannot
be presumed for all the forty communities listed by Pausa-
nias as participating in the synoecism of Megalopolis (Paus.
8.27.3–7). On the other hand it must be remembered that
the forty communities listed by Pausanias may have been
designated prospectively in 371, but not all were actually
synoecised in 368.19

To conclude: the institution of synoecism shows, once
again, how the Greeks radically and consciously interfered
with what can be called natural growth of communities
and, often with surprising success, imposed artificial relo-
cations and reorganisations of their poleis. Synoikismos is
yet another aspect of the rationality of the Greek polis.
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Destruction and Disappearance of Poleis

The frequent wars often entailed the destruction or the dismemberment of a poleis and the annihilation or enslavement or expulsion of its population (see Index 20). Such disasters happened so frequently that a kind of technical terminology was developed for all the variants. To destroy the urban centre of a poleis was usually called "to raze it to the ground" (καταστραφύλην τὴν πόλιν, noun: καταστραφή). To split up a poleis into small villages was called "to break up the settlement" (διοικεῖσθαι τὴν πόλιν, noun: διοικείσθαι). To annihilate and/or enslave the population was called ἀνδραποδίζειν or ἀνάστατονποιεῖντὴνπόλιν (noun: ἀνδραποδισµός), and for the expansion of the population the proper phrase was ἀναστάτουςποιεῖντὸςδεῖνας or ἀνάστατονποιεῖντὴνπόλιν (noun: ἀνάστασις). Other idioms could be used, but those above occur so frequently that they deserve to be treated as technical terms. They describe four different phenomena which often occurred together: the destruction of a poleis was almost always accompanied by the annihilation or enslavement or expulsion of its population or with its fragmentation into village communities. It must be added that not only poleis but also second-order settlements could be exposed to ἀνδραποδισµός and physical destruction of the urban centre.¹

1. Enslavement

The term ἀνδραποδισµός is invariably used in connection with the conquest and sack of a (besieged)

---

¹ καταστραφύλην (Ios. 14.7; Dem. 18.36); καταστραφή (Lys. 13.8; Lēythri 21.9–10 (C4s)). Used retrospectively by Arrian, Diodoros, Plutarck and Strabo, etc.

² τὴν πόλιν διοικεῖσθαι (Dem. 5.10); Μαντίνης διοικεῖσθαι (Ios. 8.100). The noun διοικεῖσθαι is found in late sources only (Harpl. My).

³ The verbs ἀνβαραποδίζειν (active: Hdt. 2.21.95; middle: Hdt. 1.76.2) and ἀνδραποδίζειν (active: Xen. Hell. 2.1.15; middle: Hdt. 1.66.3) designate the "enslavement" of a poleis. In the middle voice the verb ἀνδραποδισθῆναι (Xen. Men. 1.2.62) is also used about the illegal attempt by a kidnapper to make another person his slave or to have him sold off as a slave. With a few exceptions, see n. 6, the noun ἀνδραποδισµός denotes the enslavement of the population of a city (Dem. 1.5; Ios. 4.100; Pl. Resp. 469b; Thuc. 2.68.9). Cf. Ducrey (1968) 107–47 and Volkmann (1990) who covers C4 as well as later periods.

⁴ διοικεῖσθαι τοὺς τῶν δείνας (Ios. 4.108) or διοικεῖσθαι τοὺς τῶν πόλιν (Thuc. 6.76.2; IG v 40.9–6); ἀνάστασις (Ios. 15.127; Dem. 1.5). For the meaning of the phrase, see the appendix infra.

⁵ Destruction in 342 of Porthmos, a fortified settlement in the territory of Eretria (Dem. 9.58, 10.8). Ἀνδραποδισµοί of Hylkara 415 (Thuc. 6.62.3–4). In 341 Tyridasa and Krobylos suffered ἀνδραποδισµοῖς by an Athenian army commanded by Diopeithes (Dem. 12.3; Dem. 8 hypoth. 2–3). Tyridasa was probably a poleis, but Krobylos seems to have been a non-poleis settlement on the north coast of the Propontis.
off as booty at public auction. Sometimes the city was not destroyed but handed over to new settlers together with the territory. In the strict sense the term andrapodismos covers the enslaving of either the entire population or the women and children. But when the term is found without any further specification, the presumption is that it covers several or all of the elements listed above. It may be significant, however, that the term does not occur when the entire population of a conquered city was killed off and no one enslaved.

2. Destruction The conquest of a polis was often followed by the demolition of its walls, which is here treated in the chapter about defence circuits of poleis. In this context belongs the more severe treatment that could befall a polis: to be razed to the ground. The method mostly used was apparently to set fire to the town and leave the destruction to the flames. To pull down and demolish the houses and sanctuaries would be a slow and laborious task. It is only occasionally attested in the sources and then in addition to the burning of the polis. There can be no doubt that a polis was plundered before it was destroyed, but that is commonly taken for granted and is only occasionally specified.

As pointed out above, the destruction of a polis was often combined with the andrapodismos of its population. In fifty-six instances, however, we hear about the destruction of a polis without any mention of the enslavement of its population. In forty-one cases we have no information at all about what happened to the inhabitants, either because it is passed over in silence in our sources or because the destruction is attested archaeologically but not mentioned in any text. It is reasonable to suppose that some of these poleis were exposed to an andrapodismos in addition to the attested destruction of the city. But in the remaining fifteen cases we are explicitly told what happened to the people: sometimes they escaped before the city was conquered; sometimes they were allowed to leave after the conquest; sometimes they were expelled; sometimes they were exposed to a dioikismos and sometimes they were relocated. The Syracusans in particular seem to have practised a policy whereby all or some of the inhabitants of a conquered polis were transferred to Syracuse and naturalised.

3. Expulsion A third scenario was to expel the population of a conquered polis without any destruction of its urban centre which then could be given to new settlers. It is less often attested than expulsion of the inhabitants combined with physical destruction of the town, but it seems to have been the fate of at least ten poleis, of which one, Herakleia in Trachis, had its population expelled twice within a generation. Thus, when the Athenians expelled the Aiginetans in 431 and sent Athenian colonists to the island, the Lakadainomians had the Aiginetans resettled in Thryrea (Thuc. 2.27); and when the population of Halos in Malis was expelled, their town was given to the Pharsalians (Dem. 19.39).

4. Frequency and effect Our fragmentary sources provide us with information about 113 cases of andrapodismos or expulsion of the population of a polis and/or destruction of its urban centre. But in addition to individual attestations, andrapodismos and destruction of large numbers of unnamed poleis are mentioned in various contexts.

In 494 when the Persians had quenched the Ionian Revolt, Apollonia (no. 627) 356; Nikaea (no. 385) 353; Naryka (no. 384) 352; Galepsos (no. 616) 351; Sermifia (no. 604) 348; Siphos (no. 605) 348; Stagirioc (no. 603) 348; Kamarina (no. 848) 346; Naxos (no. 361) 345; Methone (no. 341) 354. In 490 B.C. the Athenians had the Aiginetans resettled in Phthiotis (Thuc. 8.27); and when the population of Halos in Malis was expelled, their town was given to the Pharsalians (Dem. 19.39).
there seems to have been an andrapodismos and/or destruction of several poleis that had participated in the Revolt. That of Miletos is described in some detail. An andrapodismos of Phokaia and the other Ionian poleis is implied by Herodotos, but its implementation is not mentioned (6.17, 31.1–2).

In his account of Xerxes’ expedition in 480, Herodotos describes the destruction of most of the Phokian poleis (8.33, 35), of Thespiai and Plataiai in Boiotia (8.50.2), and of Athens (8.53; 9.13), but several other poleis between the Hellespont and Attika may have suffered the same fate.

According to Demosthenes, Philip destroyed Olynthos, Methone, Apollonia and thirty-two other poleis in Thrace (Dem. 9.26), and Hypereides claims that the inhabitants of forty poleis on Chalkidike were expelled by Philip in consequence of his conquest of Olynthos in 348 (fr. 80, Jensen). Both orators are undoubtedly exaggerating, but the presumption is that more poleis were razed to the ground than the three Demosthenes mentions by name, cf. Theopomp. fr. 27.

After the Phokians had capitulated to Philip in 346, their cities were destroyed (Dem. 18.36, 41; 19.65, 141; Aeschin. 2.162; Paus. 10.3.2) and the inhabitants forced to move to a number of scattered villages (Diod. 16.60.2; Dem. 19.81). According to Demosthenes 19.23, twenty-two poleis were exposed to this dioikismos.

Full sources would undoubtedly have provided us with evidence of another three-digit number of poleis which were destroyed and/or exposed to andrapodismos or anastasis. On the other hand, we have reason to believe that the fate suffered by these poleis was less disastrous than it appears. The descriptions in our sources of andrapodismos and destruction of poleis convey the impression that usually the annihilation of a polis was carried out successfully and that all that was left of a flourishing community was a heap of dismantled houses and some women and children deprived of their liberty and deported to other poleis. But reading the sources for the history of the region one or two generations later and studying the archaeological remains of poleis exposed to destruction and andrapodismos, we often discover that the annihilated polis still existed, and apparently flourished almost as if nothing had happened.

Of forty-six poleis exposed to andrapodismos, only five or perhaps six disappeared for good. A further six persisted as poleis but were settled with new inhabitants, whereas three to five may have lost their status as poleis but persisted as municipalities lying in the territory of a larger polis. The remaining thirty-one poleis appear in our sources as sometimes even flourishing communities only a decade or a generation after the andrapodismos. In quite a few cases we know that the polis was resettled with people who had survived the andrapodismos but even in cases when the polis was taken over by new settlers, the community seems to have maintained its former identity, not only its name, but also its dialect, its traditions, and its cults.

Of fifty-two poleis destroyed after their conquest, eight seem to have disappeared for good and at least two lost their status as poleis but persisted as municipalities. No fewer than forty-two survived as poleis, or were refounded shortly after the destruction. The fate of the twenty-two Phokian poleis which allegedly were demolished in 346 is particularly interesting because some of the defence circuits that can still be seen are now believed to antedate the dioikismos and presumed destruction in 346 (see 401 infra).

The overall conclusion is that annihilation of a polis seems to have been achieved in about a score of the 112 individually attested poleis. In the other cases the andrapodismos must have been partial and the destruction of the city superficial. Just as it has been shown that the devastation of the countryside of a polis must have been less disastrous than is alleged in the sources, so it can be shown that in most cases the destruction of the urban centre of a polis and the annihilation of its population must have been less effective and disastrous than appears from the accounts found in Herodotos, Thucydidest, Xenophon, Demosthenes and Diodoros.

Naxos (no. 41) 403; Olynthos (no. 588) 348; Arisbe may have persisted as a kome of Methymna. Tyrdida (no. 681) may have disappeared in 341.

32 Olynthos (no. 588) 479; Skyros (no. 521) 476; Argos Amphilochikon (no. 118) c. 440; Kyme (no. 57) 421; Potidea (no. 598) 356; Sestos (no. 672) 353.

33 Arisbe (no. 795) C6; Euboea (no. 15) 485–8; Mykenai (no. 335) c. 460; Thyrea (no. 346) 424; Sybaris (no. 70) was destroyed in 510 but is attested in C5 as, probably, a dependent polis of Kroton.

34 Priene (no. 866) 546; Barke (no. 1025) c. 534; Lemnos (nos. 502–3) C6; Miletos (no. 854) 484; Artake (no. 736) 393; Kalchedon (no. 743) 493; Prokonnesos (no. 759) 493; Eretria (no. 370) 490; Naxos (no. 507) 490; Zankle/Messana (no. 51) 488; Eion (no. 630) 476; Plataiai (no. 218) 427; Torone (no. 620) 422; Skione (no. 669) 421; Melos (no. 505) 455; Iasos (no. 891) 414; Selinous (no. 44) 409; Kedreai (no. 899) 405; Iasos (no. 891) 405; Katane (no. 30) 403; Pharsalos (no. 41) 395; Rhegion (no. 68) 387; Orchomenos (no. 213) 364; Tenos (no. 525) 362; Thronion (no. 388) 353; Orchomenos (no. 213) 346; Chaireneia (no. 201) 346; Chorisiai (no. 202) 346; Koroneia (no. 210) 346; Thebai (no. 221) 346; Gryneion (no. 809) 353/4.

35 Pellene (no. 240) C6; Sybaris (no. 70) C6; Torone (no. 620) C5; Selinous (no. 44) C5; Melos (no. 505) 405; Skione (no. 669) 405/4; Plataiai (no. 218) 366; Thebai (no. 221) 316/5.

36 Dispontion (no. 250) c. 570; Smyrna (no. 867) c. 545 (refounded in C4); Herakleia on Sicily (no. 20) C6; Aiolaidi (no. 170) 480; Tiryns (no. 356) c. 460; Strymy (no. 650) c. 550; Sermynia (no. 604) 348; Singos (no. 605) 348.

37 Thucydides (no. 54) 354; Ormeai (no. 354) 416/5.

38 Hanson (1983).
APPENDIX

The Meaning of τὴν πόλιν ἀνάστατον ποιεῖν or γενέσθαι

The lexica distinguish between two meanings of the adjective ἀνάστατος: when the subject is a people, the suggested rendering is “driven from one’s house and home”, but when the subject is πόλεις or χώρα, the meaning is said to be “ruined”, “laid waste”. Following Powell (1938) s.v. we suggest that “ruined” is misleading and that “laid waste” is better replaced by “depopulated”.

First, there are numerous passages in which it is impossible to tell whether “ruined” or “depopulated” is the preferable translation; but there are some passages in which an ἀνάστατος πόλις is certainly a “polis whose population has been expelled”, but not a “ruined polis”.

In Isokrates’ letter to Archidamos we are told how Greek mercenaries in Asia Minor treated the Hellenic polis: they made them anastatoi by killing some inhabitants, expelling others, depriving some of their possessions and maltreating women and children in the most abominable fashion. Spelling out what it means to make a polis anastatos, all the atrocities concern the population, none the physical destruction of the town.40

In his speech Against Leokrates (60–62) Lykourgos charges Leokrates with having deserted his polis and claims that, by leaving the polis the way Leokrates did, the polis would become uninhabited (τὴν πόλιν ἀοίκητον ἃν γενέσθαι). But to become ἀνάστατος is the death of a polis (πόλεως ἐστὶ δάνατος ἀνάστατον γενέσθαι). Again, the point is that the polis is deserted, not that it is destroyed.

Second, the adjective ἀνάστατος and the noun ἀνάστασις are derived from the verb ἀναστάναι. This verb means “make to stand up”, “raise up”, or “make people emigrate” and, when used intransitively, the meaning is to “be compelled to migrate”, “be depopulated” (LSJ s.v.). If the object is a building or a statue vel sim., the meaning is to “build” or “set up”, never to “destroy” or “pull down”. Similarly, the noun ἀνάστασις followed by an objective genitive denoting a building or a statue vel sim. is not attested in the sense of “destruction”; on the contrary, it bears the meaning “erection”. Thus, Demosthenes claims that the most laudable deed for which Konon was rewarded was the erection of the walls of Athens in the 390s (Dem. 20.68: ἀνέστησε τὸ τείχη and 72: ἢ τῶν τείχων ἀνάστασις). It would be odd if the adjective ἀνάστατος carried the meaning “ruined”, “destroyed”, especially since the meaning “forced to migrate” or “depopulated” seems to fit all occurrences: under the sense “ruined”, “laid waste”, LSJ s.v. ἀνάστατος cites Soph. Trach. 240: ἀνάστατος δορὶ χῶρα, but LSJ s.v. ἀνάστασις cites Hdt. 5.29: χώρα ἀναστηκταία καὶ Eur. Hec. 494: πόλεις πᾶδα ἀναστηκτε δορὶ under the sense “to be depopulated”.

To conclude: we suggest that the principal meaning of ἀνάστατος γενέσθαι is never “to be ruined” or “to be destroyed” but “to be expelled” when the subject is a people and “to be depopulated” when the subject is a city or a region. It is, of course, true that many conquered cities were destroyed as well as depopulated, see the evidence above, and it cannot be ruled out that “destroyed” may in some cases be a connotation, but that does not change the observation that the basic meaning of ἀνάστασις πόλις seems to be “a polis made to rise up and depart”; i.e. when connected with the adjective ἀνάστατος, the noun πόλις is used in the personal rather than in the urban sense of the word. Thus, when the phrase ἀνάστατον ποιεῖν or γενέσθαι τὴν πόλιν occurs, we can safely infer that the population was expelled and the city depopulated, but unless we have other information, we cannot be sure that the polis was physically destroyed.41

40 One example is the fate of Kamarina in 484: Thuc. 6.5.3; καὶ άθροί ὑπὸ Γέλωνος ἀνάστασιν γεγονός τὸ τρίτον κατωθίσθη ὑπὸ Γέλωνος. Hdt. 7.136.2: Καμαριναῖος ἀπάνατος ἐς τός Συρακοσίων ἀρκούσι πόλεσιν, Καμαρινής δὲ τὸ ἄστο κομέσθηκε. We learn from Thucydides that Kamarina was depopulated, from Herodotos that it was both depopulated and razed to the ground.
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Stasis as an Essential Aspect of the Polis

In Hellas in the Archaic and Classical periods “belonging” in a political context meant, first of all, to belong to one’s polis. Like the modern state, the polis provided its citizens with a feeling of common identity, based on traditions, culture, ceremonies, symbols and sometimes (presumed) common descent. For a Greek citizen the polis was his fatherland (patris) for which he was expected, if necessary, to die, just as the modern state expects “every man to do his duty” (supra 49).

However, sources describing and debating the polis show (a) that a polis was not a harmonious unit but that most poleis were split up into what in the sources are called two opposed poleis.1 (b) The two poleis—i.e. the two factions—were often one of the rich (supporting oligarchy) and one of the poor (supporting democracy).2 (c) Alternatively, the two factions might be two different ethnic groups living side by side as citizens of the same polis. This situation was especially common in colonies whose citizens were recruited from different poleis.3 (d) A third scenario was discord inside one of the two major social groups, in particular rivalry between two sub-factions of wealthy citizens in an oligarchy.4 (e) The goal of each faction was to control and (if necessary) to reform the political institutions of the polis.5 (f) The opposition between the two factions within a polis entailed a constant tension and discord resulting in repeated outbursts of civil war, during which each faction was prepared to collaborate with a congenial faction in a neighbouring polis, or in a distant but hegemonic polis. The members of each faction were, in fact, willing to sacrifice the freedom (eleutheria) and independence (autonomia) of their polis if only they could gain the upper hand over the opposite faction.6

The authors who provide us with such a view are Ps.-Xenophon, Thucydides, Euripides, Isokrates, Plato and Aristotle. They all emphasise the opposition between the wealthy citizens supporting oligarchy and the commoners supporting democracy. But the fifth book of Aristotle’s Politics duly lists the alternative factors.

Even more importantly, one might object that the authors cited here were all Athenians or persons living in Athens, and may give a seriously distorted picture of the Greek world. Aineias the Tactician, however, draws a similar picture, and he is probably to be identified with the Arkadian general from Stymphalos.7 In his treaty of how to survive under siege he mentions treason among the besieged as a major risk. The theme is selected for special treatment in four chapters: 10, 11, 14 and 17. In some cases the threat comes from foreigners or mercenaries inside the walls of the besieged city.8 But often the risk of betrayal is connected with the lack of concord (homonoia) among the citizens,9 and of five historical examples reported in chapter 11, at least three and probably four concern rivalry between wealthy oligarchs and democratic commoners.10 Again, many out-

---

1 Pl. Resp. 422E; 551D; Leg. 945E; Arist. Pol. 1310b1ff; Eur. fr. 173, Nauck; cf. Thuc. 3.82–83.
2 Pl. Resp. 555B; 557A; Arist. Pol. 1268b7–8; 1289b27–40; 1290b18–20; 1302a10–11; 1303a1–2.
3 Arist. Pol. 1303b26–27, citing 8 examples: Sybaris (no. 70), Thourioi (no. 74), Byzantion (no. 674), Antissa (no. 794), Zankle (no. 51), Apollonia Pontike (no. 682), Syracuse (no. 47) and Amphipolis (no. 553). In Antissa—the only one of the 8 poleis which was not a colonial foundation—stasis was caused by the Antissians having accommodated a large number of exiled Chians.
4 Stasis between sub-factions of wealthy citizens: Arist. Pol. 1302b15–15 and 1305b2–66 with 22 examples: Massalia (no. 3), Istron (no. 685), Herakleia Pontike (no. 715), Knidos (no. 903), Erythrai (no. 845), Athens (no. 361) in 411 and 404, Larisa (no. 401), Abydos (no. 765), Herakleia Pontike (again) (no. 715), Amphipolis (no. 553), Syracuse (no. 47), Aligea (no. 358), Apollonia Pontike (no. 682), Pharsalos (no. 413), Elisa (no. 351), Corinthus (no. 227), Abydos (again) (no. 765), Larisa (again) (no. 401), Eretria (no. 370), Thebes (no. 221), Herakleia Pontike (again) (no. 715).
5 Thuc. 3.82; Arist. Pol. 1301a20–25 and the rest of book 5 passim. Cf. Gehrke (2001). There is a close connection between stasis and change of constitution (metabole politeias); cf. Arist. Pol. 1305b5, 1902b6–17), but the two phenomena must not be equated: (a) when stasis was caused by rivalry between two groups of rich citizens in an oligarchy, a coup or a revolution would not normally involve a change of constitution (cf. supra n. 4). (b) A change of constitution might take place peacefully and constitutionally without any stasis between opposing factions being involved; cf. Arist. Pol. 1301a4–15; metaβαλλοντα δ᾿ αἱ πολιτείαι καὶ δευτέρων στάσεων (“constitutions may also change without stasis”) followed by three examples. Arist. Pol. book 5 is often described as an analysis of stasis; it is in fact an analysis of metabole politeias (1301a20–25).
7 See the penetrating study by Winterling (1991).
9 (Lack of) homonoia among the citizens: 10.20, 14.1, 17.1.
10 The 5 examples are Chios (no. 840), Argos (no. 347), Herakleia Pontike (no. 715), Lakedaimon (no. 345) (anecdotal and about the early history of Sparta) and Korkyra (no. 123). We agree with Winterling (1991) 216–19 that the language, style and content of chapter 11 differ from those of the other chapters, but we
breaks of *stasis* are known from Diodoros, and his sources are partly Antiochos of Syracuse and Timaios of Taurome- 
nion (for the numerous *staseis* in Sicily and southern Italy) 
and partly Ephoros of Kyme (for, especially, the *staseis* in 
*Hell* C4f). Herodotos is the best source we have for *staseis* in 
the Archaic period and he must have got his information 
from local informants and non-Athenian historical traditions. The testimony of these non-Athenian sources provides us with a valuable addendum to the information 
obtained from the Athenian authors.

Attested outbreaks of civil war fully corroborate the gen-
eral statements made by the Athenian philosophers and 
historians. In 1985 H.-J. Gehrke published his book *Stasis: 
Untersuchungen zu den inneren Kriegen in den griechischen 
Staaten des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*11 It is one of the 
most important contributions to our understanding of 
classical Greek history published in the twentieth cen-
tury. Part I is an inventory of all attestations of *stasis* in C5 
and C4. Gehrke excludes Athens, Sparta and the western 
Greeks. Given the frequency of *stasis* among the western 
Greeks, the exclusion of this part of the Hellenic world is 
regrettable. However, the lacuna has since been filled by S. 
Berger, *Revolution and Society in Greek Sicily and Southern 
Italy* (1992).

Gehrke’s inventory comprises 283 incidents of *stasis*12 in 
seventy-eight different *poleis*,13 and Berger adds seventy-
two further examples in sixteen *poleis*. Syracuse tops the list 
with twenty-seven attested outbreaks of *stasis* in the period 
c.650 to 279/69. At the other end of the scale is Sparta: after 
a long period of recurring *staseis*, it enjoyed a system of 
good laws (*eunomia*), and in the late fifth century it had 
not been exposed to any violent change of constitution for 
centuries (Thuc. 1.18.1). Yet, it must be remembered that the 
Lakedaimonians’ foundation of Taras in 706 was the result of 
a *stasis* (Antiochos *FGHist* 555 fr. 13; Arist. *Pol.* 1306b31), 
and that the *coup* planned by Kinadon in 400 was a *stasis* 
that might have triggered a civil war (Xen. *Hell.* 3.3.5–11).

As surveyed in Index 19, this inventory records 279 out-
breaks of *stasis*14 in 122 named *poleis*. To this already im-
can see no reason to reject it. In the opening of the chapter it is explicitly 
ated that it is taken over from another treatise, probably one of Alcinous’ own 
lost books and probably placed here by Alcinous himself. If that is the case, 
the chapter must be included in any interpretation of the treatise as a whole; see 

11 As the title says, Gehrke’s study covers the period 500–300. For *stasis* in the 
Archaic period, see Lintott (1982) 13–81.
12 Gehrke, *Stasis* 255–57, based on his inventory 13–199.
13 Leaving out regions (Achaia, Aitolia, Akarnania, Paphlagonia, Thessaly) and *poleis* in which the attestation of a *stasis* can be questioned.
14 The Inventory and Index do not include a number of incidents which

pressive number must be added information about *stasis* affecting all or most *poleis* in a region: in 421 discord among 
rival factions in the Parrhasian *poleis* induced one of the 
factions to seek support from the Lakedaimonians who 
readily sent a relief force. This *stasis* must have affected as many as half a score of the Parrhasian *poleis*.15 In 366 
the Thebans had the constitutions of all the Achaian *poleis* 
changed into democracies, and forced the new democratic 
regimes to exile the members of the oligarchic factions. 
However, the exiles soon returned to their *poleis* and, appa-
rently, reintroduced the oligarchic constitutions.16 More 
than a dozen *poleis* went through this double change of 
constitution which happened in the course of less than a 
year. In the majority of all these cases the source is Ari-
rotle, Diodoros, Thucydides or Xenophon. Yet, 
though these authors may offer a biased account, there 
is no reason to believe that they invented the rival factions 
civil wars they describe. Given the very fragmentary 
nature of our sources, there can be no doubt that discord 
among the citizens and civil war were problems which most 
of the time affected most of the Greek *poleis* from Massalia 
to Herakleia Pontike.

The further conclusion is that, in case of conflict be-
tween loyalties, belonging to one’s social group often mat-
ter more than belonging to one’s *polis*. That is undoubt-
edly treason, but it would count as treason for the los-
ing faction only; and that is why the Greeks had so many 
laws and regulations against high treason,17 so many politi-
cal actions against possible traitors,18 so many citizens 
living in exile,19 and so many reconciliations and general

Gehrke records as outbreaks of *stasis*. (1) Gehrke includes some examples of 
*stasis* attested in a region but not in any named *poleis*, see nn. 15, 16. (2) According 
to Gehrke, *Stasis* 257, a *stasis* often lasted a few days only. Therefore consecutive 
occurrences within weeks or months of *coup* to *coup*, and sometimes 
counter-*coup* to counter-*coup* are counted as separate outbreaks of *stasis* (e.g. 
*Sikyon* 366b, 366c, 366d), whereas in this inventory they are treated together 
as consecutive outbursts of one *stasis*. (3) Gehrke includes some 50 incidents 
where, in our opinion, our sources testify to a change of constitution only, and 
not to *any* *stasis* as the reason for the change (e.g. *Ambrakia* 338, 336; *Amisos* 
334; *Andros* 411, 393; *Antissa* 405, 403/2 etc.; cf. n. 5 supra). On the other hand, 
in addition to the *staseis* in Sicily and southern Italy we include *staseis* before 
500, and a number of *staseis* not included in Gehrke’s study: *Abydos* (no. 765) 
c.360, *Chaireneia* (no. 201), *Orchomenos* (no. 251) and *Siphai* (no. 248). 

17 Erythrai c.450 (IG II 7.32); Thasos c.410 (ML 83); *Eretria* c.350 (IG XI 2 
190); *Eretria* c.330 (Tod 191 – RÖ 83); *Chersonesus* (Bosporos) c.300 (Syll.2 
360); *Ilion* (*Iliion* 25 (C3)).
18 For political trials in Athens, see Hansen (1999) 203–24; Burckhardt and 
Ungern-Sternberg (2000); for trials of Spartan kings, see Ste Croix (1972) 350–3; 
for trials of Theban political leaders, see Buckler (1986) 138–50.
19 Selbert (1979); McKechnie (1898) 16–33.
amnesties to end civil wars. Stasis was an everyday phenomenon.

The fact that so many Greeks were willing to sacrifice the freedom (eleutheria) and independence (autonomia) of their polis requires an explanation. By giving up autonomy in the sense of independence, one could keep what was much more important: viz. the self-government of one’s polis exercised by one’s own faction. If the opposing faction came to rule the polis, it would impose its will on you and your fellows in all matters, day in and day out. If you came to rule, you would be in control of almost all decisions that mattered in everyday life. What would you lose by sacrificing the autonomia of the polis? You would have to pay tribute, but not necessarily a large one; in times of war you might have to assist the hegemonic polis. But essentially the polis was left as a dependent, but still self-governing community. Dependent status became a nuisance only if a polis had to suffer a foreign garrison on its acropolis, or if its self-government was constantly interfered with by outside harmosts or episkopoi.

On the other hand, apart from the help from the neighbour polis to subdue the opposing class, there might be a bonus: viz. that a small polis could have the hegemonic polis as its protector, and so be safe from being attacked by neighbours who might be a more severe threat than the, perhaps, more distant hegemonic polis. So, what endangered the prosperity and well-being of a polis was not so much the loss of autonomia as the lack of homonoia. Accordingly, what the Greeks prayed for was not autonomia but homonoia and freedom from stasis. As far as we know, autonomia was never deified in any polis and made the object of a cult, whereas homonoia became a goddess whose cult was venerated all over the Greek world, especially from the fourth century onwards.

So we have belonging to one’s polis as against belonging to one’s social group or, especially in colonies, ethnic group. How was the belonging expressed? When the belonging and loyalty were towards one’s polis, the answer is: in the phalanx the citizen was standing next to his fellow citizens fighting for his polis; in the political assemblies the citizen was sitting next to his fellow citizens discussing polis matters; in the religious processions the citizen was walking alongside his fellow citizens celebrating one of the Olympian gods, perhaps the patron deity of his polis. In each of the three fields the polites filled a fixed place in a recognisable polis institution, be it the ekklesia, the phalanx or the komos. And the citizens would be called on almost daily to participate in one of these institutions (Hansen (2000) 165–70).

But which were the groups for which a citizen felt so strongly that they could outweigh his loyalty to his polis? What were they called? Which common cause united such groups? And how were they organised?

The best-known word for such a faction is στάσις. The word is derived from the verb στάτημαι and must have undergone the following development of meaning. Its basic meaning is “position” or “stand”, from which the following metaphorical senses are derived: (1) closest to the literal meaning is “stand” in the sense of “standpoint.” The next step is probably that, being used about about a standpoint you share with a number of other persons, the meaning of stasis is shifted from the standpoint itself to the group of persons who take the same stand on some issue. Thus, stasis

20 Selinus c.500 (1W 22 – Nomina i 17); Mytilene c.330 (IG XII 2:6); Chios 332 (RO 84); Nakona 300–270 (SEG 30 1199: 39 1014).

21 For the view that eleutheria and autonomia were all-important to a Hellenic polis of the classical period, see Ehrenberg (1947) 48: “Was not Athenian treatment at least of the loyal States moderate? But no Greek . . . would ever see things in this light . . . because they could not help thinking mainly, if not exclusively, in political terms, that is to say in terms of Polis life and in particular of Polis autonomy . . . Nothing counted when weighed against the loss of political freedom.” Quoted and convincingly contradicted by Ste Croix (1954–55) 29.

22 Gehrke, Stasis 359: “Die Griechen liessen sich relativ leicht beherrschen, paradoxerweise nicht, weil sie zur Servilität geboren waren, sondern im Gegenteil, weil sie nichts mehr perhorreizierten als Herrschaft, die Herrschaft ihres inneren Gegners, und nichts mehr schätzten als Freiheit, die Freiheit von eben dieser Herrschaft.” In our opinion, this lucid analysis of the role of stasis in Greek society is fully supported by the sources, e.g. by Brasidas’ speech in Akanthos as reported by Thucydides at 4.86.4–5: “I have not come here to take part in factional politics (συνοπτικά). It would be a dubious sort of liberation if I were to go against Spartan tradition and either enslave the many to the few (το ελήνου τοις ἄλλοις) or the minority to the whole people (το ἄλλου τοις σαυτοῖς). That would be worse than foreign rule (χαλεπώτερα γὰρ ἂν τῆς ἀλλοφυλοῦ ἀρρητῆς) (trans. Hornblower). For a different view, dictated by different circumstances, see Thuc. 8.48.5.

23 For the concept of the dependent polis, see Hansen (1995) and supra 87–94.
acquires its well-attested sense of group or faction. Then, in the plural, stasis comes to designate two or more groups holding conflicting views on key issues. Finally, the focus of meaning shifts from the groups holding conflicting views to the conflict between such groups, and stasis develops its most common metaphorical sense: viz., “discord” and ultimately, “civil war”. To sum up, the development of meaning is: (1) stand, (2) standpoint, (3) group of persons sharing a standpoint, (4) in the plural two or more groups of persons holding conflicting standpoints, (5) the conflict between such groups, civil war.

In this context the important sense is (3): group of persons, faction, political group. A person belongs to a stasis, and his sense of being a stasiotes is stronger than his sense of being a politeis. The opposition between being a stasis and being a politeis is explicitly emphasised by Plato at Plt. 303C: “those who participate in the running of these constitutions can be disregarded as partisans rather than statesmen” and Leg. 715B: “those who legislate for the sake of a particular group we shall call partisans, not citizens”.

Next, stasis almost invariably denotes a group which by force or stratagem attempts to suppress opposing groups, assume power and change the constitution. A stasis is not a political party or group working within the framework of the political institutions of the polis (Hansen (1987) 74). One exception is Thucydides’ account of the Thessalian army at 2.22.3 where we learn that the regiment provided by Larisa was commanded by two strategoi, each representing his stasis. In all other sources a stasis is a revolutionary group.

An inspection of the sources shows that factions (staseis) are designated and described in one of three different ways.

(1) The group is defined by its affiliation with another polis. Thus, from the name of a polis or an ethnos a verb is formed with the sense of “fraternising with” the polis or ethnos in question. One example is Ὀρχομενίζοντες used by Hellenikos about Boiotians affiliated with Orchomenos. Other similar verbs are Αττικίζοντες, Λακωνίζοντες, Αργολίζοντες, Φιλεπιζόντες.

(2) The group is defined and designated by its preference for a form of constitution, mostly democracy versus oligarchy. But sometimes the rivalry between rich and poor may result in the setting up of a tyranny.

(3) The group is defined and designated by its wealth and the social position of its members. Typically the poor are opposed to the wealthy.

As is well known, the three ways of designating and defining the groups are not mutually exclusive. On the contrary, they usually go hand in hand. The poor favoured democracy and, in C5 and C4, they looked to Athens for support against the rich, who favoured oligarchy and looked to Sparta for support. So, we are fairly well informed about the ideology of the two groups, but we are remarkably ignorant of...
how the groups were organised and how their members could express their feeling of identity, loyalty and belonging. We know that the groups were often called *hetaireiai*, but apart from what we know about the oligarchic Athenian *hetaireiai* in 411 and 404 we are left in the dark about *hetaireiai*, and particularly democratic *hetaireiai*, in the Greek *poleis*. There are two explanations of our ignorance.

(a) *Stasis* was civil war; it was by definition an unconstitutional and criminal act. The dominant group of citizens would control the institutions of the *polis* of which we are well informed. The opposing group would have to organise its revolt in secret, and its organisation had to be kept a secret. If the group succeeded in ousting the opposing group, it would take over the control of the *polis* institutions; if it lost, its group would be annihilated. That is why such groups have left so few traces in our sources.

Let us adduce one example. In Samos in 412 a democratic faction deposed a ruling oligarchy.²⁶ Two hundred oligarchs were executed and 400 exiled. The revolt is described as “the revolt of the people in Samos” (ἡ ἐν Σάµῳ ἑπανάστασις ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου), whereas the decision to kill or exile the 600 oligarchs is ascribed to “the Samian people” (ὁ δήμος ὁ Σαµίων). Here *demos* is obviously used in two different senses. The *demos* behind the revolt is “the common people”, forming a group, but not being officially organised as a body of government in any sense. The *demos* behind the proscription of the 600 oligarchs is the Samian state, undoubtedly the *ekklesia* which by a majority, perhaps unanimously, who knows, must have voted for the motion to execute or exile the members of the opposing faction.

(b) Most of our sources for constitutional and political matters are Athenian, and in many cases we use our detailed knowledge about Athenian institutions to supplement the meagre sources for other *poleis*. Thus, from our rich information about debates in the Athenian *ekklesia* we presume that such debates took similar forms in *poleis* where we know that they had an *ekklesia* but do not know anything about how it worked. But Athens was famous for being a fairly homogeneous society, and suffered from *stasis* only twice during the long period of democratic rule from 507 to 322. Almost all we know about the ancient Greek *hetaireiai* as political clubs and centres of the oligarchs comes from these two episodes in 411 and 404 bc.²⁷ The absence of well-organised factions in Athens, apart from the years 411 and 404, prevents us from guessing how such factions were usually organised in other *poleis*, where they probably played a much more prominent part in politics.

Conclusion: in times of peace and under settled conditions a Greek citizen’s principal loyalty was to his *polis* and that was where he belonged politically. But in troubled periods and especially in times of war his loyalty to the *polis* was often overridden by his loyalty towards a group within the citizenry—often a social group, but sometimes an ethnic group, especially in colonies—and he was mostly, but not always, prepared to sacrifice the *autonomia* of his *polis* in order to get the upper hand of the opposing *stasis* in his *polis*. Thus, civil war inside the *polis* was an inescapable effect of war between *poleis*,²⁸ and even more than external peace, i.e. *eirene*, concord, i.e. *homonoia*, was the desired but usually unobtainable ideal in the classical Greek world.

In the Western world since the Renaissance loyalty towards the state has almost always been stronger than loyalty towards one’s social group. The result has been relatively infrequent civil wars, and war with other nations has not fostered disunity or civil war. On the contrary, it has united the people. To have a common enemy has often fostered an otherwise unknown spirit of self-sacrifice, and has often entailed a temporary co-operation between opposed parties.²⁹ Furthermore, since the Age of Napoleon, nationalism—conceived as the one-to-one relation between nation and state formation—has been and still is one of the strongest forces in history (Thomson (1957) 885). And in cases when discord has resulted in civil war and dissolution of the state, the root of the discord has mostly been opposition between ethnic groups, as is sadly apparent even today, especially in central and eastern Europe.

In ancient Greece we find almost the reverse situation. Mostly, the citizens of one *polis* had the same ethnic identity as the citizens of the neighbouring *poleis*: they were all Hellenes. In many cases they have the same sub-ethnic identity: they were all Boiotians or Phokians, etc. In each *polis* all the citizens usually belonged to one and the same ethnic group and even subgroup. The best proof of the prevailing ethnic homogeneity of the Greek *polis* is, in fact,

²⁶ Thuc. 8.21. We follow those who believe that Samos in 412 was an oligarchic coup now overturned by the democratic faction; see esp. Gomme, Andrewes and Dover (1981) 44–7 and 155–56. The alternative explanation, preferred esp. by Gehrke, *Stasis* 142–44, is that the ruling democrats had 600 of their opponents killed or executed in order to prevent an oligarchic coup.


²⁸ This conclusion is an almost verbatim confirmation of the views expressed by Thucydides at 3.82.1–2.

that when, occasionally, two different ethnic groups were living side by side as citizens of the same polis, the result was civil war—just as has been the case in modern Europe. That happened sometimes in the colonies when the colonists came from different poleis. Ethnic homogeneity among the citizens of a polis and shared with citizens of neighbouring poleis must be contrasted with political disunity and discord both among the citizens of any polis—leading to stasis—and among citizens of neighbouring poleis—leading to polemos.
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Since Fustel de Coulanges (1864) 280–81 and passim it has commonly been claimed that religion was the dominant aspect of community life: (1) "the polis provided the central framework in which Greek religion operated"; (2) "in the world of the Greek cities the opposition between the sacred and the profane—which we assume to be fundamental in the area of religion—was either blurred or utterly irrelevant". Thus, (3) "religion provided the framework and the symbolic focus of the polis. Religion was the very centre of the Greek polis." In our opinion, this holistic view of the polis is skewed, and it is particularly the second and third propositions we find misleading.

Re (1) With one small addendum we are in agreement with the first proposition: “the polis came to provide the central framework in which Greek religion operated”. The Greek pantheon with its sanctuaries and cults was not invented by the polis; it was much older than the polis and taken over by the polis. When did that happen? A predominant view is that it happened early and that the polis emerged out of the activities connected with the building of temples and the communal organisation of religious festivals. There can be no denying that the rise of temple building and the emergence of the polis took place simultaneously, viz. in C8–C6, and the two phenomena were probably connected; but at the same time there is ample evidence of what must have been private cults during the Archaic period, family or clan cults are attested side by side with polis cults in the new sacred law from Selinous of C5f. Temple building by poleis is attested in the Archaic period, but we hear also about temples financed and built by private persons and families. In Archaic Athens all public priesthoods were filled for life from among members of the gene. The polis took over in the course of the Classical period, and an increasing number of priesthoods were filled from among all Athenians. The general picture is that when the polis emerged its organisation and control of religion was not particularly strong; it grew constantly in the course of the period and had become paramount in C4s.

Re (2) The opposition between the sacred and the secular is abundantly attested in our texts. It was a matter of life or death to a citizen whether or not the olive tree he had uprooted was a sacred one (Arist. Ath. Pol. 60.2), and there would be an unambiguous answer to the question. A clear distinction between sacred and public money is acknowledged in inscriptions (Migeotte (1998)), e.g. on C4–C3 bronze tablets from Lokroi Epizephyroi, all recording money which the polis borrowed from the sanctuary of Zeus Olympios and repaid to the sanctuary (Costabile (1992) 113–14). When in need of money, the polis could of course make a decision about what could be a compulsory loan of sacred money, but the loan had to be repaid to the gods in due time. There is no evidence that sacred money was “secularised” or “expropriated” by the polis (Linders (1975) 12–18). Again, when you had entered a temenos, you were treading on sacred ground, and certain activities did not take place on festival days, etc. To draw the line between the sacred and the secular was as easy—or, rather, as difficult—as it was in the Middle Ages and still is. There was, and has always

---

4 For the following, see Burkert (1992) and (1995).
7 The treasure of the Siphnians in Delphi (Hdt. 3.57.2); the stoa of the Athenians in Delphi (ML 25 (C5f)); the temple of Athena Nike in Athens (ML 44 (C5m)). Direct evidence is sparse but it is commonly believed that almost all temples were built by the community, i.e. in most regions mostly by the polis. See Morgan (1993) 19; Polignac (1995) 19–20; Nielsen (2002) 176–84.
8 The Kleomenes who “made” (ἐνέγραψε) the C6 temple for Apollo in Syracuse (IG xiv 1) may have been the patron who paid for the temple (Herrmann (1999) 100). The Alkmaionidai rebuilt the temple of Apollo in Delphi (Hdt. 5.62.2–63.1; Arist. Ath. Pol. 19.4); Themistokles built a shrine for Artemis Aristoboule in Athens (Plut. Them. 22.2–3); Xenophon erected a temple for Artemis at Skállous (Xen. An. 5.3.7–9). Some of these persons may have acted on behalf of their polis, but not the Alkmaionidai who were in exile, and probably not Xenophon who was a foreigner.
9 Hereditary groups of upper-class citizens, based on descent in the male line and apparently subdivisions of the phratria (Aeschin. 2.147; IG v 19 6 (C5f); Parker (1996) 56–66, 284–327). See 95 supra.
10 The first attested example is the priestess of Athena Nike (ML 44 (C5m)).
been, an overlap. Religion was indeed extremely important; almost every human act, including a meal, was introduced with a ritual (as it still was until our grandparents’ generation), but religion constituted one aspect only of polis life, and not necessarily the focal one, which was the polis as a community of politai. Both a battle and a general assembly were preceded in Antiquity by a sacrifice, in the Middle Ages by a prayer. Both rituals were important, but neither turned the battle or the assembly meeting into a sacred act like a procession during a festival.

Re (3) Both as a political and as a military organisation the Archaic and Classical polis was a male society from which women were excluded.13 Female citizens possessed citizen status and transmitted citizen status to their children, but they did not perform the political activities connected with citizenship. They were astai rather than politai.14 Religion was different. Here women took part in the rites and cults both of their household and of the polis itself (Just (1989) 23). There were some cults from which women were excluded,15 but similarly there were others from which men were excluded, e.g. the Thesmophoria.16 Most goddesses were served by priestesses rather than by priests (Holderman (1985) 299–330). In religion women were insiders, they joined in the performance of many rituals, and even possessed an official status (Kearns (1996b); Jones (1999) 123–33).

13 Vidal-Naquet (1983) 26; Bruhns (1994) 79–83. In almost all sources the exclusion of women from politics and armed forces is taken for granted, and therefore not explicitly prohibited. For Athens see the shocking idea “to hand over the polis to the women” and give them political rights (Ar. Eccl. 210) or to allow them to join in the defence of the polis (Pl. Resp. 450C–452C; Leg. 814C). The explicit exclusion of women from the pyrrhotis of the polis is attested, e.g., for Naukratis (Ath. 190A). Again, although there are numerous honorific decrees for women (e.g. IG xii 3, 36, Amorgos (C2)), it is extremely rare to find citizenship among the privileges bestowed on a female honorand. One example is the poet Aristodamas of Smyrna (C3). In Chalae she is honoured with prosernia, and her brother with politia (F. Delphi 211, 3145) but in Lamia she obtains in her own right both proserniai and politiai (SyII 552). Another example is the Molossians’ grant of citizenship to Philista, the wife of Antimachos, during the reign of Neoptolemos (C4) (SEG 15 384). For the extended rights and duties of women in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, see Bremen (1996). In C3–C1 they appeared as energeitai (Bremen (1996) 15–19) and performed liturgies (Bremen (1996) 25–30).

14 For aste, see SyI 1055.6–7 (Halkiarnassos (C3); Egypt. I. Metr. 333 (Naukratis)). The feminine form politis is sometimes used of females of citizen birth, see Arist. Pol. 1273b33, 1274b28; IG xii 2, 386.21 (Aigalee (C1)); IG v 2 288b.31 (politis apo genous, Mantinea (C3)); I.Kos 178.6 (Kos (C3)); Dem. 57.30 (Athens). For Athens, see Mosse (1985) and Jones (1999) 123–33. There is, we think, no attestation of politis signifying a female citizen exercising citizen rights. Queens, of course, are a case apart, as they have always been throughout history.

15 “Women were sometimes excluded from the cults of Poseidon, Zeus, and Ares, all emphatically masculine gods” (Parker (1985) 85). For the exclusion of women from the cult of Poseidon see, e.g., SyI 1024.9–1025.6, LSCG 96, Mykonos C2.200.

16 The most widespread Greek festival and the principal form of the Demeter cult, celebrated by (married) women of citizen status. See Burkert (1985) 242–46. Next, a sanctuary was sacerdotal and functioned as a place of refuge (Sinn (1993) 200). A person who escaped into a sanctuary or held on to an altar was protected against violence not only from his personal enemies, but also from officials. Even when the suppliants was a criminal, the punitive authority of the polis stopped at the threshold of the temple.17 But if the polis authorities violated the asylon, as sometimes happened, there was no one to punish them but the gods. These observations reveal two important aspects of Greek religion: on the one hand, polis religion was not necessarily the core of the polis. On the other hand, there was no institutionalised and organised religious sphere distinct from and, sometimes, opposed to the polis sphere. In the Greek world there was nothing like the mediaeval opposition between two competing power organisations: the Crown and the Church.

It is of paramount importance for our investigation that we have taken the political rather than the religious institutions to be the centre of the polis.18 If we had shared the view that religion was the centre of the polis, this inventory would have been organised differently. We would not have based our investigation on the ancient concept of the polis as a community of adult male politai united through their politeia, i.e. their political institutions; we would instead have started by listing Archaic and Classical temples, sanctuaries, divinities and communal cults, and then have treated the economic, social, political and military aspects of the polis as functions which derived their meaning and importance from the religion. Another result would have been that the emphasis on the urban aspect of the polis would have been toned down. While the political aspects of the polis were closely connected with the polis in the urban sense and concentrated in the city, sanctuaries were placed all over the territory and the opposition between polis and chora was of secondary importance in religion.

The essence of polis religion were prayers and animal sacrifice performed by priests at annual or monthly festivals organised by polis officials at public expense and attended

17 In c.632 Kylon attempted to set himself up as the tyrant of Athens. He escaped and his followers took refuge at an altar on the Acropolis. Although they were manifestly guilty of treason, it was considered a sacrilege and a pollution of the whole city when the Athenian archons had them dragged away from the altar and executed (Thuc. 1.126.10–11). The Spartan officials did not dare to have Pausanias killed in the temple of the goddess of the Brazen House (Thuc. 1.134.1–2).

18 In our endeavour to see religion as one aspect of the polis and not necessarily the predominant one, we follow Walter Burkert (1992) and (1995). With Moses Finley (1981) 23 we share the “insistence on the secular quality of public life” and with Oswyn Murray we share the view of the polis as an essentially rational community centred on its political institutions; see Murray (1990) 19–22, (2000) 241–42, and Hansen (1990) 215 n. 1, (1991) 63–64.
by all members of the community. The polis festivals were indeed the most spectacular aspect of Greek religion; but we must not forget that there were private cults as well, some performed by individuals, such as the cult of the dead, some by private organisations. It suffices here to mention an inscription from Halikarnassos in which a priestess is instructed to perform both private and public sacrifices, including a monthly sacrifice on behalf of the polis, for which she is paid one drachm by the polis. In any sanctuary many of the sacrifices were made, and many of the votive offerings donated, by individuals—both citizens and foreigners—and on their own initiative.

To conclude, polis religion was religion (a) used by the polis itself, or (b) organised by the polis, or (c) directly created by and related to the polis and its institutions. In fact, “polis religion” has conveniently been subsumed under those three headings (Burkert (1995) 202). Re (a): Every communal activity was accompanied by religious acts; thus a meeting of the people’s assembly in Athens was opened with a sacrifice, a prayer and a curse. Re (b): Both gods and heroes were worshipped publicly by the whole community in connection with the large festivals, which were organised by the polis and usually attended by all the polis’ inhabitants (not just the citizens). Re (c): As the polis developed, new cults were set up which were directly and specifically connected with the polis’ political institutions. In the council house there was, typically, a cult for Zeus or Athena with the epithet Boulaios (-aia). Similarly, abstract political concepts were sometimes deified: in Athens the democratic constitution was represented as a goddess, Demokratia, to whom the strategoi made annual sacrifices. Homonoia, Concord, was another personified deity worshipped in many poleis, though especially in the Hellenistic and Roman periods (Thérault (1996)). Deification of the polis itself, however, is unattested until the Hellenistic period, when, e.g., the sculptor Eutychides created the cult image of Antiocheia in the shape of Tyche with a turret crown on her head and her right foot on the river god Orontes (Balty (1981)). The closest we get to a cult of the polis as such is the public cult of Hestia, the goddess of the (public) hearth, placed in a building which in most poleis was called the prytaneion. The focus of the cult was a hearth with an eternal flame which was meant to symbolise the eternal life of the polis (Miller (1978)).

Although the polis was not defined, many poleis had a specific patron god or goddess; some of the poleis’ symbols were connected with its tutelary divinity, for example Poseidon with trident as shown on the coins of Poteidaia (no. 598) or on the shields of Mantinean hoplites; and the annual festival for the patron deity was one of the grandest. Whenever we have information about the protective divinity of a polis, it is recorded in the Inventory. The problem is that it is virtually impossible to set up a list of criteria by which one can identify the patron divinity of a polis; and the sources we have indicate that some poleis had no identifiable patron divinity, whereas others had several. To have one specific tutelary god for all aspects of the polis is, in fact, not easily compatible with the polytheism practised by the Greeks. The concept of the tutelary god or goddess seems to some extent to be a modern one. So, in principle, one ought to record all divinities attested for every single polis, including, of course, the cults of heroes. Especially in colonies where the oikistes could be turned into a hero, the hero cult of the oikistes was an important one. But to include all attested divinities of the Archaic and Classical periods and all their cults cannot be contained within the framework of this investigation. As in the case of magistrates or proxenoi or Panhellenic victors, it has been necessary to exemplify and to record major divinities only, including the specific protective divinity of the polis in question, if known. The result is here, as with all other parameters included in this investigation, that the material has to be very selective for large poleis for which several score of cults of divinities are known, and most comprehensive for very small poleis for which information about a sanctuary of a major divinity may be the only or one of the best pieces of evidence we have for the polis status of the community.

Furthermore, it is of course polis cults that are described in this Inventory. Sanctuaries and divinities specifically connected with communities above or below polis level are either briefly mentioned in the introduction or passed over in silence, except for the two crucially important sanctuaries at Olympia and Delphi of which brief descriptions have been incorporated. The concept of polis religion must

---

20 Aleshire (1994) discusses the distinction in Athens between state cults and private ones.
21 Syll. 1015, Halikarnassos (C3). It must of course be remembered that even private sacrifices were made at public shrines with the services of the public priest(es).
23 Aesch. 1.23 with scholia; Hansen (1987) 90.
24 McDonald (1943) 115, 132, 135–7, 167, 179, 200, 229–83.
26 e.g. IG xii 8 356 (C6) where Dionysos and Herakles are commemorated as the protectors (πόλεως φυλακαί) of the polis Thasos.
be taken seriously, and it must be taken into account that sanctuaries and cults of divinities did not constitute a distinguishing mark of a polis, something by which the polis differed from (a) smaller and (b) larger political units. Re (a): Erchia was an Attic deme, a civic subdivision of the Athenian polis. Yet, a sacrificial calendar of C4 lists cults of a score of divinities, including cults of Zeus Polieus and Athena Polias, to be performed sometimes on the Athenian Acropolis, sometimes on the acropolis of Erchia (SEG 21 541, 22 131). By contrast with, e.g., the Eleusinian mysteries, there is no indication that the rituals performed by the deme of Erchia were shared by all Athenians and formed part of the Athenian polis religion. Re (b): Thermos was the religious centre of Aitolia and since C4 of the Aitolian League, but Thermos was not a polis and the sanctuary of Apollo in Thermos was common to all Aitolians. If a communal cult had been evidence of polis status, both Thermos and Erchia should have been included in this inventory as poleis.

One further complication is the chronological limits of the Inventory, which in this case are particularly difficult to respect. This Inventory goes down to 323, but often the best or only source we have for the sanctuaries and divinities of a polis is a description found in Pausanias, in some scholia, or in late lexica. When can the information obtained from such sources be used as evidence of polis religion in the Archaic and Classical periods? Let us take Pausanias. He reports what he saw, i.e. the sanctuaries standing in the first half of the second century AD. Some of them can be dated by a historical reference connected with the shrine, or by the information that the sanctuary was adorned with a statue made by a named sculptor who can be dated to the period before 323. Sometimes Pausanias calls a temple old, but that is not enough to ensure that it had been erected in C4 or earlier and assigned to the specific divinity mentioned by Pausanias. External evidence can be crucial, e.g., if Pausanias’ testimony can be connected with the remains of a sanctuary of the Archaic and/or Classical periods, or, what is less convincing, with Archaic or Classical coins with types representing the divinity in question. The information found in scholia and lexica presents similar methodological problems, and in the majority of all cases we are unable to date the information we get. Nevertheless, on the assumption that religious beliefs and rituals are old and prone to persist unchanged for many centuries, the information in late sources about sanctuaries and divinities is not infrequently used as evidence for polis religion of the Archaic and Classical periods. Yet, the evidence we possess shows that religious beliefs and practices changed as rapidly, sometimes even more rapidly, than social and political institutions. Old cults were transformed, sometimes beyond recognition, and new cults were introduced. Therefore the use of Hellenistic and Roman sources to describe polis religion of the Archaic and Classical periods must be avoided unless the source is retrospective or can be associated with other sources which explicitly concern the period before 323. The repudiation of late sources entails that our lists of Archaic and Classical divinities and cults are rather short, much shorter than similar lists in, e.g., RE.

For the reasons outlined above, a person who wants to study the cults of, e.g., Artemis in the Archaic and Classical Greek world must not expect in this Inventory to find all or even most of the relevant cults. Only a selection of the divinities is recorded; especially the large poleis are under-represented, and only the major divinities are included in Index 17.

References

Bremen, R. van 1996. The Limits of Participation (Amsterdam).


Fustel de Coulanges, N. D. 1864. La Cité antique (Paris).


Linders, T. 1975. The Treasurers of the Other Gods in Athens and their Functions (Meisenheim am Glan).


McDonald, W. A. 1943. The Political Meeting Places of the Greeks (Baltimore).


——— 2000. "What is Greek about the polis?", Polis & Politics 231–44.


City Walls as Evidence for Polis Identity

The prevailing view among ancient historians and classical archaeologists is that defensive walls were not an essential aspect of the Archaic and Classical polis, either as a concept1 or as a physical phenomenon.2 According to the orthodoxy, very few poleis had a defence circuit in the Archaic period, and even in the Classical period many poleis were unfortified, most notably Sparta (no. 345) and Elis (no. 251).3

Our investigations suggest a different picture of the polis (see Index 23). We shall treat the concept of polis separately from what we know about individual walled poleis and start with the concept. In the Classical period the defence circuit was an essential, though not indispensable, element of the polis. According to Euripides, the wild Kyklopes lived in caves, not in a walled polis like civilised Greeks (Eur. Cyc. 115–18). In the introduction to his Histories Thucydides surveys the progress of civilisation in Hellas from the earliest settlements to the end of the Persian War, and one of the turning points is the transition from unwalled poleis lying inland (1.2.2, 5.1, 6.1) to coastal poleis protected by walls (1.7.1, 8.2). Thucydides dates the turning point to the period after King Minos’ thessalocracy but before the Trojan War. Similarly, Xenophon’s Sokrates imagines that the building of defence circuits round the polis is one of the changes that has happened since the Heroic period when Sinis, Skiron and Prokroustes were at large (Xen. Mem. 2.1.14). True, in Laws Plato prefers a polis without walls, like Sparta (Leg. 778D), but Aristotle points out that this is an extremely old-fashioned view and argues that the only sensible policy for a polis is to have walls (Pol. 1330b32–31a20).4

A survey of the defence capability of known poleis shows that the Greeks of the Classical period sided against Plato and took Aristotle’s advice. The Inventory includes 491 communities directly attested as poleis in Archaic and/or Classical sources (poleis type A). Of these, thirty-two are unlocated. Of the remaining 459 poleis, 261 are attested as fortified before the end of the Classical period, some by the remains of walls dated to the Archaic and Classical periods, others through direct or indirect references to walls in written sources, many through both types of evidence combined. Only four poleis are positively known to have been unfortified until the end of the Classical period: Delos (no. 478), Delphi (no. 177), Gortyns (no. 960) and Sparta (no. 345), whereas Elis (no. 251), Magnesia on the Maeander (no. 852) and Talleis (no. 941) were still unfortified in 400. Admittedly, for 186 poleis we have no explicit information. But thirty-two of these have remains of walls reported as undated. Future investigations may assign some of these walls to the Classical period. Of the cities included in our inventory “barely 10% have been investigated to any significant extent” (Morgan and Coulton (1997) 87) and the view that walls are not likely to disappear completely does not stand up to scrutiny. There are numerous instances of ancient walls of which not a stone is left, although in some cases travellers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries reported visible remains.5

There can be no denying that, even though a few poleis were still unfortalled, the Greeks of the Classical period thought of their polis as centred on a walled town. Today this view is gaining ground (Ducrey (1995) 251–55). What is still highly controversial is that the picture does not change significantly if we move back to the Archaic period. Again, we shall start with the concept and with our principal source for the Greeks’ conception of man and society: the Iliad and the Odyssey. In this context we do not have to take a position on the date of the Homeric poems. What we want to stress is that, in C6f and even earlier, the Iliad and Odyssey were undoubtedly recited in public as well as in private schools and had become an important part of the cultural baggage of the Greeks in all parts of the Hellenic world (Hymn. Hom. Ap. 172–73; Xenophanes fr. 11). The Homeric polis is protected by—and adorned with—steep walls and beautiful towers. Not only named cities are protected by walls, like Troy (II. 3.153ff), Thebes (II. 19.99) and Tiryns (II. 2.559). When the poet alludes to a polis in general, or a polis in fairyland, it is once again the walls that are the essential characterstic,

---

1 Starr (1957) 98; Nippel (1989) 1032.
3 See Lawrence (1979) 121.
4 See Winter (1971) 1–2.
5 The city walls of Tegea were seen by Béard in the 1890s, but today nothing is left; see Pfauth (1997) 49–51.
pressing his view reveals that others might prefer to describe expense of the urban sense, but the antithetical way of ex-
Here the personal sense of the word is emphasised at the
there are men capable of saving themselves” (Alc. fr. 426).
136
now been destroyed’” (fr. 391, PMG). In a lost
poems by Hesiod do not deal with warfare they have
are like a crown, cf. Anakreon: ‘the crown of the
poleis
is used metaphorically about the wall since the walls of the
Ol
Alkaios argues that a poleis is not just a town but a commu-
towers and gates were one of the most important charac-
tistic of the poleis as a town c.600. Thus, the defence circuit
was an essential aspect of the concept of the Archaic poleis.
How does this view fit with what we know about individual
walled poleis of C7 and C6?6
Excavated remains of city walls dated by external evi-
dence—i.e. walls associated with stratified datable ob-
jects—constitute the most securely dated category of walled
poleis of the Archaic period. No fewer than eleven poleis had
defence circuits associated with remains antedating 600,
and they include Smyrna (no. 867), Paphos (no. 1019), Ab-
dera (no. 640), Halieis (no. 349) and Megara Hyblaea (no.
36). Hill-top settlements are attested as well as settlements
on level ground, and the geographical distribution is con-
siderable. Remains of walls built in the period between 600
and 550 have been found in eighteen poleis from all over the
Mediterranean, including Eu(h)esperides in North Africa
(no. 1026), Massalia in France (no. 3) and Bouthrotos in
Epeiros (no. 90). Examples from Euboia (Eretria (no. 370))
and East Lokris (Halai (no. 386)) show that city walls were
not confined to colonies and other poleis in the periphery
of the Greek world. An additional twenty poleis have walls
that can be dated to the period 550–480/79 and they include
Istros in the Black Sea Area (no. 685) and more poleis in the
Greek homeland, such as Kalydon (no. 148), Ambrakia (no.
113), Argos (no. 347) and Thasos (no. 526). Thus, dating by
stratified objects provides us with evidence of altogether
forty-nine poleis enclosed by walls in the Archaic period.
The other category of archaeologically attested city walls
consists of remains which with some probability have been
dated to the Archaic period because of their construction
and masonry style. There are fifty-three defence circuits in
this group so that for altogether 102 poleis there are remains
of walls older than 480/79.
In addition to the archaeological evidence literary sources
provide us with information about fortified poleis of the
Archaic period, in most cases poleis exposed to a siege.
Almost all the evidence comes from Herodotos: four poleis
with walls antedating 550 can be listed, ten between 550
and 500, and finally twenty-three between 500 and 479. Ten
of these thirty-seven sites overlap with the forty-nine sites
where physical remains of walls have been found. So adding
the poleis attested as fortified in literary sources to those
whose fortifications are attested archaeologically, we reach
a total of 129 poleis attested as fortified in the Archaic period,
to which must be added an unknown number of Archaic
walls demolished and thus obliterated in the Classical and
Hellenistic periods because they had to be replaced by new
walls that enclosed a larger area.7
A survey of all the evidence, including the walls of the
Classical period, provides us with the following data. Of all
the 1,035 communities included as poleis in this Inventory,

6 The following section down to the cue for n. 7 is by Rune Frederiksen.
7 Unpublished dissertation by Rune Frederiksen.
166 are unlocated. Of the 869 located poleis, remains of walls of the Archaic and/or Classical periods are attested for 438, and a further ninety poleis are referred to in written sources as being fortified. Thus 60 per cent of all are explicitly attested as walled settlements. Furthermore, while altogether 222 of the poleis are attested in literary sources as fortified, no more than nineteen are attested as unfortified, and of these six are attested in later sources as fortified. On the other hand, not all poleis had a defence circuit protecting the entire settlement. A total of 101 poleis had both a fortified acropolis and a defence circuit enclosing the lower town. But at least sixty-nine poleis seem to have had a fortified acropolis only. In most cases the acropolis wall is older than the town wall, or the two walls are contemporary, but there are examples of acropolis walls that are built later than the town walls.

There can be no doubt that in C4 almost every polis had a teichos, at least one protecting the acropolis, and for a polis not to be protected by walls was both exceptional and regarded as old-fashioned. Not just in poetry but in reality, a defence circuit had become an indispensable aspect of the town, just as it was in the Middle Ages. But there is an important difference in the function: in the mediaeval town the sharp division between city and country began at the gates. They were guarded all the time and closed during the night. Furthermore, customs were often exacted on all goods which passed the gates. In ancient Greece, city walls were erected for defence purposes only; the gates were guarded in time of war (Aen. Tact. 28.1–4); but in peacetime, anyone could pass freely during the daylight hours, and though at night the gates were probably shut, they seem not to have been guarded, and people could still get in and out. The only evidence that customs were levied at the gates is a lexicographical note of doubtful value. If it can be trusted, the reference must be to imported goods on which duties were usually paid in the harbour, but occasionally at the gates if they had been brought to the city overland. It is unbelievable that anything was levied on produce brought into the city by citizens who worked their fields in the countryside but lived in the town. Thus, in contradistinction to what happened in the Middle Ages, the walls around an ancient Greek polis did not become a barrier between the town and its countryside, except in periods of war.
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What kind of urban centre did a Greek of the Classical period picture to himself when he heard the word polis? Modern historians’ immediate answer to this question is often restricted to quoting Pausanias’ reluctant classification of Panopeus as a polis in spite of the absence of administrative offices, a gymnasium, a theatre, an agora and a fountain house. But Pausanias’ account miss the mark by 500 years. If we focus on contemporary sources and want to avoid a too Athenocentric picture, the best we can do is to read Aineias the Tactician’s treatise, How to Survive under Siege. Aineias is a fourth-century author. Admittedly he writes in Attic Greek, but he was probably an Arkadian. Another important source is a long fragment of a periegesis by Herakleides of Crete in which Athens, Chalkis and Coris were described briefly. Herakleides is a Hellenistic author, but so early that we find it admissible to use his account as a source for the polis of the late Classical period. To these two texts which both treat the polis in the sense of town can be added scattered remarks and passages from literary and epigraphical sources of the Archaic and Classical periods. Finally, a particularly interesting passage from literary and epigraphical sources of the Archaic and Classical periods is found in the Pseudo-Aristotelian treatise Peri Kosmou (De Mundo) 400b15–20. This treatise was presumably written as late as the first century AD but “it contains much that is genuine Aristotelian doctrine” (Ross 1949: 11) and is therefore included here, with due caution, as a possible source for C4. A survey of the sources leads to the following sketch.

A polis (in the sense of an urban centre) was a town which was also the political centre of a polis (in the sense of a state), and there are very few attestations of an urban settlement which was called a polis without being the centre of a self-governing community. It follows that in most polis (in the sense of state) there was only one urban settlement which was called polis. Such a polis had a hinterland, called chorain the urban sense, and a polis lying on the coast would have a harbour, called limen or epimeion, often including an emporion, i.e. a special market for foreign trade. The port of a large inland polis could itself be a major urban settlement which occasionally was considered a polis in the urban sense, and could be a polis in the political sense too.

Almost all polis were enclosed by a circuit wall (supra 135) which in most cases must have been the line of demarcation between the polis (in the sense of town) and its chorain the sense of hinterland; see supra 137. But sometimes, even in polis with walls, the line of demarcation between polis and chorawas a boundary stone inscribed ἄρος πόλεως, which may have been placed outside the walls to demarcate a zone in which there was a ban on erecting houses.

Of the other urban settlements inside the territory of a large polis some were centres of civic subdivisions, but some were just centres of habitation and local trade without any political institutions at all. Some of the larger polis, however, succeeded in dominating or subduing some of the
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The Polis as an Urban Centre

This chapter is an updated and revised version of Hansen (2000a) 154–56.


2 See the excellent description of the "Durchschnittspolis" by Winterling (1995) 205–11.


4 In the MS he is called κριτικός, which Müller for no obvious reason changed into κριτικός, so he was probably from Crete; see Pfister (1951). We quote the text of K. Müller in GGM 1 97–106.

5 The passage has no mention of a gymnasium, perhaps the most important public building in a Hellenistic polis, and that may indicate that it goes back to C4.

6 For the very few possible exceptions, altogether 20 out of 384 attestations, see Hansen (2000b) 195–202 and supra 34.


8 Thuc. 2.71.3, 3.106.2; Xen. Hell. 5.2.4; Syll. 37–8 B.15 (C3), Teos (no. 868).

9 Aen. Tact. 8.2; Thuc. 3.72–3; Arist. Pol. 1323b32f; Ps.-Skylax 13, 34, etc.; IG IX2 717.4 (C3), Chaleion (no. 159).

10 Arist. Pol. 1327b32f; Hellen. fr. 75; Theopomp. fr. 53; Thuc. 1.30.2, 2.84–5.

11 Aigion (no. 358) Dem. 23.211; Athenai (no. 361) IG i 1 1011A & B (C3m); Bosporos – Pantikapaion (no. 690) Dem. 34.34; Byzantium (no. 674) Theopomp. fr. 62; Chalkis (no. 365) HeracL Cret. 28; Histiaeia (no. 372) IG xii 9 i.186.29 (C3a); Corinth (no. 227) Thuc. 1.13.5; Miletos (no. 854) Milet. 140.3.32 (C3m); Phasis (no. 711) Hippoc. De Aere Aquis et Locis 16; Rhodes (no. 1001) Dem. 56.47; and Salamis on Cyprus (no. 1020) Isoc. 9.47. See Hansen (forthcoming).

11 e.g. Skandeia, the port of Kythera (no. 336), called polis in the urban sense at Thuc. 4.54.1; Hansen (1995) 43–44 and (2000b) 195–96.

12 Naoulochos (no. 857), the port of Priene, is called a polis in the sense of L’Priene l.6 but seems to have been a polis in the political sense too; see Hansen (1995a) 44. For Notion (no. 858), the port of Kolophon, see supra 92.

13 ἄρος πόλεως (SEG 48 1140 (C4s)), Paros (no. 599), Hansen (1996) 37 with n. 147. For alternative interpretations, see Matthaiou (1992–98) and BE (1999) 420 (ν. 147) and the references of ancient authors; see supra 92.

14 Poliartikos (SEG 48 1140 (C4s)); Paros (no. 599), Hansen (1996) 37 with n. 147. For alternative interpretations, see Matthaiou (1992–98) and BE (1999) 420 (ν. 147) and the references of ancient authors; see supra 92.

15 e.g. Soloygia (Thuc. 4.42.1–2), Asai and Maussos (Theopomp. fr. 173), all in the territory of Corinth. There is no evidence that Corinthian konnai were organised as civic subdivisions. See Hansen (1995b) 61–71; Gschmitter (1991) 429, 434f.
neighbouring poleis, and if these dependencies were allowed to persist as poleis in the political sense, their urban centre would also be called a polis.\textsuperscript{16}

Even very small poleis seem to have had a four-digit number of inhabitants,\textsuperscript{17} and the population of a polis was often so numerous that the inhabitants did not know one another.\textsuperscript{18}

As a town the polis was first of all a centre of habitation, and through excavation or survey archaeologists have come to distinguish between two different types of nucleated settlement: (A) a small settlement, often placed on an eminence, which was extended downhill and grew to become a proper town, and (B) a cluster of closely set villages which eventually were merged into a conurbation with a defence circuit enclosing the entire settlement.\textsuperscript{19} In towns of type (A) the eminence (acropolis) was often walled and clearly distinguished from the habitation quarters below.\textsuperscript{20}

The acropolis was sometimes reserved for sanctuaries and other public buildings,\textsuperscript{21} but sometimes had room for habitation as well.\textsuperscript{22} To have an acropolis was not a characteristic confined to poleis of type (A). Many poleis of type (B) possessed a proper acropolis close to or as a part of the conurbation: e.g. Corinth (no. 227), Argos (no. 347) and Athens (no. 361).

The most urgent need of the polis as a habitation centre was a sufficient supply of fresh water, and as a specific type of public architecture many poleis were adorned with one or more fountain houses where the inhabitants could supplement the water drawn from wells in private houses.\textsuperscript{23}

Every polis was divided into publicly owned quarters, used for walls, streets, harbours, and all kinds of public architecture, some of it monumental, as against privately owned habitation quarters, used for (mostly) fairly simple family houses.\textsuperscript{24} Mansions and palaces were virtually unknown before the late Classical and Hellenistic periods, and that goes even for poleis governed by a tyrant.\textsuperscript{25} Instead of the dichotomy between public and private space we sometimes meet a tripartition into sacred (hieron), public (demesion) and private (idion) space, or, alternatively, a primary distinction between private and public space is supplemented with a subdivision of public space into sacred and profane.\textsuperscript{26}

Habitation quarters were often irregular with crooked streets and haphazardly arranged houses, but in the Classical period an astonishing number of towns had adopted the centralised planning of streets and habitation quarters which erroneously has been ascribed to Hippodamos of Miletos, the C5 architect of the Peiraieus (Martin (1974) 221–52). To have a town organised in accordance with a rigid plan can be traced back to the colonies founded by the Greeks in Sicily in C8l.\textsuperscript{27} And during the Archaic and Classical periods a constantly growing number of poleis, first outside and later in Hellas itself, were organised in accordance with a rectangular street plan. But even more important than having the streets laid out in rectangular fashion was the habit of having the rectangular blocks framed by the streets subdivided into lots of equal size, mostly eight or ten or twelve lots per block, and standardising the houses constructed on the lots;\textsuperscript{28} they were a kind of ancient terrace houses not too far removed from what is known from some parts of some modern European cities. The degree of town planning and rationalisation practised in the so-called Hippodamian poleis was as astonishing as the degree of planning and rationalisation practised in the artificial subdivision of the citizen body into, e.g., phylai, phratrai and hektostyes, etc. (Murray (1997)), or as astonishing as the rigorous planning and rationalisation practised in the

\textsuperscript{16} Helisson (no. 273), a dependency of Mantinea, is called polis in the urban sense at SEG 37 340.6–7. Mykalessos (no. 212) a dependency of Tanagra (or, perhaps, Thebes), is called polis in the urban sense at Thuc. 7.29.3.

\textsuperscript{17} Even the tiny polis of Koresia (no. 493) seems to have had 1,000 inhabitants, and the urban population of Plateiai (no. 216) must have totalled 2,000; cf. Hansen (1997) 27–28. Several poleis, however, can have had no more than some 100 inhabitants, e.g. Chorsiai (no. 202). For two different, but not very different guesses of the Boiotian urban population, see Bintliff (1997) and Hansen (1997) 62–63.


\textsuperscript{19} This typology was invented and developed by Snodgrass (1987–89) 56–64 and (1990) 130–31. Examples of type (A) are Aleiptra (no. 230), Agion (no. 231), Eretria (no. 370) and Halartos (no. 206, the one selected by Snodgrass as a typical example of type A). Examples of type (B) are Argos (no. 347), Athenai (no. 361), Sparta (no. 345) and Thebsiai (no. 222, the one selected by Snodgrass as a typical example of type B); see also Morgan and Coulton (1997) 124.

\textsuperscript{20} e.g. in Thebes (no. 222); cf. Symeoneoglous (1985) 117–22. For attestations of a separately walled acropolis, see Index 23.

\textsuperscript{21} Orchoimenos in Arkadia (no. 286); see Osborne (1987) 118–19. Cf., however, Jost (1999b) 240 n. 51.

\textsuperscript{22} As, e.g., in Thebes, see Fossey (1988) 204.

\textsuperscript{23} Crouch (1995). On fountain houses see Wycherley (1967) 198–209. Famous fountain houses are known from Megara (no. 225); Corinth (no. 227); Phigalia (no. 292), still used; Athens (no. 361) and Olynthos (no. 508).


\textsuperscript{26} Tripartition: IG v.2 64.37–42 (Tegea); subdivision of public space into sacred and profane: Arist. Pol. 1330b9–46; Diod. 14.41.6 (Syarakoussai), see Hansen (1997) 13.

\textsuperscript{27} Fischer-Hansen (1996).


Apart from being a centre of habitation, the polis was a centre of (a) political institutions, (b) cults, (c) defence, (d) industry and trade, and (e) education and entertainment.

Re (a) As a political centre the polis accommodated all the central political institutions and the buildings in which they resided (Index 2.4): a prytaneion, a bouleuterion, and a number of archeia. For some unknown reason dikasteria are only exceptionally mentioned in our sources. Only a few polis had a separate ekklēsiasterion. In the Archaic period a meeting of the assembly, called agora, was presumably held in the agora. In Classical sources there are quite a few references to assemblies of the people being held in the theatre, and the agora was no longer seen as the obvious political centre of the polis where assemblies were held, but the prytaneion, the bouleuterion, a dikasterion or a stoa with offices of magistrates were often placed in the agora or next to the agora. In the Archaic and Classical periods almost all the public political buildings were small and undistinguished, and monumental political architecture began to appear only in C4.38

Re (b) As a centre of public cult the polis housed a number of sanctuaries, some with monumental buildings such as temples and theatres. Until a generation ago the prevailing view was that almost all the major public sanctuaries were erected within the walls of the polis, and that the temples were typically placed on the acropolis. This view has been considerably modified in two respects: (a) many of the major sanctuaries were extra-urban and often situated right on the threshold to the territory, almost as a demarcation of the territory. (b) As time went on, new cities had their urban sanctuaries interspersed between the habitation blocks and no longer erected on the acropolis. Sanctuaries of Athena, Apollo and Aphrodite are typically found inside the walls, whereas sanctuaries of Zeus, Demeter, Hera and Poseidon are often situated in the hinterland. Correspondingly, festivals connected with the urban sanctuaries were celebrated in the polis, whereas festivals for the gods who had their temples in the countryside were celebrated in the chora.47

All the remains of Archaic and Classical buildings show that monumental architecture was sacred architecture, and all written sources confirm that the archaeological evidence presents a true, not a skewed, picture of what monumental architecture was in the Archaic and Classical Greek world. According to Thucydides (1.10.2) the edifices to be admired by posterity are the temples. Again, when the Athenians denounce the destruction of Athens during the Persian invasion, it is the burning of the temples on the Acropolis for which they seek retribution (Lycurg. 1.81; Plut. Per. 17.1). Setting prestigious public against plain private architecture, Demosthenes speaks of temples as opposed to houses owned by the political leaders of the preceding century (Dem. 3.25–26). And listing the monumental buildings in Athens he mentions the Propylaia, the Parthenon, the stoa and the docks but makes no reference to the Pnyx, the bouleuterion, the dikasterion or the prytaneion (Dem. 22.76, cf. 23.207). Almost all polis must have had at least one monumental temple, and to have a temple can be seen as a characteristic of a polis, although not one by which a polis could be distinguished from other types of settle-

43 Polignac (1995) 21–25, 33–41. 44 Martin (1991) 253–55. 45 Schachter (1992). 46 Aen. Tact. 10.4. 47 Aen. Tact. 17.1. 48 Greek "monumental" buildings have the following characteristics: (1) they are built by the public (the polis) and for public use (Coulson (1977) 17–18). (2) They require an architect as opposed to a builder (ibid. 15–17). (3) They are grander than necessary for their purpose: including the forecourt the bouleuterion at Miletus covered 2,100 m2 and the auditorium itself could accommodate 1,200–1,500 persons, but most councils had fewer than 500 members, and Massalia and Kroton are exceptional in having had 600 (Strabo 4.1.5) and 1,000 (Val. Max. 8.12.15, ext.1) respectively. (4) They are of fine materials and distinguished workmanship: when the temple of Apollo at Delphi was rebuilt after the fire of 548, the Alkmionidai paid for having marble substituted for limestone (Hdt. 5.62.3). (5) They are often embellished with ornaments, e.g., fluted columns crowned by capitals, sculptured metopes and akroteria, etc. (6) They are expensive and labour-intensive. Some types of public building for which architects were often used were of ordinary local limestone, completely undecorated and in no way larger than necessary. Nevertheless they must have been so costly and so time-consuming to construct that by this criterion alone they deserve to be called "monumental". City walls (Arist. Pol. 13312) and theatres (Diod. 16.83.3) are obvious examples.
ment. There was of course a world of difference between many of the peripteral temples in the Greek homeland and the simple temples in antis in many of the colonies in the Pontic region. But there was a similar difference between the fairly distinguished private houses in Miletos and the dug-outs built by the colonists in Olbia.

Re (c) As a centre of defence the polis was a town whose walls could protect its inhabitants as well as the rest of the population. Walls are an essential aspect of the polis, and inside the walls was enough open space to accommodate the rural population for as long as the enemy occupied and pillaged the countryside.50 Protracted warfare might lead to a siege of the polis and sometimes to its conquest, either by being betrayed by insiders or by being stormed or by beingstarved into surrender. Since military events loom large in ancient historiography, the defence aspect of the polis is particularly well attested in our literary sources. The army was made up of the citizens each of whom owned his own weapons, and, Sparta excepted, there were probably no barracks and no arsenals before the Hellenistic period, nor barracks and no arsenals before the Hellenistic period, or a hippodromos,52 often connected with a gymnasium,53 and drama, performed in the theatre.54 In the Archaic and early Classical periods both the gymnasium (with palaistra, stadion and hippodromos)55 and the theatre56 were simple constructions which in most poleis have left no traces whatsoever, but all three types of building were monu-

Re (d) As an economic association the centre of the polis was the agora,55 the epicentre was often a harbour, and in sources dealing with the economy of the polis, the agora and the limen are often juxtaposed.56 Every polis had an agora,57 which in Archaic and early Classical towns was just an open square marked off with horoi.56 A polis might have an emporion, i.e. a market reserved for foreign trade.59 In the Classical period all traces of the agora as an assembly place have vanished, and the agora was now primarily the market-place. Shops and booths were erected, many of a temporary nature.59 An agora was often adorned with a stoa (see Index 25).60 Later and especially in poleis with a grid plan, the agora was flanked with two or even three stoas,62 some of which were used for shops.63

Re (e) As a centre of education and entertainment the polis was the place where the schools for children were found.64 The more advanced education of adults was often connected with the gymnasia,65 which, however, were primarily centres for sport and military training.66 In the Archaic and early Classical periods gymnasia were usually placed outside the polis,67 but in the course of the late Classical and Hellenistic periods the gymnasium was moved inside the walls and became perhaps the most important public building housing what was now the most important institution in the polis, viz. the ephebeia.

Of entertainments, often connected with the major religious festivals, the two most spectacular types were competitions in sport, conducted in a palaistra,67 a stadion68 or a hippodromos,69 often connected with a gymnasium,70 and drama, performed in the theatre.71 In the Archaic and early Classical periods both the gymnasium (with palaistra, stadion and hippodromos)72 and the theatre73 were simple constructions which in most poleis have left no traces whatsoever, but all three types of building were monu-

59 Dem. 18.186.
60 Xen. Hell. 5.2.29 (Thebes). See Kuhn (1985).
61 Herod. Cret. 23 (Anthemion).
62 Herod. Cret. 28 (Chalkis).
63 IG XII.2.14; cf. SEG 26 878, 34 850 (C46), Mytilene (no. 798); see Coulton (1976) 10–11.
64 Thuc. 7.29.5, Mykalesos (no. 212); Hdt. 6.27.2, Chios (no. 840); Paus. 6.9.6 (492), Astypalaea (no. 476).
65 Pl. Euthyd. 271C; Theophr. Char. 5.7.
66 Xen. Hell. 3.4.16–18; Ages. 1.26–27, Ephesos (no. 844).
67 Aen. Tact. 23.6; I.Cret. iv 64, Gortyns (no. 960); Herod. Cret. 1, Athenai (no. 396); Xen. Hell. 3.2.27, Elis (no. 251); Xen. Hell. 3.2.25, Thebai (no. 221).
68 Hel. Cret. 28, Chalkis (no. 365); Arist. Oc. 1346v18, Byzantion (no. 674).
69 e.g. SEG 27 261 (gymnasianarchal law from Berotra C2); cf. Delorme (1960) 93–230.
70 See Sammelbuech. 30 no. 355, a fourth-century inscription from Naukratis (no. 1023) in which two named persons dedicate a palaistra to Apollo.
71 Alexis fr. 272. See Index 25.
72 A hippodrome is attested already in Hom. Il. 23.330, but not again until 8.23.8, Aesch. 3.8.8, Tarnynai; Dem. 47.53, 76; Xen. Hipp. 3.1.3, Athens (no. 361); Xen. Hell. 3.4.16, Ephesos (no. 844); Xen. Hell. 6.5.30, Sparta (no. 345); Pl.Crit. 197C (Atlantis).
73 Ant. 3.8.3.
74 The oldest attestations of theatres in Greek literature are Hdt. 6.67.3, Sparta (no. 345) and Thuc. 8.93.3 (Mounicha in Peireaia).
75 Muller-Wiener (1968) 166–68.
76 The only known Archaic theatres are those in Metapontion (no. 61): phase I: Cyl; phase II: Cyl; phase III: 500–475, and in Thorkos (phase I: 525–480). Cyl theatres have been found in Argos (no. 347); Athenai (no. 361), Chaireneia (no. 201), Ikarios, Isthmia, Corinth (no. 227) and Syrakousai (no. 47). See Frederiksen (2002).
mentalised in the course of the late fifth and fourth centuries.

Summing up, how did the polis change between c.600 and c.320? A circuit of walls became an almost indispensable part of the polis, and one which in Aristotle’s opinion was a major adornment of the city. Apart from the defence circuit, temples were virtually the only type of monumental architecture worth mentioning down to the end of the Archaic period. Theatres with a stone kaiolon began to be constructed in the fifth century only and, with a few notable exceptions, political architecture was not monumentalised until the Hellenistic Age. Remains of gymnasia, stadia and hippodromes tell the same story. They are conspicuous by their absence until the late fifth century, but became impressive monumental buildings during the Hellenistic period. From an architectural point of view, however, the most dramatic change of the polis seems to have been in the layout and construction of private houses. A growing number of poleis were organised in accordance with a rectangular street plan, but even more important is that the rectangular blocks framed by the streets were subdivided into lots of equal size, mostly eight or ten or twelve lots per block, and the houses constructed on the lots were also standardised; they were a kind of ancient terrace houses. A crucial problem is to what extent and how the town planning was organised by the polis in the sense of a political community; but that is a problem which has to be further investigated.
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In the Hellenic world in the Archaic and Classical periods most coins were struck by *poules* (see Index 26). How do we know? (a) In the written sources there are general statements that striking coins was one of the tasks incumbent on a *polis* (Pl. Resp. 371B; Arist. Mag. mor. 1194b18–25). (b) From other sources we obtain information about mints of individual communities explicitly attested as *poules* (Dem. 24.212–14, Athens; IG xii.2i (C5s), Mytilene and Phokaia; Syll. 2 218.14–15 (C5f), Olbia). (c) The majority of all Greek coins of the Archaic and Classical periods can be ascribed to communities which in contemporary written sources are explicitly called *poules*, e.g. the C5s silver drachms from Taras inscribed *TAPANTINΩΝ* compared with Thuc. 6.44.2: τῶν πόλεων . . . Τάραντος (infra 299, 302). Taras is a straightforward example; there are many like it, but it may be difficult and sometimes even impossible to ascribe a coinage to a known community or to identify this community as a *polis*.

Initially we shall set aside the anepigraphic coins and concentrate on those which carry a legend.1 Legends on Archaic and Classical Greek coins fall into the following groups: (a) an ethnic usually in the genitive plural, sometimes in the nominative singular; (b) the ktetic form of the ethnic, usually in the neuter singular; (c) a toponym either in the genitive or in the nominative; (d) the name of a person; (e) the name of a god or a hero, usually together with a representation of the divinity in question; (f) symbols indicating date or denomination; (g) miscellaneous other terms conveying a message to the user of the coin. The legends may be spelled out, but often they are abbreviated, and the different types can be illustrated as follows.

Re (a) Examples of the ethnic in the genitive plural are *AIONIAON*, C5f (Head, HN2 291); *AMO(PΩΩΝ)*, C4f (Head, HN2 481); *BOIΩΩΝ*, c.338–315 (Head, HN2 352); *EYBOI(ΕΩΝ)*, C4f (Head, HN2 362); *KATANAION*, c.400 (Head, HN2 134); *KAΣΩΩΝ*, C4f (Head, HN2 461); *ΝΑΓΙΩΝ*, C5f (Head, HN2 725); *NEΠΙΟΛΩΤΕΩΝ* (Rutter, HN3 70); *ΣΤΥΜΦΑΛΩΝ*, C4f (Head, HN2 454); *ΦΩΚΕΩΝ*, C4m (Head, HN2 339); *ΧΑΙΚΙΔΕΩΝ* (in Thrace), C4f (Head, HN2 209). Nominative singular forms are NEA-

ΠΟΛΙΤΗΣ (Rutter, HN3 68); ΡΗΓΙΝΟΣ, or ΡΕΓΙΝΩ, C5l-C4e (Head, HN3 187–91). For an occasional nominative plural form, see *POΔΙΟΙ* (Babelon, Traité ii.2 1015).

Re (b) Examples of the ktetic form of the ethnic are *APKADIKON*, C5 (Head, HN2 448); *ΟΛΥΝΠΙΚΟΝ*, C5e (Head, HN2 420); *ΕΠΡΟΝΙΚΟΣ* or *ΕΠΡΩΝΙΚΟΣ* (Makedonian tribe), C5e (Head, HN2 202); *ΘΕΣΠΙΚΟΝ*, C4f (Head, HN2 354); *ΝΑΓΙΔΙΚΟΝ*, C5l (Head, HN2 725), cf. Babelon, Traité ii.1 890–95; *ΝΕΟΠΟΛΙΤΙΚΟΝ* (Rutter, HN3 68).

Re (c) Examples of the toponym in nominative or genetic are *ΑΡΚΑΓΑΣ* or *ΑΡΚΑΓΑΝΤΟΣ*, C6s-C5f (Head, HN2 120); *ΔΙΚΑΙΑ* (in Thrace), C5m (Head, HN2 252); *ΖΑΚΥΝΘΟΣ*, C5s-C4f (Head, HN2 429); *ΛΑΚΥΩΝ* (in France), C4 (Head, HN2 6); *ΝΕΠΙΟΛΩΣ* (Rutter, HN3 68); *ΡΕΓΙΩΝ*, C5e (HN3 187).

Re (d) A personal name, either in the nominative, or in the genitive, or in a prepositional phrase, is mostly the name of a mint official, often abbreviated. Occasionally it may be the name of the engraver. In other cases it is the name of a ruler or a general or a mercenary leader. Examples are *ΕΠΙ ΔΕΜΟΚΡΙΤΟΣ* on C5s coins from Abdera (Head, HN2 254), a mint official who is perhaps identical with the pre-Socratic philosopher Demokritos of Abdera. For names of engravers, see *ΕΥΑΙΝΕΤΟ* on some Syracusan coins of C5f (Guarducci (1974) 532). In most cases names of mint officials and engravers are easily distinguished from names of rulers and mercenary leaders. Examples of such names are *ΟΛΥΜΠΙΟΝ*, or *ΟΛΥΜΠΙΟΝ*, rev. *ΜΑ* on C5f coins of Magnesia on the Maiandros struck by Themistokles in exile (Head, HN3 581); *ΠΑΥΣΑΝΙΑ* and *ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ* on coins struck by King Pausanias of Makedonia in 390–389 and by Philip II in 360–336 (Head, HN2 221–22); *ΜΑΥΣΩΛΕΟΣ* on coins struck by Mausolos in 377–353 (Head, HN3 629); *ΟΛΥΜΠΙΟΝ*, rev. *ΟΝΥΜΑΡΧΟΥ* or *ΦΑΛΑΙΚΟΥ* on coins struck by these Phokian generals during the Third Sacred War (Head, HN2 339); rev. *ΔΙΩΝΙΣΟΣ* and *ΖΑ* on coins perhaps struck by Dion of Syracuse on Zakynthos preparing his campaign against Dionysios II of Syracuse in 357 (Head, HN3 430).

---

1 For a full study, see Guarducci (1969) 615–705; (1974) 530–39.
Re (e) Names of gods or heroes are often added to a picture of the deity to ensure identification. On some C4 coins of Herakleia in Loukania we find ΑΘΑΝΑ with head of Athena in Corinthian helmet (Head, HN² 72). On C4 coins of Larisa is the legend ΑΛΕΥΑ with the head of Aleuas, the eponymous ancestor of the Aleuadai (Head, HN² 299). Sometimes it is a matter of interpretation whether a name is the name of a god or a toponym. The legend ΑΚΡΑΓΑΣ alongside the head of young Akragas on some C4 bronze coins must be the name of the river-god (Head, HN² 123); but ΑΚΡΑΓΑΣ or ΑΚΡΑΓΑΝΤΟΣ together with the eagle must designate the homonymous town (Head, HN² 123), and that shows, once again, that the toponym of a town was often used synonymously with the city-ethnic to denote the political community and not just its urban centre (supra 56).

Re (f) Examples of denominations are TTT = tritertarmorion, H = hemiobol on coins of Kraniòi on Kephallenia from c.400 (Head, HN² 427); ΟΒΟΛΟΣ on C5–C4 coins of Metapontion (Rutter, HN³ 1639–40). Rare examples of a date on a coin are all later than the Classical period.

Re (g) Various other legends include, e.g., ΟΙΚΙΣΤΑΣ (C48), referring to Heralkes as the founder of the polis of Kroton (Head, HN² 98); ΔΑΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑΣ (C4), referring to the constitution of the island of Telos (Head, HN² 642); ΣΥΝΧΙΚΟΝ, referring to an alliance of anti-Spartan poleis 394–386 (Kraay 1976 248).

Moving from a survey of the different kinds of legend to a survey of the communities which had a mint, we can establish the following list of authorities attested as striking coins: (1) poleis, (2) ethne, sub-ethne and islanders inhabiting multipole islands, (3) federations, (4) amphiktyonies, (5) alliances, (6) rulers, (7) generals and mercenary leaders, and (8) sanctuaries. All the examples added above belong in one of these categories. Some may be placed in two of the categories simultaneously.

Re (i) Attested poleis among the examples added above are Akragas, Dikaia, Katane, Knosos, Nagidos, Neapolis, Stymphalos, Rhegion, Thespiai and Zakynthos (a monopole island).

Re (2) The Ainians were an ethnos living to the south of Thessaly, and the Parrhasians an Arkadian sub-ethnos; the Euboians and the Amorgians were inhabitants of a multipole island.

Re (3) In C5l–C4e the Boiotians, the Phokians and the Chalkidians in Thrace were organised as confederations. It should be noted that ethnic groups (2) can only be distinguished from federations (3) when we have external evidence about the political organisation of the community in question. Thus, the C5 triobols and obols inscribed ΑΡΚΑΘΙΚΟΝ may testify to a certain co-operation between the various Arkadian communities, but an Arkadian Federation was set up only after the battle of Leuktra in 371 (Nielsen 1996). The ΑΡΚΑΘΙΚΟΝ triobols and obols may have been a festival coinage connected with the Panhalkadian Games in honour of Zeus Lykaiais, or a coinage issued by Tegea. In the first case it also belongs in group (8) infra, in the second case also in group (1) supra.

Re (4) The coins inscribed ΑΜΦΙΚΤΥΟΝΩΝ were struck, probably in Delphi, by the council of the Amphiktyonic League in the years after the Third Sacred War (Head, HN² 342).

Re (5) A number of coins from the Propontic region and the coast of Asia Minor have obv. the child Heralkes strangling two snakes; legend: ΣΥΝ, an abbreviated form of either ΣΥΝΜΑΧΩΝ or ΣΥΝΣΗΜΑΧΗΣ. On the reverse are the types and legends of the members of the alliance. They were struck either in 404 (Ashton 1993 9) or, rather, in the years 394–386 by an anti-Spartan alliance of Greek poleis (Kraay 1976 248). The common obverse shows that they were alliance coins, the different reverses that they were struck by a number of communities, all attested as poleis in other sources, viz. Byzantion, Ephesos, Iasos, Knidos, Kyzikos, Rhodos and Samos. For a Sicilian ΣΥΘΙΚΩΝ coinage connected with Timoleon, see infra 148.

Re (6–7) Pausanias and Philip II were kings, Themistokles and Mausolos were satraps, Onomarchos, Phalaikos and Dion were generals and mercenary leaders. The coins issued by the kings of Makedonia were common to all the poleis and regions over which the king ruled. And the coins of Onomarchos and Phalaikos were legal tender in all the Phokian poleis. But the coins struck by Themistokles have on the reverse ΜΑ, which indicates that it was also a polis coinage, viz. of Magnesia.

Re (8) The staters with the legend ΟΛΥΜΠΙΚΟΝ were probably struck in C6l-C5e for use at the Olympic Games (Babelon, Traité ii. i. 887–90). C4s coins inscribed ΕΚ ΔΙΑ- ΔΥΜΩΝ ΙΕΡΩΣ were issues of the sanctuary of Apollo at Didyma in the territory of Miletos (Head, HN² 585).
issuing authorities may have been Elis and Miletos, respectively, cf. infra 498 and 1083.

Is it possible to isolate coins struck by poleis from coins struck by ethne, or multipoliate islands, or federations, or amphictyonies, or rulers, or mercenary leaders, or sanctuaries? This question can be answered in the affirmative if we take a closer look at the coins inscribed with ethnic.

As pointed out 59 supra, we can distinguish between three different types of ethnic: (1) regional ethnics (ethnics denoting, in the singular, a person and, in the plural, a people inhabiting a region), (2) city-ethnics (ethnics denoting, in the singular, a person and, in the plural, a people inhabiting a polis and its hinterland), and (3) sub-ethnics (ethnics denoting, in the singular, a member of a civic subdivision and, in the plural, the members of a civic subdivision, be it a phyle or a phratria, or a patra, or a hekatostys, or a kome, or a demos).

First, not one single coin of the Archaic and Classical periods is inscribed with a sub-ethnic, such as the Hylleis of a Doric community, or a gentilician group ending in -idai, be it a phratria or a patra or some other group. Nor is any demos or kome attested as having its sub-ethnic on a coin. In the older numismatic literature, including Head’s HN, there are a four examples of coins allegedly struck by a civic subdivision and inscribed with a sub-ethnic. But one of the examples was later discarded as a misinterpretation, another is a puzzle to which there is no answer yet, and in the two remaining cases the issuing authority was in fact not a civic subdivision but a polis.

(1) Under cities of Lesbos, Head, HN² 559 lists a bronze coin of C₄: obv. head of Athena, rev. female head with sphendone, legend: AIΠI. Head notes that, according to Strabo 12.2.2, Aigeiros was a κώμη between Methymna and Mytilene. The coin has no known provenance, and Mason (1993) 243 comments that “the supposed coins of Aigeiros are, we suppose, a phantom . . . consisting of a single bronze with the inscription AIΠI, which could just as easily be assigned to Aigeira in Achaia, Aigina or Aigion”. Thus, we do not have to assume that AIΠI is an abbreviated form of a sub-ethnic denoting a kome.

(2) Some rare billion coins of C₅f have with good reason been assigned to Lesbos. They are inscribed KΙΘΙ (Head, HN² 560, infra 1018). Yet no attested Lesbian toponym fits this legend. The coins may have been struck by a Lesbian polis which disappeared in C₅f and has not left any other trace. In any case, there is no evidence that the coins were minted by any Lesbian second-order settlement we know of.

(3) A C₄–C₃ issue of bronze coins has obv. Triptolemos in winged car drawn by snakes, rev. pig standing on Eleusinian bakchos; legend: ΕΛΕΥΣΙΩ and, on one coin, ΑΘΕ (Head, HN² 391; SNG Cap. Attica 414–19). According to Kroll and Walker (1993) 26–28 the legend is not an abbreviated form of the sub-ethnic ΕΛΕΥΣΙΩ(ΝΙΑΚΩΝ), and the coin inscribed ΑΘΕ reveals that they were struck by the Athenian mint for the festival of the Mysteries, not by the Eleusinians.

(4) The Salaminians on the island of Salamis struck bronze coins in C₄. Types: obv. female head (nymph Salamis?), rev. “Boiotian” shield and sword in sheath with strap (shield of Aias?); legend: ΣΑΛΑ. The beginning of this coinage is now dated c.400 (Kroll and Walker (1993) 215). The legend is probably the abbreviated form of the ethnic Σαλα(μιών), indicating that the coins were struck on Salamis by the Salaminians, but Σαλαμιώνες is not a demotikon, or another form of a sub-ethnic. Salamis is explicitly classified as a polis in Ps.-Skylax 57, and accordingly the adjective is a city-ethnic, not a sub-ethnic.

The inference is that all ethnics on coins, including ktetetic forms, must be either regional ethnics or city-ethnics. As explained above, these two types of ethnic are in most cases easily distinguishable,³ and we can therefore establish a list of 420 Archaic and/or Classical mints issuing coins inscribed with city-ethnics. ⁴ These 420 mints constitute the bulk of the material. The remaining twenty-three mints recorded in Index 26 struck exclusively anepigraphic coins (eight mints), or coins inscribed with a toponym only (four

³ A list of Archaic and Classical coins inscribed with regional or sub-regional ethnics or names of multipoliate islands includes Achaians: CaE (ΑΧΑΙΩΝ, Head, HN² 466); Aintians, CaE (ΑΙΝΙΩΝ, Head, HN² 291); Akarnanians, C₄ (AK, Head, HN² 333); Amorgoi, CaE (AMO, Head, HN² 481); Arkadians, C₅ (ΡΑΚΙΑΙΩΝ, Head, HN² 444); Bisaltians, C₅ (ΒΙΣΑΛΙΩΝ, Head, HN² 200); Boiotians, C₅–C₄ (ΒΟΙΩΤΩΝ, Head, HN² 348, 352); Bottiaians, C₅–C₄ (ΒΟΤΙΑΙΩΝ, Head, HN² 213); Chalkidians, C₅ (ΧΑΛΚΙΙΩΝ, Head, HN² 209); Derrones, C₅ (ΔΕΡΡΡΩΝΙΚΟΣ, Head, HN² 202); Edonians, C₅ (ΕΔΩΝΙΕΩΝ, Head, HN² 201); Euboians, C₅ (ΕΥΒΟΙΩΝ, Head, HN² 362); Kasts, C₆–C₅ (ΚΑΣΕΣ, ΚΑΣΙΝ, Head, HN² 623); Lernians, C₆ (ΛΕΡΝΩΝ, Head, HN² 262); Lesbians, C₆ (ΛΕΣΗΝ, Head, HN² 588); Lesbians/Aiolians, C₆ (ΑΙΟΙΕΣ, Head, HN² 599); East Locrians, C₆ (ΛΟΚΡΩΝ ΥΠΟΚ ΕΙΔΗΚΟΝ, Head, HN² 362); Molossians, C₆ (ΜΟΛΟΣΣΩΝ, Head, HN² 321); Parrhesians, C₆ (ΠΑΡΡΗΣΙΩΝ, Head, HN² 431); Pepareithians, C₆ (ΠΕΠΑΡΘΙΩΝ, Head, HN² 353); Peraithians, C₅ (ΠΕΡΑΙΘΙΩΝ, Head, HN² 304); Pheraiians, C₅ (ΠΕΡΑΙΩΝ, Head, HN² 304); Pheraiians, C₅ (ΠΕΡΑΙΩΝ, Head, HN² 304); Phokians, C₆–C₅ (ΦΟΚΗ, Head, HN² 338).

⁴ In 267 cases the ethnikon (or ktetikon) is spelled out or, if abbreviated, there is no doubt that it is an abbreviation of the ethnic. In 132 cases the legend is abbreviated is such a way that the full form may have been either the toponym or the city-ethnic. In most cases it is undoubtedly the city-ethnic that is abbreviated, but even if it is the toponym, that does not make any difference in relation to the identification of the mint as belonging to a polis: so far as the toponym denotes an urban settlement, it indicates polis status of the community in question as much as the city-ethnic derived from the toponym; cf. infra.
denoting an urban centre were probably struck by *poleis* in the political as well as in the urban sense.

In addition to the coins inscribed with a city-ethnic, some coins inscribed with a regional ethnic alone, and some inscribed with a regional ethnic and a city-ethnic combined were probably struck by *poleis*.

Some Arkadian staters of C4f are an example of the first category. The types are *obv*. Pan, rev. Zeus Lykaios with the legend *APK* in monogram and, on some, *ΠΟ* and *ΘΕ*. These types are identical with those used in the Hellenistic Age by Megalopolis and inscribed *ΜΕΓ*. Furthermore *ΠΟ* and *ΘΕ* are presumably abbreviations of the names Possikrates and Theoxenos, two of the ten *oikistai* of Megalopolis. The generally accepted view is that these coins were issued by Megalopolis (no. 282) rather than by the new Arkadian Federation (Head, *HN*2 445). The other two examples which are relevant in this context are the Eretrian coins (no. 370) inscribed with the name of the island *ΕΥ-ΒΟΙ* and some Pontic coins of c.400 inscribed with the regional ethnic *ΣΙΝΔΩΝ*. It is usually believed that the issuing authority in this case was not the Sindian tribe, but the *poleis* Gorgippia (no. 696).

An example of the second category are some Boiotian coins of C5i which have *obv*. *TA* in the openings of a Boiotian shield and rev. *ΒΟΙ* in a wheel of four spokes. The presumption is that these coins were struck by Tanagra (no. 220) in the period after the Persian War when Thebes was disgraced and the leadership of the Boiotian *poleis* passed to Tanagra. But the *obv*. legend indicates that these coins were a *poleis* issue of Tanagra as well.

On coins from six of the mints included in Index 26, the only legend is the name of the ruler of the *poleis* in question, which seems unproblematic, and in two cases, both communities lying along the Adriatic coast, the only inscription on the coins is the name of a divinity.

After this presentation of the material we want to focus on the coins inscribed with city-ethnic or toponym. For the sake of argument, let us disregard the few anepigraphic coins as well as those inscribed with a regional ethnic only or the name of a raja or a divinity. We are then left with 424 mints that struck coins with a city-ethnic or toponym denoting an urban centre.

---

5 Anaphe (no. 474), Andros (no. 475); Aphrodias (no. 1005), Eion (no. 631), Hyampolis (no. 182), Kythnos (no. 501), Phasis (no. 711), Seriphos (no. 517). Note that 4 of the 8 are Cycladic islands.
6 Akragas (no. 9), Katane (no. 30), Selinous (no. 44), Tyrndars (no. 49), Zankle/Messana (no. 51), Kyrene (no. 57), Metapontion (no. 61), Neapolis (no. 63), Pandosia (no. 64), Pyxous (no. 67), Taras (no. 71), Zakynthos (no. 141), Imbros (no. 48), Kos (no. 497), Aineia (no. 557), Dikaia (no. 568), Dikaia (no. 643), Herakleia (no. 713), Kromna (no. 723), Iolla (no. 812), Gortyns (no. 960). It is worth noting that almost all are colonies and that there is a heavy concentration in Sicily and Italy.
7 Dikaia (no. 643) and Herakleia (no. 713).
8 Pyxous (no. 67) is retrospectively classified as a *poleis* by Diodoros; Kromna (no. 723) for which the city-ethnic is attested in a C4m treaty between Sinope and Herakleia which the Kromnitans are allowed to join if they so wish.
9 Cf. by contrast, the coins issued by Naulechon (no. 857), the port of Priene.
of communities which are explicitly attested as poleis in other sources (poleis type A). A further 122 are not called poleis in our sources, but they are communities for which we have other evidence indicating that they were in fact poleis (poleis type [A]B and B). The presumption is that the remaining thirty-seven were poleis for which coins are the principal or the only evidence of polis status (poleis type C).13 In none of these thirty-seven cases is there any evidence indicating that they were not poleis.

To conclude: coins are an extremely valuable type of evidence whenever the problem is to distinguish poleis from demos or komai or phyllai or other types of civic subdivision. The problem with the numismatic evidence is how to distinguish polis issues from issues struck by communities above polis level: ethne, federations, kings and tyrants ruling a plurality of poleis, etc. Here, however, the distinction between regional ethnics and city-ethnics offers an almost infallible guide-line, if we restrict the investigation to coins with city-ethnics. All such coins seem to have been struck by poleis.

To strike coins inscribed with city-ethnics was a sign of polis status, but not of independence. Poleis which were members of a federation could have a mint alongside the federal mint;14 or coins were struck whose legends combined the regional ethnic, signifying the federation, with an abbreviated form of the city-ethnic, signifying the polis in question.15 Dependent members of a hegemonic league struck coins in the name of their polis.16 Corinthian colonies, though still dependent on their metropolis, struck staters combining the Corinthian Pegasos with a legend signifying the colony.17 Some Athenian klearchies had a mint.18 Many poleis subjected to the king of Persia issued their own coins.19 Even though Philip II came to rule Thessaly in 344/3, he did not suppress the civic coinage of Larisa.20 The Athenian coinage decree of C5s is the only known case in which a hegemonic polis interfered with the right of its dependent poleis to strike coins.

A different problem to be taken into account is that coins struck by a polis were not necessarily struck by a Hellenic polis. Many barbarian communities learnt to strike coins from the Greeks, they imitated the Greek types, and might also provide their coins with Greek legends.21 This legend was one sign of Hellenisation, but if it is the only information we have, it is a moot point whether such communities deserve to be included among the Hellenic poleis. In Sicily, for example, there was a rapid Hellenisation of indigenous communities in C4s in the wake of Timoleon’s campaigns, and for many communities, coins with Greek types and legends are the best evidence we have; see n. 13 supra.

How many of the Hellenic poleis struck coins in the Archaic and/or Classical periods? Of all the 1,035 poleis included in this Inventory, a mint is attested for no more than 444, i.e. for fewer than half the poleis we know of. But, as usual, our sources are poor. It is, we think, an educated guess that the present survival rate of ancient Greek coins is less than one in a thousand and perhaps no more than one in tens of thousand, and of these fewer than half, we guess, have been published. Numerous mints are attested by a handful of coins only.22 Sometimes a polis mint was in operation for a short time and had a fairly small output, which indicates that scores of mints, especially small mints, are probably unattested in the available material. Conversely, we have coins struck by unidentified communities, many of them probably poleis, which have left no other evidence of their existence.23 There can be little doubt that the list

---

13 The majority of these are border communities in which the striking of coins in C4 is the first clear sign of Hellenisation. There are 17 such poleis type C in Sicily and 6 in Aiolis. Those in Sicily are: Akrai (no. 10), Alontion (no. 12), Galaria (no. 16), Herbesbos (no. 22), Hippana (no. 25), Imachara (no. 26), Kentoripe (no. 31), Kephaloidion (no. 32), Longane (no. 35), Morgantina (no. 37), Mystratos (no. 39), Nakone (no. 40), Petra (no. 42), Piakos (no. 43), Sileraioi (no. 45), Stelianaioi (no. 46), Tyrheni (no. 50). Those in Aiolis are Boione (no. 805), Chalkis (no. 806), Gambrion (no. 808), Iolla (no. 812), Kentoripe (no. 829), Tisna (no. 835), and Salamis (no. 836); cf. Martin (1995) 272–3.

14 Cf. the C4 mints attested in Troas, Aiolis, Ionia and Karia.

15 In the Classical period East Lokris was presumably a hegemonic league dominated by Opous (no. 386) (Nielson (2000) 318–9). But coins were struck by at least 2 and probably 3 of the dependent members: Larymna (no. 381), Skarphsea (no. 387), and Thronion (no. 388).

16 Head, HN2 406–7.

17 Myrina (no. 502) and Hephaistia (no. 503) on Lemnos, Imbros (no. 483) and Salamis (no. 363); cf. Martin (1995) 272–3.

18 Cf. all the C4 mints attested in Troas, Aiolis, Ionia and Karia.

19 In the Classical period East Lokris was presumably a hegemonic league dominated by Opous (no. 386) (Nielson (2000) 318–9). But coins were struck by at least 2 and probably 3 of the dependent members: Larymna (no. 381), Skarphsea (no. 387), and Thronion (no. 388).

20 Martin (1985) 41–59, esp. 54.

21 Barbarian poleis that struck Greek coins include, e.g., Solous in Sicily (Head, HN2 170), Damastion in Illiria (Head, HN2 318), Selge in Pamphylia and Tarso in Kilikia; see infra 1213–14. The Lykian towns struck coins with Greek types but indigenous legends, see infra 1219.

22 Of the Athenian gold coins struck in 407 less than 1 in 3,000 are known today (Kraay (1976) 68–69). Among the Boiotian coins of C4s, all with the Boiotian shield on the obverse, most can be assigned to well-known Boiotian poleis, and three pieces inscribed PHILAI or MOI (Rutter HN2 1356–7), some rare coins inscribed ZO (Rutter HN2 1278), and three pieces inscribed ΠΑΟΙ (Rutter HN2 1005–6). Among the Boiotian communities of C4s, all with the Boiotian shield on the obverse, most can be assigned to well-known Boiotian poleis, but some have legends which do not fit any of the Boiotian communities we know of, viz. AMI or AOI/MIO or ΠΙ (Head (1881) 57–
of Archaic and Classical poleis with a mint will grow in the future, partly by the discovery of new coins and partly by a careful inspection of the thousands of catalogues of coin auctions in which one can find information about a seven-digit number of ancient Greek coins in unpublished private collections.25

Even if it can be presumed that full sources would provide us with evidence of another three-digit number of poleis mints, there can be no denying that far from all poleis had a mint. Sometimes two poleis shared a mint,26 and often a

85). From the Pontic regions are some rare silver and bronze coins of C6–C4 with the legend T A M (infra 950). There are the staters with 3 dolphins and the legend ΠΟΣ once assigned to Karpathos but now left without identification (Cahn (1957)); and the anepigraphic coins with warrior (obv.) and lyre (rev.), once assigned to Kalymna, have suffered the same fate (Wartenberg (1998)). From Asia Minor there are C6–C5 lion staters inscribed O Y A (Head, HN vi 258), and bronze coins with Apollo on both sides and the rev. legend ΣΕΛ (Head, HN vi 548; infra 1002), etc. In all probability many of the unidentified coins were struck by Greek poleis which, so far, have left no other trace of their existence but would have been recorded in our inventory if we had had better sources.

25 Of the coins struck by the Roman emperor Pescennius Niger (193–94 AD) some 1,100 are known today. C.250 are in museums and published private collections, but no fewer than 850 other coins have been found and identified by inspection of numismatic auction catalogues, of which the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge now possesses a spectacular collection of over 32,000 items (information provided by T. V. Buttery).

26 Adranon and Piatos (nos. 6 and 43), Leontinoi and Katane (nos. 33 and 30), Lipara and Mytilis (nos. 34 and 39), Kyme and Neapolis (57 and 63), Gortyns and Phaistos (nos. 960 and 980), Kyrene and Euesperides (nos. 1028 and 1026), Barke and Taucheira (nos. 1025 and 1029).
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Colonies and Indigenous Hellenised Communities

Most accounts of the history of Greece in the Archaic period highlight an opposition between self-grown poleis in Hellas (or Greece) as against emigrant polities founded outside Hellas and mostly in the Archaic period c.750–500. Most of the colonies, called apoikiai, were independent poleis; some were just trading stations (emporia). This picture of the Greek world is not wrong, but it is not true either. It is much too clear-cut in the distinctions on which it is based. Explicitly or implicitly it is taken for granted (1) that Hellas covered Mainland Greece, the adjacent islands and the west coast of Asia Minor, to the exclusion of all regions north and west of Akarnania as well as north-east and south-east of the Aegean Sea; (2) that all the Hellenic poleis outside this “Hellas” were emigrant communities; (3) that they were founded by metropoleis situated inside “Hellas”; (4) that emigrant poleis were invariably placed outside “Hellas”; (5) that colonisation abated c.500, perhaps even earlier, and did not gather momentum again until the colonisation of the Near East initiated by Alexander the Great; and (6) that colonies were of two types: apoikiai, which were independent poleis, and emporia, which were not poleis. All six propositions need modification.

Re (1) It is a qualified truth that Hellas was confined to Mainland Greece, the adjacent islands and the west coast of Asia Minor. We are not here going to trace, once again, the origin of the concept of Hellas; I prefer to investigate what Hellas covered in the Classical period. At first one is struck by the number of apparent contradictions in our sources. Sicily is sometimes distinguished from Hellas (Theopomp. fr. 193) but sometimes seen as a remote part of Hellas (Pind. Pyth. 1.75 with scholia; Eur. Cyc. 297–98). Epeiros is outside Hellas according to Thucydides (2.805) and Ephoros (fr. 143), but the region around Dodone and the river Acheloos is called “old Hellas” by Aristotle (Mete. 352.34) and was considered to be part of Hellas by Herodotos (2.56). In the King’s Peace of 386 (Xen. Hell. 5.1.31) the poleis in Asia given to the king are opposed to the Hellenic poleis (poleis Ἐλληνιδές) which, in a paraphrase of the Peace (Xen. Hell. 6.3.12), are called the poleis in Hellas; yet, in the same work Agesilaos is quoted for juxtaposing the poleis in Asia with the poleis in his own part of Hellas (Xen. Hell. 3.4.5). Herodotos describes Xerxes’ invasion of Greece as the campaign “through Europe against Hellas” (7.88) or “through Thrace against Hellas” (7.105). So Xerxes had to march through all of Thrace before he reached Hellas; but according to Xenophon, a growing problem in Hellas was Olynthos, the largest polis along the coast of Thrace (Xen. Hell. 5.2.12).

In our opinion the clue to the contradictions can be found in the C4 periplous ascribed to Ps.-Skylax. This treatise is organised into three main sections: Europe (1–69), Asia (70–106) and Libya (107–112). Europe is subdivided into three parts: the regions west of Hellas (1–33), Hellas (34–65), the regions north and east of Hellas (66–68), plus a summary in 69. Now, the subdivision of Europe is not just into three parts with Hellas covering the central part. In the Chapter about Ambrakia (33) Ps.-Skylax says that from this point Hellas begins to be “continuous” (συνεχής) until the Magnesian polis Homolion; and in 65 Ps.-Skylax ends his account of Magnesia with the note that Hellas is “continuous” from Ambrakia until this point. Thus, it is not Hellas, but, strictly speaking, the “continuous” part of Hellas that covers the regions from Ambrakia to Homolion. It follows that from the Pillars of Herakles to Epeiros and from Makedonia back the Pillars of Herakles, the coasts of the Mediterranean and the Pontic Sea were dotted with poleis, each of them part of Hellas, but separated by land settled with barbarians. In Ps.-Skylax such a polis is called a polis Hellenis, but in other sources it can be called a polis Hellas (Hdt. 7.22.3; Thuc. 6.62.2), a strong indication that it was part of Hellas. So, according to this view, all Hellenic

---

2 “Emigrant community” would be a better rendering of apoikiai than “colony” (criticised by Osborne (1999) 252). But the traditional rendering “colony” is acceptable if we avoid all comparisons with the Roman colonia and use “colony” in its modern sense of “a country or an area settled and controlled by people from another country, sometimes by force” (Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary of Current English (1995) s.v.).
5 See 7 supra and Malkin (2001).
poleis were situated in Hellas; wherever there was a Hellenic polis, it was Hellas. Thus, all the Greek colonies were part of Hellas, but surrounded by “barbarian” regions which were not part of Hellas. Admittedly the traditional view of a fairly clear division between self-grown poleis in Hellas and colonies outside Hellas may be supported by a passage in Thucydides: After the Trojan War, he says (1.12.4), Hellas enjoyed peace and established colonies (apoikiai), the Athenians to Ionia and the islands, the Peloponnesians to Sicily, Italy and some places in Hellas. The presumption is that Sicily, Italy, Ionia and the islands were outside Hellas at the beginning of what we call the Dark Ages, but Thucydides’ description of the colonisation is also compatible with the view found in Ps.-Skylax: that, by the colonisation, Hellas was extended to comprise all the Hellenic communities wherever they were but, of course, not the areas between the Hellenic communities.

On this interpretation, it is not a contradiction to hold that Sane in Thrace was a polis Hellas (Hdt. 7.22.3), i.e. a part of Hellas, while Thrace was outside Hellas (Hdt. 7.8β), an interpretation supported by numerous other sources.

Herodotos twice lists votive offerings set up in Hellas, some by Kroisos (1.92.2–2) and some by Amasis (2.182.1). Those dedicated by Kroisos are found in Thebes, Ephesos, Delphi and Branchidai in the territory of Miletos. Those set up by Amasis are found in Kyrene, Lindos and Samos.

When the 10,000 were encamped at Kalpe on their way to Byzantion, Xenophon tells them that they are “at the gates of Hellas” (Xen. An. 6.5.23: ἐπὶ ταῖς θύραις τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐσμέν), and, similarly, Kallisthenes described (stinking) Byzantion as the “the arm-pit of Hellas” (ForHist 124 fr. 5.13: ἐκάλει . . . τὸ Βυζάντιον µασχάλην τῆς Ἑλλάδος. So, Byzantion was part of Hellas; but, like Thrace, the Pontic region and Troas as such were outside Hellas, cf. Hdt. 9.114.2 where a squadron is said to sail from Abydos towards Hellas.

In his Olympian speech of 388 Lysias complains that Hellas is in a disgraceful state because some parts are under the barbarian—i.e. the Asian poleis ruled by the king of Persia—while other poleis have been uprooted by tyrants—i.e. by Dionysios I of Syracuse. In this speech the poleis in Asia, Sicily and Italy are subsumed under Hellas.

To conclude, it serves no purpose to distinguish between colonising poleis in Hellas and colonies outside Hellas, but, for the sake of argument, we shall in the following sections refer to the modern and widely accepted concept of a “Hellas”, or “Greece”, which stretched from Akarnania to Thessaly and included the adjacent islands and the west coast of Asia Minor (Eder 1999) 654). In English this “Hellas” is often called “the Greek heartland” or “the Greek Homeland” (Snodgrass 1980) 41), as opposed to apoikia which actually means “a settlement far from home” (Hammond 1959) 112; cf. Osborne 1996) 119). In German it is often called das Mutterland (Bengtson 1977) 93; Schuller 2002) 117), suggesting a link to metropolis. We shall refer to it as “Hellas”.

Re (2) Not every Hellenic poleis outside “Hellas” was a colony settled with a contingent of immigrants sent out by a metropolis. Some colonies were the result of a private initiative, and sometimes the colonists may have come in a trickle and not as a contingent. Even more important is the fact that many settlements were indigenous communities which became Hellenised by acculturation. Such settlements were neither found by Greek settlers nor conquered and taken over by Greeks. They became Hellenised over a long period through immigration of individual Greek settlers and through regular interaction with neighbouring Hellenic communities. One aspect of their Hellenisation was to be equipped with an invented Greek foundation story or myth to make them more like the proper Greek colonies in the region. The distinction between colonies and Hellenised polities is apparent from numerous sources. Describing the six poleis on Athos, Thucydides tells us that Sane was a colony of Andros, whereas the five others were poleis inhabited by “bilingual barbarians” with different ethnic backgrounds mixed with a few Chalkidians; i.e. the majority of the population were barbarians who spoke Greek and their own native tongue (Thuc. 4.109.3–4). Again, in his account of Kimon’s campaign in Karia, Ephoros distinguishes between two types of poleis lying along the coast: some were colonised from Hellas and some

9 Graham (1964) 7–8; (1982) 143. Osborne (1999) wants to describe private enterprise as the regular procedure in the early period, by contrast with the Classical period when colonists were sent out by the polis. But the evidence for the earliest colonies is thin and, e.g., the Corinthian colonies founded in C7 were certainly public ventures, initiated by the Kyplstid tyrants.

10 The colony usually mentioned in this context is Pithekoussai (Bdgwad 1992) 108; Osborne (1999) 257–59), which, however, seems to have been a regular apoikia (no. 65 infra), cf. Graham (1997).

11 The tradition that Kleonai in Athos was colonised by Chalkidians (Heracid. Lemb. 62) carries no weight against Thucydides’ explicit account: see no. 580 infra. It cannot be precluded that Herakleides mixed up Chalkidians from Sithone with Chalkidians from Chalkis on Euboia.

9 Graham (1964) 7–8; (1982) 143. Osborne (1999) wants to describe private enterprise as the regular procedure in the early period, by contrast with the Classical period when colonists were sent out by the polis. But the evidence for the earliest colonies is thin and, e.g., the Corinthian colonies founded in C7 were certainly public ventures, initiated by the Kyplstid tyrants.

10 The colony usually mentioned in this context is Pithekoussai (Bdgwad 1992) 108; Osborne (1999) 257–59), which, however, seems to have been a regular apoikia (no. 65 infra), cf. Graham (1997).

11 The tradition that Kleonai in Athos was colonised by Chalkidians (Heracid. Lemb. 62) carries no weight against Thucydides’ explicit account: see no. 580 infra. It cannot be precluded that Herakleides mixed up Chalkidians from Sithone with Chalkidians from Chalkis on Euboia.
were bilingual poleis garrisoned by the Persians (fr. 191 = P Oxy. 1610, cf. Diod. 11.60.4). This Inventory comprises 129 Hellenised communities as against 279 colonies. There is a small overlap. Tauromenion, for example, was a partly Hellenised community which in 392 was colonised by Syracuse. In eighty-two cases our sources do not allow us to decide whether a polis was a colony or an indigenous Hellenised community. Such communities were particularly common in Italy, in Sicily (Fischer-Hansen (2002)) and especially in Karia, where there were a few scattered Greek colonies of which only Halikarnassos and Knidos can be traced today, as against some sixty other polities of which the great majority must have been indigenous Hellenised poleis.

Re (3) Many of the major Hellenic colonies were indeed founded by mother cities situated in “Hellas” as described in (1) above, but others were founded by the colonies themselves, a phenomenon called secondary colonisation (see Index 27). In some cases even tertiary colonisation is attested. Melaina Korkyra, for example, was refounded in C4 by Issa, itself a colony founded in C4f by Syracuse, itself a colony founded by Corinth in 733. In overviews of Greek colonisation, secondary colonisation is often mentioned in passing, but hardly ever discussed as an essential element of colonisation, and the ubiquitous distinction between colony and mother city does not always take into account that the colony becomes a metropolis when secondary colonies are founded. According to Ridgway (1996) 362 the major metropoleis in the Archaic period were Chalkis, Corinth, Eretria, Megara, Miletos and Phokaia. Eder (1999) 654 has a list of twenty major colonisers, all of them in “Hellas”. Why are Massalia, Sinope, Syracuse and Thasos not mentioned as well? Secondary colonisation was particularly important in Sicily, Italy, Illyria and Libya, where colonies founded by colonies outnumber colonies founded by poleis in “Hellas”.

Re (4) It is true that most colonies were founded outside “Hellas”, but it must not be forgotten that quite a few colonies were placed in “Hellas”. Out of altogether 279 colonies, fifty were situated in “Hellas”. What then is the difference between a colony and a synoecised polis such as Megalopolis? Well, the founding of Megalopolis was in some respects treated like an act of colonisation, e.g. by having oikists, and the most conspicuous difference seems to be that a synoecised polis was created by immigration from neighbouring communities, whereas a colony was settled with people who had travelled a long way to reach their destination; cf. the Corinthian colonies in Akarnania and Herakleia Trachinia in Malis. Again, there is a close connection between the refoundation of a colony outside “Hellas” and the refoundation of a polis in Hellas which had been annihilated by an andrapodismos and a destruction of the urban centre but was resettled sometimes immediately after the disaster, sometimes later.

Re (5) The colonisation during the Classical period is mostly underestimated, but perhaps for obvious reasons. Colonisation is always treated in the chapters about Archaic history, and there one may find a short mention of colonisation during the Classical period as well (Graham (1982) 83), but since colonisation was not as prominent an aspect of Greek history between the Persian War and Alexander the Great, it is often passed over in silence in the relevant chapters. Yet, it appears that, including Athenian klerouchies, no fewer than seventy-two colonies were either founded or refounded in C5 and C4f, and it is also worth noting that the big metropoleis in this period were no longer Chalkis or Corinth or Miletos, but Syracuse (with sixteen colonies) and Athens (with twenty-one colonies, including a number of short-term klerouchies and colonies).

Re (6) All the evidence we have supports the view that the Greek settlements abroad were poleis. Out of 279 colonies founded by the Greeks and recorded in this inventory, 197 are explicitly attested as poleis in Archaic and/or Classical sources (type A), twenty-five are recorded under the heading polis (type A1), thirty-two were probably poleis (type B), and twenty-five may well have been poleis but the evidence is slight (type C). Conversely, John Graham’s list of 139 colonies founded between 800 and 500 includes only four which are not recorded as poleis in this Inventory.

The most recent list of “Greek settlements abroad” is that of Robin Osborne, which covers the entire period from the beginning of the Dark Age to the end of the Classical

12 The decision whether a given polis was a colony or a Hellenised indigenous community depends on the interpretation of our sources, both archaeological and literary. Is the presence of large amounts of Greek painted pottery an indication of trade or colonisation? Is an entry in Eusebios’ chronicle or a Hellenistic foundation myth sufficient evidence of colonisation? Each individual case must be judged by itself, and here we follow the decisions made by the authors of the chapters.

13 Thasos is treated as both a colony and a metropolis by Graham (1964) 81.

14 OCD 362–63 has articles about colonisation in the Archaic and in the Hellenistic period, but none about the Classical period.

15 Graham (1982) 160–62: (1) Agathe, a secondary colony founded by Massalia. It may have been a polis founded as a fortification, but evidence for polis status is too late to allow inclusion in this Inventory of poleis (infra 159). (2) Apollonia, the harbour of Kyrene, which became a polis only in C1 (infra 133). (3) Dikaiarchia, the harbour of Kyme in Italy, a Samian foundation of C6s. Again, the evidence for polis status is too late to allow inclusion (infra 256). (4) Tanais, a Hellenistic foundation of C3 (Bredow (2002)).
period. Again, almost all the settlements listed by him are included in this Inventory as poleis types A, [A] B or C. The inference is that, with very few possible exceptions, every colony was founded as a polis or developed into a polis not long after its foundation. Furthermore, there is no basis in the sources for the traditional distinction between apoikiai which were poleis and emporia which were not. Almost all, perhaps even all, the communities of the Archaic and Classical periods which are described as emporia in the sources are attested as poleis as well (Hansen (2004)).

On the other hand, the almost universal claim that the colonial poleis were independent must be modified (Hansen (1997) 32–34). It is well known that the Athenian klerouchies and colonies remained dependencies of Athens (Graham (1964) 166–210), but many of the the Corinthian colonies were dependent poleis too (Graham (1964) 118–53), and there is ample evidence of close political bonds between Miletos and its colonies (Graham (1964) 98–117). In C5–C4 Syracuse created a small city-state empire and, for most of the period, the majority of the Greek colonies in Sicily and several in Italy and in the Adriatic were dependent poleis dominated by Syracuse. In the Pontic region numerous poleis became part of the Bosporan kingdom and dependent on Pontikapaion, in particular Hermonassa, Kepoi, Kimmerikon, Kytaia, Myrmekeion, Nymphaios, Sindike, Theodosia and Tyritake. Similarly, Sinope is known to have ruled its colonies as dependent poleis; cf. entries for Kerasous, Kotyora and Trapezous, and Amisos was another dependency of Sinope although not a colony of that city.

REFERENCES

Hall, E. 1989. Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy (Oxford).
The composition of this inventory began in 1993. By 1998 most of the 46 chapters had been submitted, while a few arrived as recently as Spring 2003. Most chapters were completed in the period 2000–2002, but some are revised and updated versions of text submitted before the turn of the Millennium. In all chapters literature published in 2003 and 2004 has been taken into account only sporadically.
SPAIN AND FRANCE
(INCLUDING CORSICA)

ADOLFO J. DOMÍNGUEZ

I. The Region

The region under consideration here is made up of at least three different areas, partially recognised as such in antiquity: Iberia, Southern Gaul and the island of Corsica. The only common elements characterising these different areas are colonisation by Phokaia (no. 859) and the fact that both Iberia and Southern Gaul were, at least to some extent, within the area dominated commercially and possibly politically by Massalia (no. 3). Moreover, these areas mark the westernmost limit of the Greek presence in the Mediterranean.¹ Although Greek contacts with Tartessos in Iberia are attested for C71 by Herodotos’ mention of Kolaio’s voyage (152.47ed for C1 by Herodotos’ mention of Kolaios’ voyage (152.47ed for C1 by Herodotos’ mention of Kolaios’ voyage (4.152.2) and for C71/C66 by his mention of Phokaian travellers (1.163.1), Greek poleis do not seem to have existed in Tartessian territory, despite the offer made by the native king, Arganthonios, to the Phokaians, that they could establish themselves in his territory wherever they wished (Hdt. 1.163.3).

In spite of such contacts and despite the existence of strong commercial links with the Iberian world, the presence of Greek poleis in Iberia is limited to its north-eastern end; it was in Gaul that Massalia (no. 3), the most important Greek polis of the area, was founded. Massalia ended up controlling—economically and perhaps also politically—all the western world colonised by Phokaia; moreover, Massalia made a series of foundations, some of which may possibly have been poleis, although for the most part they were presumably merely “fortress-colonies”.

In Corsica the situation is different, because only a single Greek foundation is attested there, Alalie (no. 1), a city that was clearly independent of Massalia; it did not, however, survive the events of c.540 (infra).

1. Corsica (Kyrnos)

The island of Corsica, Kyrnos (Kýrpos, Κύρνος) in Greek (Hdt. 1.166.3; Diod. 5.13.3; Strabo 5.2.7), is only rarely mentioned by ancient authors. Strabo 5.2.7 gives its measurements² and stresses the uncivilised nature of its inhabitants,³ but he provides hardly any information about the history of the island, though he does offer an interesting account of the foundation of Elea: when the Phokaians left their city, they sailed first to Corsica and Massalia under the direction of one Kreontiades and, rejected in both places, they founded Elea.⁴

Diodorus alludes to the good harbours of the island and mentions the two most important (ἀξιόλογοι cities, Kalaris and Nikaia (Diod. 5.13.3 = Timaios (FGrHist 566) fr. 164). In the case of Kalaris, Diodorus has clearly misunderstood it as the name of the Phokaian foundation, Alalie (no. 1); his information undoubtedly concerned Alalie: he affirms that it was a Phokaian foundation and that the Phokaians were expelled from the island by the Tyrrenians not long after they had settled there.⁵ This mistake may possibly be explained by a confusion between Alalie (falsely rendered as Kalaris, perhaps due to a certain phonetic resemblance to the Etruscan and Roman name of the city, Aleria) and the Phoenician city of Karalis (today Cagliari) in Sardinia.

The other important city was Nikaia; according to Timaios ((FGrHist 566) fr. 164), it was a foundation of the Tyrrenians, planted when they were masters of the sea (θαλαττοκρατοῦντες) and had conquered all the islands along the Tyrrenian coast;⁶ however, Clerc (1927) 258

¹ Cf. Ps.-Skymnos 149–50 on Mainake: αὐτὴ πρὸς Εὐρώπην δὲ τῶν ἑλληνίδων πόλεως ἀπασίων ἐσχάτην ἐχει θέσιν.
² 160 miles in length and 70 miles in width; the perimeter is given as 3,000 stades.
³ ἀγριωτέρους εἶναι θηρίων.
⁴ Strabo 6.1.1: πλεῦσαι πρῶτον εἰς Κύρνον καὶ Μασσαλίαν μετὰ Κρεοντιάδου, ἀποκρουσθέντας δὲ τὴν Ἕλλες κίπα.
⁵ Diod. 5.13.3–4 τούτων δὲ τήν μὲν Κάλαρα Φωκαικῆς ἐκτίσα, καὶ χρόνων τινὰ κατοκήσαντες ὑπὸ Τυρηνῶν ἐξεβλήθησαν ἐκ τῆς νῆσου.
⁶ On these islands, see Plin. HN 3.81.
defends the Greek identity of Nikaia on the basis of its name, though others have suggested that the city may have been founded as a result of the Etruscan and Punic defeat of the Greeks in the battle of Alalie. In any case, it has not been located, and its presumed relationship to Alalie remains to be proved (Gras (1993)).

The best and most abundant information on the foundation of a Greek polis in Corsica is given by Herodotos in the account of the foundation of Alalie (no. 1; Hdt. 1.165–66). As far as we know, Alalie was the only Greek polis on the island; in time, it became an Etruscan city, conquered later by the Carthaginians and finally by the Romans (L. Cornelius Scipio: CIL 2.32); in 81, Sulla established a military colony at Aleria (Plin. HN 3.80.6; cf. Pompon. 2.122).

2. The Mediterranean Coast of France (Iberia and Ligystike)

This region consists of territory that in antiquity was called by at least two different names: Iberia (Ἰβηρία, Thuc. 6.2.2) and Liguria (Λιγυστικῆς κατὰ τὴν Κελτικὴν ἔχοντα Λίγυες). The fragments of Hekataios do not distinguish sharply between Iberia and Liguria, although one may have described the Misgetes as an ethnos of Iberia, while another possibly considered the Elisyes to be a Ligurian ethnos. However, at Hdt. 7.165 the Elisyes are distinguished from both the Iberians and the Ligurians. Hekataios may have placed Massalia in Liguria.

In a fragmentary reference to Aischylos, Pliny states that this poet placed the river Rhône in Iberia (HN 1997 37.32 = Aesch. fr. 73a, Radt); however, Ps.-Skylax 3 seems to think of the region from Emporion (no. 2) to the river Rhône as territory occupied by intermingled Iberians and Ligurians: ἀπὸ δὲ Ἰβηρῶν ἐχοντα Λίγυες καὶ Ιβηρεῖς μαγάδες μέχρι ποταμοῦ Ῥοδανοῦ. The text may imply not so much ethnic mixture as the co-existence of these two ethnic groups in a territory which would comprise, more or less, modern Languedoc (Gailledrat (1997) 34). East of the Rhône, Ps.-Skylax 4 mentions only the Ligurians: ἀπὸ Ροδανοῦ ποταμοῦ ἐχονται Λίγυες. The picture provided by Ps.-Skymnos is different: above (ἐξανω) the Iberians he places the Bebrykes (200–1); below (κάτω) the parathalaiioi Ligurians he then places the Greek cities founded by Massalia, from Emporion to Antipolis (201–16). Massalia itself he places in Liguria (211).

Strabo 3.4.19 points out that while earlier authors—he relies partially on information originating from Aischylos—placed the boundaries of Iberia beyond (ἐξανω) the Rhône, i.e. on its western bank, in his own day the boundaries were placed in the Pyrenees; this information seems to come from Artemidoros (cf. Steph. Byz. 324.2–6 and Gallazzi and Kramer (1998) 196–97).

It seems, then, that in the Archaic and early Classical periods the Greeks had imprecise and ill-defined notions about the borders between Iberia and Liguria: they ran somewhere between the rivers Hérault and Rhône. On their arrival the Celts seem to have pushed the Ligurians to the east and to have replaced them in the southern regions of France or even to have created situations in which peoples of different ethnicities co-existed, especially in the eastern part of this region (Celto-Ligurians: Arist. Mir. auct. 8377). From C4 the region around Emporion—the Pyrenees—probably came to be considered as the border between Iberia and southern Gaul; references to areas of mixed population continue to occur, however, though such references are not further developed by any ancient author. The end of the process took place in the Roman period when, as Strabo points out, the borders were fixed in the Pyrenees. At the same time, Strabo 4.1.1 calls all of the region between the Pyrenees and the Alps Transalpine Celtike, and Liguria is limited to the region east of Massalia and, more specifically, from Monoikos to Italia (Strabo 4.6.3). In Roman terminology, we may speak about the provincia Gallia Narbonensis, from the Pyrenees as far as the river Var; to the east of it, one would enter Italy (Plin. HN 3.31).

In the present context, the chief characteristic of the area described above is that this was the main area of Massaliote expansion.

The earliest Greek presence in the area seems, at least on the basis of the literary evidence, to be concentrated at
Massalia (no. 3) itself, a foundation of c.600. However, archaeological evidence suggests the possibility of pre-colonial contacts between Greeks and indigenous populations, e.g. the three cups and the oenochoe of C3I from the indigenous cemetery of Le Peyrou, near the place where Agathe (infra) was later founded (Nickels et al. (1981); Nickels (1989)), and the sporadic finds of C3I Greek pottery at Mailhac (Gailledrat (1997) 69–70).

However, the foundation of Massalia marked the real beginning of Greek presence and expansion in the region, an expansion that was basically a coastal phenomenon; besides, the expansion of Massalia was a long-term process running from C6 to the beginnings of the Roman occupation of the region. Massaliote activity, moreover, varied from period to period: during C6 and C5E it was directed towards the development of commercial interests (Bats (1988)), whereas from C5I/C4E it aimed primarily at establishing greater territorial control through the foundation of colonies and fortified centres. Such settlements are, obviously, of greater interest to our sources and are described below. Whether any of the settlements founded by Massalia in this period, and presumably dependent on it, can be considered poleis (albeit dependent poleis; cf. Hansen (1997b)) is uncertain: some may have been poleis, but in no case does the evidence warrant inclusion in the Inventory, which includes only two possible Massaliote foundations: Emporion (no. 2) and Rhode (no. 4). Of these, Emporion certainly and Rhode possibly were founded prior to C4. According to ancient writers, Massalia’s reason for founding these settlements was the need for defence against the barbarians living in the direction of Iberia as well as towards Liguria (Strabo 4.1.5); trade interests or the wish to control the coastline may have provided an additional reason (as implied by Strabo 4.1.9, 10 and 4.6.3).

The following Greek settlements on the Mediterranean coast of France are mentioned by our sources.

**Agathe (Ἀγάθη)** Ps.-Skymnos 202–8 seems to include Agathe in the πόλεις Ἑλληνίδες founded by the Phokaian Massaliotes (Μασσαλιώται Φωκαῖες), although in this passage, strictly speaking, polis is not used about Agathe. Strabo 4.1.5–6 calls it a polis and an epiteichisma founded by Massalia (κτίσμα Μασσαλιωτῶν; cf. Plin. **HN** 3.33: Agatha quondam Massiliensium) for protection against the barbarians living in the direction of Iberia. It may have been a “polis founded as a fortress” (12) in the typology of Hansen (1997b). Archaeology has revealed two phases of occupation; in the earlier phase Agathe was probably only an emporion, and remains of C6–C5I houses of mudbrick seem to belong to it; to the later “Massaliote” phase from C5I belong houses with stone basements and mudbrick walls. It seems that the city had a grid plan in this phase. The C5I city covered 4.25 ha (Nickels (1983) 421–22, (1995)). At least two phases of the circuit wall have been established, the oldest dating to C6, and showing repairs during C5 (Nickels and Marchand (1976); Nickels (1982) 273–74). The territory of Agathe was divided into plots from at least C4E; its area has been estimated at c.20,000 ha, partly devoted to agriculture, and containing at least 1,500 kleroi (Clavel-Lévêque (1982); García (1995)). **Barr.** 15, AC.

**Antipolis (Ἀντίπολις)** Ps.-Skymnos 216 seems to consider Antipolis the most remote of the cities founded by Massalia (αὐτῶν [sc. πόλεων] σχῆμα). Strabo 4.1.5 includes it among the epiteichismata set up for defence against the barbarians and describes it as one of the poleis of the Massaliotes (4.1.9). In 155/4 Antipolis certainly belonged to Massalia (Polyb. 33.8.1), and it still belonged to Massalia prior to 49 (Strabo 4.1.9; Schnitzer (1958) 24), but its status in the Archaic or Classical period is unknown. The ancient city of Antipolis must be somewhere below modern Antibes; however, the relatively abundant Archaic finds (Clergues (1969); Ducat (1982) 89–90) must belong to the native village; the remains of the supposed Archaic Greek city are, consequently, unlocated so far (Bats (1990)). A Greek presence in Classical times can be proved only by Greek inscriptions, especially the verse dedication set up by one Therpon to Aphrodite in C35 (IG xiv 2424; **LSAG** 288 no. 3; cf., however, the doubts expressed by Clerc (1927) 257 on the circumstances of its discovery). **Barr.** 16, AC.

*Athenopolis (Athenopolis)* This place, qualified by Plin. **HN** 3.35 as Massiliensium, must be sought on the coast between the Citharista portus (La Ciotat or, better, Olbia) and Forum Iuli (Fréjus) (Pompon. 2.77). **Barr.** 16 (St-Tropez?), HR.

*Avenion (Ἀβενιών)* Steph. Byz. 146.16 calls it a πόλις Massaliaς; he does not give any indication of his source, but it may be Artemidoros, as in the entry on Καβελλιών (Cavellio; see infra; cf. Brunel (1945) 130). It is undoubtedly to be identified with modern Avignon, assigned by Strabo 4.1.11 and Plin. **HN** 3.36 (Avennio) to the Cavares. The reason for its designation as a “city of Massalia” must be sought in the close links that the Gauls of this region maintained with Massalia (Clerc (1927) 242–43; Barruol (1975) 233–44). Massalia presumably never included this area within its
Kyrene (Κυρήνη) Among the poleis of that name mentioned by Steph. Byz. 396.18–19, one is assigned to Massalia. It is otherwise unknown, but Barruol (1975) 224 has suggested identifying it with the site of La Couronne, where the quarries exploited by Massalia were located (Strabo 4.1.6). Barr. 15, unlocated (La Couronne?), H.

Kabellion (Καβελλιών) Steph. Byz. 345.17 calls it a πόλις Μασσαλίας; his source is Artemidoros’ Geography. Strabo calls it Καβαλλίων (4.1.3, 11) and assigns the city to the Cavares, as does Plin. HN 3.36 (Cabellio). It is to be equated with modern Cavaillon, and its relationship to the Massaliote dominion must be similar to that of Avenion (cf. supra). Barr. 15, unlocated, H.

Monoiocos (Μάνοιοκος) Strabo 4.6.3 describes it merely as a harbour (λιμήν), although in Steph. Byz. 456.7 it appears as a polis in Liguria, accompanied by a reference to Hekataios (fr. 57). Not in Barr.; Hecat. fr. 57 indicates A.

Nikaia (Νίκαια) This is one of the poleis founded by Massalia as a fortress (epiteichisma) for protection against the barbarians according to Strabo 4.1.5, who includes it among the πόλεις τῶν Μασσαλιωτῶν situated between Massalia and the river Var (Strabo 4.1.9; cf. Steph. Byz. 474.22; Plin. HN 3.47). The city existed in 154 (Polyb. 33.8.2), but is absent from Ps.-Skymnos 216; if we accept that Timaios is the main source for that passage in Ps.-Skymnos, Nikaia probably had not yet been founded by 260 (the date of Timaios’ death; Bats (1986) 29, 40, n. 57; Bats and Mouchot (1990) 223; Bats (1992) 273). It provides the most interesting evidence as to the kind of control exercised by Massalia over its dependencies (Strabo 4.1.8; CIL V 7914). It corresponds to modern Nice. Barr. 16, AC.

Olbia (’Ολβια) Ps.-Skymnos 216 mentions Olbia as a polis within the series of cities founded by Massalia to the east, and Strabo 4.1.5 adds that Olbia was one of the epiteichismata founded by Massalia for protection against the barbarians. The archaeological evidence suggests that Olbia was a “polis founded as a fortress” (cf. Hansen (1997b) 36). The earliest city wall is dated to c. 340–330 (Coupy (1986) 391–96; Bats et al. (1995) 372–76) and the city was laid out on a grid plan; it seems that Olbia was a square of 165 m × 165 m (Coupy (1986) 397–99; Bats and Brenot (1990) 208–9). The size of the city suggests that its population cannot have exceeded c.1,000 persons (Coupy (1974) 196), i.e. between 200 and 240 citizens of military age, which would amount to an infantry battalion or σύνταγμα (Coupy (1986) 397–99). Olbia had an agrarian territory of 305 ha, distributed in lots already from Ca4m (Benoit (1985) 45–47). Several cult places and other public works have been excavated at the site. Barr. 16, HRL.

Rhodanousia (’Ροδανούσια) This is described as a polis founded by Massalia by Ps.-Skymnos 208 and perhaps by Strabo 4.1.5, who also includes it among the epiteichismata designed to protect Massalia from the barbarians living around the river Rhône. Steph. Byz. calls it both πόλις Μασσαλίας (542.15) and πόλις ἐν Μασσαλία (546.1). The foundation date of the city is unknown, and its identification is likewise uncertain: some scholars have suggested identifying it with the site known as Espeyran (Saint-Gilles-du-Gard) (Barruol and Py (1978) 94–100), though recently doubts have been expressed (Bats (1986) 41, n. 63; Py (1990) 112–13, 284–85). Barr. 15 (Espeyran?), CHR.

Sekoanos (Σηκοανός) Leaning on the authority of Artemidoros, Steph. Byz. 562.7 describes Sekoanos as a πόλις Μασσαλιωτῶν; however, we may be dealing here with a mistake by Stephanos (πόλις instead of ποταμός); so Barr. 15, unlocated, H). It must be one of the rivers between the Rhône and Massalia, or even a waterway, perhaps the fossa Mariana (Barruol (1975) 199–200).

Stoichades Islands (Στοιχάδες) Strabo 4.1.10 mentions these five islands and says that they were tilled by the Massaliotes, who in ancient times (τὸ παλαιὸν) had built a fort (φρούριον) there to prevent piracy. Steph. Byz. 585.19 merely says πρὸς Μασσαλία. The modern name is îles d’Hyères. Barr. 16, CHRL.

Tauroeis (Ταύροεις) Tauroeis was one of the fortress-cities (epiteichismata) founded by Massalia to protect the coast against inland barbarians (Strabo 4.1.5, 9); the defensive character of the site is stressed by Caesar (B Civ. 2.4.5), who calls Tauroentum castellum Massiliensium (1.49). Artemidoros (apud Steph. Byz. 608.6) places the foundation
in the time of the fall of Phokaia (i.e. c.540). It is located at
the modern town of Le Brusc, and it is generally accepted
that the foundation of the city must be placed in C3l or Cae
(Arcelin (1986) 65; Bats (1986) 29, 40 n. 57; Brien-Poitevin
(1990); Bats (1992) 273). Barr. 16, HR.

*Theline (Theline) Avienus (Ora maritima 690–91) says
that the city of Arelate (Arles), by the river Rhone, was for-
ermerly called Theline, “when it was inhabited by Greeks”
(Arelatus illic ciuitas attollitur, Theline vocata sub priore
saeculo, graio incolente). Strabo 4.1.6 is silent about the Greek
identity of Arelate but describes it as a πόλις καὶ ἑμπόριον
οὐ µίκρον. Archaeology suggests the existence of a Greek
emporion from c.540, which lost its Greek character from—
perhaps—C4r (Arcelin (1995)). Barr. 15, ACH.

Troizen (Τροιζήν) The last of the cities called Troizen and
mentioned by Steph. Byz. 639.9, it is in Italy, but belongs
to Massalia (ἐν Μασσαλία τῆς Ἑλλάδας). In addition,
Eust. II.1.442 mentions a Massaliote city called Troizen and
placed in Italy (καὶ ἑτέρα ἐν Ἑλλάδα Μασσαλιωτικῇ).
Some scholars suggest that this Troizen must be a fortress
located in southern France, but situated east of the river Var
and so, formally, beyond the frontier between the
provincia and Italy, but subject to Massalia, as was Nikaaia (Strabo
4.1.9) and the other Massaliote poleis in Italy listed by Ptol.
Geog. 3.1.2 (cf. Barruol (1975) 233); others emend the text of
Stephanos and suppose the existence of two cities called
Troizen, one in the territory of Massalia and another in Italy
(cf. Brunel (1974)) or suggest a mistake in Stephanos’ and
Ptolemaios’ reading of their sources (cf. Clerc (1927)
247–49); finally, it has been suggested that Massaliote
Troizen in Italy cannot be other than the city of Poseidonia
(cf. Morel (1992) 20–21), neighbouring on and supposedly
closely related to Phokaian Hyele (no. 54), in its turn appar-
ently closely related to Massalia (Ps.-Skymnos 250: καὶ
Μασσαλιωτῶν Φωκαέων τ’ Ἑλεά πόλις). Not in Barr.

3. The Mediterranean Coast of Spain

The Greeks referred to the coast of the Iberian peninsula by
the generic name Ηβηρία, a term which, as time went on,
ended up as the name of the whole peninsula (Strabo 3.4.19).
The name Iberia seems to have been coined by the Greeks to
designate the westernmost places in the Mediterranean vis-
it by them since C3l; it presumably derives from the name
of the river Hiberos; however, the name Hiberos was applied
to several rivers of the Iberian peninsula in antiquity
(Domínguez (1983); Jacob (1988); Gaïlledrat (1997) 35–36),
and this fact may explain the different and sometimes con-
tradictory views which ancient writers hold on the extent of
Iberia (cf. Strabo 3.4.19). However, even if Herodotos (1.163)
still distinguishes between Tartessos and Iberia, the C5l his-
torian Herodoros of Herakleia ((FGrHist 31) fr. 2a) includes
within Iberia all of the coast between the western end of
the peninsula and the river Rhône, and so Strabo’s definition
of Iberia may be valid from C5l onwards: οἱ δὲ νῦν ἄριτον
αὐτής τίθενται τῇ Πυρήνῃ (3.4.19).

If the late and hardly reliable references to Rhodian
colonisation in Iberia (see Rhode (no. 4) with Domínguez
(1990) and Santiago (1994(b)) are disregarded, the only
Greeks to frequent Iberia seem to have been the Samians
and, above all, the Phokaians (Hdt. 4.152, 1.163–164;
for the earliest contacts, of C7l/C6e, is found at e.g. the
Tartessian town of Onoba (modern Huelva; Cabrera
(1988–89)), at the Phoenician city at Cerro del Villar
(Cabrera (1994)) and at the Iberian village at the location
where Emporion was eventually founded (Aquilué et al.
(1998) 24–25). However, these early contacts did not lead to
the foundation of Greek poleis: only Emporion developed
the structures of a polis and then only several decades after
the initial contacts between Greeks and natives. The Greek
settlements in Iberia were foundations of the Phokaians
(no. 859) or, perhaps, of the Phokaians from Massalia (no.
3); at least, it seems that Massalia ended up controlling,
probably both economically and politically, a major part of
the coastal regions of Iberia.

The Greek settlements in Iberia mentioned by our
sources are the following.

Alonis (Ἀλονίς) Artemidoros (apud Steph. Byz. 80.7)
describes Alonis as a νῆσος καὶ πόλις Μασσαλίας. It is not
completely certain that Alonis was located in Iberia,
although it may be the place called Allone by Pompon.
2.93, and situated in the Sinus Ilicitanus; it could also be the
Ἀλονίας of Ptol. Geog. 2.6.14. It remains unlocated, although
many suggestions have been advanced for its site (García y
Bellido (1948) 58–59); recently, Rouillard (1991) 303–6 has
suggested that it may be on modern Santa Pola, where exca-
vations have revealed a (native) fortified settlement of C5s
and finds show strong Greek influences (Moret et al. (1995);
Badié and Moret (1997)). Barr. 27 (S. Pola?), CHRL.

Hemerokespeion (Ημεροσκοπείον) Hemerokespeion
was the most famous (γνωριμίαστα) of the three
πολίχνια Μασσαλιωτῶν between the river Jucar and New
Carthage (Strabo 3.4.6: μεταξὶ [. . .] τοῦ Σούκρωνος καὶ
πόλις Κελτιβήρων) and the only one known by name. To the Romans it was Dianium, on account of its sanctuary of Artemis Ephesia (Strabo 3.4.6). Artemidoros (apud Steph. Byz. 302.1) considers it a polis of the Celtiberians, founded by the Phokaians: πόλις Κελτιβήρων, Φωκαέων ἀποικος. Avienus, Ora maritima 476–77—probably the earliest reference to the city—says merely that it had been inhabited in ancient times (Heremescopium quoque habitatia pridem hic ciuitas), but was deserted in his own day. In spite of the strong Greek influence in the presumed area of location (Domínguez (1991a) 125–27), the existence of this city cannot be demonstrated by archaeological evidence, and it is not impossible that the literary tradition for its existence arose only in Roman times (Pena (1993b)). Barr. 27 (Denia), CHRL.

Mainake (Μαυνάκη) The earliest reference to Mainake is in Avienus' Ora maritima 427–31: he does not give any information about its origins and identifies it incorrectly with Malaka: Malachaeque flumen, urbe cum cognomine, Menace priore quae uocata est saeculo Malachaeque flumen, urbe cum cognomine, information about its origins and identifies it incorrectly (Ps.-Skymnos). Barr. 180 (Sanmartí (1992)). Most other Iberian toponyms of allegedly Greek poleis are known (Jacob (1994)), but only in two cases have scholars suggested that they were in fact Greek: Pyrene and Cypselae. (1) Pyrene is mentioned by Hdt. 2.33.3 as the place where the river Istrros begins (‘Ἰστρος τε γάρ ποταμός ἀρξάμενος ἐκ Κελτῶν καὶ Πύρηνων πόλεων ἀπασών ἐχει δέσιν. Strabo 3.4.2 likewise describes Mainake as the most westerly polis ever founded by the Phokaians (ὑστάτη τῶν Φωκαίκων πόλεων πρὸς δύσει κειµένην), on the basis of received tradition (παρελήφθημεν), but he distinguishes its ruins from Phoenician Malaka. In spite of the great quantity of hypotheses regarding its possible location, neither the date nor the character of Mainake have been clarified (for a recent summary and a new proposal, see Jacob (1994)). Barr. 27 (Cerro del Peñón?), ACH.

Several other Iberian toponyms of allegedly Greek poleis are known (Jacob (1985)), but only in two cases have scholars suggested that they were in fact Greek: Pyrene and Cypselae. (1) Pyrene is mentioned by Hdt. 2.33.3 as the place where the river Istrros begins (‘Ἰστρος τε γάρ ποταμός ἀρξάμενος ἐκ Κελτῶν καὶ Πύρηνων πόλεως ἀπασών ἐχει δέσιν. Strabo 3.4.2 likewise describes Mainake as the most westerly polis ever founded by the Phokaians (ὑστάτη τῶν Φωκαίκων πόλεων πρὸς δύσει κειµένην), on the basis of received tradition (παρελήφθημεν), but he distinguishes its ruins from Phoenician Malaka. In spite of the great quantity of hypotheses regarding its possible location, neither the date nor the character of Mainake have been clarified (for a recent summary and a new proposal, see Jacob (1994)). Barr. 27 (Cerro del Peñón?), ACH.

Several other Iberian toponyms of allegedly Greek poleis are known (Jacob (1985)), but only in two cases have scholars suggested that they were in fact Greek: Pyrene and Cypselae. (1) Pyrene is mentioned by Hdt. 2.33.3 as the place where the river Istrros begins (‘Ἰστρος τε γάρ ποταμός ἀρξάμενος ἐκ Κελτῶν καὶ Πύρηνων πόλεως ἀπασών ἐχει δέσιν. Strabo 3.4.2 likewise describes Mainake as the most westerly polis ever founded by the Phokaians (ὑστάτη τῶν Φωκαίκων πόλεων πρὸς δύσει κειµένην), on the basis of received tradition (παρελήφθημεν), but he distinguishes its ruins from Phoenician Malaka. In spite of the great quantity of hypotheses regarding its possible location, neither the date nor the character of Mainake have been clarified (for a recent summary and a new proposal, see Jacob (1994)). Barr. 27 (Cerro del Peñón?), ACH.

Several other Iberian toponyms of allegedly Greek poleis are known (Jacob (1985)), but only in two cases have scholars suggested that they were in fact Greek: Pyrene and Cypselae. (1) Pyrene is mentioned by Hdt. 2.33.3 as the place where the river Istrros begins (‘Ἰστρος τε γάρ ποταμός ἀρξάμενος ἐκ Κελτῶν καὶ Πύρηνων πόλεως ἀπασών ἐχει δέσιν. Strabo 3.4.2 likewise describes Mainake as the most westerly polis ever founded by the Phokaians (ὑστάτη τῶν Φωκαίκων πόλεων πρὸς δύσει κειµένην), on the basis of received tradition (παρελήφθημεν), but he distinguishes its ruins from Phoenician Malaka. In spite of the great quantity of hypotheses regarding its possible location, neither the date nor the character of Mainake have been clarified (for a recent summary and a new proposal, see Jacob (1994)). Barr. 27 (Cerro del Peñón?), ACH.

Several other Iberian toponyms of allegedly Greek poleis are known (Jacob (1985)), but only in two cases have scholars suggested that they were in fact Greek: Pyrene and Cypselae. (1) Pyrene is mentioned by Hdt. 2.33.3 as the place where the river Istrros begins (‘Ἰστρος τε γάρ ποταμός ἀρξάμενος ἐκ Κελτῶν καὶ Πύρηνων πόλεως ἀπασών ἐχει δέσιν. Strabo 3.4.2 likewise describes Mainake as the most westerly polis ever founded by the Phokaians (ὑστάτη τῶν Φωκαίκων πόλεων πρὸς δύσει κειµένην), on the basis of received tradition (παρελήφθημεν), but he distinguishes its ruins from Phoenician Malaka. In spite of the great quantity of hypotheses regarding its possible location, neither the date nor the character of Mainake have been clarified (for a recent summary and a new proposal, see Jacob (1994)). Barr. 27 (Cerro del Peñón?), ACH.

Several other Iberian toponyms of allegedly Greek poleis are known (Jacob (1985)), but only in two cases have scholars suggested that they were in fact Greek: Pyrene and Cypselae. (1) Pyrene is mentioned by Hdt. 2.33.3 as the place where the river Istrros begins (‘Ἰστρος τε γάρ ποταμός ἀρξάμενος ἐκ Κελτῶν καὶ Πύρηνων πόλεως ἀπασών ἐχει δέσιν. Strabo 3.4.2 likewise describes Mainake as the most westerly polis ever founded by the Phokaians (ὑστάτη τῶν Φωκαίκων πόλεων πρὸς δύσει κειµένην), on the basis of received tradition (παρελήφθημεν), but he distinguishes its ruins from Phoenician Malaka. In spite of the great quantity of hypotheses regarding its possible location, neither the date nor the character of Mainake have been clarified (for a recent summary and a new proposal, see Jacob (1994)). Barr. 27 (Cerro del Peñón?), ACH.

4. The Massaliote Colonisation

This is not the place for a detailed discussion of the colonisation activities of Massalia (no. 3), which affected mainly the coastal regions of Iberia, Gaul and Liguria. However, a few words must be said. Our sources frequently vary in their descriptions of the origins of individual sites, which are sometimes described as Massaliote and sometimes as Phokaian foundations. It seems that later sources especially tend to conflate these two terms, obviously because Massalia itself was a foundation of Phokaia. Consequently, it is sometimes difficult to identify the founder of a site. In any case, it seems that Massalia was from the beginning the centre for the Phokaian designs on the western Mediterranean (Gantès (1992); Tréziny (1995)). At least, Massalia soon began to expand its area of influence, mainly westwards. The main evidence for westward expansion comes from Emporion (no. 2), where the Palaia Polis (modern San Martín de Ampurias) seems to have been frequented by Greeks from c.600, and where the first Greek settlement, dated c.575, has a strong Massaliote flavour (Aquilué et al. (1998) 26–28); a close relationship with Massalia seems to continue until at least C6; but from C5 Emporion develops its own area of economic and perhaps political interests (Sanmartí (1992)).

Within the area in which Phokaia and/or Massalia had interests in the Archaic and Classical periods were other settlements that later sources describe as poleis, e.g. Agathe (supra) and Rhode (no. 4). It is not certain, however, that they were all poleis; thus, while Rhode minted coins during C4, Agathe did not. There is no information about the status of the settlements that were not poleis; they may have been trading ports or emporia frequented by the Massaliotes (or even by the Phokaian). Archaeology has revealed a network of C6–C5 Massaliote trading posts in southern France, and such sites attest to the wide trading interests of Massalia...
(Bats (1992)). In most cases the names that the Greeks eventually applied to these sites remain unknown, but it is not impossible that their names were misinterpreted by later writers as names of Greek polis.

From C51 Massalia began to secure her control of the coastal regions of southern France by establishing a network of fortress-cities, beginning with Agathe, “promoted” to this status from the previous status of emporion; this policy continued well into Roman times (Strabo 4.1.5). Olbia, founded in 340 or 330, shows clearly the military character of these foundations (see supra). The remainder of these Massaliote fortress-colonies seem to have been founded in Hellenistic times, the later ones undoubtedly at a time when Massalia benefited from the assistance of the Roman army in subduing the native tribes living inland (Strabo 4.1.5; Bats (1986); Arcelin (1986)). It is not wholly clear what type of relationship cities like Agathe and Olbia had to Massalia; it is tempting to consider them as “polis founded as fortresses” according to the typology suggested by Hansen (1997b) 36 no. 12; they may have been dependent polis (Gschnitzer (1958) 25), as even Strabo (4.1.5 or, implicitly, 4.1.9) seems to attest (at least for later times) when he speaks about the ἕπικοοι of Massalia; some scholars have considered them to be similar to klerouchies (Sanmarti (1992) 29), but we should not rule out the possibility that these places were used by Massalia as bases to develop the penetration inland of her commercial interests (Clavel-Lévêque (1985) 81).

From C5 Emporion (no. 2) seems to have begun to develop its own interests; it began to mint coins and to erect public buildings and, perhaps, to constitute itself as a polis; Rhode (no. 4) seems to follow a similar path slightly later.

It is not known when the three πόλεις Μασσαλιωτῶν (Strabo 3.4.6) situated between the river Jucar and New Carthage were established; the only one known by name, Hemeroskopeion, was perhaps not a polis, and Artemidoros considers it a Phokaian foundation. If the site at La Picola can be related in any way to Alonis, it was clearly not a Greek polis but a native fortress-town strongly influenced in its lay-out and defensive works by Greek models of the Classical period. Whether those two places depended on Massalia or Emporion (or on Massalia through Emporion?) cannot be ascertained.

II. The Poleis

1. Alalie Map 48b. Lat. 42.10, long. 9.70. Size of territory: 3(?). Type: Α.α. The toponym is Ἀλαλή, η (Hdt. 1.165.1, 166.3). A city-ethnic is not attested; Herodotos refers to the community as οἱ Φωκαιείς (1.166.2 bis).

Alalie is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 1.165.1 (ἀνεστήσαντο πόλιν). The name of the territory is unknown, but its extent, after C6 when the refugees from Phokaia arrived, has been calculated at 200 km² (Gras (1985) 404), and it may have been divided into lots (Jehasse and Jehasse (1987) 380). The “epoecised” city put a fleet of sixty ships to sea (Hdt. 1.166.2), which indicates a population of c.20,000 inhabitants (Gras (1985) 400–6) or even more (Domínguez (1985) 375–76).

Alalie was founded by Phokaia (no. 859), in accordance with an oracle, 20 years before the fall of Phokaia, i.e. c.560 (Hdt. 1.165.1). In c.546 the Phokaians decided to relocate their city in reaction to the Persian threat, and almost half of the Phokaian citizens were received at Alalie. From the Alalian point of view, the arrival of these refugees may have been perceived as reception of ἐποίκιοι, while from the point of view of the Phokaians it was a case of metoikesis (Demand (1990) 37). The refugees arrived with wives, sons and sacred objects from their home sanctuaries (Hdt. 1.164.3, 166.3).

After a naval battle with the Carthaginians and the Etruscans c.540, in which the Alarians were victorious but suffered severe losses, the city was perhaps dismantled (Hdt. 1.166.3; ἀνέλαβον [...] καὶ τὴν ἄλλην κτίσιν, and certainly abandoned (Hdt. 1.166.3; ἀνέλαβον τὰ τέκνα καὶ τᾶς γυναίκας [...] καὶ ἔπειτα ἀπέντες τὴν Κύρνον ἐπέλειον ἐς Ῥήγιον). However, the abandonment was perhaps not complete, as the existence of some archaeological remains dated to C6 (and antedating the foundation(?) of the Etruscan city) would suggest (Jehasse and Jehasse (1982) 255; cf. Domínguez (1985) 376–77). In any case, after the battle, Alalie ceased to be a polis and its site was subsequently occupied by an Etruscan city, whose cemetery (C6 – C3m) has been excavated (Jehasse and Jehasse (1973)).

Herodotos 1.166.3 seems to imply the existence of a political body making decisions, but its composition or organisation is unknown. At 1.166.1 he implies the existence of religious precincts (ἱερὰ) at Alalie, some of them perhaps of a substantial nature (temples)—he uses the verb ἐνιδρύω; besides, the Phokaian refugees carried with them all the sacred objects, statues and offerings (τὰ ἁγάλματα [...] καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἀναθήματα) taken from their original hiera at Phokaia—except those made of bronze and stone and the paintings (Hdt. 1.164.3)—and we may think that they placed these in newly built edifices as soon as they arrived at Alalie; however, they have not been identified. Remains of a city wall have been discovered, of the agger type, with a broad glacis in
front of it, perhaps dated to C6s (Jehasse and Jehasse (1982) 250–53, (1994) 312–14) and perhaps protecting the Greek city. There are also remains of C6s dwellings constructed in mud-brick (Jehasse and Jehasse (1994) 312) as well as Greek pottery of Archaic date (Jehasse and Jehasse (1982) 251–54).

2. Emporion (Emporites)  Map 25. Lat. 42.10, long. 3.10. Size of territory: 2. Type: A;β. The toponym is 'Εμπόριον, τό (Ps.-Skylax 2; Ps.-Skymnos 204) and the city-ethnic is 'Εμπορίτης (SEG 37 838 (530–500); Strabo 3.4.8) or 'Ενπορείτης (C4l coins, infra). Some scholars have suggested that the original name may have been Pyrene (Hind (1972)) or *Kypselē (Lamboglia (1949), (1974); Oikonomides (1974)) and one of these names (in particular Pyrene) might well have been the name of the first settlement, which was renamed Παλαιά πόλις (Strabo 3.4.8) when the (new) city on the mainland was founded; however, there is no evidence for the use of any of these names to refer to Emporion, whose name is presumably attested already in C6l (SEG 38 838; cf. supra).

Apart from Ps.-Skylax 2 (Hansen (1997a) 88), the earliest references to Emporion as a polis are in Polyb. 3.39.7 and Ps.-Skymnos 202–4 (all in the urban sense). It is described as a polis in the urban and political sense by Strabo 3.4.8, a passage which also refers to the politēuma and uses dipolis about Emporion. If Pyrene at Hdt. 2.33.2 designates the present city, this passage provides an occurrence of polis in the territorial sense. It is usually inferred from the toponym that Emporion was an emporion. For a discussion of this question, see Hansen (forthcoming). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in a C6l inscription (SEG 37 838) and on coins (EM, EMΠΙ, ΕΜΠΟΡ (C5l–C4); ΕΜΠΟΡΙΤΩΝ(C4l–C3); Villaronga (1994) 3–8,1730) and externally in a commercial document of C5m (SEG 38 1036).

Emporion was founded c.600 (Aquilué et al. (1996) 61–62), whether by Massaliote Phokaians (Ps.-Skymnos 203–4), Massaliotes (Ps.-Skylax 2; Strabo 3.4.8) or Phokaians (Livy 26.19, 34.4; cf. Pliny 3.22). Ps.-Skymnos 204–5 includes Emporion among the Greek poleis founded by Massalia (καὶ πόλεις 'Ελληνιδές, ἃς Μασσαλιώται Φωκαῖοι ἀπόκακας πρῶτη μὲν 'Εμπόριον); Strabo 4.1.5 seems to imply that Emporion was included within the system of fortresses set up by Massalia to protect the coast (supra 162–63). However, on present evidence it is not clear how long Emporion remained within that Massaliote system (cf. Gschnitzer (1958) 25–26).

The territory of Emporion stretched into the interior of the country (mesogaia), and at least a part of it was called 'Ιονγκάριον πεδίου (Strabo 3.4.9). According to some scholars, the territory comprised 360 km² and may have been bordered by native villages (Plana (1994) 109–16). In one of these the remains of a possible C3 sanctuary of Demeter have been found; it may have replaced an older shrine (Pons (1993)). The existence of a C4 cadaster occupying 15,000 ha has also been proposed (Plana (1994) 169–89). However, these figures seem too high for such a tiny urban centre, and other scholars have suggested a smaller territory of 3,300 ha: 1,300 ha of arable land and 2,000 ha of eschatia (Sanmartí (1993) 92–94). The reference in Strabo 3.4.8 to Rhodes (no. 4) as a πολείκαιον 'Εμπορίτων seems to imply that, at least by C5s, Emporion had integrated the territory of Rhodes into its own territory.

On the basis of the size of the city (5 ha), it has been supposed that the inhabitants numbered max. 1,500–2,000 (Domínguez (1986) 4; Marcit and Sanmartí (1990) 118–19).

Originally Emporion was divided into separate Greek and non-Greek communities, but at a certain point the two communities merged into one to form a single citizen body of mixed ethnicity (Strabo 3.4.8; Pena (1988) 11–27; Santiago (1994a)). This merger may have taken place c.375, when the second city wall was constructed, thus suppressing an extra-urban settlement (assigned to the natives by its excavator), and situated by the C5 city wall (Sanmartí (1993) 88–89).

The existence of a political community is indicated by the C5–C4 mint (infra) and by bricks stamped ΔΗΜ (ἰ δηµοσία/δηµόσιον) and dated perhaps to C3 (Almagro (1952) no. 35; Pena (1992) 141). The only reference to the political system is found in Strabo 3.4.8, which refers to a πολίτευμα μικτόν of Greek and barbarian νόµοι produced by the merger described supra. A C5s lead tablet found at Emporion contains the word (or the ending) νόµος, although its precise meaning cannot be determined (Almagro (1952) no. 21; Pena (1992) 140–41; Santiago (1993) 288–89). The honours owed to Artemis Ephesia were presumably defined by law (Strabo 4.1.4), and in later sources there are references to custom (mos) and laws (leges; Livy 34.9 (rC2e)). Livy (34.9 (rC3e)) also refers to several magistrates.

The agora of the city is known only in its C2f form (Mar and Ruiz de Arbulo (1993) 160–69). Although Artemis Ephesia was worshipped at Emporion (Strabo 3.4.8), her sanctuary has not yet been identified. A C5s sanctuary consisting of at least an Ionic temple and a double altar has been excavated in the southern part of the city. In C4f the area was reorganised and a new sanctuary constructed, perhaps devoted to Asklepios; the Palaia polis has yielded a relief
depicting two sphinxes, almost certainly from a temple (Marcet and Sanmartí (1990) 69). The city had a public water reservoir, dug in Ç4e, and included within the sacred area placed in the southern part of the city; by the city walls and their southern entrance gate (ibid. (1990) 87). The earliest Greek settlement, in antiquity situated on an island that is now connected to the continent, may have functioned as the acropolis; it was called Παλαιὰ πόλις (Strabo 3.4.8).

Strabo 3.4.8 mentions the existence of a city wall at Emporion and sketches the history of its development. The first wall so far known was constructed in Ç5s in the southern part of the city (Sanmarti and Nolla (1986)); Ç275 that wall was dismantled and in the same area a new wall was constructed with an elaborate L-shaped entrance system (Sanmarti et al. (1992)); this is certainly the wall mentioned by Livy 34.9. In Ç3s a proteichisma was constructed; however, in Ç2m all these fortifications were demolished and, reusing the same stones, a new wall was constructed 20 m further out, a wall that is still preserved (Sanmarti et al. (1988))). According to Livy 34.9 (rÇ2e), the defence of the city walls of the polis was—at least in times of war—entrusted to one-third of the inhabitants, who were on duty every night.

The oldest remains of dwellings come from the Palaia polis and consist of rectangular rooms in mudbrick on stone basements; they date to Ç6f (Aquilué et al. (1996) 57–58, (1999) 217–30). The city on the mainland seems to have reached its maximum extent already in Ç5s, which makes it difficult to sketch the first stages of its development and layout; in any case, it seems to have been centred on a main street running north–south and crossed at right angles by secondary streets (Marcet and Sanmarti (1990) 106–8).

The patron divinity of Emporion was Artemis Ephesia (Strabo 3.4.8); cults of the Nymphs, Themis and Poseidon are epigraphically attested (Almagro (1952) nos. 9–11, 49), as are cults of Asklepios and Sarapis; in all these cases the evidence is Hellenistic or Roman.

The mint of Emporion possibly began to strike silver coins of the Auriiol type in Ç5f, imitating Massaliote prototypes. From Ç5m the mint produced minor denominations and was under the influence of Sicily, Mainland Greece and Asia Minor; their weights vary from 0.15/0.25 g to 0.46/0.45 g and 0.90/0.95 g; the coins are anepigraphic. Ç4l/Ç4f coins are inscribed with the legend ΕΜ, ΕΜΠΙ or ΕΜΠΙΟΠ and show influences from Magna Graecia and Athens; the weight is 0.94 g. From Ç4l Emporion struck a so-called drachm weighing 4.70 g. Types: obv. head of a goddess (Artemis?); legend: ΕΜΠΙΟΡΙΤΩΝ or ΕΝΠΙΟΡΕΙΤΩΝ; rev. horse (Villaronga (1997)). It is quite possible that all these coins were struck on the Phokaian standard (Campos (1992); García-Bellido (1994)), and both the first issues and the drachms seem also to be related to the weights of the Massaliote system (Villaronga (1998); Head, HN2 1–2; SNG Cap. Spain-Gaul 637–39).

Emporion was perhaps considered to be the coloniser of nearby Rhode (no. 4; Strabo 3.4.8). A very fragmentary Ç5s lead tablet has the sequence [. . .]νοι ἐκσκατοικίσατι, meaning something like “where to establish (or found) a city” (Almagro (1952) no. 21; Pena (1992) 140–41; Santiago (1993) 288–89), though it is unclear where and when the eventual foundation was to be planted.

3. Massalia (Massaliotes) Map 15. Lat. 43.28, long. 5.22.

Size of territory: 3. Type: Ατα. The toponym is Μασσαλία, η (Hecat. fr. 55; Thuc.1.13.6) and the city-ethnic Μασσαλιώτης (Dem. 32.8; Arist. fr. 560). In the Ionic dialect they are, respectively, Μασσαλιή (Hdt. 5.9.15) and Μασσαλιότες (LSAG/288 no. 2 (Ç5f)).

Massalia is called a polis Hellenis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 4 (cf. Ps.-Skymnos 209, perhaps drawing on Timaios (FGrHist 566) fr. 71, though probably not for the term polis). It is called polis in the political sense by Arist. Pol. 1305b–5; politikos is used about the constitution at Arist. Pol. 1305b10, and politeuma is found at Pol. 1321b30–31; there was an Aristotelian Massalioton politeia (Arist. fr. 560), and Dem. 32.8 refers to the politi.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on Ç5m coins (Brenot (1992)) and externally in Dem. 32.8–9 and Arist. fr. 560. The earliest examples of the external individual use are LSAG 288 no. 2 (Ç5f) and IG xiv 295 (Ç4f); see further Robert (1968) and Manganaro (1992)).

There are two different traditions about the foundation of Massalia, and consequently two different dates for the foundation. One tradition places the foundation in 600 (Timaios (FGrHist 566) fr. 7 = 120 years before the battle of Salamis), while the other places it at the time of the fall of Phokaia (no. 859) to the Persians in 346 (Antiocchos (FGrHist 555) fr. 8; Isoc. Archidamus 84). The archaeological evidence supports the earlier date (Graham (2001) 38), but the existence of two different foundation dates may perhaps suggest a kind of refoundation in Çem, as a consequence of the arrival of refugees from Phokaia after the Persian conquest of Ionia (Gras (1987)); Dominguez (1991b) 250–53; Bats (1994); Gras (1995)). All the sources agree on the metropolis: Phokaia (Hecat. fr. 55; Thuc. 1.13–14; Arist. fr. 560), though there is no unanimity concerning the oasis(s): it was Euxenos (Arist. fr. 560), or Simos and Protis (Just. Epit.}
The territory is called Μασσαλιώτις (Strabo 4.2.3); the toponym may also have been used to denote the territory (cf. Brunel (1945)); it is referred to as ἡ Μασσαλιώτις χώρα at Arist. Mir. ausc. 837ª8 (cf. Ps.-Skylax 4) and is described as planted with olives and vines but poor in grain (Strabo 4.1.5). The territory of Massalia has been the subject of much discussion (Bats (1986) 17–19; Morel (1986)) and it is now supposed that throughout the Archaic and Classical periods Massalia possessed a territory of c.70 km² (Arcelin (1986) 74), territorial expansion taking off only in C3 (Strabo 4.1.5; Bats (1986); Arcelin (1986) 52–75). In any case, there are hardly any archaeological traces of the occupation of the territory (Arcelin (1986) 47). Apart from controlling its territory proper, Massalia seems to have founded, and kept under its sway, a network of coastal cities (Strabo 4.1.5, 9) with the intention of protecting the coast against incursions of inland barbarians. Leaving aside the very problematic cases of the cities inibia (Emporion, Rhode, etc.), the beginning of this policy can be dated to C5, which saw the foundation of Agathe, and its continuation is marked by the foundations of Olbia (C4s), Tauroes (C5l) and Nikaia (C5l/Cez7), the only cities for which we have acceptable dates (Bats (1986) 27–30). The way in which Massalia controlled these foundations is incompletely known (Gschnitzer (1958) 20–26), although in general it seems that the majority (or all) of them may have been dependent “poleis founded as fortresses” in the typology of Hansen (1997b) 36 no. 12; however, in no case can polis status be proved, and accordingly each city is briefly described in the Introduction above.

If we can trust Justinus’ retrospective narrative, Massalia had a foedus and amicitia with Rome from the time of its foundation (Just. Epit. 43.3.4, 5.3), completed in C4e with the granting to Massalia of immunitas and the establishment (or renewal?) of a foedus aequo iure (Just. Epit. 43.5.10; see Nenci (1958) 63–97). Massalia sent envoys to Delphi in C4e (Just. Epit. 43.5.8).

The armed forces of Massalia, especially the fleet, were deployed on several occasions; thus, a naval defeat of the Carthaginians is reported for the very moment of the foundation (Thuc. 1.13.6, Paus. 10.18.7) as well as for later occasions (Just. Epit. 43.5.2; Gras (1987)). On land Massalia waged wars against the natives from the foundation of the city (Just. Epit. 43.4.9–11, 5.1) and established a network of fortified places for protection against the native populations (Just. Epit. 43.3.13; Strabo 4.1.5, 9 (C4?)); cf. supra.

It has been suggested that the total population of the city never exceeded 20,000 inhabitants (Bats (1992) 273). The existence of γένη, such as the Πρωτιάδαι, is attested for C4 (Arist. fr. 560).

Massalia had an oligarchic constitution (Arist. Pol. 1305b4, 10, 1320b8, 1321a30); the enfranchised citizens are referred to as the politeuma, and access to the politeuma was by election of those found worthy of membership (Arist. Pol. 1321a29–31). Aristotle also refers to an undated stasis in Massalia by which the oligarchy was changed into a constitution that came closer to being a politeia, the positive variant of popular rule (Pol. 1305a1–4); perhaps its outcome is the eumonic aristocracy mentioned by Strabo 4.1.5 for his own day (or that of his informant(s)). Some Massiliote laws are referred to by Theophr. fr. 117, Wimmer; Ael. VH 2.38.1; and Livy 37.54.22 (1189). These laws were Ionic (νόμοι Ἰωνικοί) and were exhibited in public (Strabo 4.1.5). Val. Max. 2.6.7 mentions the death penalty as having been used since the foundation of the city.

Massalia had a council (interpreted as a senatus by Val. Max. 2.6.7) called the Six Hundred (οἱ Ἐξακόσιοι), whose members served for life and were called τιμωροί (I.Lampsakos 4.45, 48 (C2e); Strabo 4.1.5); this council was presided over by the Fifteen (οἱ Πεντεκαίδεκα; Strabo 4.1.5; Caesar, B Civ.1.35.1), who were in turn controlled by the Three (οἱ Τρεῖς; Strabo 4.1.5), one of whom was chairman (Strabo 4.1.5) and possibly the eponymous magistrate, although this is not confirmed. There is no solid evidence for the existence of an assembly at Massalia; however, the existence of a demos may possibly be implied by the reference to the public exhibition (δημοσία) of the laws (Strabo 4.1.5), and IG xiv 357 (C1?) has sometimes been interpreted to prove the existence of a demos, but it is a problematic document; Properzio (1989) 296–97 denies that it alludes to
a Massaliote demos, while Clerc (1927) 451 n. 1 considers the inscription a falsum.

In C2, and almost certainly before, the agora of Massalia was situated in a low-lying area between the two main elevations of the city, Saint-Laurent hill and Moulins hill (Gantès (1992) 85). Although it has not been found, Massalia presumably had a temple dedicated to Athena, since Strabo 13.1.41 refers to its ξέωνον just as Just. Epit. 43.5.6 (rC5?) alludes to its simulacrum and to the porticus of the temple, situated on the arx. The city also possessed a ἐπόρον devoted to Apollo Delphinios and a temple (νεός) dedicated to Artemis Ephesia, both on the ἄκρα (Strabo 4.1.4). A monumental Ionic C6l capital has been unearthed (Benoit (1954)), as has a set of fifty tiny C5e naïskoi with a seated goddess pertaining to two different sanctuaries (Clerc (1927) 227–40); a possible C4e Thesmophorion has also been identified (Gantès (1992) 79, 85). The water management system of the city was very elaborate, with cisterns, water reservoirs and drains, some of them dating to C6e (Trouset (1990)). There is an epigraphical reference to a stadiion (perhaps of Roman date: Benoit (1966) 20); from the foundation of the city the harbour received special attention and many substantial structures related to it have been excavated, the oldest ones dating to C6l (Guéry (1992); Hesnard (1995) 65–78).

Massalia had an acropolis; Strabo 4.1.4 refers to the πέτρα, presumably the acropolis, and furthermore refers to the ἄκρα, presumably a part within the acropolis. The acropolis was perhaps circled by a separate wall, different from that around the city proper according to Strabo himself (4.1.4; Tréziny (1994) 128–29, modified in Tréziny (2001) 49). Just. Epit. 43.4.4 implies the existence of walls from at least the second generation of colonists. There are remains of an early (C6l) city wall which already enclosed the area of the later city almost in its entirety; in C4 a new defensive system was built and the previous wall razed to the ground at several points (Tréziny (1994) 125–30, (1995) 44–45, (2001) 45–53).

During C6f Massalia slowly expanded and came to occupy almost 25 ha; in C6m the extent of the city was already more or less similar to that of the later city (c.40 ha (Tréziny (2001) 53). While some houses and other urban features are known from C6e, the general layout of the city is not fully known, though there is some evidence of C6m grid planning (Tréziny (1995) 50); perhaps the main axis of the city was constituted by the prolongation, inside the city, of the road that entered the city through the eastern gate and led to the agora. In C4f some quarters of the city had a regular plan (Gantès (1992); Moliner (2001) 101–8).

Strabo 4.1.4 seems to imply that the patron divinity was Artemis Ephesia. Also attested is the cult of Athena (Strabo 13.1.41), supposed by some scholars to be the protective divinity of the city (Tréziny (1994) 129–30). Massalia celebrated the Anthestheria (referred to by Just. Epit. 43.4.6 (rC6) as Floralia) and the Thargelia (Serv. ad Aen. 3.57; Lact. Plac. comm. ad Stat. Theb. 10.798; IG xiv 2464(?) (Salviat (1992) 144–45).

Massalia erected a treasury at Delphi (Diod. 14.93.4 (1396), App. Ital. 8.3 (1396; rC4m)), identified with the so-called Aiolian treasure at Marmaria and dated between 540 and 530 (Salviat (1981)). Paus. 10.8.6–7 furthermore mentions a statue of Athena dedicated at Delphi as well as one of Apollo (10.18.7) dedicated to commemorate a naval victory over the Carthaginians; Just. Epit. 43.5.8 (rC4e) also refers to the dedication of offerings to Apollo at Delphi.

The mint of Massalia struck silver coins from c.525/520 to 470/460 of the so-called Auriol-type, heavily influenced by contemporary Ionian issues (Furtwängler (1978)). From C5n Massaliote coins became more similar to the coins issued in Magna Graecia and Sicily, and down to C4e we can trace at least seven issues of obols weighing from 0.71 to 0.85 g, with types mainly reminiscent of those found in Sicily. Many of these issues carry the legend ΜΑΣΣΑΛΙΩΤΑΝ (in the Doric dialect; Brenot (1992)). The minting of obols, although progressively of lower weight, continued until C3l (Brenot (1980)). In C4e begins the minting of a new and short-lived coin, a drachm weighing 3.75 g (called a “heavy drachm” to distinguish it from the “light drachm” weighing 2.65 g issued from C3l). Issues of this coin ceased in 360. It shows on the obv. Artemis Ephesia and on the rev. a lion similar to the lion on the coins of Elea; the legend is ΜΑΣΣΑΛΙΗΤΩΝ (this time in Ionic dialect; Brenot (1982)). It has been argued that all these coins were struck on the Phokaian standard, despite the different weights used in the different issues (García-Bellido (1994); SNG Cop. Spain-Gaul 708–28).

4. Rhode (Rhodetes) Map 25. Lat. 42.15, long. 23.20. Size of territory: ? Type: B:a. The toponym is Ρόδη (Ps.-Skymnos 204; Steph. Byz. 546.4) or Ρόδος (Strabo 3.4.8, 14.2.10); the city-ethnic is Ροδησίας (coins, infra) or Ρόδαιος (Steph. Byz. 546.4).

Rhode is called a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skymnos 202–4. Strabo 3.4.8 describes it as a polichnion. The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is attested by C4l coin legends (infra).
According to Strabo 14.2.10, Rhode was colonised by Rhodians prior to the foundation of the Olympic Games. Ps.-Skymnos (205–6; cf. Strabo 3.4.8) also alludes to a Rhodian foundation and to later Massaliote occupation (Ps.-Skymnos 203; cf. Strabo 14.2.10). Strabo 3.4.8 states that Rhode belonged to Emporion (no. 2). The sources thus seem to imply a double foundation, first by Rhodians and afterwards by Massalia (Strabo 14.2.10), or Phokaians from Massalia (Ps.-Skymnos 202–6), or, alternatively, by Rhodians and Emporitans (Strabo 3.4.8). The much debated Rhodian foundation must, however, be rejected (Domínguez 1990); Santiago (1994b) 59–63; Graham (2001) 36–37). The short and obscure reference by Strabo 14.2.10 to the causes of the Rhodian foundation of Rhode (ἐπὶ σωτηρία τῶν ἀνθρώπων) may possibly be based on a foundation myth, but such a myth must be of a late date (Domínguez 1990).

The only reference to public enactments is found in Strabo 4.1.4, where he alludes to the enacting by law of the honours owed to Artemis Ephesia. This goddess had a temple in Rhode (Strabo 3.4.8, 4.1.4) and was the patron divinity of the city (Strabo 3.4.8).

Although the site of the Greek city has yielded ceramic evidence dating to C6l and C5 (Martín, Nieto and Nolla 1979) 326–27; Vivó 1996) 112), the earliest levels associated with habitation date from C4e (Puig et al. 1994–95) 128). However, the layout of the settlement at this date is almost unknown, since in C3e the city underwent a complete reorganisation which obliterated the previous houses; it has, however, been suggested that the layout was more or less regular (Puig et al. 1996)); the C4e houses had foundations of large stones (Puig et al. 1994–95) 128); in C3e, the city was reorganised and enlarged with the construction of a new quarter on a regular plan, with streets crossing each other at right angles; some of the streets discovered so far are 4 m wide (Martin, Nieto and Nolla 1979) 269–311; Vivó 1996); Martín and Puig (2001) 59–60). In C3l a strong city wall was erected and enclosed all of the settlement (Puig et al. 1996) 243–44; Puig 1998b) 155–63); in its eastern course the wall perhaps served also to channel the river and to give way to harbour constructions (Puig 1998a) 118).

Rhode was perhaps considered one of the fortresses established by Massalia to protect the coast from barbarians living inland (Strabo 4.1.5). In addition, Strabo describes Rhode as a ἰσθήμιον Ἔμποριτῶν (3.4.8). Clearly, these classifications must refer to different periods, but it is not known when and how Rhode was integrated into the Massaliote dominion, nor when it came under Emporitan control, though it seems that it came under Emporitan influence only in the Roman period (C3l/C2e).

Rhode apparently struck only a minor series of drachms, weighing 4.70 g, between C4l and C3e. Types: obv. head of a goddess, sometimes with a symbol (trident, dolphins); legend: ΡΟ∆ΗΤΩΝ; rev. rose, at first seen from above and afterwards from below (Campos 1992) 200; Villaronga (1994) 11–14). The standard used is the Phokaian (García-Bellido 1994) 126–28) and it seems to be identical to the one used for Massaliote coins (Villaronga 1998; SNG Cop. Spain–Gaul 633–36).
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I. The Region

The name of the island was Σικελία, ἳς (Pind. Pyth. 1.19; Hdt. 5.46.1; Thuc. 1.12.4, 6.1.2; IG I$^3$ 370.1.52 (418/17); I.Delos 104.117 (364/3); IG IV$^2$.1 95.60 (356/5)). The corresponding ethnic is Σικελιώτης (Thuc. 3.90.1; Xen. Hell. 2.2.24; Pl. Ep. 7.327b), which specifically denotes the populations of the Greek poleis on the island (Hellan. fr. 79a1; Thuc. 4.58.1, 7.32.2, 57.11). It is used only externally; collectively it is used by e.g. Thuc. loc. cit., Xen. Hell. 2.2.24 and Corinthis 8.3 23.1 (341); individually, it is used in IG I$^2$ 1369 bis (epitaph (C5)); cf. IG II$^1$ 10287–88, 10290 and Agora xvii 662, Classical epitaphs), and IG II$^2$ 69.9 (honorary decree (C4f)). The Greeks were not the only ethnic group inhabiting the island, which was already occupied when they arrived, a fact that is reflected in Classical expositions of the historical development of the nomenclature of the island: the early name was, according to Thuc. 6.2.2, Τρικαλία, ἰς, a name reflecting the physical form of the island (cf. Ephor. fr. 137b = Ps.-Skymnos 268; Diod. 5.2.1; Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 1.22.2; Strabo 6.2.1). This name was replaced by Σικανία, ἰς, coined from Σικανία, the earliest historical population, which had been driven from their native Iberia, according to Thuc. 6.2.2 (cf. Hellan. fr. 79a; Hdt. 7.170.1; Diod. 5.2.1; Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 1.22.2). Σικανία itself was replaced by Σικελία upon the arrival of invaders from Italy; these were (a) the Sikeloi, according to Thuc. 6.2.4 (cf. Antiochus (FGHist 555) fr. 4), and they defeated the Σικανοί in battle and gave their name to the island; (b) the Αὐσονες, according to Hellan. fr. 79a, whose king Σικελός gave his name to the island and the invaders. Two other ethnic groups, the Ελυμοί (Thuc. 6.2.3) and the Φοινίκες (Thuc. 6.2.6), also inhabited the island before the Greeks arrived but did not give their name to it. On nomenclature, see further Manni (1981) 44–45 and Sammartano (1998).

Greek colonial communities began to be founded in Sicily in C8. The earliest Greek colony was Naxos, which was founded by Chalkis (no. 365) in 735/4;¹ Syracuse was founded by Corinth (no. 227) in 733/2; Megara was founded by mainland Megara (no. 225) in 728; Gela was founded from Rhodes and Crete in 689/8; and Zankle was founded, by Kyme (no. 57) and Chalkis or by Naxos, c.730.² Such “primary” colonies as these went on to found “secondary” colonies of their own: e.g. Zankle founded Mylae in 716, and Himera in 648; Megara founded Selinus in 651/50 (Diod. 13.59.4; Euseb.) or c.628/7 (Thuc. 6.4.2); Syracuse founded Akrai in 664, Kasmenai in 644/3, and Kamarina c.598; and Gela founded Akragas c.580. The foundation of Greek poleis, however, was not exclusively a phenomenon of the Archaic period; thus, Hieron of Syracuse founded Aitna in 476; Tyndaris was founded by Dionysios I of Syracuse in 396; and Tauromenion was a foundation of C4f.

The initial Greek colonies were planted at suitable coastal sites, and not always at virgin sites. Thus, Syracuse superseded an indigenous settlement and may have reduced a native population to servitude in the process (cf. the Kyllyrioi of Hdt. 7.155); Leontinoi and Naxos likewise replaced indigenous settlements, although at Leontinoi there was possibly cohabitation between Greeks and locals, at least for a period (Polyaen. 5.5).³ Note also that such phenomena as intermarriage between Greek and indigenous populations may

---

¹ Recent attempts to discard Euboian colonisation in the West, on the basis of an argued lack of archaeological evidence (cf. e.g. Papadopoulos (2000) 355) are disregarded in this chapter. At Naxos, for instance, the influence of Euboian pottery has been amply demonstrated (Pelagatti (1981) 305–12; Lentini (1990) (1992) 11–14, 25), and evidence such as the spread of the Euboian alphabet to Etruria (Ridgway (1998) 315–16) and the onomastic evidence of the calendars (Triumpy, Monat. 39–43) support the literary sources for Euboian colonisation.

² For the details of the foundation dates, see the entries in the Inventory below.

³ See the respective entries below.
be indicated by archaeology. However, the indigenous settlement pattern does not seem to have significantly determined where Greek colonies were founded.

The relationship between Greeks and indigenous populations cannot be treated here, but for some aspects of this problem, see the entries for the indigenous cities below.

According to Thucydides (6.2) and other literary sources, the Sikanians were Iberian fugitives and the first “post-heroic” settlers in Sicily, occupying the western and central part of the island to which they had been forced by later Sikels and other invaders, Morigetes and Asonus, from the mainland who settled primarily in the eastern part of the island (survey of sources: Bérard (1957) 448–58; Anello (1997)). The Elymians who settled in the westernmost part of the island, bordering upon the Phoenician colonies, were Trojan fugitives (literary sources: Manni (1981) 128–30). The cultural division of the island into mainly Elymian, Sikanian and Sikels regions, as in Thucydides’ account, has been seen reflected in corresponding cultural diversities in the archaeological material (Bernabò Brea (1957) passim), but this picture is probably too simplistic (Albanese Procacc (1997) and Leighton (1999) 215–68 for presentation of the archaeological evidence).

According to Thuc. 6.2.6, there were Phoenician settlements all over Sicily prior to the arrival of the Greeks; but when the Greeks arrived, the Phoenicians withdrew to Motya, Soloes and Panormos; the reason was, Thucydides states, that they relied on an Elymian alliance (ξυμµαχία . . . πίσων τῇ τών Ἐλόµων), and that this area was the closest to Carthage (ἐντεύθεν ἐλάχιστων πλοίων Καρχηδόν Σικελίας ἀπέχει). Such a picture is not supported by archaeology, which, on the contrary, has shown that the Phoenicians arrived in Sicily more or less when the Greeks did (Leighton (1999) 225–32). Thus, the Phoenician presence cannot initially have determined the locations of Greek colonies.

The dates of foundation given above are derived primarily from the literary tradition and in particular from Thucydides, but partly also from archaeological evidence, two types of evidence that generally produce roughly similar dates. But there is obviously a risk of circular argumentation when a chronology of Greek Geometric pottery based upon the colonial dates furnished by the literary tradition is in its turn used to confirm the literary tradition (Burn (1955) 134–35; Bérard (1957) 279; R. Van Compernolle (1992) 776–78). This danger can only be avoided by employing a chronology of Geometric wares established by Near Eastern archaeology or by Near Eastern finds from Greek contexts, such as the scarab with the name of Bocchoris found at Pithekoussai (cf. most recently Hannestad (1996) and Morris (1996)). This is not the place for a detailed discussion of this problem, and three points must suffice.

(1) The study by Bérard, though dated in matters of detail, is still valid as regards its main conclusion: that the chronological sequence of the foundation dates as established by archaeological investigations is well in keeping with that established on the basis of the literary tradition (Bérard (1957) 279–99, esp. 299).

(2) A chronology of the foundation dates established solely on the basis of archaeological evidence does seem to confirm the traditional chronology, and a skeleton outline of the earlier foundation dates can be established on the basis of: (i) Naxos: ceramic finds from the earliest period of the settlement date to c.740–730, and thus confirm the traditional foundation date of 735/4 (and attest to ties with Euboia: Pelagatti (1981) 304–11; Lentini (1984–85) esp. 836–38, (1993–94) 1009); (ii) Syracuse: the archaeological evidence suggests a foundation date in C8s, and C8s habitation remains on Ortygia are similar to contemporary remains from Megara Hyblaia and Naxos (Pelagatti (1982) 126–27); the archaeological evidence is thus compatible with the traditional foundation date of 733; (iii) Gela: the traditional foundation date of Gela is 689/8 (Thuc. 6.4.3; Eusebios gives 691); however, there is archaeological evidence for Greek occupation already by C8, and mortuary evidence too points to Greek presence in C8 (on both, see entry for Gela); thus, archaeological evidence attests Greek occupation of Gela prior to the traditional date of foundation, and this may suggest that the city was founded in two phases (Fiorentini and De Miro (1983); Fischer-Hansen (1996) 332–34); (iv) Selinous: Diod. 13.39.4 dates the foundation of Selinous to 651/50, whereas Thuc. 6.4.2 gives c.628/7. The earlier of these dates is supported by archaeological evidence too (cf. also R. Van Compernolle (1992) 778–79).

6 See R. Van Compernolle (1983) and Hodos (1997). However, for a critical assessment of the archaeological evidence, see Shepherd (1999).

7 See the details in the individual entries.
evidence from the recently excavated Buffa and Manuzza cemeteries (Tusa (1982) 191–94; Rallo (1982); cf. R. Van Compernolle (1992) 777–78), but the difference in chronology may not be significant (however, see Cook (1946) 73 for the view that trading posts may have preceded the colony proper where more than one foundation date has been transmitted); (v) Himera: the date of foundation of 648 is inferred from the notice that the city was inhabited for 240 years before its destruction in 408 (Diod. 13.62.4). There is sporadic evidence of a C7m settlement, supporting the traditional date of foundation, on the coastal plain below the upper plateau near the estuary of the river Himera (Vassallo (1997) 85–90).

(3) The chronological divergences found in several of the literary sources rarely amount to more than c.25 years, as for instance in the case of Selinous, where the foundation date is reported both as 651/50 and c.628, a discrepancy that is hardly significant for early Archaic history (Asheri (1979a) 94) and that is also acceptable in the classification of ceramic styles (Morris (1996) 58). Another caveat is that the different literary “dates of foundation” may possibly refer to different moments in the early history of a colony; accordingly, a rigid chronological framework should be avoided (Gras (1986) 11–13; Morris (1996) 55–57): sites may have been colonised in phases (see above for the example of Gela); foundations may have been the result of a colonial process evolved over a period, as for instance in the case of Megara Hyblaia, where the preliminary settlements at Trotilion and Thapsos failed. Pre-colonial Greek contacts established with indigenous settlers complicate the issue: there is widespread evidence of Greek presence in the colonial regions earlier than the traditional foundation dates.9 The chronological framework of these early contacts may depend on a revision of the dating of the “pendent-semicolon circle skyphoi” (Snodgrass (1994) 5).

In addition to the “historical” accounts of the foundation of colonies, there were mythical traditions incorporating the island into Greek horizons (Bérard (1957) 301–83, 392–97; Giangiulio (1983)). Thus, Thuc. 6.2.3 reports that the Elymnoi were of Trojan descent, arriving after the Achaian sack of Ilium. Though not as pronounced in Sicily as in the case of Magna Graecia, such myths did sometimes function as charter myths for Greek colonial enterprises (Malkin (1998) 4, 20). Whether there is any direct connection between these heroic traditions and the widespread evidence of Mycenaean contacts with the West (Vagnetti (1991), (1996) 152–59) remains an open question (Leighton (1999) 184–86). However, whereas Minoan contacts are not so far documented, Mycenaean contacts with Sicily (and South Italy), sporadic from C16 to C15, increased significantly in C14–C13, with Mycenaean presence attested for instance on Thapsos near Syracuse, on Lipari, and at Scoglio del Tonno (Taras) (Vagnetti (1991), (1996) 141–43, 152–53, 168). Late Bronze Age maritime trading posts and the hunt for metal resources and other trade goods determined the routes taken by later Greek expansion westwards. Indeed, trade must have played a paramount role in the early colonisation of the West: the development of the concept of trade, the significance of the historical trade links of Euboian and Phokaia traders, and the commercial aspect of C8–C6 colonisation have been traced in studies by Mele (1979), (1988)). Commerce was at times closely associated with piracy and trade in slaves (for which see Morel (1984) 143).

According to Thuc. 6.4.5, Zankle was founded by pirates from Campanian Kyme (no. 57), and according to Ephor. fr. 137a (= Strabo 6.2.2), Tyrrenhian pirates created difficulties for early Greek commerce in the region of the Straits of Messina. The importance of the trading route through the Straits has been treated on several occasions by Vallet (most recently in Vallet (1988)) and need not detain us here, but the links across the Straits between Zankle and Rhegion (no. 68), between Naxos and Lokroi (no. 59), and between Mylai and Metauros (no. 62), played a significant role in joining together the two coastal territories, creating a cultural and political koine (Vallet (1988) 172). Indeed, Rhegion and Zankle/Messana are most often treated together in regional studies.

Although there are obvious geomorphological differences between the individual sites, distinctions between “mercantile colonies” (e.g. Naxos?) and “agricultural colonies” (e.g. Leontinoi and Selinous), are not easily made (see also infra). Although most of the Sicilian colonies may have been primarily agrarian, they were located beside natural harbours offering coastal trade, or near river estuaries, providing access to the hinterland.10

The early Greek foundations seem to have developed quickly into poleis, and the very process of colonisation may have been of paramount significance here. Thus the earliest Greek lawgivers, Charondas and Zaleukos, may have been active in the West already from C7m, and these and later legislators from Sicily and South Italy won a certain renown.

---


10 The evidence of coin types is used by Lacroix (1986) 111–39 to demonstrate the importance of rivers and arable land for the location of the individual colonies.
Zaleukos of Lokroi Epizephyrois is a shadowy figure, but he was known to Ephor. fr. 139 (= Strabo 6.1.8) and Demosthenes (24.139–41; cf. Musti (1976) 48–50, 72–81; Link (1992)); the legislation of Charondas of Katane was also used in other Chalkidian cities in Sicily (Arist. Pol. 1274a23–24) and is attested at Rhegion before the tyranny of Anaxilas (Cordano (1978)). In fact, the evidence for urban planning, territorial divisions and political architecture in the early colonies has prompted the suggestion that the early development of the polis as an institution took place, or at least was accelerated, in the colonial foundations (cf. e.g. Snodgrass (1977) 33 and (1994) 8–9; Ridgway (1992) 108–9; Polignac (1995) 118–27).

From their early history the Greek territories in Sicily became divided into main zones of influence, based upon the ethnic origin of the foundations (cf. Asheri (1979a) 105–39): a Chalkidian/Ionian zone, and a Dorian one, although too rigorous a model is hardly tenable, since some foundations were of mixed origin, as borne out by the literary and archaeological evidence. Another issue complicating the question of the ethnic identities of the Greek colonies—this time their “Greek-ness”—is the fact that even if some colonies were planted at previously unoccupied sites (e.g. Naxos), others were certainly planted at sites already occupied by indigenous communities (e.g. Syracuse and Leontinoi); this raises questions of co-existence and reciprocal influences (Asheri (1996) 88–90, 96–101 with refs.). One long-lasting effect of the foundation of Greek colonies is the fact that many communities which were originally not of Greek ethnicity had by the Classical period—due to prolonged interaction, not always peaceful, with the Greek colonies—come to resemble Greek poleis to such a degree that they are for all practical purposes indistinguishable from Greek poleis “proper”. Such communities are included in the Inventory below as possible poleis (type C).

Somewhat related to this phenomenon is the fact that several settlements, whose ancient identity is unknown and which are known exclusively from archaeological evidence, have all the appearance of Greek settlements, and are often indistinguishable from colonies proper (Asheri (1996) 77; cf. Osborne (1998) 264); such settlements may have been poleis but are here treated in the List of Pre-Hellenistic Settlements (infra).

An important feature of the C6 history of the Greek poleis in Sicily is the emergence of powerful dynastic tyrannies that extended their influence outside their poleis of origin (Seibert (1982–83) 33–54) and were connected with each other by ties of intermarriage. Phalaris and Theron of Akragas expanded Akragantine influence as far north as Himera and subjugated vast tracts of land (see entries for Akragas and Himera). In C5e, Hippokrates of Gela expanded his rule significantly in north-eastern Sicily and made Gela a hegemonic power; however, his successor, Gelon, transferred his seat to Syracuse and proceeded to augment its population by incorporating the populations of several conquered cities as well as mercenaries (see entry for Syracuse). Gelon’s brother, Hieron, was installed as ruler at Gela, and the Deinomenid dynasty continued to rule Syracuse and most of Sicily until the fall of Thrasyboulos in 466 (Luraghi (1994) 273–373). In contrast to Magna Graecia, where the Italiote League was created in C5l–C4e, the poleis of Sicily were never united in a league or federation, and what political unity there was consisted in the hegemonies of the great tyrants of Syracuse: according to Diod. 11.26.2, Gelon, after his defeat of the Carthaginians at Himera in 480, created a web of symmachiai, and his rule may almost be considered a political unification of the Greek part of the island, as may the rule of Dionysios I later. Even after the fall of the Deinomenids, Syracuse continued to play a dominant role in Sicilian history, in particular during the reign of Dionysios I. Tyranny as such continued to be a major characteristic of the Sicilian Greek poleis throughout the Classical period (see individual entries).

The Greeks often clashed violently with the Carthaginians. Initially, however, relations between Greeks and Phoenicians seem to have been good, and Selinous and Himera were for long periods at peace with the Phoenician world, exploiting the opportunities for trade and economic development (Tusa (1983) 302–14; Zahrnt (1993) 355–57). The expedition by Pentathlos to western Sicily c.580 (see Lipara (no. 34)) and the C6l adventures of Dorieus (Hdt.

---

11 C6 fragments of a law code in the Chalkidian script from the settlement of Monte San Mauro (= Euboia?) have been ascribed to the legislation of Charondas (IGSII pp. 171–85; IGDS no. 15; van Effenterre and Ruzé (1994) 11; Cordano (1986b)).
13 Early Doric communities: Akragas, Akrai, Gela, Heloroni(?), Herakleia Minoa, Kamarina, Kasmenai, Megara, Selinous, Syracuse.
14 e.g. Himera, which was founded by Ionian Zankle with a group of exiles (the Miletai) from Dorian Syracuse (see entry for Himera). For archaeological evidence of mixed communities at e.g. Naxos, see entry for Naxos and Pelagatti (1981) 302; for Gela, see Fiorentini and De Miro (1979) 103–104 and Panvini (1996) 38–39. Cf. also Osborne (1998) 267–68, arguing for the widespread practice of private enterprise at the early foundations, which is likely to have produced ethnically mixed communities.

15 For intermarriage among the Emennids of Akragas and the Deinomenids of Gela and Syracuse, see e.g. Vallet (1980); Luraghi (1994) 266–62. For a useful genealogical table of the two dynasties, see Neue Pauly iii (1997) 374.
5-40; cf. Herakleia (no. 21)) inaugurated a long period of intense conflict.16 Gelon of Syracuse and Theron of Akragas defeated a major Carthaginian invasion at Himera in 480, and C3l–C4e is characterised by another serious conflict with Carthage, during which such major Greek poleis as Selinous, Himera and Akragas were sacked, and Gela and Kamarina abandoned (cf. Tusa (1979); Bondi (1979); Huss (1985) 100–23). During this conflict, Dionysios I rose to power at Syracuse, and under his aegis a peace treaty was concluded with Carthage which secured the civic rights of Selinous, Himera, Akragas and Gela. However, conflicts continued throughout C4e, with changing outcomes, and resulted in vast programmes of resettlement of the inhabitants of destroyed cities and the settling of mercenaries at cities such as the newly founded Tyndaris (McKechnie (1989) 35–42). Athenian decrees style Dionysios ὁ Σικελίας ἄρχων (IG ii2 18.7 (394/3); IG ii2 103.19 (369/8)), recognising the fact that he came to rule all of Greek Sicily, which was thus again united under tyrannical rule. Dionysios had interests outside Sicily: he waged war against the Italiote League, he founded colonies along the Adriatic, and as late as 369 he intervened in Greece on behalf of Sparta (no. 345). After the troubled interlude of Dion and Dionysios the Younger, and further conflicts with Carthage, Sicily experienced a significant revival in the 340s, when Timoleon of Corinth put an end to tyrannies, brought in new settlers, relocated citizens from destroyed cities, and refounded e.g. Megara, Gela, Akragas and other cities (Sordi (1961); Talbert (1974) esp. 146–60; Mossé (1999)). Several refoundations were of originally indigenous communities which became “Hellenised” and are described in the Inventory below.

The Inventory below describes forty-seven Greek poleis of various origins (Greek colonial foundations, “Hellenised” indigenous communities, Timoleontic refoundations). In addition, there existed in the part of the island under Greek influence17 the following twenty-nine noteworthy settlements which cannot be shown to have been Greek or “Hellenised” poleis.

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis

**Adryx** (Ἄδρυξ) Philistos (FGrHist 556) fr. 61 (πόλις Συρακοῦσων, but not a verbatim quotation; cf. Steph. Byz. 30.5: πόλις Συρακοῦσων). Probably a Hellenised indigenous city within the dominion of Syracuse (no. 47). Location unknown; Barr. C.

**Agathyron** (Ἄγαθυρνος) Diod. 5.8.2 (r mythical times, πόλις); Strabo 6.2.1; Steph. Byz. 11.22 (πόλις). Near Capo d’Orlando (Barr.). There are sporadic C3–C5 archaeological remains from the urban site and cemetery (Scibona (1985) 426). It had no mint of its own, but C4 bronze coinage of Tyndaris has obv. Apollo, legend: ΤΥΝΔΑΡΙΟΣ, rev. warrior, legend: ΑΓΑΤ (upros), which may refer to it and reveal some sort of relationship between the two sites (Lacroix (1965) 47; cf. entry for Tyndaris). Barr. C(?).

**Akrilla** (Ἄκριλλα) Steph. Byz. 63.11 (πόλις Σικελίας οὐ πόρρω Συρακοῦσων). The encampment of Hippokrates in the vicinity of Akrilla in 213 (Livy 6.2, 35.4) indicates a location in the hinterland of Kamarina (no. 28), and the city is now most often identified with modern Chiaromonti Gulfi (so Barr.), where numerous remains of habitation cover also the C4 Greek period. The proximity of Akrilla to Kamarina and Syracuse (no. 47) suggests a strong degree of Hellenisation (Di Stefano and Marotta D’Agata (1987); Di Vita (1987)). Barr. AC.

**Assoros** (Ἀσσόρος) SEG 30 1122 (city-ethnic, C4l–C3m); Diod. 14.58.1 (city-ethnic); Steph. Byz. 137.7 (πόλις). Located at modern Assoro (Barr.). Assoros was a Sikel community (Diod. 14.58.1, 78.1) and concluded a treaty with Dionysios I in 396 (Diod. 14.78.1); it is mentioned in the Entella inscriptions (Bejor and Morel (1984) 331; SEG 30 1122). There is archaeological evidence of Hellenisation from C5 (Morel (1961); Bejor and Morel (1984) 333), but Greek-style coinage begins only in C3l at the earliest (Head, HN2 127). Barr. H, but C according to Diod. 14.58.1, 78.1.

**Ergotion** (Ἐργέτιον) Philistos (FGrHist 556) fr. 10; Ptol. Geogr. 3.4.7; Polyaen. 5.6 (rC3e, πόλις); Steph. Byz. 275.10 (πόλις). Unlocated: the conquest of the city by Hippokrates (infra) suggests a location on the borders of the hinterland of Kamarina (no. 28) or of Leontinoi (no. 33), on the slopes of Etna; Manni (1976b) 614–16 opts for the plain of Leontinoi. However, the listing of Ergotion after Kamarina and Hybla Heraia (Ragusa?) and before Noai in the C3s Delphic list of theorodokoi (Manganaro (1964a) 434–35) may indicate a

---

16 Note, however, that even so there is evidence for Phoenician presence in the Greek poleis, e.g. Syracuse, perhaps in the role of artisans: Morel (1984) and Asheri (1932/2) 167.

17 i.e. Phoenician/Punic sites are not included in the list, even though some were strongly Hellenised or possessed Greek institutions.

Hybla Geleatis (Ὑβλα ᾮ Γελατίς)18 Thuc. 6.62.5; Paus. 5.23.6 (πόλις, κόμη); Plut. Nic. 15.3 (πολιτεία). According to Thuc. 6.94.3, Hybla Geleatis was located between Kentoripa (no. 31) and Katane (no. 30); according to Paus. 5.23.6, it was a Κόμη in the territory of Katane in Roman times. It is normally identified with modern Paternò, but the identification is not certain, though a Latin inscription with a dedication to Venus Victrix Hyblensis (CIL x.2 7013; Freeman (1891–94) i. 516; Manganaro (1964a) 432–33) was found in the vicinity. At 6.62.5 and 94.3, Thuc. presumably describes Hybla Geleatis as a Sikel community; according to Paus. 5.23.6, it was a barbarian community and housed a cult of more than local significance. For the anti-Douketian stance of Hybla Geleatis, see Diod. 11.88.6; cf. Manganaro (1964a) 452–33; Manni (1974) 66–71; and Giangiulio (1990a). Barr. C.

Hybla Heraia (Ὑβλα ᾮ Ηραία) Steph. Byz. 645.1 (πόλις); the text was emended by Cluver, whose emendation, though normally accepted, is rejected by Manni (1974) 61–65 and (1976b) 615–16. According to Hdt. 7.135.1, Hippokrates of Gela died at a city (πόλις) named Hybla fighting the Sikels; from the context, this Hybla was in the vicinity of Ragusa, the modern locality most often identified with Hybla Heraia. For the evidence for C6f Greek tombs at Ragusa, see Di Stefano and Marotta D’Agata (1996) 543–44. Barr. AC.

Hykkara (Ὑκκάρα) Thuc. 6.62.3 (πόλιαμα); Timaios (FGrHist 566) fr. 23 = Ath. 327B (πολιτεία); Apollodoros (FGrHist 244) fr. 8 (πόλις); Diod. 13.6.1 (πολισμάτων); Steph. Byz. 646.20–21 (φρούριον). Site and location unknown, though possibly to be located at modern Carini (so Barr. tentatively). Thuc. 6.62.3 describes it as Sikanian, whereas Timaios and Diod. (loc. citz) describe it as Sikeli. It was probably a Sikel city, and the degree of Hellenisation must remain uncertain, since the evidence is tenuous (Bejoy (1990)). The city was taken and enslaved by the Athenians in 415 (Thuc. 6.62.3). Barr. AC.

Inessa (Ἰνεσσα) Thuc. 3.103.1 (πόλιαμα). Sikel (Thuc. 3.103.1: Σίκελικον) site of unknown location west of Katane (no. 30). For its Greek occupation and phase, see Aithna (no. 8). The acropolis of the city was occupied by the Syracusans in 426 (Thuc. 3.103.1). According to Diod. 11.76.3, Gelon erected a temple there in honour of Demeter. The location of Inessa—most often identified with Civitá—is still unresolved (Bombaci and Massa (1990) 290–93). Barr. C.

Inyx, Inykos (Ἰνύς, Ἰνύκος) Hdt. 6.23 (πόλις); Pl. Hp. mai. 282e; Paus. 7.4.6 (πόλις); cf. Manni (1981) 192–93 and Massa (1990) 303–4. Historically, the city is known only from the imprisonment there of Skythes, mounarchos (cf. Manni (1981) 192–93 and Massa (1990) 303–4). According to Pl. Hp. mai. 282e, Inykos was only a chorion pany smikon. The city is described as Sikel by Paus. 7.4.6 (cf. Manni (1976a) 186 n. 45). Barr. C.

Kakyon (Κάκυων) P Oxy. 665 = FGrHist 577, fr. 1. Uncertain location. Syracusan mercenaries took refuge here after the fall of the Deinomenids (P Oxy. 665 = FGrHist 577 fr. 1); Ptol. Geog. 3.4.7 locates Kakyon (Müller prints Makyon, but suggests also Maktorion) north-west of Phintias (modern Licata). Kakyon is often identified with the modern site of Monte Saraceno (Adamesteanu (1956); Manni (1981) 151; Barr.; see Monte Saraceno, infra). Barr. AC.

Kale Akte (Καλή Ἀκτή) Hdt. 6.22.2 (proposed site of polis foundation). Marina di Caronia. A Sikel site, where the Zanklaians (no. 51) in C6e planned to found an Ionian polis. Zankle sent a delegation to Ionia and invited colonists, but the only positive response came from some Milesians (whose polis had been enslaved by the Persians) and Samian aristocrats who felt obliged to flee Samos on account of their participation in the Ionian Revolt (Hdt. 6.22). However, the colony never materialised owing to the intervention of Anaxilas of Rhigion (Hdt. 6.23); but c.446 the site was colonised by the Sikeli leader Douketios with the assistance of Archonides I of Herbita and possibly Corinthus (no. 227), whence Douketios may have set out (Diod. 12.8.2, 29.1; Maddoli (1977–78); Demand (1990) 55–57). Kale Akte is normally located in the vast region of Marina di Caronia, but the exact location of the ancient city is still uncertain (Scibona (1987) 9–12; recent investigations have not clarified the problem (Bonanno (1997–98) 433), although a fortified plateau with traces of a regular urban layout is described by Bonacasa Carra (1974) 111–12, table 6.3. Barr. C.

18 Steph. Byz. 644.24–645.4 lists three communities called Hybla: (1) Geleatis/Gerelatis (Ὑβλα ᾮ Γελατίς (ἡ μυκρές)); (2) Heraia (Ἱεραῖα (ἡ μείζων)); (3) Megareis (ἡ μεγάλη) = Megara Hyblaia (Ἰνεσσα), cf. Ps–Skymmos 277. The text in Stephanus is heavily corrupt; for an emendation offering a better reading, see Jacoby ad Phlistos (FGrHist ξ56) fr. 20; cf. Manni (1981) 184–85, Archias, victor in Olympia in 364 (and on two other occasions) was from one of the Hyblas (Olympinikai no. 442), though which one is unfortunately unknown. For the location of the Hybla that played a role in the foundation of Megara Hyblaia, see Bernabo Brea (1968) 163, arguing for an identification with Pantalica.
Kamikos (Καµικός) Hdt. 7.170 (πόλεις), Strabo 6.2.6; schol. Pind. Pyth. 6.5a (Σικελικῆς πόλεις). According to Hdt. 7.170.1, Kamikos was in his day a possession of Akragas (no. 9; πόλιν Καµικόν, τὴν κατ’ ἐµὲ Ἀκραγαντῖνοι ἐνέµοντο; cf. Diod. 4.78.2); according to schol. Pind. Pyth. 6.5a, it was a Sikel town and was taken by exiles during the reign of Theron (cf. RE X.1836–37; Berve (1967) 135); according to Strabo 6.2.6, it was a barbarian community. It was the legendary seat of Kokalos (Diod. 4.78.2; Strabo 6.2.6). Fischer-Hansen (2002) 134. Barr. C.

Maktorion (Μακτόριον) Hdt. 7.153.1 (πόλεις). According to Hdt. 7.153.1, a polis located above (i.e. inland from) Gela (no. 17); Steph. Byz. 429.7, citing Philistos (= FGrHist 556, fr. 3), reports that it was founded by one Monmon (Μόµνων), a name which seems not to be Greek (though the text could be corrupted; Jacoby, ad loc.); its ethnic identity was, accordingly, presumably not (originally?) Greek. Its location is uncertain; it is normally identified with Monte Babbonia (Manni (1976a) 187, (1981) 199; Bejer (1991) 305; Barr., tentatively). Barr. AC.

Menai, Menainon (Μεναί, Μέναινον) Apollodorus (FGrHist 244) fr. 5 = Steph. Byz. 444.12 (πόλεις); Diod. 11.78.5 (πόλεις); Ptol. Geog. 3.4.7. From Diod. 11.78.5 and 14.78.7, it appears that Menai was situated in the vicinity of Morgantina (no. 37), and it has been identified with modern Mineo (Messina (1992); Holloway (1990) 148; Barr.; see also Noai below). Menai was founded by the Sikel king Douketios in 459, and in his report of the foundation Diod. 11.78.5 calls it a polis (Μέναιον πόλιν ἐκτιεσε), presumably in both the urban and the political sense. Diodorus’ brief report leaves the impression of a city founded according to Greek principles, but its ethnic identity must originally have been Sikel, and at 14.78.7 (τρισηδέ) Diodorus implicitly describes it as Sikel. At the presumed site of Menai (Mineo) are remains of a primitive Sikel Archaic circuit wall (Messina (1992) 147), attesting to activity at the site before Douketios’ foundation in 459; a subsequent Hellenised phase is attested by finds from the C4–Hellenistic cemeteries (Messina (1992) 146–47). Barr. C.

Menai (Μέναι) Diod. 11.88.6. This is the patris of Douketios (Diod.) and was relocated to Palike in 453 (Diod.). Presumably not identical with the preceding Menai. Not in Barr., but C (Diod.).

Motyon (Μότυον) Diod. 11.91.4 (φρούριον). Uncertain location. Diod. 11.91.4 (ταξις) describes Motyon as a phrourion in the territory of Akragas (no. 9). It is not clear whether it was a permanently settled site or simply a military installation. It was taken by the Sikel leader Douketios in 451, but recaptured the following summer by Akragantine forces (Diod. 11.91.1–4). The route of Douketios into Akragantine territory after the conquest of Aitna–Inessa (Diod. 11.91.1) suggests that Motyon was located in the north-eastern part of Gelon–Akragantine territory; the site of Sabucina, which is strongly fortified and reveals more indigenous traits than sites such as Monte Saraceno and Monte Babbonia, may be the best candidate. However, the identification remains unresolved (Manni (1976a) 201–2, (1981) 206). Barr. = Vassallaggi, AC.

Omphake (’Οµφάκη) Paus. 8.46.2 (πόλισµα Σικανῶν); Philistos (FGrHist 556) fr. 19 = Steph. Byz. 493.8 (πόλεις). Uncertain location. According to Paus. 8.46.2 (cf. 9.40.4), Antiphemos, founder of Gela, sacked Omphake, a polisma Sikannon, and took from that city an image made by Daidalos; if historical, the report implies that Omphake was conquered shortly after the foundation of Gela. Omphake was occupied by Syracusan mercenaries after the fall of the Deinomenids in 466/5 (P Oxy. 665 = (FGrHist 577) fr. 1). Omphake is normally identified with Butera (supra) in the foothills inland from Gela (no. 17; Manni (1976a) 185–86; Gargini (1993c) 462–63; Adamesteanu (1994–95); Barr., tentatively). Barr. AC.

Palike (Παλική) Diod. 11.88.6 (πόλεις), 90.1 (πόλεις); Steph. Byz. 496.6 (πόλεις). Palike was founded by the Sikel leader Douketios in 453 (Diod. 11.88.6) but was soon razed to the ground (κατεσκάφη) in unknown circumstances (Diod. 11.90.1; cf. Demand (1990) 55–57). The picture of Palike given by Diod. 11.90.1 is that of a city founded according to Greek customs, with strong walls and the chora portioned out in kleroi. The Hellenic inspiration seems apparent (cf. Bell (1984–85) 505–6; Demand (1990) 55–57). Trinakria has been thought to be an alternative name for Palike, and in that case Palike was destroyed by the Syracusans in 440 (Diod. 12.29.2; cf. Casevitz (1972) 106 ad 29.2), but the identification seems uncertain (Manni (1981) 237–38). Palike was situated close to the pan-Sikelian sanctuary of the Palikoi. The sanctuary was embellished with colonnades and other public buildings (Diod. 11.89.8 (ταξις)). The location and identity of the sanctuary near Lake Nafta north-west of Syracuse (no. 47) is confirmed by epigraphic evidence (Gentili (1962–63)). The plateau of Rocchicella above the sanctuary, with remains of Archaic and circuit walls, Classical(? habitation structures, and Archaic architectural terracottas from a sacred building, is
now identified with the city of Palike (Martin et al. 1979) fig. 226; Manni (1981) 213; Di Stefano and Guilletta (1994) 281; Maniscalo and McConnell (1997–98), which cannot therefore have been founded ab novo by Douketios. In Barr., Palike is registered as unlocated but near Palikon Limne, cf. Pali corum Stagna.

**Trinakie** (Τρινακίη)  Diod. 12.29.2 (πόλις). Sikel town of unknown location; for attempts at identification with such towns as Palike, Piakos and Triocala, see Manni (1976b) 609–10 and (1981) 237–38. According to Diod. 12.29.2–4, Trinakie was one of the leading Sikel cities in the time of Douketios and was destroyed by Syracuse (no. 29). Contacts with Gela are attested already by C7s, shortly after the foundation of Gela, and from that period onwards the site became strongly Hellenised: C6 naĩskos of Geloan type were erected on the acropolis; an orthogonally planned urban layout has been traced on a lower plateau; tombs at Monte Bubbonia employed Greek colonial burial customs; and tomb gifts were predominantly Greek. A C5f coin hoard (IGCH 2071, cf. p. 308) contains coins of Akragas, Kamarina, Gela, Himera, Leontinoi, Zankle, Messana, Selinous and Syracuse, Akanthos and Athens, and points to a wide commercial network. Fischer-Hansen (2002) 136–43. Barr. = Maktorion, AC.

**Tyrrakinai** (Τυρακῖναι)  Steph. Byz. 642.9 (πόλις); listed in the C38 Delphic catalogue of theorodokoi (BCH 45 [1921] col. IV.101), between Heloron (no. 18) and Kamarina (no. 28), but unlocated (so Barr., but see Messina (1991) for a suggested site with Hellenistic remains); the only indication that it existed in the Classical period is IG II² 10467, an epitaph for Μενισκαῖς Τυρακῖνας dated “s.IV a.(?)”; Manganaro (1964a) 423–24, 433–34; Manni (1981) 240–41. Barr. H, but IG II² 10467 attests C if correctly dated to C4.

**2. Unidentified Settlements**

**Butera**  Situated in the foothills of the Geloan plain c.12 km north of Gela (no. 17), and most often identified with Omphake (Bejor (1985); infra). There are no Archaic or Classical urban remains, but there is significant C7e evidence of Greek presence from the cemetery. C7–C6 votive finds and C5 architectural terracottas testify to extra-urban sanctuaries (Bejor (1985) 223). On the basis of the very unusual funeral rites employed in Greek C7 burials—the practice of akephalia (burial of the head separately from the body), with parallels only at Gela and Cretan Priniass—Adamesteauanu (1994–95) interprets the C7 settlement phase at Butera as Cretan and fully Greek, and identifies it with Omphake, founded at the same time as Gela, but soon taken by that city (cf. Paus. 8.46.3). Fischer-Hansen (2002) 134–35. Barr. AC, s.v. Omphake, tentatively identified with Butera.

**Monte Bubbonia**  Situated on the mountain ridge above the river Gela valley, c.20 km north-east of Gela (no. 17). A settlement that occupied a fortified plateau, with a sanctuary on a separately fortified acropolis. The ancient name is unknown; Omphake and Maktorion (so Barr.) have been suggested (Pancucci (1980–81) and (1992) with refs.). Remains of formal habitation scattered over more terraces may be primarily Timoleontic, as corroborated by numismatic evidence. However, there are several C6l Greek finds from the plateau and from the cemetery (Orlandini (1962) 99–101; Di Noto (1992); Wilson (1996) 100). A dry-stone circuit wall in indigenous technique is attributed to a C6m Hellenised phase; a later reinforcement is attributed to the period of Timoleon. A small C6e shrine is mixed native and Greek according to its structural details and finds. The indigenous tombs were replaced by Greek-type trench tombs in C6l. The few undisturbed graves have yielded Attic vases and a fragment of a terracotta statuette of Demeter. Fischer-Hansen (2002) 157. Barr. AC.
Monte Iudica  Sikel settlement on a hill near Castel di Iudica, with sporadic remains of C8–C5 habitation and with some evidence of contacts with the Greek world from the Archaic period (Corretti (1992)); the cemetery is Hellenistic. The site has been tentatively identified with such ancient toponyms as Ergetion, Imachara (no. 26) and Herbita (no. 23; cf. Corretti (1992) 379; Wilson (1996) 75). Recently, Manni (1976b) 615 and (1981) 211 has tentatively proposed an identification with ancient Noai (tentatively followed by Barr.). Fischer-Hansen (2002) 172–73. For Noai, cf. Apollodoros (FGHist 244) fr. 6 = Steph. Byz. 477.21 (πόλις).

Monte San Mauro  Situated on a plateau c.25 km north-east of Gela (no. 17) in the border area between the Geloan and Chalkidian zones of influence—a strategic position commanding the upper Gela–Maroglio valley. The site occupies an extensive plateau with habitation areas, sanctuaries and cemeteries distributed over five separate hill-tops and adjacent slopes. The settlement has been identified with Omphake, or Maktorion, or Galeria (no. 16) or simply as a Greek settlement of unknown identity (Spigo (1979), (1986) 20). A recent suggestion identifies the site with Leonitini’s foundation of Euboa (no. 15), and the interpretation of the site as Chalkidian is supported by epigraphic evidence (infra). A monumental building has been interpreted as public or “administrative”, an interpretation supported by the finds from the building which include C6e fragments of a law code pertaining, inter alia, to homicide, written in the Chalkidian alphabet and tentatively associated with the law-giver Charondas (Cordano (1986b) 41; IGDS no. 15). C7–C6 habitation remains reveal some regularity of orientation, and some of the structures are remarkable for their typology (houses of pastas type) and for their contents (Lagona (1973) 297; Spigo (1986)). Apart from habitation, the buildings also served as workshops and magazines for the production of pithoi and arulae, which suggests the presence of a temenos of Demeter (Spigo (1979) 31–32). Fischer-Hansen (2002) 143–49. Barr. A, but some of the archaeological remains are C.

Monte Saraceno  Settlement on a plateau above the river Salso c.20 km north of Licata (ancient Phintias). The ancient name is unknown; Adamesteanu (1956)—followed by Manni (1981) 151 and Barr.—suggests that it is to be identified with Kakyron (supra). In any case, the settlement, indigenous in origin but Hellenised from C7 (Miccichè (1989) 31–34), secured Geloan-Akragantine influence in the upper Himera valley (Gargini (1993a)). By C6 Monte Saraceno was Hellenised: a monumental temple and smaller naisskoi were erected on the acropolis (supra). From C6 the lower slope was urbanised and there are clear traces of urban planning of a type known from Akragas (no. 9)—probably a reflection of Akragantine expansion in the time of Phalaris (cf. Berve (1967) 130)—with the use of plateai, stenopoi and even ambitus; urban remains offer richer evidence of Greek housing than Kamarina, Heloron, Kasmenai and Akrai (Calderone (1980–81)). There is evidence of workshop areas inside the habitation zones, but also of smaller temene (Calderone (1984–85) 536–38). Fischer-Hansen (2002) 149–52. Barr. = Kakyron?, AC.

Vassallaggi  Settlement south-west of Caltanissetta in the Salso valley, c.40 km north of Licata (ancient Phintias). The identity of the site is unknown, but it is often identified with Motyon (so Barr.). The Greek influence in this originally indigenous settlement commenced in C6e (De Miro (1962) 143; cf. Miccichè (1989) 56, 183 with refs.), and may be connected with the foundation of Akragas (no. 9) in 588. The increasing Hellenisation should probably be seen against the background of the Akragantine expansion under Phalaris (De Miro (1962); Berve (1967) 130; Luraghi (1994) 254–55). A regular urban layout is attested, with houses raised on terraces, and a single wide plateia dividing the habitation area into two sections (De Miro (1980) 723–24). C5m destruction levels have been interpreted as testimony (ibid.) that the city was Motyon, which was taken by Douketios in 451 (Diod. 11.91.1). The revitalisation of the site (ibid.; cf. Merighi (1963)) would in that case reflect the reconquest of Motyon by Akragas (Diod. 11.91.4). A temenos with a naisskos and altar is known from the habitation area; the votive remains seem to point to a cult of Demeter and Persephone (De Miro (1962) 143–44; Tusá and De Miro (1985) 246–50). An open space between temenes and gate is interpreted as an agora, and the overall urban layout shows similarities with the northern part of the Himera plateau. The tomb finds from the cemetery are primarily Greek (Orlandini (1971); cf. Johnston (1973)). The numismatic evidence from the site has revealed close C5s ties with Akragas (Merighi (1963)). Fischer-Hansen (2002) 153–57. Barr. = Motyon, C, but A is attested by C6e finds (supra). It is clear that the majority of the sites listed here were indigenous communities. Indigenous communities, however, were affected by the presence of Greeks in various ways: a major Greek polis might conquer an indigenous community and incorporate it into its territory, as Akragas did in the case of Kamikos; Greeks might destroy indigenous
settlements (Trinakie); indigenous community founders would work with an eye to Greek traditions (Douketios; cf. Rizzo (1970) 58–66); or Greek ways of life might penetrate into indigenous populations (“Hellenisation”). Some of the indigenous communities may well have been city-states—e.g. the foundations of Douketios,—but apart from that there is very little evidence on the status of the sites listed above.

In some cases it cannot be decided whether a settlement was Greek or indigenous; this is true even of settlements referred to by historical writers (e.g. Maktorion), but the difficulties involved in establishing the ethnic identity of a given settlement is nicely illustrated by settlements known from archaeological evidence and not securely identified with an ancient toponym, such as Butera, Monte San Mauro and Monte Saraceno.¹⁹ These sites present a very strong degree of Hellenisation and may possibly have to be identified with Greek colonial foundations whose sites are unknown; e.g. Euboia (no. 15) may perhaps be at Monte San Mauro. However, they may also be the sites of Greek cities not mentioned by the written sources, or they may be indigenous communities, or communities of mixed ethnicity. Furthermore, although indigenous Sicilian settlements are normally fortified by means of earth and stone ramparts (Bonacasa Carra (1974)), several of the sites in question date to C6–C5, a period when these sites were often under Hellenic influence. Special circumstances or pressure of time made it convenient also at Greek sites to employ this technique, for instance at Himera and Kamarina (Bonacasa Carra (1974) 94, 115–18). The characteristic type of Sicilian naiskoi erected in Sikel settlements are often indistinguishable from the buildings known from the sanctuaries in the Greek colonies, and Greek cults, above all that of Demeter and Persephone, are widely attested at the indigenous sites.²⁰ In other words, the interrelations of Greek and indigenous populations are very complex and cannot be approached *simply* in terms of “Hellenisation”.

It should also be noted that Greek influence and expansion were not always quietly accepted by the indigenous populations. In C6, the colonising expedition of Pentathlos of Knidos lost its leader when it supported Selinous in a war against Segesta (cf. Lipara (no. 34)), and the expedition of Dorieus was crushingly defeated by Phoenicians (cf. Herakleia (no. 21)).

A number of the Sikel settlements in the interior listed above reveal a high degree of Hellenisation by the early Classical period, the outcome of cultural change under the influence of the Greek cities on the coast. However, Greek influence, or even domination, crumbling under the pressures of internal strife, led to a C5 Sikel movement aiming at greater political autonomy. Such a movement has been linked to the democratic movements within the Greek cities, for instance at Syracuse, where the democratic faction invited the Sikel cities to support the revolt against Thrasyboulos (Diod. 11.68.1 (r466)).

The Sikel leader Douketios, variously called *hegemon*, *basileus* or *aphegoumenos ton Sikelon* (Diod. 11.76.2, 78.5, 88.6), appears in the sources for the first time in connection with the collaboration between Sikel tribes and the democratic party in Syracuse in 461/60.²¹ After the fall of the Deinomenids and the establishment of democratic rule at Syracuse there followed a period of internal consolidation and, with the help of Sikel tribes led by Douketios, Hieron’s settlers were expelled from Aitna/Katane and the city was resettled with its former inhabitants (Diod. 11.76.1–3). The Sikels had nursed a grudge against the inhabitants of Aitna since their occupation of Sikel land, and this land was now portioned out between themselves and the Syracusans.

However, Sikel territory remained independent of the Greek colonial cities, and Douketios founded a new city, Menainon (Diod. 11.78.5 (459/8)), near or at Menai, his birthplace (cf. Diod. 11.88.6), somewhere on the inland edge of the plain of Katane. Douketios also distributed land in Greek fashion and extended his authority inland by the capture of Morgantina. Menainon/Menai are unlocated, the latter possibly to be identified with modern Mineo; however, the heartland of Douketian territory seems to have been the region of Caltagirone in central-eastern Sicily.

---

¹⁹ Settlements such as Monte Bubonnia and Monte Saraceno excavated in the 1950s and 1960s were defined as Greek *poleis* by their investigators, for instance by Adamesteanu: “we now have evidence of the Hellenisation of the interior regions, not only of the coast. These towns are characterised by their sanctuaries as formally Greek, and no longer indigenous settlements backward in their development. We are confronted by real Greek centres, the result of a fusion of indigenous and Hellenic elements—they were *poleis* already in the first half of the fifth century and not just insignificant indigenous settlements” (Adamesteanu (1966) 143). Some of the sites listed above may be connected with the historical cities of Omphake, Maktorion, Kakyron and show that these played a political, an economic and a cultural role not dissimilar to that of the coastal cities. The interpretation of the early investigators has been taken up by later scholars, for instance by Uhlenbrock, who defines the settlements at Monte San Mauro and at Monte Saraceno as anonymous sub-colonies of Gela (Uhlenbrock (1988) 122–23); the term *poleis* is used for all the Hellenised Sikelian settlements by Bonacasa Carra (1974) 103; cf. Micciché (1986) *passim*.

²⁰ For exhaustive treatments of these Sicilian sites, see Micciché (1989); Dominguez (1989); and Fischer-Hansen (2002).

Sikel self-assertion was by C5m strong enough to muster an uprising of the Sikel communities. A league of Sikel cities may have existed before Douketios, but it is attested in the sources for the first time during his rule. The Sikels entered into a Greek-inspired *synteleia* of “homoethnic” cities under the leadership of Douketios in 453 (Diod. 11.88.6), perhaps not merely a military alliance, though this is what Diodorus emphasises, but rather a wider economic and political collaboration (Manni 1976a: 201), and a new capital of the unified Sikels was founded at Palike (Diod. 11.90.1). Douketios modelled his foundations on the Greek *polis*—and cities such as Morgantina, Henna, Longane, Abakainon (for which see the entries below) and other centres listed above struck Greek-inspired autonomous coins from C5m. According to the sources, the *synteleia* excluded the city of Hybla, possibly because it was not considered a Sikel city proper but a city with a significant Greek element (Manni 1976a: 202).

Syracuse and Akragas reacted to the growing influence of the Sikel movement. Douketios had led campaigns against Aitna/Inessa, the Dorian-Sikel settlement which had received the *xenoi* expelled from Aitne/Katane, and later a Sikel anti-Akragnantine stance led to the capture of the Akragnantine *phourion* Motyon. The threat to Akragas was averted with the help of Syracuse, which had been drawn into the conflict (Diod. 11.91.1 (r451)). A year later the Sikel alliance was defeated at Nomai by the Syracusans and Motyon was regained by the Akragnantines; several of the Sikel survivors escaped to scattered forts and Sikel settlements (Diod. 11.91.2–4). Douketios, who had given himself up to the Syracusans, was sent into exile at Corinth (no. 227) (Diod. 11.92). However, with the probable connivance of Syracuse, which wanted to control Sicily’s Tyrrhenian coast, he returned a few years later with a contingent of Greeks to found the city of Kale Akte, in collaboration with Archonides, the ruler of Herbita (Diod. 12.8.2 (r446)).

The foundation was seen by Akragas as evidence of Syracuse territorial ambitions and as a breach of the treaty between the two cities. In the ensuing battle, Syracuse defeated Akragas (Diod. 12.8.2–4), but Douketios and the Sikel movement gained little advantage. The death of Douketios in 440 hindered the establishment of new alliances and put an end to the Sikel movement (Diod. 12.29.1). Syracuse successfully stifled Sikel independence and subjugated the Sikel cities; only the city of Trinakie offered resistance (Diod. 12.29.2–4); this city is otherwise unknown and is possibly to be under-

stood as a symbolic name for a Sikel alliance, though it has also been identified with the cities of Palike or Piakos (Manni 1981: 237–38; Loicq-Berger 1967: 212). Heavy tributes were imposed on the Sikel cities subject to Syracuse (Diod. 12.30.1 (r1439); Thuc. 6.20.4), but the settlements of the interior retained their independence (Thuc. 6.88.4). There are even traditions of democratic institutions, for instance the *ekklesia* at the indigenous site of Kentoripa (no. 31) (Diod. 13.83.4 (r406)).

The Sikels took the side of Athens during the first Athenian expedition to Sicily in 415 (Thuc. 3.103.1, 4.25.9); for the subsequent alliances of the Sikels and Athens, and for the military help offered by the Sikels, see Thuc. 6.45, 62.5, 88.4 and 7.57.11; Archonides of Herbita is specifically called a *philos tois Athenaiois* by Thuc. 7.1.4. Later, during the Carthaginian–Greek conflicts, the Sikels supported the Carthaginians (Diod. 13.59.6 (r409), 14.7.5 (r404)), though some Sikel tribes supported the Greek cities (Diod. 13.86.5).

A number of indigenous cities obtained autonomy as an outcome of these conflicts, but most were later resubjugated by the Syracusans under Dionysios I. The Hellenisation of the Sikels gathered further momentum and is finally reflected in the C4 Timoleontic refoundations of Greek cities on several of the originally Sikel sites.

II. The *Poleis*

5. Abakainon (Abakaininos) Map 47. Lat. 38.05, long. 15.05. Size of territory: ? Type: B/B. The toponym is Ἀβακαῖνος, ἤ (Diod. 14.90.3) or Ἀβάκαινος, τό (Diod. 19.65.6; Steph. Byz. 2.11). The city-ethnic is Ἀβακαϊνοὺς (C4s coins, *infra*; Diod. 14.78.5; Steph. Byz. 2.15).

Abakainon is called a *polis* in the urban and political sense at Diod. 14.90.3 (r393) and 19.65.6 (r315), and in the urban sense at 14.90.4 (r393). The passage at 14.90.3 describes it as a *polis symmachis* of Magon, and in a later period it was part of the *symmachia* of Agathokles, alongside such *poleis* as Kamarina, Leontinoi, Katane and Messana (Diod. 19.65.6 (r315), 19.110.4 (r311)). The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on coins struck c.400 (*infra*), and the external collective use is found in Diod. 19.110.4 (r311).

In 366, Dionysios I deprived Abakainon of a part of its *chora*, which was handed over to his new foundation, Tyndaris (no. 49; Diod. 14.77.5). Abakainon was situated south-east of Tyndaris, at modern Tripi. The ancient city, destroyed by the modern, is poorly known. However, Diodorus’ report (14.90.3) that in 393 Carthaginian troops
defeated by Dionysios took refuge in the city (ἐφυγον εἰς τὴν πόλιν) suggests that by this date it was fortified. There are sporadic Greek remains from C6, and substantial Greek remains from C4 (Villard 1954); the investigation of the extensive cemetery north of the city has brought to light also monumental C4 tombs of the type known from Leonitinoi (Bacci and Spigo 1997–98); the city minted a Greek-style coinage from C5m (infra).

Abakainon struck silver coins (litra, hemilitron) from c.C5m: obv. laureate head, bearded (an indigenous god assimilated to Zeus) or beardless (assimilated to Apollo), or, on later coinage, female head (nymph, or Demeter or Persephone); rev. wild boar and acorn, at times a grain of barley or sow and piglet, legend: ABA, ABAK (above acorn) IN (below), ABAK (on obv.) AINI (on rev.), ABAKA/INION (Head, ΗΠ 118; Bertino 1975); SNG Cop. Sicily 1–6. In C4s, the city struck in bronze: (1) Probably from the time of Timoleon: obv. female head; rev. forepart of bull, or forepart of man-headed bull, legend: ABA, ABAK[AINI]INON, ABAKA/INION (Head, ΗΠ 118; Bertino 1975) 124–26; SNG Cop. Sicily 7; (2) c.344–338: obv. head of Dioskouroi, legend: ABA; rev. “free horse”, legend: ABA; the obv. type may indicate influence from the mint of Tyndaris or, more generally, from southern Italy (Bertino 1975) 124–26.

6. Adranon (Adranites) Map 47. Lat. 37.40, long. 14.50. Size of territory: ? Type: B.α. The toponym is Ἀδρανός, τό (Diod. 14.37.5, 16.68.9, Steph. Byz. 28.1). The city-ethnic is Ἀδρανῶτας (-τας); C4s coins (infra) and Diod. 16.68.9.

Adranon was founded by Dionysios I c.400, and in his report of the foundation Diod. 14.37.5 refers to it as a polis (πόλις ἐκτεταρτή), presumably in both the urban and the political senses; it is called polis in the urban sense at Diod. 16.68.9 (r345/4); it is called a polis mikra in the urban sense at Plut. Tim. 12.2 and polichnion at 12.3. The chronological relationship between Adranon and the neighbouring indigenous site of Mendolito (contemporary or successive sites?) is as yet unclarified (Albanese 1991 esp. 548, 552–53).

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C4s coins (infra), and the external collective use in Diod. 16.68.9, 69.3 (r345/4). A stasis is mentioned at Plut. Tim. 12.2.

In 344/3, Timoleon received Adranon into his symmachia, and the city presumably provided him with armed forces (Diod. 16.69.3; Plut. Tim. 12.6).

There are Greek finds from C6 at Adranon, but the majority of the finds from the habitation area and adjacent cemeteries belong to the Dionysian foundation and date from C4–C3; the finds suggest a local production of red-figure pottery. The impressive ashar isodicamic double curtain-wall, enclosing an area of about 60 ha, probably dates from the period of Dionysios’ foundation (its gates are mentioned at Plut. Tim. 12.6). Votive deposits found within the urban area have revealed a sanctuary of Demeter. Survey of site: Marotta D’Agata and Spigo (1984). Adranos, identified by the Greeks with Hephaistos and presumably the patron divinity of the city as well as a divinity honoured throughout Sicily, had a temple in the city (Plut. Tim. 12.2, 6; LIMC I 12: 229–30).

Adranon began minting bronze coins under Timoleon: (1) obv. Apollo, legend: ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝ; rev. lyre; (2) obv. head of local river-god (Adranos?); rev. butting bull, legend: ΑΔΡΑΝΙΤΑΝ (Head, ΗΠ 188–19; LIMC I 12: 230; Karlsson 1995) 154–55 with refs.; SNG Cop. Sicily 10–12. A single known litra has obv. head of nymph; rev. bull, fish in exergue, and legends: ΠΠΑΚΙΝΟΣ and ΑΔΡΑΝ, a joint issue of Piakos (no. 43; possibly at Mendolito), and Adranon suggesting proximity and collaboration between these two communities (Jenkins 1975) 87–92; see also the entry for Piakos.


Diodorus calls his native city a polis in the political sense at 14.9.2 (r404) and 14.9.4 (r392); the urban sense is found in 14.9.5 (r392); politai is found at 14.9.5–6. The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C5l and C4 coins (infra), and Diodorus uses the collective city-ethnic e.g. at 14.65.5.

At 14.9.4–7 (r392), Diodorus describes Agyrion as ruled by the (Hellenised?) tyrant Agyris, allegedly the most powerful Sicilian ruler after Dionysios I; the city is described as walled (τοῦ τείχους, 14.9.6), as having an acropolis (14.9.5) and c.20,000 citizens (πόλεως ὁικ ἐκλείπουσι δημογραφία, 14.9.4), and Agyris as wealthy (χρημάτων πολλῶν, 14.9.5). Agyris concluded a symmachia with Dionysios I and campaigned with him pandemei (14.9.7).

In the time of Timoleon, Agyrion was ruled by the tyrant Apolloniades, who was, however, deposed by Timoleon, whereupon the Agyrians were granted Syracusan citizenship (Diod. 16.82.4; cf. Moggi 1976) 357, who suggests that the population was transferred to Syracuse (no. 47). Timoleon later settled 10,000 new colonists in Agyrian
territory (ἡ Ἀγύρινα), said to be sizeable (Diod. 16.82.5; the territory (chora) is mentioned also at Diod. 14.95.2, from which passage it appears that in C4 it extended as far as the river Chrysas). In view of Diod. 16.83.3, this was presumably a regular refoundation of Agyrion. It is there reported that the prosperity brought about by Timoleon (cf. R. P. A. Patanè (1992) 77) led to the erection of a splendid theatre, temples, a bouleuterion, an agora, a circuit wall with towers, and monumental tombs (Diod. 1984).

Influence, is known from possibly as early as C3 (Agyris: ΑΓΥΡΙΝΑΙΩΝ Aitna I is called a polis by Pind. Pyth. 1.31 and 61, presumably in the urban as well as the political sense (cf. Hansen (2000) 175–76; cf. Diod. 11.66.4 (r466)). Δάμος is found in Pind. Pyth. 1.70. The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on coins (infra); the external collective use is found in Pind. Nem. 9.30. For the individual use of the city-ethnic, see below on the athletic record of Hieron and Chromios.

In 476, Hieron transferred the populations of Katane (no. 30) and Naxos (no. 41) to Leontinoi (no. 33), renamed Katane as Aitna, and settled his new foundation with 10,000 oiketares: 5,000 from the Peloponnese and 5,000 from Syracuse (no. 47; Diod. 11.49.2; cf. Schaefer (1961) 293); though the report on the relocation of populations refers to both Katane and Naxos, Katane (with parts of adjacent territories) was the site refounded as Aitna: καί τὴν μὲν Κατάνην μετωνόμασε Ἀιτνην, τὴν δὲ χώραν οὐ μόνον τὴν Καταναίαν ἅλλα καὶ πολλῆν τῆς ὁµόρου προσθέσει κατεκληροίχησε, μυρίων πληρώσας οἰκήτορας. (Cf. Strabo 6.2.3, who focuses exclusively on Katane in his report on the foundation of Aitna.) Deinomenes, Hieron’s son, ruled the city as βασιλεὺς (Pind. Pyth. 1.60–61). Chromios was installed by Hieron as τῆς Αἰτνης ἐπίτροπος and so presumably was the guardian of Deinomenes while he was still a minor (Schol. Pind. Nem. 9; cf. RE III. 2454; Puech (1958) 19). Pind. Pyth. 1.62 says that Hieron founded the city Ἰδίῳ στάθμας ἐν νόμοις, presumably indicating that Aitna was intended as a Dorian city.

After Hieron’s death in 466, his brother Thrasyboulos enlisted the help of the Aitnaians in his unsuccessful attempt to suppress the uprising of the Syracusans against him (Diod. 11.67.7); at Aitna the rule of Deinomenes survived long enough for him to erect a commemorative monument for Hieron by Onatas at Olympia (Paus. 6.12.1–2, 8.42.8–10), but by 461 Hieron’s settlers were expelled after long fighting (πλείστις μάχαις) with Syracuse as well as with the Sikels under Douketios (Diod. 11.76.3); the original Katanaians returned (Strabo 6.2.3) and a new geopolitical arrangement followed (Diod. 11.76.3: κατεκληροίχησαν τὴν γῆν, i.e. the Sikels and the Syracusans). The Aitnaians retired to Inessa and founded a new Aitna (Strabo 6.2.3), on which see below, Aitna II.

With Diod. 11.49.2, scholars see Hieron’s foundation as a “plan . . . thoroughly dominated by concern for mercenaries” (Demand (1990) 51), and Thrasyboulos indeed used Aitnaian forces in his power struggle at Syracuse (supra). In addition, Timaios (FGHist 566) fr. 142a = schol. Pind. Nem. 1.1 and Diod. 11.49.2 stress another, personal, motive of

8. Aitna (Aitnaios) Map 47. Location of Aitna I as Katane, but Aitna I with a larger territory (Diod. 11.49.1), the location and territorial size of Aitna II being unknown. Type: Αιτνα (I), Αἰτνα-β (II). The toponym is Αἴτνα, ἦ (Pind. Pyth. 1.60; fr. 105a, Maehler); or Αἴτνη (Diod. 11.49.1; Strabo 6.2.3), though for example Diod. 11.66.4 and 67.7 (r466) calls it Κατάνη. The city-ethnic is Αἴτναιας (C5f coins, infra; Pind. Nem. 9.30).
Hieron’s: his wish to become an ὀλίκουστής with heroic honours (cf. Trumpf (1958) 131 and Harrell (2002) 444–47). Hieron did in fact receive heroic honours at Aitna (I) in his capacity as oecist (Diod. 11.66.4); according to Strabo, he was buried at Aitna (I), but his tomb was destroyed by the Katanaians on their return (6.2.3).

The phase of Aitna (I) is not archaeologically distinguishable from that of Katane (no. 30); however, the construction of the theatre (TGR II 428–30, C5?) may perhaps be attributed to Hieron in the light of the tradition that Aischyllos composed and performed The Women of Aitna in honour of the newly founded city (Aesch. fr. 25, Mette). C5 votives attest to a sanctuary of Demeter, highly suggestive given the importance of this cult for the Deinomenids (Dunbabin (1984) 64; White (1964)). The cult of Zeus became important at Aitna during the reign of Hieron (cf. Pind. Pyth 1.29; Ol. 6.96), an importance reflected in the type of a seated Zeus (Aitnaios) found on the coins of the new foundation.

Hieron won victories at Olympia and at Delphi (refs. in Olymphonikai 221) and was proclaimed a citizen of Aitna (Ἄἵρναιοι) according to schol. Pind. Nem. 1.1 = Timaios (ForHist 566) fr. 142a, a custom followed by Chromios as well (ibid.). Chromios was victorious at the Nemean chariot race (Pind. Nem. 1, date uncertain) and in the same event at Sikyon (no. 228; Pind. Nem. 9, in 476 or 474).

Aitna soon struck coins: a single surviving tetradrachm, probably from the time of its foundation (476), has on the obv. quadriga with Athena as charioteer and a Nike above, as at Syracuse; rev. Zeus enthroned, holding thunderbolt and an eagle-tipped sceptre. A single surviving drachm has obv. horseman; rev. type similar to the tetradrachm. The rev. of both denominations carries the legend AITNAION (Boehringer (1968) 76–79; Kraay (1976) 212). A magnificent tetradrachm with obv. head of a Silenos, legend: AITNAION; rev. seated Zeus, was issued either by the Aitnaains a few years before 461 or by them as an inauguration issue when they refounded Aitna (II). This second issue also has litrai with rev. thunderbolt, legend: AITNAION (Boehringer (1968) 80–98; Kraay (1976) 212–13; Manganaro (1996b) 308).

Aitna II The Aitnaains were expelled from Aitna (I) in 461, retired to Inessa, a Sikel site 80 stades inland from Katane on Mt. Etta, and refounded their community there, proclaiming Hieron ὀλίκηστης and preserving the name of Aitna (Strabo 6.2.3; Diod. 11.76.3). The location of Aitna II is unknown, although various attempts have been made to identify the site (Bombaci and Massa (1990) 290–93). At its foundation this new community was presumably a polis, as indicated by the proclamation of an oecist (Strabo 6.2.3; cf. also infra on coins), but its later history was tumultuous: in 451, Douketios took the city and in this connection Diod. 11.91.1 mentions a person whom he describes as ὁ ἄθροισμενος αὐτῆς (sc. Αἴτνης). Syracusan ηπίπης in conflict with Dionysios I took Aitna in 405 (Diod. 13.113.3), and the site formed the base of opposition to Dionysios (14.7.7, 8.1, 9.5); Dionysios sent presbeis urging the exiles who had gathered with the ηπίπης at Aitna to return to Syracuse, but the majority remained at Aitna (Diod. 14.9.6–8). In 403 the settlement (termed phourion in this connection) was taken by Dionysios (Diod. 14.14.2). In 396 Dionysios I persuaded the “Campanians living at Katane” to relocate to Aitna, and here it is again described as a phourion (Diod. 14.58.2), which is not incompatible with its being a polis (cf. Thuc. 8.62.3; Nielsen (2002)), but Dionysios obviously treated it as a dependency. Close connections with Syracuse may have been facilitated by the foundation history of Aitna. On the other hand, Syracusan control over the area of Aitna (II) may have a history going back beyond the original foundation: according to Diod. 11.26.7, Gelon planned to build a temple of Demeter at Aitna, but because of his death it was never completed (Diod. 11.26.7). However, the date (the reign of Gelon) reveals that the “Aitna” in question must have been Inessa (= the later Aitna II) and not Aitna I founded by Hieron only in 476, and so the passage reveals that Gelon held a dominion in the territory of Katane/Aitna II (cf. Freeman (1891–94) ii. 524–25).

If Aitna can be presumed to have remained a polis during all these events, its identity as a Hellenic polis may be uncertain after the settlement of Campanians at the site: in 396 Himilkon sent ambassadors to “the Campanians in possession of Aitna”, urging the city to cut its ties with Dionysios (Diod. 14.61.4), and Diod. 16.67.4 (1345) again refers to “the Campanians living at Aitna”; however, in 339 Timoleon “destroyed the Campanians at Aitna, having forced them to surrender by siege” (Diod. 16.82.4), and Aitna appears in the C35 list of Delphic theorodokoi in Sicily (BCH 45 (1921) 25, col. iv 96; Manganaro (1964a) 420, 432), presumably as a fully Hellenic community.

The polis status of C5 Aitna II is to some extent dependent upon the attribution to Aitna II of some litrai and, especially, of one C5m tetradrachm with obv. Silenos, legend: AITNAION; rev. seated Zeus, cf. Bombaci and Massa (1990) 289 (supra). The stylistic affinity between this issue and issues of Naxos (no. 41) and Katane (no. 30) has been seen by some, though perhaps not entirely convincingly, as
evidence of a C5m sympoliteia between these cities in the face of Syracusan pressure (Bombaci and Massa (1990) 289). The Campanian mercenaries settled at Aitna II struck Timoleontic symmetrica bronze coins in 342–339:

(1) obv. head of Zeus Eleutherios, legend: ΖΕΥΣ
EΛΕΥΘΕΡΙΟΣ; rev. thunderbolt, legend: ΑΙΤΝΑΙΟΝ
Talbert (1974) 181, 187–88); (2) obv. head of Athena or
Persephone, legend: ΑΙΤΝΑ[ΩΝ]; rev. “free horse”
(Bombaci and Massa (1990) 289; SNG Cop. Sicily 13; SNG
Cop. Suppl. 60).

9. Akragas (Akragnantinos) Map 47. Lat. 37.20, long. 13.35.
Size of territory: 5. Type: Aa. The toponym is Ἀκράγας, ἦ
(Pind. Ol. 2.6; Thuc. 6.4.4), the city-ethnic is Ακραγαντίνος
(Hdt. 7.165; IGDS no. 182a).

Akragas is called a polis in the urban sense by Empedokles
fr. 112.2 (DK): ἄν’ Ἄκρα ἄριστος (acropolis itself occurs at
Diod. 13.84.3 (1406)), by Xen. Hell. 2.2.24 (cf. Pind. Ol. 2.93
and Pyth. 12.1) and by Ps.-Skylax 13 (where it is listed under
the heading πόλεις Ελληνίδες ἀἵδε); in the political sense
polis occurs in Thuc. 6.4.4, 7.46.1. The politieia was described
by Aristotle (Arist. fr. 479); Empedokles has patris (fr. 157.2,
DK) and ἄστυν (fr. 112.1, DK).

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on
C5s coins (infra), the internal individual use in Empedokles
fr. 157.1, DK. The external collective use is found at Hdt. 7.165
and in IGDS nos. 95 and 182 (C5); the external individual use
is found in Hesperia 43 (1974) 322, no. 3.6 (331–324) and
presumably in IGDS no. 182b (C5); it is applied also to
Empedokles (e.g. Arist. Cael. 279f.16).

Akragas was founded by Gela (Thuc. 6.4.4), according to
other sources with the participation of a Rhodian contin-
gent (Pind. fr. 105, Bowra; Polyb. 9.27.8, 108 years after
the foundation of Gela, i.e. c580 (Thuc. 6.4.4), 100 years before
the Olympic victory of Theron at the 76th Olympiad (476)
giving to Pindar (Ol. 2.166–69 with schol.). The oecists
were Aristonoos and Pystilos (Thuc. 6.4.4). Of the two
oecists mentioned in the sources, one may have come from
Gela, the other from Gela’s metropolis, Rhodos (cf.
Leschhorn (1984) 52–55; Musti (1992)). The archaeological
evidence, above all that from the Montelusa cemetery, is in
agreement with the time of foundation given by the literary
sources (Waele (1971) 88–97; De Miro (1988b) 240–44). The
institutions of Akragas were modelled on those of Gela
(Thuc. 6.4.4; νόμματα τὰ Γέλωνων).

The foundation of Akragas secured Geloan interests
westwards. It is therefore not easy to map Akragantine and
Geloan spheres of influence since sites such as Vassallaggi
and Sabucina may have had first a Geloan, later an
Akragnantine phase. However, territorial ambitions under
Phalaris secured territory westwards to the river Halykos
and Selinuntine territory with the site of Minoa, a city
founded by Selinous (Hdt. 5.46.2); a palladius taken as spoils
from the city of Minoa was dedicated to Athena Lindia by
the Akragantines (Lind. Chron. (FGrHist 532) fr.
30 = Xenagoras (FGrHist 240) fr. 17). A number of phouria
laid out by Phalaris in Akragantine territory in the Himera
valley are listed by Diod. 19.108.1–2 ((rC6); cf. Polyena. 5.1.3),
but the tradition that Phalaris had a phourion on the
Eknomos hill may be a late fabrication; the site is normally
located somewhere in the hills above Licata (Bejor (1989d)).
Spoils captured from Kokalos dedicated to Athena Lindia
are listed in the Lindian Chronicle ((FGrHist 532) fr.
27 = Xenagoras (FGrHist 240) fr. 14; survey of sources:
Braccesi and De Miro (1992) 8–12). Kamikos, the seat of
Kokalos, was somewhere in the Akragantine hinterland
(cf. Hdt. 7.170.1, who calls it a polis inhabited in his
day by Akragantines: πόλιν Καμικών, τὴν κατ’ ἐμὲ
Ἀκραγαντίνοι ἑνάμοντο; Diod. 4.78.2; De Miro (1962)).
Under Theron, Himera came within the Akragantine sphere
of influence, and the domination of Akragas in the decade
483–472 is reflected in the crab appearing on the rev. of
the coins of Himera (Hdt. 7.165; Bonacasa (1992); cf. the entry
for Himera). The influence of Akragas over a vast area of
central Sicily is inferred also from the circulation of C5s
Akragantine bronze coins (Vassallo (1983)). The settlement
pattern in the chora of Akragas is little known, and only a
few suburban sanctuaries are known, among them the
sanctuary dedicated to chthonic deities at Palma di
Montechiaro on the coast 20 km south-east of Akragas
(Castellana (1994)). There is evidence of a number of C6
phouria and C6 Hellenised settlements along the coast
between Gela and Akragas (Bejor (1987); Castellana (1994)
302–4). Plut. Dio 49.1 mentions a site in Akragantine territo-
ry called Νέα πόλις which is, however, unlocated. Diod.
13.81.3 (1406) refers to κτήσεις in the territory when it was
evacuated in the face of the Carthaginian threat.

According to Diog. Laert. 8.63, Akragas had a population
of 800,000 inhabitants at the time of Empedokles, an
obvious exaggeration (Waele (1979)). According to Diod. 11.53.5.
4,000 Akragantines and Himeraians were killed in battle
against Hieron in 472, but the number of Akragantines is not
specified. At 12.8.4 Diodorus relates that a thousand
Akragantines were killed at the battle of Himera in 446. At
the time of the Carthaginian conflicts, Akragas had, accord-
The constitutional history of the city was eventful. Within ten years of its foundation, power was seized by Phalaris (c.570–554), who is described as a τύραννος ἵκ τῶν τιμων by Arist. Pol. 1310b28. His reign was a period of expansion, with several victories over the indigenous population, in particular the victory over the Sikanian stronghold of Uessa (Polyaen. 5.1.4), and the conquest of Minoa; the Akragantine dedication to Athena Lindia of a palladion was booty taken from this town (Lind. Chron. [FGrHist 532] fr. 30 = Xenagoras [FGrHist 240] fr. 30). Phalaris may have extended Akragantine influence to Himera (no. 1106). The rivalry with Syracuse led to a war in 415 (Thuc. 7.32.1) and the return to their native country of the inhabitants (cf. Waele (1969)).

The prosperity brought by the reign of Theron the archontes (Theron’s son Thrasydaios was installed as tyrant in Himera (Diod. 14.8.6). Theron died after a reign of sixteen years and was honoured as a hero (Diod. 11.53.1–2); he was succeeded by Thrasydaios in Akragas (Timaios [FGrHist 566] fr. 93), who for a year exercised power παρανόµως καὶ τυραννικῶς (Diod. 11.53.4). The subsequent conflict with Hieron and the fall of Thrasydaios led to the establishment of a democratic government in 471 (Diod. 11.53.5) and the return to their native country of the ἀρχαῖοι πολίται, who were given back their civic rights (Diod. 11.76.5). Empedokles is reported (by Diog. Laert. 8.66 = Timaios [FGrHist 566] fr. 2) to have put an end to an oligarchy “of the 1,000” (τὸ τῶν χιλίων ἄθροισμα) which had existed for three years, but refused the offer of βασιλεία (Xanthos [FGrHist 765] fr. 33; Arist. fr. 865), thereby obtaining a cessation of stasis and bringing about political equality (Neanthes [FGrHist 84] fr. 28). Exactly when this occurred is uncertain, but E. W. Robinson (1997) 78–80 assumes that it was some years after the fall of the tyrannical. The city was surrounded on the west by the river Hypsas and on the east by the river Akragas, with their confluence just below the city. Ancient remains at the estuary may attest a citizen of Akragas served as theorodokos of Epidauros (no. 348; IG iv.1.95.11.91), and c.331–324 one of its citizens was appointed proxenos by Athens (no. 361; Hesperia 43 (1974) 322, no. 3). Reception of envoys is attested at Diod. 11.68.1 (1466; the sending of envoys is attested in Diod. 12.8.4 (1446).

The city was surrounded by the river Hypsas and on the east by the river Akragas, with their confluence just below the city. Ancient remains at the estuary may attest a citizen of Akragas served as theorodokos of Epidauros (no. 348; IG iv.1.95.11.91), and c.331–324 one of its citizens was appointed proxenos by Athens (no. 361; Hesperia 43 (1974) 322, no. 3). Reception of envoys is attested at Diod. 11.68.1 (1466; the sending of envoys is attested in Diod. 12.8.4 (1446).

In 356/5 a citizen of Akragas served as theorodokos of Epidauros (no. 348; IG iv.1.95.11.91), and c.331–324 one of its citizens was appointed proxenos by Athens (no. 361; Hesperia 43 (1974) 322, no. 3). Reception of envoys is attested at Diod. 11.68.1 (1466; the sending of envoys is attested in Diod. 12.8.4 (1446).
C6e circuit wall was built in local limestone in an ashlar technique. Eight or nine gates gave access to the city at natural openings in the ridge of hills (cf. P. Marconi (1929) 32–41, fig. 15). Diod. 13.81.3 refers to τείχη in reference to 406 when it was decided to evacuate the territory and take refuge behind the fortifications.

The hill of Athena, used as a retreat during the assault of the Carthaginians (Diod. 13.85.4 (r406)), is normally interpreted as the acropolis of the city (Polyb. 9.27.6). Polyb. 9.27.7 locates the temples of Athena and Zeus Atabyrios on the highest point of the city, but whether the Athenaion (probably the sanctuary of Athena Polias) and the temple of Zeus were located on the highest point of the mediaeval city of Girgenti or further south on the “Rupe Atenea” hill is still not clear; also all of the hills in the north and north-east may have constituted a single acropolis (Waele (1971) 217–22).

Akragas presents one of the most impressive examples of Sicilian urban planning. Although the fully excavated insulae are mainly of later date, the urban layout of the Archaic and Classical city may be reconstructed as an orthogonally planned city with plateiai oriented east–west, and stenopoi oriented north–south; investigations in the habitation area west of the Olympieion point to C6–C5e for the overall urban layout (De Miro (1980) 711–15, (1992) 155). The north-western part of the city had a slightly different orientation. The urban area comprised c.625 ha including the surrounding hills, while the habitation area on the plateau comprised c.140 ha (Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994) 5). C5f witnessed significant building activity at Akragas (see e.g. Diod. 11.25), with several allusions to the high standard of living of the inhabitants (e.g. Heraclid. Pont. fr. 76, Wehrli; Diod. 13.81.4–5).

The bouleuterion and the ekklesiasterion were situated centrally in the urban layout on the small hill of S. Nicola (De Miro (1988a) 66, fig. 2). The hill was laid out as a sanctuary in C6, but from the C4 became the focus of civic structures, perhaps with a surrounding agora. The C4l bouleuterion, replacing C6–C4 temples, was built on the northern part of the hill on an artificial terrace supported by a new, monumental terrace wall which endows the area with some monumentality. The seating capacity was c.300 (De Miro (1985–86)). The ekklesiasterion was situated south of the bouleuterion on the southern slope of the S. Nicola hill (De Miro (1988a) 66, fig. 2). The koilon, covering about 1,250 m², had a seating capacity of c.3,000 (Hansen and Fischer-Hansen (1994) 57 with refs.). The excavators date the structure to C4–C3, though earlier dates have been suggested, such as the period of the refoundation of Akragas by Timoleon, 339 (cf. Plut. Tim. 35.2), or even C5 (Greco and Theodorescu (1983) 45, 79). The open space north-east of the Olympieion sanctuary has tentatively been identified with a lower, mercantile (?) agora (Fiorentini (1990) 17).

Stoas are now known from the early urban history (De Miro (1977) 95–96). The remains of a theatre (?) mentioned by Fazello (sixteenth century AD) is surmised in the S. Nicola area, near the other public buildings, but there are no remains. A C5 fountain house was part of the sanctuary of Demeter below the Rupe Atenea (Siracusano (1983)). Public works begun after the victory at Himera in 480 included underground conduits to carry waste water away from the city constructed by the architect Phaex. The “swimming-bath”, kolumbethra, mentioned by Diodorus, seven stades in circumference, probably fed the water supply of the city (Diod. 11.25.3–4 (r480); cf. also Waele (1971) 52, 113; Wilson (2000) 7).

The sources refer to cults of Zeus, Hera, Apollo, Athena, Demeter, Kore and Hermes (Waele (1971) 185–207). The epithe of the Athena of the sanctuary located on the acropolis (Diod. 13.85.4; Polyb. 9.27.7; supra) is uncertain. The Geloan-Rhodian origin of the settlers may suggest Lindia, but in Polyaena, 6.51 we have Polias. A Rhodian origin of the major city cults is corroborated by the Rhodian origin of the cult of Zeus Atabyrios located on the acropolis (Polyb. 9.27.7). According to Polyaena, 5.1.1, a temple was dedicated to Zeus Polieus, but it is most likely the same cult. A cult of Demeter is known from Pind. Pyth. 12.1–2 and from Polyaena, 5.1.1 (a thesmophorion). The cult statue of Apollo in a suburban Asklepieion (Polyb. 1.18.2) was the work of Myron (Cic. Verr. 4.43.93).

evidence of an Archaic sanctuary in the vicinity, unknown cult (P. Marconi 1929) 46, 155–56. A sanctuary to the west of the Olympeion gate 5; a C6ς temple in antis and a “lesche” or aikos, from the C5ς sanctuary enlarged with a stoa or porticus and other buildings (De Miro (1977) 94–100). Further west, the C5ι temple “G”; in the cella, remains were found of an earlier Archaic naikos (P. Marconi 1929) 86–87. Near the sanctuary of the chthonic deities (Waele (1971) 195–99; Hinz (1998) 79–90); temple “I”, C5m; north of this, remains of two C6ς naikoi possibly superseded by temple “I” in C5m. The central part of the city, the S. Nicola hill, was laid out as a sanctuary with at least two temples in the Archaic period; the structure of one was partly reused in a C4ς naikos, the cult was possibly that of Demeter (Polacco (1988); Hinz (1998) 90–91). The identification of the C5ς suburban sanctuary located between the city and the coast (P. Marconi 1929) 87–93) as that of Asklepios rests upon Polyb. 1.18.2, but must remain uncertain.

The only cemetery of the city itself yet examined in any detail is that of Contrada Pezzino west of the city, dating from the period of the foundation to C5λ, and again from C4ς (De Miro (1989)). Further cemeteries were dispersed along the roads leading south and east from the city.

Xenokrates won a Pythian victory in 490 (Pind. Pyth. 6) and an Isthmian victory in, presumably, 472 (Pind. Isth. 2); Exainetos (496), Empedokles (496) and Theron (476) won in the Olympic Games (Olympionikai 167, 170, 220), and Exainetos (Olympionikai 341, 346) was particularly honoured in 412 when he entered the city in a chariot and was escorted by all the chariots of the Akragantines, 300 chariots each drawn by two white horses (Diod. 13.82.7). According to Pausanias, Akragas set up a bronze group in Olympia to commemorate a C5ς (?) defeat of the Phocians at Motaia (Paus. 5.25.5; cf. LSAG 274), and a statue of Apollo was dedicated at Delphi 475–450: Ἀκραύγαντινοι τιδήμιοι ΑΠΑΛΩΝ (Bousquet (1959) 149–50). For the dedication of the spoils taken at Minoa to Athena Lindia by the Akragantines, see supra.

Akragas initiated coinage c.520/510 with an issue of didrachms on the Attic standard; obv. eagle standing in profile, legends: ΑΚΡΑΓΑΝΤΟΣ, or, later, ΑΚΡΑ, ΑΚΡΑΓΑΣ (see Brugnone (1978) for the use of the sign Λ = alpha); rev. crab with, on some later groups, officials’ names or abbreviations. The terminal date of the first issue is a little before 470 (Jenkins (1970) 162–64; C. Boehringer (1984–85) 119–22; SNG Cop. Sicily 20–40). The tetradrachm replaced the didrachm as the main denomination c.464; main types as above, legend: ΑΚΡΑΓΑΝΤΟΣ (SNG. Cop. Sicily 41–45); also lower denominations based on the litra (SNG Cop. Sicily 46–51). Just before its destruction in 406, Akragas struck sophisticated issues, some signed, and some issues now used the city-ethnic as legend: ΑΚΡΑΓΑΝΤΙΝΟΝ (SNG Cop. Sicily 53), while ΑΚΡΑΓΑΝΤΙΝΟΝ is found in C4λ–C3ς. Rare gold issues from the same period (SNG Cop. Sicily 52) may reflect minting in response to the need to pay mercenaries (cf. Gela (no. 17)). The first bronze coinage of Akragas, from c.450, was cast shapes (Westmark (1979); SNG Cop. Sicily 61–63); later coins were struck in bronze; types: obv. eagle; rev. crab, some inscribed ΑΚΡΑΓΑΝΤΙΝΟΝ (Vassallo (1983); Westmark (1984); SNG Cop. Sicily 65–90). The city as refounded by Timoleon c.338 struck symmachia coins of the free horse type (Karlsson (1995) 161; SNG Cop. Sicily 91–92).

10. Akrai (Akraios) Map 47. Lat. 37.05, long. 14.55. Size of territory: ? Type: C5ς. The toponym is Ακραι, αι (Thuc. 6.5.2; Diod. 23.4.1); Steph. Byz. 62.5 has Ακρα; the city-ethnic is Ακραίος (IG xiv 215.3 (C3)).

The only (implicit) reference to Akrai is in the treaty of 263 between Rome and Syracuse (Diod. 23.4.1), which lists the poleis assigned to Hieron II and uses poleis in the political sense. The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found in IG xiv 215.1; it is also found as the epithet of Zeus Akraios, if the conjecture by Wilamowitz is accepted (IG xiv 203).

Lack of the name of an oecist and of a mint are factors which make which the polis status of Akrai uncertain and tend to suggest a military settlement protecting the territory of Syracuse (no. 47; Di Vita (1956), (1987)) rather than a polis. There are very few sources for the Archaic and Classical periods, and no mention of the city from between the period of its foundation (Thuc. 6.5.2) and the encampment of Dion in its vicinity (Plut. Dio 27 (1357)). All in all, the status of Akrai seems uncertain. Thucydides uses the toponym without qualification, implying, perhaps, a phrourion controlling Syracusan dominion, though it may possibly have been a dependent polis founded as a fortress (as has been suggested for Kasmenai (no. 29) by Hansen (1997a) 36).

Akrai was founded by Syracuse (no. 47) in 664 (Thuc. 6.5.2) c.36 km west of Syracuse itself, as the outcome of Syracuse’s policy of subjugating a large part of south-east Sicily (Di Vita (1987)). There is evidence for small nucleated settlements and farmsteads in the hinterland (Curcio (1979) 87–88; Marotta D’Agata et al. (1994) 196), but the size of Akraian territory is uncertain, and it was in any case part of the Syracusan dominion. A C4 relief of Demeter and Apollo
from Serra Palazzo, a few kilometres from Akrai, may indicate a suburban sanctuary (Orsi (1920)).

Akrai occupied a plateau west of modern Palazzolo Acreide between the upper reaches of the Tellaro and Anapo valleys. The city was defended by steep slopes and a circuit wall raised on the edge of the plateau. Only short stretches are extant, built as a solid ashlar wall dated to C4f (Bernabò Brea (1956) 21–25, fig. 9). IG xiv 217 (Hell.) mentions a pyla Selinuntia (Pugliese Carratelli in Bernabò Brea (1956) 2; Manganaro (1965) 204–5 supplies an alternative reading). The urban site occupied the central part of the plateau, covering about 35 ha (Bernabò Brea (1956)). Evidence for the early urban history of Akrai is limited, early remains being sparse. The most conspicuous remains are the C3 theatre (Mitens (1988) 84–87) and the C2 bouleuterion (Gneisz (1990) 302). However, there are traces of early town planning which may go back to the time of foundation (Voza and Lanza (1994)). The east-west plateia spans the whole city from the Syracusean gate in the area of the probable agora, the theatre and bouleuterion to the Selinuntine gate.

The C6s temple of Aphrodite on a hill above the city has a history going back to C7m (Bernabò Brea (1986); for the attribution: IG xiv 206, 208). There is epigraphic evidence for cults of Hera (IG xiv 208), Zeus Akraios (IG xiv 203: Διὸς Ἴαος ὑπὸ Ἱαοῦραίος), Artemis (IG xiv 217) and Kore (IG xiv 217; cf. Hinz (1998) 119). See further Pugliese Carratelli (1956) and Bernabò Brea (1986) 13.

The cemeteries of Akrai are located on the adjoining plateau south of the city, Contrada della Pineta (in use C7–C5) and on the Colle Orbo, located above the city outside the west gate (C7 and C6; Bernabò Brea (1956) 114–17).

11. Alaisa (Alaisinos) Map 47. Lat. 38.00, long. 14.15. Size of territory: ? Type: B:β. The toponym is Αλαίσα, Ἱ (Diod. 14.16.2, 4). The city-ethnic is ΑΛΑΙΣΙΟΣ (C4m coins, infrα; Diod. 23.4.1).

According to Diod. 14.16.2, Alaisa was founded by Archonides of Herbita in 403/2, in order to house veteran mercenaries, a symmikton ochlon that the war against Dionysios had brought to the city, as well as poor citizens of Herbita (no. 23) itself; in the report of the foundation, Alaisa is called a polis (πόλις ἐκ της Ἀλαισας), presumably in both the urban and the political sense. Another tradition held that it was a foundation by Himilkon of Carthage (Diod. 14.16.4). In the Roman period, however, the Herbitan origin of the city was considered a disgrace by its citizens (Diod. 14.16.3), and this may explain the variant tradition. The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C4s coins (infra), and the external collective use in Diod. 23.4.1 (126).

Alaisa was member of Timoleon's symmachia (cf. Diod. 16.73.2 (1342/1)), as can be inferred from its minting of Timoleontic symmachia coins (infra).

Alaisa is identified with Castel di Tusa on the north coast of Sicily, where there are substantial remains of an ancient urban site: habitation structures that reveal an orthogonal layout with an agora; a circuit wall in ashlar technique; a monumental sta; and remains of two temples, of which one must have been of Apollo (infra), all Hellenistic (Scibona (1976b)). The epiklesis of Apollo—Archagetas (infra)—is testimony to the importance of his cult.


12. Alontion (Alontinos) Map 47. Lat. 38.05, long. 14.40. Size of territory: ? Type: C:γ. The toponym is Αλόντιον, τό (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 1.51.2; Ptol. Geog. 3.4.2). The city-ethnic is ΑΛΟΝΤΙΝΟΣ (C4e coins, infrα).

No source calls Alontion a polis, but it is included here on account of its C4e coins.

According to legend, patron of Akarnania, guide of Anchises (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 1.51.2; for the Akarnanian origin of Patron, cf. Fromentin (1998) 256 adDion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 1.51.2), settled at Alontion, which would seem to indicate a claim to Greek identity, and by C4e it minted Greek-style coins (infra). Alontion has been identified with San Marco d’Alunzio (Bruno (1965) 141–48), in origin a Sikel site, but with some evidence of C4 Hellenisation. The few documented Greek structures are the remains of a (probably Hellenistic) circuit wall built in isodomic technique and a suburban temple. In addition, coin types suggest cults of Greek divinities (infra).

Alontion struck bronze coins from C4e: obv. head of Athena; rev. cuttlefish, legend: ΑΛΟΝΤΙΝΩΝ. According
to Karlsson (1995) 150, fig. 3, Alontion issued Timoleontic symmachia coins with the short-haired Zeus Eleutherios (but no refs. are given, ibid. 166 n. 3); Rutter (1997) 168 includes Alontion in his list of C4s Timoleontic symmachia coins.

13. Apollonia (Apolloniates) Map 47. Lat. 38.00, long. 14.35. Size of territory: ? Type: C.α. The toponym is Ἀπολλωνία, ἠ (Diod. 16.72.5). The city-ethnic is Ἀπολλωνιάτης (Diod. 16.72.5).

At 16.72.5, Diodorus reports that Apollonia, which with Engyon (no. 14) had been ruled by the tyrant Leptines, had its autonomia restored by Timoleon in 342/1; in his brief report of the incident, Diodorus refers to Apollonia as a polis in the political sense and uses the collective city-ethnic; it is called a polis in the urban sense at Diod. 20.56.4 (1307).

According to Steph. Byz. 106.4–5 (as emended by Clüver), Apollonia was located near Kale Akte and Alontion (i.e. on the north coast of Sicily), and urban remains on the plateau of Monte Vecchio, Commune of S. Fratello, have been identified with Apollonia; the remains testify to circuit walls and habitation structures built in isodomic masonry of local marble (Bernabò Brea (1975) 15; Scibona (1976a)). However, Manni (1981) 145 opts for modern Pollina, pointing out that according to Diod. 16.72.5, Apollonia was near Engyon. According to Diod. 20.56.4, the city was taken by Agathokles in 307 after a short siege, and this suggests that it was fortified by this date.

14. Engyon (Engynos) Map 47. Lat. 37.45, long. 14.35. Size of territory: ? Type: C.α. The toponym is Εὔγυον, τό (Diod. 16.72.3; Steph. Byz. 271.13, for which see Meineke ad loc.). The city-ethnic is Εὔγυνούσ (Diod. 16.72.4, 6) and Εὔγυν(ίνος; cf. infra).

Engyon is called a polis in the urban and political (cf. τυραννουμένη) senses at Diod. 16.72.4 (1342/1) in a passage which also uses the collective city-ethnic (cf. 16.72.6). In 342/1, the city was ruled by the tyrant Leptines, who was, however, deposed when Timoleon restored the autonomia of Engyon (Diod. 16.72.3–5).

According to Diod. 4.79.7, the famous sanctuary of the Meteres at Engyon was of Cretan origin (Manganaro (1996c) 130 n. 13 with refs.), perhaps an indication that Greek identity was claimed for the city (infra).

The location of Engyon is uncertain, though we are told that the neighbouring city was Agyrion (no. 7), located 100 stades away (Diod. 4.80.5). Manganaro has, on the basis of Hellenistic inscriptions (φαταί τα Ἐὔγυν[ίνω]) on bullets found at Troina, suggested this as the site of Engyon, and the possible attestation of a civic organisation with phratria is of some importance as an indication of Greek identity (Manganaro (1964b), (1996c) 130; contra Manni (1976b) 606–7).

At Troina, the archaeological remains of a circuit wall and the evidence from tombs do not antedate C4s; there is no evidence of an original Sikeli settlement. However, the identification of Troina with Engyon (accepted by Barr.) cannot be considered absolutely certain (Militello (1961); Bejor (1989a)).

15. Euboia (Euboeus) Map 47. Unlocated. Type: C.α. The toponym is Ἑὔβοια, ἠ (Callim. Aet. II fr. 43.52, Pfeiffer; Ps.-Skymnos 287; cf. Freeman (1891–94) i. 380: “Its name, recording the home-memories of the men of Leontinoi, is the earliest distinct instance of the name of a land being used as the name of a town; for there was a town as well as an island of Naxos, but there was no town of Euboia”); in Hdt. 7.156.3 the city-ethnic is given as Ἑὔβοεύς (to which is added ὁ ἐν Σικελία; cf. Camassa (1989a) 391–92: “uno specifico riferimento agli abitanti del centro [i.e. the city of Euboia] e non . . . una designazione dei coloni d’ascendenza euboica in Sicilia”). The site of Euboia is unidentified, but it was presumably located somewhere in the hinterland of Leontinoi (no. 33) where the presence of Chalkidian Greeks is well documented (Procelli (1989)). The city has been tentatively identified with different modern towns and localities (cf. Camassa (1989a) 392), most recently with the site of Monte San Mauro near Caltagirone (Frasca (1997)). Barr. (following Manni (1981)) suggests a location at the ACH site at Licodia Euboia.

The only Classical source to mention Euboia is Hdt. 7.156.3, which reports that Gelon subjected it to the same treatment as Megara, I.e. the pakeis received citizenship at Syracuse (no. 47) while the demos was sold into slavery; this ought to imply a Euboian population socially differentiated into pakeis and demos, and since the other communities relocated by Gelon were certainly poleis—viz. Kamarina (no. 28) and Megara (no. 36)—the presumption is that Euboia was a polis as well (cf. Seibert (1979) 226, 228). Strabo 10.1.15 also reports Gelon’s relocation of the city and implies that it meant a change of status for Euboia: it became a Syracusan phrourion, and the inference is that it was a polis prior to that (Ἑὔβοια ... ἔν Τέλων ἐξανάστασις, καὶ ἐγένετο φρουρίων Συρακοσίων; cf. the entry for Leontinoi, which became a phrourion of Syracuse in the later 420s). Euboia is called a polis by Ps.-Skymnos 287 in reference to the time of foundation. The external collective use of the city-ethnic is found at Hdt. 7.156.3.
Only two events of Euboian history are known: its foundation and its destruction. It was founded by Leontinoi (no. 33) (Strabo 6.2.6). The date of the foundation is unknown and must be inferred from the context in which the literary sources mention it: Strabo 6.2.6 discusses its foundation together with the foundations of Himera (no. 24), Callipolis (no. 27) and Selinous (no. 44), which may suggest a C7 date for the foundation; however, Ps.-Skymnos 287–88 treats the foundation alongside that of Mylai, so a C8 date cannot be entirely excluded. Euboia’s existence as a polis ended when c.485–483 Gelon sold its demos into slavery and relocated the pachis to Syracuse (Hdt. 7.156.3; chronology: Dunbabin (1948) 416); after that it was a Syracusan phrourion (Strabo 10.1.15).

16. Galeria (Galarinos) Map 47. Unlocated (Manni (1981) 175–76; Scibona (1989) 536). Type: Cβ. The toponym is Γαλερία or Γαλάρια, η at Diod. 16.67.3, 19.104.1; the city-ethnic is Γαλαρίνος (C5m coins, infra).

Galeria is called a polis in the urban and political senses at Diod. 16.67.3 (1345/4); politiai are mentioned at Diod. 19.104.1 (1312). The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C3m coins (infra). According to Steph. Byz. 196.11, Galeria was a foundation by the Sikeli Morgos; it is included here on account of its Greek-inspired coinage (infra).

Reception of an embassy is implied by Diod. 16.67.3 (1345/4): Entella sent for help against the Carthaginians, and Galeria responded by sending 1,000 hoplites, who were all killed.

Galeria struck two distinct issues of silver litrai. The earlier issue dates to C5m: obv. Zeus seated on throne holding eagle-tipped sceptre, legend: ΣΟΤΕΡ; rev. Dionysos standing, holding kantharos and vine, legend: ΓΑΛΛΑ. The iconography is known from coins of Aitna (no. 8) and Naxos (no. 41), but the style is indigenous. A later issue dates to 430–420 and is known from three specimens: obv. Dionysos holding kantharos and thyrsos; rev. vine and bunch of grapes, legend: ΓΑΛΑΠΙΝΟΝ (Head, HN² 139; Jenkins (1975) 83–85; Marwitz (1982) 56; Cutroni Tusa (1984–85) 290). The type depicting Zeus Soter seems to indicate a Greek cult (Gabrici (1959) 19; Marwitz (1982)).

17. Gela (Geloios, Geloaios) Map 47. Lat. 37.05, long. 14.15. Size of territory: 4 in C7; for the C6–C5e dominion, see below. Type: Aσα. The toponym is Γέλαια, ἡ (Hdt. 7.153.1) or Γέλα (F.Delphes 111.4 452 (c.474); Thuc. 4.58). The uncontracted city-ethnic is Γελειαῖος (IGDS no. 132 (550–525)), contracted to Γελά (Hdt. 7.154.1; Thuc. 7.58.1; IGDS no. 158 (C3e)); the form Γέλαιας is found in SEG 24.303 (C6–C5), possibly an Ionic form, but see IGDS notes ad 132 and Cordiano (1995), who suggests reading ἐκελάτας, i.e. the city-ethnic of Hyele (no. 54), not Gela.

Gela is called polis in the political sense by Thuc. 6.4.3, and in the urban sense by Thuc. 6.4.3 and Theopomp. fr. 358. Polites occurs at Hdt. 7.155.1 and astos at Hdt. 7.156.2. Its politia was described by Aristotle (Arist. fr. 491). A C5 bronze weight is inscribed διαμοσίς ῥα (IGDS no. 152). It is called patris in Empedokles fr. 156.4 (DK).

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found in IGDS no. 153 (C5e) and on C5 coins (infra). The external collective use is found in Hdt. 7.156.2 and Thuc. 7.58.1; the external individual use is found in IGDS no. 132 (550–525), IVO 142 (c.488) and IG II² 8460 (C4e).

Gela was founded 45 years after Syracuse, i.e. in 689/8, by colonists from Rhodos and Crete (Thuc. 6.4.3); according to Hdt. 7.153.1 by Lindians (no. 997) from Rhodos. The oecists were the Rhodian Antiphemos and the Cretan Entimos (Thuc. 6.4.3; cf. the C6–C5 dedication to Antiphemos: IGDS no. 135, indicating a cult of the oecist (Orlandini (1968) 44–46)). The colonists instituted νόμιμα Δορικά at Gela (Thuc. 6.4.3). Early Geloan expansion into the hinterland may be inferred from the sack of Omphake, a πόλις Σικανίων, by Antiphemos (Paus. 8.46.2 (1C7)); and conflicts between Geloans and the indigenous population are attested in other sources, e.g. Artemon (FGrHist 569) fr. 1 and the Lindian Temple Chronicle 25 = Xenagoras (FGrHist 240) fr. 12, which mentions an ἀκροβόλινον εἰς Ἀρηίτου dedicated to Athena Lindia by the Geloans. It was probably this expansionist policy that led to the foundation of Akragas (no. 9), which was founded 108 years after Gela’s own foundation, i.e. c.580 (Thuc. 6.4.4; cf. Pind. Ol. 2.93 with schol. 576).

The plateau of Gela dominated the coastal plain and the vast inland lowland. Apparently, the plain was mainly agricultural and without settlements. It was delimited by a row of hills settled with indigenous sites which all came under Geloan influence in C7, soon after the foundation of Gela. Two of the larger cities were Omphake (perhaps modern Butera: see most recently Adamesteanu (1994–95) 113), subjected by Gela early on (supra), and Maktorion (possibly modern Monte Bubbonia: Bejor (1991) 305). The tracts along the valleys of the rivers Salso (ancient Himera), Dessueri and Maroglio (ancient Gela and its tributaries) came under Gela’s influence from C5e, as far inland as Caltanissetta (sites of Sabucina; Gibil Gabib) and Caltagirone (site of Monte San Mauro, perhaps a Chalkidian settlement and therefore on the edge of the Geloan area of influence) (Orlandini (1962); see Euboia (no.
Eastwards the border between Gela and Kamarina (no. 28) was marked by the Dirillo valley, with a rural sanctuary at Feudo Nobile dedicated to chthonic divinities (Canzanella 1989)). Westwards Geloan influence may have reached as far as the river Platani (ancient Halykos), the eastern frontier of Selinus (no. 44). In C7 the immediate hinterland of Gela comprised an area of about 375 km², but the period of Hippokrates and Gelon saw a Geloan dominion comprising large tracts of north-east (Chalkidian) and south-east (Syracusan) Sicily. Philistos (FGrHist 556) fr. 5 implies a C6m treaty of symmachia between Gela and Kamarina, and possibly between Gela and Syracuse (no. 47).

From c.505, Gela was governed by tyrants, beginning with the rule of Kleandros and Hippokrates, sons of the Olympic victor Pantes (Olympionikai 51). Kleandros was tyrant for seven years (Hdt. 7.154.3; Arist. Pol. 1316b37), and after him his brother Hippokrates took over τὴν µουναρχίην, also for seven years (Hdt. 7.155.1; cf. 6.23.3 and Thuc. 6.5.3: τὺπαννος). Hippokrates conducted an aggressive foreign policy both against the indigenous population (Hdt. 7.154.2–3) and against the Greek cities of Kallipolis (no. 27), Naxos (no. 41), Zankle (no. 51) and Leontinoi (no. 33), all of which he “enslaved” (Hdt. 7.154.2). He also managed to defeat the Syracusans in battle and to lay siege to their city, but this conflict was settled through arbitration by Corinth (no. 227) and Korkyra (no. 123) by which Syracuse had to cede Kamarina to Hippokrates (Hdt. 7.154.2–3). Kamarina was then refounded by Gela with Hippokrates as oecist (Thuc. 6.5.3; Philistos (FGrHist 556) fr. 15). When Kamarina was destroyed by Gelon in 484, the Gelonts refounded it once again c.461 (Thuc. 6.4.3; Diod. 11.76.5); see further Berve (1967) 137–40. Zankle and its ruler Skythes were dependent allies of Hippokrates (Hdt. 7.154.2; see Zankle/Messana (no. 51)).

On Hippokrates’ death, the citizens of Gela attempted to free themselves from tyranny, but Gelon, the former δορυφόρος of Hippokrates, defeated them in battle and took power (Hdt. 7.155.1). When in 485 Gelon became tyrant of Syracuse, he moved his seat as well as “more than half” of the Gelon astoi to that city (Hdt. 7.156.2). The government of Gela was entrusted to Gelon’s brother, Hieron (Hdt. 7.156.6), who later inherited the tyranny of Syracuse and was succeeded at Gela by another brother, Polyzalos (F.Delphes 111.4 452: [Γ]ὴλας . . . δι[ν]ἀσι[ω]ν). Tyranny at Gela presumably came to an end in 466/5 (Berve 1967) 141).

In 405 Himilkon besieged, pillaged and destroyed (?) Gela (Diod. 13.108–111.1–2), and after the defeat of Dionysios I the peace treaty between Carthage and Syracuse (no. 47) stipulated that Gela be an ateichistos tributary of Carthage (Diod. 13.114.1; Staatsverträge 210). Gela was one of the Timoleontic refoundations (Plut. Tim. 35.1–2; Talbert (1974) 153–55, 204).

Our sources for the military strength of Gela provide us with scanty information about the size of the polis: a contingent of 500 hippes is mentioned by Diod. 13.83.2 (rC55; cf. Timaios (FGrHist 566) fr. 26a). In 415, during the Athenian attack, 200 Geloan cavalry assisted Syracuse (Thuc. 6.67.2), and the same number was sent in 413 (Thuc. 7.33.2). In 414 a small contingent from Gela under the command of Gylippos marched to the support of Syracuse (Thuc. 7.1.5), and in 413 a navy (nautikon) of five ships as well as 400 akontistai were sent to Syracuse (Thuc. 7.33.1). At the battle of Himera in 406 a contingent from Gela fought at the side of Kamarina (no. 28) and Syracuse (no. 47) (Diod. 13.86.5). A C6–C5 Geloan defeat at the hands of Rhegion (no. 68) is attested by SEG 24.303.

Civil war is attested, as in all other major Sicilian poleis: an early stasis (C7–C6) was resolved without bloodshed by an ancestor of Gelon (Hdt. 7.153.2). Another stasis, in which Dionysios I interfered, is mentioned for the year 406: the demos rose against the despoteia of the dynatotatoi and succeeded owing to Dionysios’ assistance; in this connection the ἐκκλεσία and psephismata are mentioned (Diod. 13.93.2–4; Berger (1992) 23–25.

Diplomatic activities comprise receipt of envoys (implied by Diod. 11.68.1 (1466)) as well as sending of envoys (Timaios (FGrHist 566) fr. 22 (1424); Diod. 13.93.4 (1406)). In 424, Gela hosted a pan-Sicilian peace congress, which had developed from an ekecheiria between Kamarina (no. 28) and Gela (Thuc. 5.58, 65; Timaios (FGrHist 566) fr. 22). A Geloan served as Epidaurian theodorodos in 356/5 (IG iv.2.1 95.11.83). Another was appointed Samian proxenos in C41 (IG x11.6 33).

The rulers of C5f Gela displayed their power at the Panhellenic sanctuaries. Gelon was victorious at Olympia in 484 (Olympionikai 158; IvO 143 and Paus. 6.9.4; Harrell (2002)); and Polyzalos was victor at Delphi c.478 (SEG 3 396; LSAG 266, 275 no. 9; F.Delphes 111.4 452; cf. Harrell (2002) 460–62). For Gelon’s donations at Delphi: Syll.3 33–34 (cf. Harrell (2002) 453–55). Gela had a thesauros at Olympia (Paus. 6.19.15), a richly furnished C6m building, restructured in C5f (Mertens-Horn and Viola (1990) 238–39). Communal consultation of oracles is implied by Diod. 13.108.4, which also attests to an internal communal dedication of a bronze image of Apollo.

The city occupied the east–west-oriented coastal plateau, and during C7–C5 a part of the lowland plain to the north
The central part of the plateau was probably the main habitation area in the Archaic and early Classical periods, delimited further to the west by the early cemeteries (Shepherd (1995) 60–70). There is evidence of C8l Greek occupation, a pre-colonial phase apparently supporting the statement by Thuc. 6.4.3 that an area of Gela called Lindioi was occupied before the founding of Gela (for a colonisation of Gela in two phases, see Wentker (1956); Fiorentini and De Miro (1985)). (Mortuary evidence, too, indicates a Greek presence from the end of C8.) Architectural terracottas have revealed a large sanctuary, consisting of at least two monumental temples (Fischer-Hansen (1996) 327–32 with refs.); the identity of the divinity is uncertain; Orlandini (1968) 31 suggests Zeus Atabyrios.

No traces of a circuit wall from the period of foundation have been found so far, though the existence of—presumably early—walls is implied by Thuc. 6.4.3. There are remains of a C6 circuit wall, possibly raised in connection with C6l civic strife (Orlandini (1961) 141–44), or, if in part of later origin, in connection with the threat of the Carthaginians in C5l (De Miro and Fiorentini (1976–77) 434–35). Fortifications in C4l are attested by Diod. 19.107.5 (r137) and 19.110.2–3 (r131). Little is known of the habitation area on the plateau (Buongiovanni and Canzanella (1990) 13). The Archaic city incorporated the north slope of the plateau and part of the plain below (Spagnolo (1991)). The size of the Classical city, including a part of the lowland plains to the north but excluding the western cemetery and including the eastern sanctuary, was about 200 ha. There is clear evidence of the destruction by the Carthaginians in 405, but also of a re-establishment of the Greek settlement soon after (Fiorentini (2002)). The Timoleontic refoundation of Gela with a new overall urban plan comprised habitation quarters in terraces along the north slope and on part of the upper plateau, incorporating also a new industrial quarter, public baths and the western part of the plateau, enclosed by the impressive circuit walls at Capo Soprano (Buongiovanni and Canzanella (1990) 20–22; Panvini (1996) 100–20).

There is further evidence of urban cults: a sanctuary on the southern slope was dedicated to Hera (Orlandini (1968) 31–33; IGDS nos. 137–38), and close by was the heroon for the oikistes Antiphemos (supra). Gela was surrounded by a number of suburban sanctuaries (surveys: Orlandini (1968); Fiorentini (1985)), with paramount importance assigned to sanctuaries for Demeter (Kron (1992); Hinz (1998) 55–69). Other sanctuaries, previously thought to be suburban, are now known to have been located within the northern boundary of the city (Orlandini (1968) pl. 1.5; Spagnolo (1991) 69). The stay of Aischylos at Gela surely implies that the city had a theatre in C5m. A C7–C5 building complex located on the coast south-east of the plateau near the estuary of the river Gelas has been interpreted as harbour structures (Fiorentini (1985) 22; Panvini (1996) 54–57).

Gela began minting on the initiative of Gelon, c.490–485. The first issue was of didrachms and tetrachrachms on the Attic–Euboian standard, obv. naked rider; rev. forepart of man-headed bull, legends: ГΕΛΑΣ (Jenkins (1970) 25). A second issue, mostly of tetrachrachms, c.480–470, is strongly influenced by the Syracusan mint and has obv. four-horse chariot with a flying Nike above; rev. forepart of man-faced bull, legends: ГΕΛΙ, ГΕΛΑΣ. Issues with the same obv. and rev. types, and variants including didrachms and drachms, are known until C6l (SGN Cap. Sicily 251–66); drachms have obv. legend ΓΕΛΟΙΟΝ (Jenkins (1970) 49). Tetrachrachms from c.440–430 have the standard rev. type, but a standing female figure crowns the bull’s head with a wreath (a local nymph or water-goddess in the role of Nike?); legend: ΣΟΣΙΠΟΛΣ. The obv. type is very similar to obv. dies from Himera (Jenkins (1970) 71–72). From c.425 the tetrachrachms carry the obv. legend ГΕΛΩΙΩΝ; ГΕΛΑΩ[ academia] ΠΟΛΣ (Jenkins (1979) 257–75, 277, 279). Smaller denominations (didrachms and litrai) have as types horseman or head of river-god or Demeter and the legend ГΕΛΑΣ or ГΕΛΩΙΩΝ (SGN Cap. Sicily 269–70, 277, 280–81). A gold coinage (dilitron and litra) was issued in C5l, probably to pay the mercenary armies fighting the Carthaginians in 406/5 (Diod. 13.93). The rev. of the gold litra has as type head of the deity Sosipolis, legend: ΣΕΣΙΠΟΛΣ (SGN Cap. Sicily 276). Bronze coinage began c.420 (Jenkins (1979); SNG Cap. Sicily 282–87). The refoundation of Gela by Timoleon was marked by a new issue of silver litrai; the obv. type of a warrior sacrificing a ram is variously interpreted as Antiphemos, the oecist of Gela, or as Timoleon himself in the guise of the oecist of New Gela (Jenkins (1979); SNG Cap. Sicily 288).
18. Heloron (Ailoros) Map 47. Lat. 36.50, long. 15.05. Size of territory: ? Type: Α:α. The toponym is Ελωρός, 76 (Ps.-Skylax 13) or Ελωρός (BCH 45 (1921) iv.100 (230–210); Steph. Byz. 270.3). The city-ethnic is Αἰλώρος (Diod. 23.4.1) or Ἐλωρήτης (Etym. Magn. 333.3).

Heloron is explicitly called a polis (πόλις Ελωρόν) in the urban sense in Ps.-Skylax 13, where this phrase is found under the general heading οἷκοσιν δὲ καὶ Ελλήνες (which is opposed to οὗτοι μὲν βάρβαροι), but apart from that there is no evidence for its status in the Archaic and Classical periods. The evidence for Heloron as a polis in the political sense is C3; like Akrai (no. 10), the city is listed in the treaty between Syracuse and Rome of 265 as a polis assigned to Hieron II (Diod. 23.4.1 = Staatsverträge no. 479); this may suggest dependence on Syracuse (no. 47) at an earlier date (infra). In assessing the polis status of Heloron, the fact that it is listed in the Delphic list of theorodokoi (230–210) (BCH (1921) iv.100; cf. Manganaro (1964q) 420) may have some retrospective value. According to Ael. NA 12.30, Heloron was once a Συρακοσίων φρούριον. There are no written sources for the foundation of Heloron, and there are no coins. Heloron is here defined as a polis type A on the basis of Ps.-Skylax 13, but its polis status is uncertain given the proximity of Syracuse; it cannot be excluded that Heloron was an early military outpost in the southern dominion of Syracuse, though it may have been a dependent polis founded as a fortress (as has been suggested for Kasmenai by Hansen (1997a) 36; cf. Akrai (no. 10) and Kasmenai (no. 29)).

To the west, Heloron’s territory bordered upon the territory of Kamarina (no. 28). Heloron was founded on a coastal plateau about 18 km south of Syracuse and c.400 m to the north of the river Tellaro (= ancient Heloros); (morphology of the site: Voza (1978) pl. 37, 1; plan of site: Voza (1980–81) pl. 130). Archaeological evidence points to a foundation in C8l–C7e (Voza (1973a) 117 no. 381; (1978)); so Syracuse secured its interests southwards before founding the secondary colonies of Akrai, Kasmenai and Kamarina (Di Vita (1956)). An abundance of Greek C7–C6m material is known from this site, whereas limited C5 material suggests that this was a period of recession. The city prospered during the period of Timoleon, and above all in the Hellenistic period. The C6 circuit wall was built in a pseudo-isodomic technique as a double curtain-wall with internal fill (emplektion), in all 2.80 m wide (Orsi et al. (1966) 310–12). A local limestone was used, as well as odd material, such as a C6 tombstone (IGDS no. 98). The Archaic circuit wall was incorporated in the C4 fortification when the wall was strengthened and towers were added (Orsi et al. (1966) 220–31). The C4 circuit wall is known on the north, west and south of the town, its course following the edge of the habitation plateau; the eastern side facing the sea also seems to have been fortified.

The habitation area comprised about 9 ha. The 1,500 seating capacity of the C4–C2 theatre (infra) gives some indication of population size in the late Classical period.

The main routes across the plateau were not laid out in straight lines but in accordance with the uneven terrain—uncommon in Western Greek urban planning (Voza (1980–81) 686–87). Though this road system is known primarily from its Hellenistic phase, there is little doubt that its origin is Archaic. An open space bordered by public buildings on the highest point of the plateau is interpreted as an agora (Voza in Storia della Sicilia i. 550, fig. 90). The main urban area in the southern-western part of the city was on a grid plan and delimited on the north by a C4m(?) temenos (the so-called Asklepieion) of unknown cult (Orsi et al. (1966) 287–88, 320). Sparse remains of habitation structures in the southernmost part of the area are of C8l–C7e date and reveal affinities with contemporary architecture from Megara (no. 36) and Syracuse (no. 47; Voza (1978), (1980–81) 685–86). Yet another temenos marked the southern limit of the city: a C4s temple dedicated to Demeter (Voza (1973a) 118–19; Hinz (1998) 116–18) and smaller thesauroi/naiskoi.

A suburban Demeter sanctuary spanning the Archaic and the Hellenistic periods was located near the coast north of Heloron (Voza (1973a) 123–26; Storia della Sicilia i. 548; Hinz (1998) 111–16). The Hellenistic programme of public building included a small C4–C2 theatre outside the southern perimeter of the city (Orsi et al. (1966) 232–35, 324–27; Mitens (1988) 89–91). Hesychius refers to an Ελώρος ἀγών (s.v.) celebrated at the river Heloros and possibly to be connected with the city.

19. Henna (Hennaios) Map 47. Lat. 37.35, long. 14.15. Size of territory: ? Type: Β:β. The toponym is Ἑννα, ἡ (Diod. 14.14.6). The city-ethnic is Ἑνναιοί on C5m coins (infra); Ἑνναιοί is found in SEG 30 1123.8 (C4l–C3m; cf. SEG 32 914) and Philistos (FGrHist 556) fr. 5 and Diod. 14.14.7 (1403).

Henna is called a polis in the urban sense in SEG 30 1123.13 (C4l–C3m; cf. SEG 32 914) and Diod. 14.14.7–8 (1403). The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C5m coins (infra); the external collective use of the city-ethnic is attested in Philistos (FGrHist 556) fr. 5 (C6m) and in SEG 30 1123.8 (C4l–C3m; cf. SEG 32 914) and Diod. 14.14.7 (1403), and the external individual use in Diod. 14.4.6 (1403).
A C6m alliance with Syracuse is attested by Philistos (FGrHist 556) fr. 5. In 403, the city experienced a brief tyranny under Aeimnestos, a citizen of Henna itself who acted at Dionysios I’s instigation; shortly after his rise to power, however, Dionysios fomented a 

\begin{equation}
\text{stasis} \end{equation}

during which he broke into the city and deposed Aeimnestos (Diod. 14.14.6–8). In C4I–C3m Henna gave assistance to the people of Entella, who had been driven from their city and were received by the Henannais καὶ πόλι καὶ χώραι (SEG 30 1123.8–13; cf. SEG 32 914). The grateful Entellans after their return granted isopoliteia to the people of Enna (SEG 30 1123.16 (C4I–C3m); cf. SEG 32 914).

According to Steph. Byz. 271.4, Henna was a foundation by Syracuse (no. 47; κτίσμα Σιρακοσίων) established in 664. While this may be evidence that a Greek identity was claimed for the city, the historicity of the report is doubtful, as is the suggestion that it derives from Philistos of Syracuse (FGrHist 556, fr. 5; Manni (1981) 169). All evidence points to a Siculan site strongly Hellenised: the archaeological evidence attests to some degree of Hellenisation already from C6e (pace Vallet (1962) 42), and the degree of Hellenisation is significant from C5m, when Greek-style coinage is introduced and the cemeteries bear a strong Greek stamp (Fiorentini (1980–81) 599); cf. also the reference to an agora at Diod. 14.14.7 (1403); late sources refer to a theatre (Polyaen. 8.21 (1214); Frontin. Str. 4.7.22). Traces of the circuit wall of the acropolis (cf. Polyaen. 8.21) are known; the published drawings suggest a Hellenistic date (Orsi (1931) 384–88; Fiorentini (1980–81) 599; Martorana (1982–83); Bejor and Marotta D’Agata (1989)). The cult of Demeter at Enna was famous; the sources for the cult are mainly literary (Diod. 5.3.1–3; Strabo 6.2.6), whereas the archaeological evidence is tenuous, and the suggested location of the Demeter sanctuary on a rocky spur north of the settlement plateau remains uncertain (Orsi (1931) 379; Hinz (1998) 121–24), though a C3 inscription referring to Dam[ater] or Dam[atriastan] was found in the vicinity (IGDS no. 198).

The strongest evidence of C5m Hellenisation is provided by the minting of silver dirhms from perhaps as early as c.450: obv. quadriga driven by Demeter holding torch; rev. Demeter sacrificing at altar holding torch, legend: \textit{HENNAION}; a variant issue has obv. head of Demeter; rev. Demeter sacrificing at altar (Gabrić (1959) 12–15; Jenkins (1975); Cammarata (1987)). Henna issued bronze coinage in the period of Timoleon: (1) obv. head of Demeter, legend: \textit{AMAT} or \textit{AMATHP}; rev. torch between ears of corn, or head of ox with filleted horns, legend: \textit{ENNA}; (2) obv. head of Demeter, legend: \textit{AMATHP}; rev. goat before torch of Demeter between ears of corn, legend: \textit{ENNA} (SG Cop. Sicily 234); see Bejor and Marotta D’Agata (1989) 191; Talbert (1974) 181 and Cammarata (1987).

20. **Herakleia** (1) (Herakleotes) Map 47. Lat. 37.25, long. 13.15. Size of territory: ? Type: Ba. The original name was Minoa (Μυώις, ἣ (Hdt. 5.46.2), Μυώα (Diod. 4.79.1)); the new, or additional, name Herakleia (‘Ἡράκλεια, Polyb. 1.18.2) is commonly assumed to have originated with the seizure of the city by the remnants of the expedition of the Spartan Dorieus (Hdt. 5.46.2; RE viii. 437). The double name, Herakleia Minoa, is rare (Polyb. 1.25.9: ‘Ἡράκλεια ἡ Μυώα); Herakleia is common (Polyb. 1.18.2; Diod. 19.7.17); but Minoa appears as well (Herac. Lemb. 59; Diod. 16.9.4; Plut. Dio 25.11). The city-ethnic is ‘Ἡρακλεώτης (Diod. 20.56.3 and possibly IG xi.6 38 (C4l), on which see infra).

Hdt. 5.46.2 calls it an ἀσικης of Selinous (no. 44); the oecist(s) and the date of foundation are unknown, but the date must be post-628 (date of Selinos’ foundation). It is called a \textit{polis} only in later sources: in the urban sense at Plut. Dio 25.6 (r time of Dion) (cf. \textit{πολισσαντοι} at Plut. Dio 25.5), and in the political sense at Diod. 16.9.4 (1537). A description of its constitution was included among the 158 Aristotelian \textit{politeiai} (Herac. Lemb. 59; Arist. no. 55; Gigon, which uses \textit{polis} in a mythological account of the foundation by Minos of Crete). The external collective use of the city-ethnic is found in Diod. 20.56.3 (1307). IG xi.6 38 (C4l) is a decree by Samos (no. 864) granting proixeny etc. to \textit{Ἐπινοῆς Εὐθύμου Ηρακλεώτης} and a reasonable case can be made that the honorandus originated from the present Herakleia (Kebric (1975), (1977) 3–4; Shipley (1987) 164).

There are very few sources for the Archaic and Classical periods. Nothing is known of the political and institutional life apart from the notice of mythic stamp that Minos imposed Cretan laws on the city (Herac. Lemb. 59; cf. Perlman (1992)).

Shortly before 500, Minoa was captured by those Lakedaimonians who, under the leadership of Euryleom, had survived the ill-fated expedition of Dorieus (Hdt. 5.46.2). The city seems to have been defeated by Akragas in C6L or C5e, Lind. Chron. (FGrHist 532) fr. 30 = Xenagoras (FGrHist 240) fr. 17 recording a dedication at Lindos by Akragas of a \textit{palladion} taken ἐκ Μυώαις. Though the date of this episode is uncertain, it is most often seen as the aftermath of the occupation of western Sicily by Euryleom and the Spartans (Luraghi (1994) 41, 233–34). During Theron’s reign (488–473) Herakleia seems to have been a city within
the dominion of Akragas (no. 9), possibly after its conquest by Theron (cf. Diod. 4.79.4 with Fontana (1978)). After the fall of the Deinomenids, the city seems to have been involved in the fighting between the disenfranchised mercenaries, who occupied the city, and the Syracusans, who with the Akragantines eliminated the mercenaries (see FGrHist 577 fr. 1). The city must have come into Carthaginian hands by the treaty of 383 between Carthage and Dionysios I (Diod. 15.17.5); when Dion sought refuge in Herakleia in 357, the city was still under Carthaginian dominion (Plut. Dio 25.5; Diod. 16.9.4), ruled by an āρχων (Plut.) or an ἐπιστάτης (Diod.), but it is described as in Akragantine territory (Diod.). By the treaty of 339 it reverted to the Greek area (Diod. 16.82.3) and was refounded by Timoleon (Talbert (1974) 159–60). In 314 it became Carthaginian once again (Diod. 19.71.7).

Herakleia was founded by Selinous (Hdt. 5.46.2), and the colony may have served to secure the eastern border of Selinous’ territory which was threatened by Akragantine expansion during the reign of Phalaris (De Miro (1962) 144–46). The foundation date is uncertain, but the perspective of a powerful Selinous securing its eastern border towards Akragas as well as archaeological evidence (infra) suggest a 5th c. date. However, the city was presumably within the Akragantine dominion already by 6th c. and at least from 5th c. (supra); Akragas was located only 25 km to the east.

The size and exploitation of the chora of Herakleia is little known. An area of c.6 km² has been surveyed, and a C6 farmstead or workshop found c.350 m north of the city (Wilson and Leonard (1980)).

The city was founded on a low coastal promontory (modern Capo Bianco) on the estuary of the river Halykos (modern Platani). On the north side the plateau slopes gently down to the Halykos valley, on the south side erosion has produced vertical cliffs, and part of the habitation area of the Greek city may have been destroyed. A 6 km-long stretch of the circuit wall is preserved on the north-east and west sides facing the river valley and the hinterland; it is unknown whether the cliff facing the sea was fortified. The C5 wall was strengthened, with square towers built in small blocks of sandstone, but superseded by a C4 gypsum ashlar wall with an upper structure of sun-dried brick (Tusa and De Miro (1983) 177–78; De Miro (1994) 480 dates the earliest phase of the circuit wall to C6). At the time of Timoleon’s refoundation a new defensive wall was erected within the earlier city, reducing its size by a half (De Miro (1958a)).

There is evidence of C6 occupation, but the early history of the site has not been fully investigated, and the size of the area occupied by the early city is still unknown. (The city did occupy the area of the later Hellenistic town, but probably also, at least in part, the western plateau within the first phase circuit wall—in all c.60–70 ha). The Timoleontic refoundation was laid out as an orthogonally planned city, with east–west-oriented stenopoia, north–south-oriented plateiai, and the single insulae c.32 m wide, like other Timoleontic refoundations (De Miro (1958b), (1980) 716–21). The urban facilities included a C4 theatre (De Miro (1955)).

The Archaic cemetery with fairly numerous tombs from the period 550–500 is located just outside the circuit wall north-east of the city. The cemetery was bisected by a road, and there are indications of social differentiation (De Miro (1965) 10–11; Wilson (1996) 92).

21. Herakleia (2) Map 47. Unlocated site in western Sicily, in the region of Eryx. Type: C.a. The toponym is Ἡρακλείη, ἦ (Hdt. 5.43) and Ἡράκλεια, ἦ (Diod. 4.23.3). A city-ethnic is not attested.

Following the advice of Antichares of Eleon and the affirmation of the Delphic oracle that he would succeed, Dorieus of Sparta, who was of royal and so Heraklid descent, set out to found a colony in the region of Eryx (Hdt. 5.43), which, according to Antichares, belonged to the descendants of Herakles (Hdt. 5.43; cf. Paus. 3.16.5). However, Dorieus’ expeditionary force was severely defeated by an alliance of Phoenicians and Egestans (Hdt. 5.46.1; cf. Diod. 4.23.3 and Paus. 3.16.5). In the aftermath of the disaster Euryleon, the sole survivor of the synktistai, and the remnants of the expedition captured Herakleia Minoa (no. 20) and ousted the tyrant Peithagoras of Selinous (Hdt. 4.46.2). Referring to the death of Dorieus as a thing of the past, Herodotos dates the defeat of the expedition prior to c.481/80 (7.158), or to 491/90 as argued by some scholars (Merante (1970a)); the beginning of the expedition is connected with the destruction of Sybaris (no. 70) by Kroton (no. 56) in c.510 (Hdt. 5.45; cf. Merante (1970a), (1970b) 131–33, who argues for an earlier chronology). According to Diod. 4.23.3, Dorieus did in fact succeed in taking back the land of the Herakleidai, and founded a polis named Herakleia (ἐκτισε πόλιν Ἡράκλειαν) which prospered for a period before being razed to the ground by the Carthaginians. Thus, it cannot be ruled out that a Spartan settlement did exist for a period and was then destroyed by the Phoenicians (cf. Bérard (1957) 260–66; Stauffenberg (1960) esp. 189–98; De Vido (1989).

22. Herbes(s)os (Herbessinos) Map 47. Unlocated, but presumably at Montagna di Marzo (so Barr.). Type: Cy. The toponym is ‘Ερβίταιος, ἅ (Diod. 20.31.5; Philistos (FGrHist 556) fr. 9 = Steph. Byz. 275.6); or ‘Ερβήσιος (Polyb. 1.18.5). The city-ethnic is ‘Ερβησιάσιος (Diod. 14.7.6 (r404); C4s coins, infra).

Herbessos is called a polis in the urban sense at Diod. 14.7.6 (r404). The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C4s coins (infra); the external collective use is found at Diod. 14.7.6 (r404) and 14.78.7 (r396). The latter passage records a peace treaty between Herbessos and Dionysios I.

Herbessos is described as a Sikeli community at Diod. 14.7.6 (r404) and 78.7 (r396), but is included here on account of its C4s Greek-style coinage (infra). In addition, Greek C6e epigraphic material from Montagna di Marzo, the presumed site of Herbessos, includes votives to Herakles (cf. IGDS 166–68).

The location of the city is unknown, though it is possibly to be located at Montagna di Marzo (Bejor 1989b 280); Diod. 14.7.6 (r404) suggests that it was fortified by C3s. The urban remains from this site are of C6m Sikeli walls with C4 reinforcements in ashlar masonry, from the Greek period. There are some traces of urban planning, but whether these are Douketian or Timoleontic is uncertain. However, the majority of the urban remains, as well as the cemeteries, are Hellenistic (Cutroni Tusa and Moreschini 1992).

Herbessos struck bronze coins from c.325, or a little earlier: obv. female head (Sikelia?), legend: ΕΡΒΗΣΙΩΝ; rev. forepart of man-headed bull (Head, ΗΝ 143; SNG Cap. Sicily 292; a Timoleontic coinage: Talbert (1974) 181; Karlsson (1995) 165 No. 3 (F); Bejor (1989b) 279 with further refs.).

23. Herbita (Herbitaioi) Map 47. Unlocated (cf. C. Boehringer 1981 100–3; Bejor 1989c)). Type: Cy. The toponym is Ερβιταία, ἅ (Ephor. fr. 91 = Steph. Byz. 275.8; Diod. 14.16.1). The city-ethnic is Ερβιταιάς (C4s coins, infra; Diod. 14.15.1).

Herbita is called a polis in the urban sense at Diod. 14.15.1 and 16.1 (r403). The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C4s coins (infra), and the external collective use in Diod. 12.8.2 (r446), 14.15.1 (r403), 14.78.7 (r396) (cf. SEG 30 1117 (C4–C3m)).

Both in 446 and in 403, Herbita was ruled by a man called “Archonides”; Archonides I is described as δυναστεύων at Diod. 12.8.2 (cf. Thuc. 7.1.4, quoted infra), and Archonides II as ἑπιστάτης at Diod. 14.16.1. However, at Diod. 14.16.1 a peace treaty with Dionysios I is said to have been concluded by ὁ δῆμος ὁ τῶν Ερβηταιῶν, and at 14.78.7 agreements are described as concluded between Dionysios and τοὺς Ερβηταίους. (See also below on colonisation.) IG II 32 (385/4) is probably a grant of proxeny by Athens (no. 361) to Archonides II, his brother Demon, and their descendants. A C4l–C3m symmachia between Herbita and Entella is attested in SEG 30 1175.35.

Recently, Greek-style silver and bronze coins of Herbita have come to light; they date from the period of Timoleon (c.350–325), and were found in the region of Gangi. Silver (probably litrai): obv. head of Apollo, legend: HEPBITAI; Rev. Apollo seated on Ionic capital. The smaller bronze denominations carry on obl. female head, legend: HEPBITAIΩΝ; rev. standing youth with spear (C. Boehringer 1981); Bejor (1989c) 284).

Herbita was involved in colonisation on two occasions: in 446, when Archonides I collaborated with Douketios in the foundation of Kale Akte (Diod. 12.8.2), and in 403, when Archonides II founded the city of Alaisa (no. 11), a foundation which eclipsed its mother city to the degree that its inhabitants denied their origin (Diod. 14.16.2–4; see Cataldi 1982); cf. supra 190). According to Diod. 14.16.2, Alaisa was founded by Archonides II in order to house veteran mercenaries, a symmikton ochlon that the war against Dionysios had driven into the city, as well as poor citizens of Herbita itself; the latter are said to have actively encouraged his plans.

In a passage referring to 446, Diod. 12.8.2 describes Herbita, or at least its ruler Archonides I, as Sikel; and the city may be described as Sikeli again at Diod. 14.78.7 (r396). The Greek name Archonides of two of its rulers may indicate a pretension to Greek identity (C. Boehringer 1981 95); but Thuc. 7.1.4 describes Archonides I as τῶν . . . Σικελῶν βασιλείων τινῶν. By C4s, however, the city issued Greek-style coins (supra).

24. Himera (Himeraios) Map 47. Lat. 37.55, long. 13.50. Size of territory: 5. Type: Α. The toponym is Ιμέρη, ἅ (Hdt. 7.165.1) or Ιμερά (Thuc. 6.6.2; SEG 11 1223 (C5f)). The city-ethnic is Ιμεραίος (C6l coins, infra; Thuc. 7.1.3).

Himera is repeatedly described as a Hellenic polis (Thuc. 6.6.2; Xen. Hell. 1.1.37; Ps.-Skylax 13); it is called a polis both in the territorial sense (Thuc. 6.6.2.2) and in the urban sense (Xen. Hell. 1.1.37; Ps.-Skylax 13), and in the urban and political senses combined (Aen. Tact. 10.22). The political sense is
found in Diod. 11.48.6 (1476). Paus. 6.4.11 uses πολιτεία in a reference to C5e, and the politēia was included in the Aristotelian collection of constitutions (fr. 515.1). Thuc. 6.5.1 calls Himera an ἀποικία, and it is described as the patra of the C6 poet Stesichoros (Test. A26, Davies); cf. SEG 29 414.4 (c.450) where [πάται] is a possible restoration (cf. CEG I 393 for other restorations).

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C6 coins (infra). The external collective use of the city-ethnic is attested by SEG 30 1079 (C6m) and Thuc. 7.1.3, 58.2. Individually, the ethnic is often applied to Stesichoros (e.g. Thuc. 5). The year of foundation, 648, is inferred from the notice that the city was inhabited for 240 years before its destruction in 409 (Diod. 13.62.4). The continued ties with Zankle are revealed by Skythes, ruler of Zankle, who 493 went to Himera as an exile (Hdt. 6.24), and if the text on a bronze plaque found at Himera is correctly reconstructed by Brugnone (1997) 271–74 as φυλαὶ Δαυνελαία, this may be taken as evidence of an “ethnic” phyle of Zanklaian colonists at Himera. But the ethnic composition of the city was mixed, the colonisers being mostly Chalkidian, i.e. Ionians, but some Syracusians, i.e. Dorians; and while the local dialect was a corresponding mixture, Chalkidian νόμιμα prevailed (Thuc. 6.5.1).

The territory was called ᾿Ιμερεία (χώρα) (Thuc. 3.115.1; Diod. 13.61.4 (1409)). The C5 immediate hinterland with a number of rural settlements, delimited by border fortresses, encompassed 50 km² (Belvedere (1988) 196–206, (2000)). The territory of Himera stretched over a vast area, estimated at 700 km², divided to the south from the territories of Gela (no. 17) and Akragas (no. 9) by the Monte Cassero hills, and in the west at the river Thermos from the territory of the Phoenician city of Soloeis. However, within the territory of Himera were scattered indigenous settlements, and the dividing line between the dominions of Himera, Gela and Akragas is not always clear (Vassallo (1996)). SEG 30 1079 (C6m) seems to attest to fighting between Himera and Sikani (cf. Thuc. 3.115.2). For the Archaic and Classical settlement pattern of the Himeraian territory, see Belvedere (1988) 196–206.

According to Diod. 13.62.4, C3,000 andres were captured during the destruction in 409, but it seems impossible to convert this number into a population estimate (cf. the few army figures below). The C5e population has been calculated at 20,000, including a rural population of 10,000, by Asheri (1973), but this figure is probably on the low side, if one takes into account that the size of the urban centre of Himera is now calculated to be 80 ha (Allegro and Vassallo (1992) 147–48).

Himera was pillaged and destroyed by the Carthaginians in 409; 3,000 surviving men were put to death (κατέσφαξαν), women and children were distributed to the victorious enemy and presumably enslaved (Diod. 13.59.4–62.5), and the site was abandoned (Diod. 11.49.4; Strabo 6.2.6), though there is some archaeological and numismatic evidence for re-occupation from 405 until the defeat of Dionysios I at Kronion in 382/1, when Himera became part of Carthaginian territory for good (Diod. 15.16.3). Later references to Himera must therefore be to the survivors who were settled at Thermai, on the border of Greek and Phoenician spheres of interest (Cic. Verr. 2.2.86; cf. Diod. 14.47.6, 56.2).

According to Arist. Rh. 1393b10–22, Phalaris, the tyrant of Akragas 570–554, was elected strategos autokratōr by the Himeraians, but the historicity of the report is doubtful (Berve (1967) 130). By C5e, however, the city was certainly ruled by tyrants. The earliest attested tyrant is Terillos (τῆρανων; Hdt. 7.165) who, expelled by Theron of Akragas, attempted to return as an ally of the Carthaginians, seeking help also from Anaxilaos of Rhegion (Hdt. 7.165). The ensuing battle at Himera in 480 led to the victory of Theron and Gelon (Diod. 11.20.3ff; cf. Zahrt (1993)). Theron conceded the tyranny of Himera to his son Thrasylaios (Diod. 11.48.6). The Himeraians rebelled against the tyranny of Thrasylaios; Theron, having curbed the insurrection, repopulated Himera with Doric and “other” colonists to whom he granted citizenship (Diod. 11.48.6–49.4). Not until 460 were those who escaped the intervention of Theron able to return to Himera (Diod. 11.76.4). During the Peloponnesian War, Himera remained loyal to Syracuse (no. 47) by not admitting the Athenian fleet in 415 (Thuc. 6.62.2) and by entering into an alliance with Gylippous against the Athenians in 414 (Thuc. 7.1.4; Diod. 13.7.7). One thousand hoplites/light-armed troops, and 100 cavalry joined Gylippous on his march to Syracuse (Thuc. 7.1.5).

A bronze plaque attests to the existence of φρατρίαι at Himera (Brugnone (1997) 274–79) and may also attest to a system of phylai (Brugnone (1997) 271–74).
At least three Himeraian athletes won Panhellenic victories: Ischyros at Olympia in 516 (Olympionikai 137) and Krison thrice at Olympia in C5m (Olympionikai 294, 306, 312). Particularly interesting is Ergoteles, who won no fewer than eight Panhellenic victories (two at Olympia (Olympionikai 224, 251) and two each at Delphi, Nemea and Isthmia). A Cretan by birth, he was a naturalised Himeraian and competed as such (Paus. 6.4.11; cf. Pind. Ol. 12 and SEG 11 1123a celebrating Olympic success; Phlegon (FGHist 415) fr. 1.13).

Himera was founded on a north–south-oriented oblong hill between the river Torto to the west and the river Himera to the east, commanding the lower Himera valley. The city occupied also the coastal plain below, though whether this comprised a harbour settlement near the estuary is as yet uncertain (Bonacasa (1976) 5–14 for a general description of the site).

A stretch of a presumably Archaic (no precise date) stone and earth rampart is known from the southern edge of the plateau, with a semicircular projection in the south-east corner and a small stretch running northwards defending the east side of the plateau (Bonacasa Carra (1974) 110–11; Bonacasa (1980–81) 855, pl. 117, fig. 2), revealing that habitation covered all of the plateau at least from the Archaic period. A wall of sun-dried bricks along the outer edge of the plateau on the northern side of the sanctuary is with some uncertainty dated to C5e and connected with the Carthaginian conflict of 480. Dividing the upper city from the city on the plain below, the wall may have functioned as a diateichisma (Allegro (1991) 71). The walls are mentioned by Diod. 13.59.7–9 in reference to the siege in 409. The upper city occupied about 32 ha, the lower city about 50 ha (Allegro and Vassallo (1992) 145–47).

Corresponding to the traditional date of foundation (648), there is sporadic evidence of a C7m settlement on the coastal plain below the upper plateau near the estuary of the river Himera. The more substantial urban remains on the plateau of Himera are from C7s, suggesting a gradual urban development from plain to plateau (Vassallo (1997) 85–90). Two Archaic urban phases are known. Already the earlier (C7l–C6e) shows features of planning, but it was soon replaced by a new overall urban layout, probably as a result of destructions of the early city and a refoundation c580–570 (Allegro (1997)). Although the Archaic town plan is impressive in its size and regularity, the remains suggest that even in this second period habitation was concentrated in certain areas: the northern area (near the sanctuary) and the southern area (near the main route to the choragia). Recent investigations have given indications of a 6.20 m-wide north–south-oriented plateia unifying the main parts of the plateau (Allegro (1988–89) 656).

Theron's repopulation of Himera in 476 (supra) resulted in further developments and reorganisation of the city, indicated by changes in the layout of single insulae (Belvedere (1976) 580–82; Allegro (1988–89) 657). A redistribution of land may be inferred from C5e epigraphic evidence (Brugnone (1997)).

The lower city had an urban plan from C7s, with later changes which correspond to the phases of the city outlined above (Allegro and Vassallo (1992)). Recently a C5f suburban quarter east of the city has been revealed between the right bank of the river and the Archaic cemetery (ibid. 139 n. 40; cf. Diod. 13.75.2 (1408)). The cemetery with tombs from the early history of Himera until c525 is located near the coast east of the Himera valley (Vassallo (1991), (1993–94)). From C6l and for all of C5 two new cemeteries were in use south of the city and on the plateau west of the city (Di Stefano (1970) 319–21; (1976)); tomb material (amphoras) reveals a wide commercial network (Vassallo et al. (1991)).

The north-eastern corner of the plateau is occupied by a sanctuary with remains of four C7s–C5e temples (Bonacasa (1970); Allegro (1991)), probably dedicated to Athena, like the city itself and its choragia (Diod. 5.3.4). A sanctuary of Demeter with at least two C6–C5 naiskoi was located in the north-western quarter of the upper city (Himera 11.194–205; Hinz (1998) 166–67). A monumental stone temple, "Temple of Victory", again presumably dedicated to Athena (Bonacasa (1980) 269), was built in the lower city in C5e (P. Marconi (1931); T. Van Compernolle (1989) 48–51, (1992) 55–58), probably to commemorate the victory over Carthage in 480 (cf. Diod. 11.25.1) or built by Theron in connection with his resettlement of the colony in 476 (cf. P. Marconi (1931) 127 for an earlier Archaic phase). Attested cults include, in addition to that of Athena (Diod. 5.3.4), those of Zeus Soter (C5l: Manni Piraino (1974) 267–69); Herakles (Diod. 5.3.4; Bonacasa (1991)); the nymph Himera (coins; cf. Cic. Verr. 2.2.87); Tyche Soteira and Zeus Eleutherios (Pind. Ol. 12.1–3).

Himera began minting drachms on the Euboian–Chalkidian standard c550–540: obv. cock; rev. incuse square with sunk and raised triangles within a square incuse field (SNG Cap. Sicily 294–96, 297 (obol)). Later issues have rev. hen in a square incuse field, and there are several variations of the basic type (SNG Cap. Sicily 298–301). An early issue has obv. legend HIMEPAION,
abbreviated on later issues to HI, HIME (SNG Cop. Sicily 301). Other coin legends are names of mint officials, in full or abbreviated: AY, TY, TYXON, ΣΩΛΕΝΕΣ. Lower denominations carry related types (Kraay (1984); C. Boehringer (1984–85) 105–8; Molinari (1986)). The first series ends c.484/3 with the expulsion of Terillos; Akragantine control at Himera c.483–470 is reflected in an issue of didrachms on the Attic standard: obv. cock, some with legend HIMEPA; rev. crab (Jenkins (1971); SNG Cop. Sicily 302–3, 304 (drachm)). During the subsequent period of Syracuse influence a new coinage was introduced with the principal denomination based upon the Syracuse tetradrachm: obv. quadriga, crowned by Nike; rev. nymph Himera pours a libation at an altar, at her side a Silenos bathes in a fountain with a spit in the form of a lion’s head (SNG Cop. Sicily 306). A variant has on the obv. biga, legend: ΠΕΛΟΠΙΣ; rev. figure of nymph named HIMEPA (Kraay (1976) 215, pl. 765). This issue may celebrate the victory of Ergoteles at Olympia in 472 or 464, and according to Biucchi (1988) the series may commence as late as 464. A late tetradrachm known from one issue only has obv. quadriga galloping, above flying Nike with wreath and tablet with inscription (signature ?); rev. nymph at altar and Silenos bathing under lion-head spout, legend: ΗΜΕΡΑΙΩΝ, probably from very shortly before the 409/8 disaster (C. Boehringer (1989) 34). Lower denominations are litrai: obv. forepart of winged, man-headed monster; rev. goat-rider; hemidrachms: obv. goat-rider, rev. Nike holding a phlaston (SNG Cop. Sicily 307–11). Bronze coinage was introduced c.420 (Kraay (1979); SNG Cop. Sicily 313–19). Coins were minted during the resettlement period c.405–383/2: lower bronze denominations with legend IME; C4 issue of silver litrai: obv. Herakles; rev. palladion, legend: ΗΜΕΡΑΙΩΝ (C. Boehringer (1989)). There is some evidence of coinage during the reign of Timoleon; an issue influenced by the Zeus Eleutheros type, after the battle of Krimisos in 342/1: obv. Kronos, legend: ΚΡΩΝΟΣ; rev. eagle and thunderbolt, legend: ΗΜΕΡΑΙΩΝ (C. Boehringer (1989) 36). On the evidence of bronze ingots counterstamped with Himeraian mint types, flans, bronze bars and slags, the public mint has been identified with a structure inside the sanctuary in the north-eastern corner of the plateau (Cutroni Tusa (1982a)).

25. **Hippana** (Hipanatas) Map 47. Lat. 37.40, long. 13.25 (Monte dei Cavalli). Size of territory: ? Type: Cβ. The toponym is Ιππανα, η (Polyb. 1.24.10); Diod. 23.9.5 has Σιττάνα, η. The city-ethnic is Ιππανάτας (C5m coins, infra).

Hippana is called a *polis* only by later sources such as Polyb. 1.24.10 (r258), who uses *polis* in the urban sense; it is included here on account of its Classical Greek-style coinage (infra) and a kerykeion inscribed ΔΑΜΩΣΙΩΝ and ΠΙΑ, restored Ιππανα [ναγιν] by Manganaro (1997).

Hippana is commonly identified with the site of Monte dei Cavalli in the territory of Himera, but the evidence for this identification is not conclusive. The urban remains are mainly from a C4m–C3m phase, which is interpreted as a Timoleontic refoundation of the originally indigenous settlement. Strongly built circuit walls in ashlars were raised on an acropolis and around the lower habitation plateau, 30 ha in area. There are some remains of public structures, a shrine and a theatre of Greek type. Aerial photography has revealed formal planning on the lower plateau: Mitens (1988) 104; Michelini (1992); Vassallo (1991).

Rare C3m silver litrai (obv. eagle on column, legend: ΠΙΑΝΑΤΑΝ; rev. dolphin and scallop) have been attributed to Hippana (Head, ΗΝ 147; Manganaro (1997) 127 n. 6, 129); the types, although ultimately based upon types of Akragas, seem to reflect Carthaginian (Motyan) influence (Manganaro (1997) 129). C4m bronze coins are restruck on Punic coins: obv. bull, legend: ΠΙΑ in exergue; rev. Astragalous (?) (Manganaro (1997)).

26. *Imachara* (Imacharaioi) Map 47. Unlocated. Barr. tentatively locates Imachara at modern Vaccarra di Nicosia (lat. 37.50, long. 14.20); cf. Cataldi (1990) 243–44. The precise location is unknown, however; a C5 kerykeion inscribed ΙΜΑΧΑΡΑΙΩΝ δαµόσιον (IGXIV 589; LSA G 269, 276.23, dating it to 475–450; IGDS no. 199, dating it to C5) was found in the region of modern Nissoria, and it may be of relevance that a rich C5–C4, mainly Corinthian coin hoard was found in the same area (IGCH 2133; Cataldi (1990) 244). Pelagatti (1964–65) 252 suggests a location at Mendolito on the basis of a Sikulan inscription iamakaram(?) found there. Type: Cβ.

The toponym *Ιμαχάρα* is suggested by the city-ethnic (infra); Ptol. Geog. 3.4.7 lists ΙΜΑΧΑΡΑ, η ΙΜΑΧΑΡΑ among the poleis mesogeiou tes Sikelias. The city-ethnic is ΙΜΑΧΑΡΑΙΟΣ (IGDS no. 199 (C5); C4 coins, infra).

No source calls Imachara a *polis*, but it is included here on account of (1) its C5 kerykeion (supra; for a full discussion of this type of evidence from Sicily, see Manganaro (1996) 141–44 (1997)), and (2) its C4 coins. Both of these attest the internal collective use of the city-ethnic, indicate a high degree of Hellenisation, and suggest *polis* status.
The mint of Imachara is known from two specimens only, both silver litrai: obv: head of Hera, legend: IMAXAPAIΩΝ; rev: butting bull (Jenkins (1975) 90–92).

27. Kallipolis (Kallipolites) Map 47. Unlocated. Type: Αα. The toponym is Καλλίπολις (Strabo 6.2.6). The city-ethnic is Καλλιπολίτης (Hdt. 7.154.2).

Kallipolis is implicitly called a polis in both the urban and the political senses by Herodotos: at 7.154.2 he mentions Hippokrates’ aggression against a number of communities, including Kallipolis; he then goes on to state that, Syracuse excepted, none of the poleis mentioned escaped being enslaved by Hippokrates (οὐδεμία ἀπέφυγε δουλοσύνην πρὸς Ἰπποκράτεος; cf. Hansen (2000) 205). So Kallipolis was a polis which Hippokrates c.495 turned into one of his dependencies (Dunbabin (1949) 380–82, 402; Vallet (1978) 119–20). It is described as an apoikía by Ps.-Skymnos 286 (cf. κτίζειν in Strabo 6.2.6). The external collective use of the city-ethnic is found in Hdt. 7.154.2.

Only two events are known from the history of Kallipolis: its foundation and its “enslavement” by Hippokrates (supra). It was founded by Naxos (no. 41; Strabo 6.2.6). The date of the foundation is unknown, but Ps.-Skymnos 286 mentions it alongside Naxos’ other foundations (Leontinoi (no. 33), Zankle (no. 51) and Katane (no. 30)), and this may suggest that it was founded contemporaneously with them (i.e. C8); M. Miller (1970) 35, 86). In Strabo’s day it was deserted (6.2.6).

Various sites have been brought forward as candidates for the site of Kallipolis, but it remains unidentified (Camassa (1989b)), though recent finds at San Marco south of Naxos are promising in this connection (Pelagatti (1981) 295 n. 5). In general, the fact that, like Katane and Leontinoi, it was a colony of Naxos suggests a location in the coastal plain north of Naxos. In any case, the foundation of Kallipolis should be seen as a part of the Chalkidian occupation of east-central Sicily. The siege mentioned by Hdt. 7.154.2 implies that Kallipolis was fortified by Cse.

28. Kamarina (Kamarinaios) Map 47. Lat. 36.50, long. 14.25. Size of territory: 4. Type: Αα. The toponym is Καµαρίνα, -ης, ἦ (Hdt. 7.154.3, 156.2; Thuc. 6.75.4). The city-ethnic is Καµαριναῖος (IvO 266.2 (480–475); Hdt. 7.156.2).

In Ps.-Skylax 13, Kamarina is listed as the first toponym after the heading θόλες Ελληνιδικές αἰδες, where polis is used in the urban sense; polis in the political sense occurs at Pind. Ol. 5.4, 20 and Thuc. 3.86.2. Asty is found at Hdt. 7.156.2, astos in Pind. Ol. 5.14, and politeuma in Timaios (FGrHist 566) fr. 22 (1424).

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C5 coins (infra); the external collective use is found in Hdt. 7.156.2 and Thuc. 7.58.1. The external individual use is found in Diod. 1.68.6 (528) and FDelphes iii.1 202.4 (266). A remarkable example is found in IvO 266.2 (480–475), a dedication at Olympia by a Mantinean who became both a Καµαριναῖος and a Συρακούσιος, and so was probably a citizen of Kamarina who in 484 was made a citizen of Syracuse by Gelon (Hansen (1996) 184 and infra).

The territory of Kamarina (Pelagatti (1980–81) pl. 168; Di Stefano (2000) (chora), (1984–85) 728, fig. 1 (territory)) is called η γῆ Καµαριναῖος in Thuc. 6.5.3 and Καµαριναῖα at Thuc. 6.78.4. It functioned as a buffer zone between the Geloan and Syracusan spheres of influence; Philistos (FGrHist 556) fr. 5 suggests that the river Hyrminios (Irminio) formed the border between Syracuse (no. 47) and Kamarina. A number of C6–C4 farmsteads, some with adjacent cemeteries, are known from the lowland plains of the Hypparis (Ippari), the Oanis (Rifriscolaro) and the Hyrminios river valleys. The orientation of farmsteads located in the hinterland coincides with that of the city, and the size of the area allotted to the single farmsteads is divisible by the size of the urban insulae, suggesting an organisation of the agricultural area analogous to that of the C5 city (Di Stefano (1993–94) 1378–81; Cordano and Di Stefano (1997) 297–99). Investigations have also shown that a system of roads joined the city with its cemeteries and the farmsteads located in the further hinterland (Pelagatti (1980–81) 723–29; Di Stefano (1984–85) 762–64). On the estuary of the river Hyrminios, at Contrada Maistro c.15 km south-east of Kamarina, a harbour settlement founded contemporaneously with Kamarina may mark the border between the territories of Kamarina and Syracuse. The site, which had a Demeter sanctuary (Cordano (1997)), was abandoned in C6l (Di Stefano (1987b)). To the north-west the river Achatos (Dirillo) formed the border with Geloan territory. An important C5 coin hoard (ICGH 2095) from the C6–C5 border settlement of Scornavacche (ancient identity unknown) in the Dirillo valley has revealed contacts with the main Greek cities of Sicily. Inland the territory of Kamarina was delimited by the Hyblaian mountains, which constituted the border of the territories of Kasmnai (no. 29) and Akrai (no. 10), and further northwards of Leontinoi (no. 33). The Sikels of the mountainous hinterland were allied with Kamarina during the C6m war with Syracuse (Philistos (FGrHist 556) fr. 17). During the Hippokratean
phase (infra), Kamarina was apparently forced to break with previous Sikel allies such as the city of Eretria (Polyaen. 5–6; cf. Philistos (FGrHist 556) fr. 10 with Sinatra (1998)) of uncertain location in the Hyblaian hills. However, the impression given by the evidence is that of a network of contacts with the Sikel hinterland, as far north as the foothills of the Hyblaian mountains, a vast area with a number of Sikel sites revealing a strong degree of Cretanisation (Di Stefano (1987a), (1988–89) with refs.). The immediate hinterland of Kamarina comprised about 50–70 km², the larger territory (dominion?) about 500 km².

Kamarina was founded by Syracuse (no. 47), 135 years after the foundation of Syracuse itself, i.e. c.598 (Thuc. 6.5.3); the date is confirmed by the archaeological evidence (infra). The oecists were Daskon and Menekles, the former a Syracusan and the latter probably a Corinthian, as suggested by onomastic evidence (Cordano (1987c)).

Philistos (FGrHist 556) fr. 5 (rC6m) refers to treaties of alliance between Kamarina and Sikels, Gela (no. 17) and other (presumably Greek) communities in a C6thm war with Syracuse. According to Thuc. 6.5.3, the Kamarinaeans were made anastatoi by Syracuse after a revolt (ἀποστασίας); this happened c.552–549 (schol. Pind. Ol. 5.16), probably in connection with the war attested in Philistos (FGrHist 556) fr. 5 in which both Syracuse and Kamarina were assisted by allies. However, the site was apparently not depopulated: not only is Parmenides of Kamarina attested as victor at Olympia in 528 (Olympionikai 125), but there is no archaeological evidence of a break in habitation (Lentini (1985) 5–6) or in the use of the Archaic cemetery (Pelagatti (1976–77) 523–26; (1978b)); so Kamarina probably continued to exist, possibly as a dependent polis of Syracuse (cf. apostasis in Thuc. 6.5.3 and the statement by Hdt. 7.154.3: Συρρηκοσίων δὲ ἵνα Καµάρινα τὸ ἄρχαίον). After the defeat of Syracuse by Hippokrates of Gela in the C5th (492?) battle at Heloroi, Kamarina passed, after arbitration by Corinth (no. 227) and Korkyra (no. 123), from Syracuse to Gela (Hdt. 7.154.3), as payment for the release of Syracusan prisoners of war (Thuc. 6.5.3). Hippokrates, acting as oecist himself, refounded the city c.490 (Thuc. 6.5.3; Philistos (FGrHist 555) fr. 15; Timaios (FGrHist 566) fr. 19). Casewitz (1985) 168, 172–73 shows that the term used by Thucydides to describe Hippokrates’ refoundation (= κατοικίζει) mainly designates the settling of new inhabitants and may be used for the “colonisation” of a site already inhabited. The term used by Philistos and Timaios (= συνοικίζει) implies the participation in the new foundation of various unspecified groups (Cordano (1992) 7). In 484 Gelon destroyed Kamarina (Hdt. 7.156.2; Thuc. 6.5.3) and transferred all Kamarinaeans to Syracuse, where they received citizenship (Hdt. 7.156.2); prior to that, Gelon had installed Glaukos of Karystos as his governor in Kamarina, and the occasion for his destruction of the city was presumably its execution of Glaukos (schol. Aeschin. 3.189; Demand (1990) 47–48). Kamarina now probably ceased to exist until its refoundation by Gela in 461; at least, a decrease in the archaeological evidence covering the years 484–461 suggests that the site was uninhabited or only sparsely inhabited in this period (Giudice (1988) esp. 56–57). In 461 (Diod. 11.76.5) Kamarina was refounded by Gela (Thuc. 6.5.3). In 427 this third Kamarina was allied with Leontinoi (no. 33) and Athens (no. 361) against Syracuse (Thuc. 3.86.2, 6.75.3). At the Congress of Gela in 424 it was decided that Kamarina was to receive Morgantina (no. 37) on condition of the payment of ἄργυρον τακτῶν to Syracuse (Thuc. 4.65.1). This congress had been called on the initiative of Gela (no. 17) and Kamarina after they had ended a mutual war by ekecheiria (Thuc. 4.58; Timaios (FGrHist 566) fr. 22). In 422 Phaiax “won over” Kamarina to Athens (Thuc. 5.4.6), but the city was allied with Syracuse as well (Thuc. 6.88.2) and eventually sided with her (infra). In 405 Kamarina suffered from Carthaginian attacks (Diod. 13.108.3), and Dionysios I forced the inhabitants (τοὺς ἑκεῖ) to relocate to Syracuse (Diod. 13.111.3); but the Kamarinaeans (with the Geloans) left Syracuse for Leontinoi τῷ Διονυσίῳ διαφόρως ἐξεστε (113.4). The 405 peace treaty between Dionysios and Carthage decreed that Kamarina be atieichistos and pay tribute to Carthage (Diod. 13.114.1). A Timoleontic reinforcement of the population is reported by Diod. 16.82.7, and the archaeological evidence points to a revival of the city in C4th (Balibar (1974) 149–50; Pelagatti (1976)).

Kamarinaean military forces assisted Syracuse during the conflict with Athens (Thuc. 6.67.2), although the city initially attempted neutrality, allied as it was to both parties (Thuc. 6.88.2); Thuc. 7.33.1 mentions contingents of 500 hoplites, 300 akontistai and 300 toxotai; a contingent of twenty cavalry is mentioned at Thuc. 6.67.2. In 406 Kamarinaean forces fought with Gela and Syracuse against the Carthaginians at the battle of the river Himera (Diod. 13.86.5), and Menes of Kamarina was commander on this occasion (13.87.5); Kamarinaean forces assisted Dionysios again in 397 (Diod. 14.47.6), and in 357 troops from the city assisted Dion (Diod. 16.9.5; Plut. Dio 27.1).

Reception of envoys is attested at Thuc. 6.75.3; sending of envoys is mentioned in Timaios (FGrHist 566) fr. 22 (r424).
At the refoundation in 461 a system of civic subdivisions was introduced whereby the citizens were organised into phratries (subdivided into triakades (Cordano (1992); Murray (1997)).

Glaucos of Karystos presumably ruled the city as tyrant on behalf of Gelon (Berve (1967) 142). Apart from that, the form of constitution is unknown, though there are glimpses of its working: a death sentence passed by the assembly is recorded in reference to c.484 by schol. Aeschin. 3.189, and a meeting of the assembly (ξύλλογος) is attested in Thuc. 6.75.3–4. Thuc. 4.25.7 refers to a faction which allegedly in 425 was ready to betray the city to Syracuse (cf. Thuc. 6.88.1 for the general hostility of Kamarina towards Syracuse).

Parmenides of Kamarina was victorious at Olympia in 528 (Diod. 1.68.6 = Olymionikai 125), and so was Psamis in 456 and 452 (Olympionikai 280, 292; cf. Pind. Ol. 4–5).

The town of Kamarina was founded on a narrow coastal plateau between the rivers Hypparis and Oanis (for the situation of the city in relation to rivers, see Cordano and Di Stefano (1997)). During the C4s/Timoleontic phase the site comprised a fortified area of not less than 150 ha. There is no evidence of a circuit wall contemporary with the foundation. The C6s circuit wall, with later phases, probably enclosed an area larger than that ascertained for the earliest habitation phase. It was built as a double curtain-wall in a mixture of ashlar and small polygonal techniques with internal fill. Part of the upper structure in sun-dried brick has been found, and there were gates corresponding to the routes westwards to Gela (no. 17), inland, and eastwards to Heloron (no. 18) and Syracuse (no. 47). An outer proteichisma wall was raised outside the north wall along the river Hypparis (Pelagatti (1970); Cordano and Di Stefano (1997) 294–96).

Structural remains from the earliest phases of the site have been found above all in the western part of the later city, close to the coast on the promontory proper, near the estuary of the river Hypparis and the harbour. The Archaic remains show an organic layout with an overall alignment of the individual structures and a specific cult area, the Athena Polias sanctuary on the highest part of the plateau. Habitation in the early period consisted of single houses and house plots with open areas. The orientation was respected by the Geloan refoundation of 461i (Pelagatti (1976) 122–25). The C5 city comprised three plateiai, whereas the northeastern part of the city with two further plateiai belongs to the C4s/Timoleontic foundation; for the public works of this phase, fortifications and sewers, see Cordano and Di Stefano (1997) 292–97. The part of the city facing the sea and the port was from early times laid out as public space; the vast area may have been divided into a mercantile agora and a civic-political agora (Pelagatti (1984–85) 683–94; Di Stefano (1993–94) 1367–71). Recent investigations at the mouth of the river Hypparis have uncovered remains of an impressive harbour structure, in part going back to the Archaic period (Di Stefano (1990)).

The major sanctuary of the city, undoubtedly dedicated to Athena, has roots in the Archaic period, but the extant remains of the temple are of C5i (Di Stefano (1984–85) 729–37). Athena was the patron divinity of Kamarina (schol. Pind. Ol. 5), and the epithet Poliaochos is used by Pind. Ol. 5.10–11. An archive of C5m lead tablets listing citizens and the phratries and triakades to which they belonged (Cordano (1992)) was deposited in the temple (Di Stefano (1992)) and demonstrates the importance of Athena. The rev. type of litrai issued after the 461i resettlement depicts Athena armed, and the cult statue of Athena Polias may have portrayed her as Athena Promachos (Rutter (1997) 138). Votive terracottas from the site show Athena also as Ergane (Martin et al. (1979) 520). C5i coin types depicting the main divinities of the city, Herakles and Athena (Westermark and Jenkins (1982) 57–8; Westermark (1998) 376), and personifications of the river-god Hipparis and the nymph Kamarina may also be evidence of cults (Lacroix (1965) 115–16). Apollo Patroos is attested in C5 (Manganaro (1995) 98–103). A sub-urban sanctuary of Demeter south of the city has yielded a few architectural remains and rich votive deposits. Figurines of the type showing Demeter with a piglet attest to the Thesmophorian aspect of the cult (Giudice et al. (1979); cf. Pelagatti (1980–81) 716–18; Hinz (1998) 119–21).

The earliest cemeteries were situated to the north-east (Dieci Salme) and the east (Rifriscolaro) of the city. About 2,000 tombs are known at Rifriscolaro from the period of the first generation of settlers (Pelagatti (1980–81) 719–23). The Classical cemetery belonging to the 461 refoundation was located south-east of the city at Passo Marinaro, where about 8,000 m² have been investigated so far (Di Stefano (1984) 55 n. 1 with refs.; Orsi (1990)).

Coinage began after the refoundation of Kamarina by Hippokrates with an issue of didrachms on the Attic standard: obv. helmet on a shield; rev. palm-tree flanked by greaves, legend: KAMAPINAION or KAMAPI (Westermark and Jenkins (1980)). This issue lasted only to 484, when the city ceased to exist. Kamarina as resettled in 461 by Gela issued a series of silver litrai: obv. flying Nike; below, a swan; rev. Athena standing and armed, legend: KAMAPINAION (-ΩΣ); this issue ended c.440 (SNG
Correct, Kasmenai was allied with the Syracusans against to support nal collective ethnic. Hansen (14) Kasmenai was founded in 64/3 (Thuc. 6.5.3) by Syracuse (no. 47), probably as a colony, although there is no mention of an oecist. The location and the urban plan (infra) point to a military settlement (Di Vita (1990) 350). Kasmenai was a polis according to Herodotos, and the site is defined as type A here, but the polis status must remain uncertain, though Pais’ conjecture of Philistos (FGrHist 556) fr. 5 (supra) would tend to support polis status by providing an instance of the external collective ethnic. Hansen (1997a) 36 classifies Kasmenai as a dependent polis of Syracuse, i.e. as a polis founded as a fortress. See also Akrai (no. 10) and Heloron (no. 18).

If the conjecture in Philistos (FGrHist 556) fr. 5 (supra) is correct, Kasmenai was allied with the Syracusans against Kamarina in C6m. A C5e bronze plaque (IGDS no. 219) found near Monte Casale is a grant (ἐκφασίασαν[τη]) of ateleia etc., possibly by Kasmenai (though this is highly uncertain, see IGDS no. 219 with refs.). The text refers to γάμοροι, and according to Hdt. 7.155.2 the Syracusan gamoroi expelled by the demos in a civil strife in 491 took refuge at Kasmenai. Cf. Asheri in CAH v2, 768.

Kasmenai is with near certainty identified as the urban site on the top of Monte Casale c.12 km west of Akrai (Marotta D’Agata and Moreschini (1992)). The settlement was founded on a high plateau (c.70 ha), bounded by steep slopes and with no direct access to a hinterland. Apart from the natural defences the plateau was protected by a sturdy circuit wall 3.4 km long, 3 m wide, built in megalithic technique and with at least three square towers along the north side. Its date is uncertain, but the wall is often considered to be contemporary with the foundation, or a little later (Adamesteanu (1986) 110). A double curtain-wall, a diateichisma(?), along the south-eastern side of the north-west plateau, the upper terrace and so-called acropolis, may date from C4f, and may therefore be taken as a later reinforcement due to Carthaginian pressure (Martin et al. (1979) 531, fig. 73).

The settlement was laid out according to a well-defined plan already in C7s. The urban plan consists of at least forty narrow streets oriented north-north-west to south-south-east, at right angles to the long axis of the plateau and delimiting insulae c.25 m wide: an early stage of Western Greek urban planning (Martin et al. (1979) 533). The rather simple layout may reflect the function of a fort or garrison defending the territory of Syracuse. Quite apart from the apparent lack of a chora, the morphology of the site is unsuitable for a colony proper, and the nature of the votive material from the shrine may also point to a military function (Di Vita (1961); Marotta D’Agata and Moreschini (1992) 291). However, against this it should be noted that “The sheer number of inhabitants, some 7–8,000 altogether, shows that the site must have been a proper town, and that some 2,000 soldiers max. must have been garrisoned in the town with their families. Also, no more than ca. 60% of the town has been excavated and the absence of e.g. an agora and public space in general carries no weight as the evidence stands” (Hansen (2000) 198–99). An analysis of aerial photographs of the plateau of Monte Casale also shows that unexcavated areas were part of the urban layout (Martin et al. (1979) pl. on p. 528).

The only public architectural known at Kasmenai is the temenos with temple located on the western plateau and
aligned with the overall urban layout. The sanctuary was squeezed into a small area otherwise given over to habitation (Voza (1976–77) 561–62). The temple has two phases: an early one c.560 and a later one 525–500 (Ciurcina (1977) 72–73), but the temenos has a C7th origin. A votive deposit of hundreds of javelins, swords and arrowheads indicates a cult of a martial divinity (supra).

30. Katane (Katanaios) Map 47. Lat. 37.30, long. 15.05. Size of territory: 4. Type: A:α. The toponym is Κατάνη, ή (Hecat. fr. 73; Thuc. 6.51.3; C5f coins, infra) or Κατάνα (IG iv².1 95.11.71 (356/5)). The city-ethnic is Καταναίος (Thuc. 7.57.11; C5 coins; IG iv² 162 (C4f)).

Katane is called a polis in the urban sense by Hecat. fr.73 and Thuc. 6.51.1–2, and in the political sense at Thuc. 7.14.2 and in Arist. Pol. 1274ζ24, a passage which also refers to the polis την. It is called patris by Diod. 11.49.2 (1476) and 11.76.3 (1461).

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C5m coins (infra), and the external use in Thuc. 6.3.3 and IG i² 291.b.11.15 (415); the external individual use is attested by Arist. Pol. 1274ε23 (rCes) and IG iv² 162 (C4f).

The territory is termed γῆ by Thuc. 3.116.1 and chora by Diod. 11.49.1 (1476), who names it Καταναία (ibid.). It comprised parts of the fertile plains delimited inland by Etna and the Monti Siracusani with the Sikeli settlements of Hybla Geleatis, Inessa, Kentoripa (no. 31) and Piakos (no. 43; Manganaro (1996a) 26), in all about 400 km². However, Leontinoi (no. 33), the earlier foundation, may have dominated part of this area, leaving a more limited area for the direct use of Katane. Chalkidian expansion far inland to the south-west of Katane and Leontinoi is revealed by the Chalkidian legal texts found at the settlement of Monte San Mauro (Frasci (1997)). The Côm indigenous centres show a notable degree of Hellenisation, probably evidence of a Chalkidian dominion comprising also the lowland plains of the rivers Simeto, Dittaino (for a phrourion at M. Turcisi, cf. Procelli (1988–89)) and Trigonion. The chora of Katane was bounded to the south by the territory of Leontinoi (cf. Thuc. 6.65.1) and to the north by that of Naxos (no. 41; Procelli (1989) 684–89; Manganaro (1996a) 25, 29). The territory suffered from an eruption of Etna in 426/5 (Thuc. 3.116), and in 415/14 it was ravaged by Syracusan forces (Thuc. 6.75.2).

Katane was founded by “Thoukles and the Chalkidians from Naxos” (Thuc. 6.3.2; cf. Hellan. fr. 82), after these had founded Leontinoi in the fifth year after the foundation of Syracuse (i.e. 729: Thuc. 6.3.2). According to Thuc. 6.3.3, the Katanaians “themselves made Euarchos their oeicest” (Leschhorn (1984) 11–13), implying that the city obtained autonomous status soon after its foundation. Thuc. 6.3.3 possibly implies that the Greeks drove out the Sikeli population, and there is tenuous archaeological evidence supporting this (Procelli (1992)).

In 476, Hieron transferred the populations of Katane and Naxos to Leontinoi, renamed Katane as Aitna and settled it with 10,000 oiketes: 5,000 from the Peloponnese and 5,000 from Syracuse (Diod. 11.49.2); though the report on the relocation of populations refers to both Katane and Naxos, Katane seems to have been the site refounded as Aitna (no. 81): and την μέν Κατάνην μετωνόµασε Αἴτνην, την δὲ χώραν οὐ μόνον την Καταναίαν ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλὴν τῆς ὁµορο προσθεὶς κατεκληρούχησε, μυρίους πληρόσας οἰκήτορας. (Cf. Strabo 6.2.3, who focuses exclusively on Katane in his report on the foundation of Aitna.) After Hieron had died in 466, the Katanaians returned in 461 and expelled the Aitnaeans (Strabo 6.2.3), according to Diod. 11.76.3 after several battles (πλείονα µάχαις) between the Hieronian settlers and Syracuse as well as the Sikels under Douketios. Cf. further Aitna (no. 81). In 403 Dionysios I was able to take possession of Katane through the betrayal of the city by the strategos Arkesilaos: the inhabitants were sold into slavery and the city granted to Campanians (Diod. 14.15.1–3), who in their turn were transplanted to Aitna in 396. After that date the demographic history of the city becomes obscure: it is mentioned again in 353 when it was taken by Kallippos, Dion’s murderer (Plut. Dio 58.4). In 394, the surviving Katanaians were settled by Rhestios (no. 68) in Mylai (Diod. 14.87.1), but presumably had to scatter across the island when Mylai fell to Dionysios later that year (Diod. 14.87.3).

Katane was presumably among the Chalkidikai poleis allied with Leontinoi (no. 33) in its war with Syracuse (no. 47) in 427 and may, with its ally, have sent an embassy to Athens asking for help in 427 (Thuc. 3.86.2–3; cf. Andoc. 3.30 with Albini (1964) 100). Nikias’ letter at Thuc. 7.14.2 mentions Katane as an ally (ξύµµαχος) of Athens (no. 361) in 414/13 (though Diod. 13.4.2 reports that it was originally in favour of Syracuse); the treaty was concluded (ἐψηφίσαντο . . . ξυµµαχίαν Ἀθηναίοις) in 415 at an assembly (ἐκκλησία) attended by Athenian strategoi and against the wishes of a pro-Syracusan faction (Thuc. 6.50.3–51.2). Cf. IG iv² 291.b.11.15 (415): a payment by Katane to Athens.

IGiv² 162 is a C4f grant of Athenian proxeny to two men of Katane. A citizen of Katane served as theorodokos of Epidaurus (no. 348) in 356/5 (IG iv².1 95.11.71; cf. Manganaro (1996a) 46 n. 81).

There is no evidence for Archaic or C5 tyranny at Katane. According to Arist. Pol. 1274ζ23, Charondas of Katane
legislated for his own city as well as for other Chalkidian cities. An **ekklesia** is attested for 415 (Thuc. 6.51.2) and a **strategos** is mentioned at Diod. 14.15.1 (r403). In 344, the city was ruled by the tyrant Mamerkos/Markos, who initially sided with Timoleon (Diod. 16.69.4) but then joined Carthage only to be betrayed by **οὗτος αὐτὴν τὴν ἱππικὸν τρίχα την** who handed Katane over to Timoleon (Plut. Tim. 34).

The urban layout at Katane is virtually unknown. The initial settlement occupied the acropolis above the coastal plain and harbour, today occupied by Piazza Dante and the Convento dei Benedettini; structural remains from this period are scarce, but Protocorinthian material confirms a C8 Greek presence (Rizza (1980–81) 769, pl. 186.1–2, (1981) 316, figs. 4–6), and there are remains of C6 habitation buildings (Giudice et al. (1979) 139–40). Traces of C8 habitation have been revealed below the acropolis near the ancient coastline (A. Patané (1993–94) 907), and the size and location of the ancient harbour are reviewed by Lagona (1996). In the later Classical period the habitation area incorporated also the lower plateau, probably with an agora located on the site of the later Roman forum close to the theatre and **odeion**. The theatre where the **ekklesia** met in 415 (Frontin. Str. 3.2.6) was located on the southern slopes of the plateau. Remains date mainly from the Roman period, but its size (seating capacity c.7,000) may reflect that of the Greek theatre (Mitens (1988) 100–3; TGR ii. 428–30, C5?). The few Greek remains are from C5 (Anti (1947) 125, 128; Bacci (1980–81a)). The adjacent Roman **odeion** may also have had a Greek predecessor, possibly a **bouleuterion** (proximity of theatre and **bouleuterion** is known from other sites; cf. Kolb (1981) 88).

On the southern slope of the acropolis a rich C6–C4 votive deposit has revealed a sanctuary. The cult of the early phase may have been that of Hera, although the evidence is tenuous. The votive terracottas show that from C5 the cult was that of Demeter and Kore, with whom Hieron, as a Deinomenid, had special bonds (Rizza (1960), (1996) 12–13, pl. 1; Hinz (1998) 161–63).

The central area of the Roman city may suggest the approximate extent of the Greek city. To the west this was delimited by the acropolis, to the north by the C6–C5e cemetery (Orsi (1918)), to the north-east by the river Amenanos, and to the south-east by the sea, in all occupying an area of 75–100 ha (cf. Rizza (1996) 11–12). According to Thuc. 6.51.1 (r415), the city had a circuit wall, destroyed in 403 by Dionysios (Diod. 14.15.2–3).

Katane began striking coins rather late compared with other Sicilian poleis, perhaps due to political or economic dependence on Naxos (Manganaro (1996a) 29): minting started c.461 on the Attic standard (with denominations based on the tetradrachm) at the time of the return of the former inhabitants relocated by Hieron to Leontini (for a survey of the coinage, see Manganaro (1996b)). The types are **obv.** man-headed river-god Amenanos crowned by a flying Nike; **rev.** Nike running and holding a wreath or fillet, legends: **KATANE, KATANAION** or, more rarely, **KATANAIOΣ** (Manganaro (1996b) 307–8; SNG Cop. Sicily 174–75). These issues are sometimes thought to predate 476 (Head, HN P 130, followed by Marotta D’Agata et al. (1987) 156), but there is greater consensus for dating them as an inauguration issue, to 461 (Stazio (1978) 191, 194; Manganaro (1996b) 305). After C5m the **obv.** type of the tetradrachms, a quadriga, reveals the influence of Leontinian and Syracusan issues; **rev.** head of Apollo, legend: **KATANAION, from C5 ΚΑΤΑΝΑΙΟΝ** (Manganaro (1996b) 309; SNG Cop. Sicily 176–79). From c.402 tetradrachms were signed by the engravers Herakleides and Euainetos: **obv.** Apollo en face; **rev.** quadriga, legend: **KATANAION** (Manganaro (1996b) 309–10; SNG Cop. Sicily 180). Varied issues of lower denominations c.450–402 are based upon drachms and fractions (types: quadriga, head of Amenanos, Silenos, bull) and upon the litrai and fractions (types: Silenos, stylised thunderbolt) (C. Boehringer (1982); Manganaro (1996b) 308, 310–11; SNG Cop. Sicily 181–84). The earliest bronze coinage is dated c.405 (Manganaro (1996b) 311); coins with **rev.** butting bull were probably minted by Mamerkos and the Campanian mercenaries settled at Katane by Dionysios between 403 and 396 (Manganaro (1996b) 312–13; SNG Cop. Sicily 184). Timoleontic issues follow in C4m: **obv.** head of nymph; **rev.** man-headed bull, Amenanos (Manganaro (1996b) 313).

A group of C5/4 hemidrachms, **obv.** head of Apollo, legend: **ΛΕΟΝ**; **rev.** butting bull, legend: **KATANAIOΣ**, may be evidence of collaboration between Leontinoi and Katane in the face of Syracusan pressure in 404–403 (Manganaro (1996b) 311–12; C. Boehringer (1998) 51), or—perhaps rather—it may be an issue of the Campanian mercenaries settled in Katane by Dionysios I in 403; in that case the legend **ΛΕΟΝ** may attest to Leontinian dependence upon Katane (Kraay (1976) 229; Corretti et al. (1990) 532).

### 31. Kentoρipον (Kentoripinos)

**Map 47.** Lat. 37.35, long. 14.45. **Size of territory:** ? **Type:** C.2γ. The toponym is **Κέντοριψα, τά** (Thuc. 6.94.3; Polyb. 1.9.4; Strabo 6.2.4) or **Κέντοριψαν, ά** (Ptol. Geog. 3.4.7). The city-ethnic is **Κέντοριψις** in Thuc. 7.32.1 and **Κέντοριψών** on C4 coins (**infra**) and in Diod. 13.83.4, 14.78.7, etc.
Thuc. 6.94.3 calls Kentoripa a πόλις in the urban sense at Diod. 16.82.4 (1339), where the political sense is possibly a connotation. \textit{Politai} is found in Porph. \textit{De vita Pythag.} 21 (\textit{rC6l}) (= Aristox. fr. 17, Wehrl). The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C4 coins (\textit{infra}), and the external collective use in Thuc. 7.32.1, Porph. \textit{De vita Pythag.} 21 (\textit{rC6l}) (= Aristox. fr. 17, Wehrl) and Diod. 13.84.4 (\textit{rC5l}).

Thuc. 6.94.3 describes Kentoripa as a Sikel community; and it is implicitly described as Sikel at Diod. 14.78.7 (1396). A claim or pretension to Greek identity may be implied by the Greek names of its Classical rulers (Damon, Nikodemos; \textit{infra}) and Greek-style coins were issued by the Timoleontic refoundation (\textit{infra}).

At 6.94.3, Thucydides relates how in 414 the Athenians won over Kentoripa by \textit{homologia}, and at 7.32.1 the \textit{Kantoripes} are described as Athenian symmachoi in 413. In 396, Damon, the ruler of Kentoripa, made a \textit{syntheke} with Dionysios I (Diod. 14.78.7); this Damon may possibly have been appointed \textit{proxenos} by Athens (no. 361) (\textit{IG} ii² 32 (385/4)). Reception of a \textit{presbeia} from Akragas (no. 9) is attested at Diod. 13.83.4 (\textit{rC5l}). A meeting of the \textit{ekklesia} is attested by Diod. 13.83.4 (\textit{rC5l}).

Porph. \textit{De vita Pythag.} 21 (\textit{rC6l}) (= Aristox. fr. 17, Wehrl) refers to a tyrant by the name of Simichos who renounced his rule upon becoming a Pythagorean. At Diod. 14.78.7 (1396) a Damon is described as δυναστεύων \textit{Κεντορπίνων}, and at 16.82.4 (1339), a Nikodemos is described as \textit{Κεντορπίνων} τύραννος and is said to have been ousted from his city by Timoleon, who gave Syracusan citizenship to its freed inhabitants (ibid.). The phrase used by Diodorus, \textit{Συρακοσίους ἐποίησε}, suggests to Moggi, \textit{Sitt. 357} that the inhabitants, along with those of Agryn (no. 7), were transferred to Syracuse; Agryn was later assigned new citizens (Diod. 16.82.5), and so presumably was Kentoripa, although this is not explicitly stated. A Timoleontic refoundation is, however, reflected in the striking of a new coinage (\textit{infra}) and in craft production of Greek type (R. P. A. Patanè (1992) 69, 73).

The archaeological evidence from the city’s Helleniised phase is mainly C4 and Hellenistic, but urban remains are few (Marotta D’Agata and Rizza (1987) esp. 236–38; R. Patanè (1988)).

Bronze litrai were struck briefly under Timoleon after the ousting of Nikodemos in 339/8 (cf. R. P. A. Patanè (1992) 69): \textit{obv.} head of Kore surrounded by dolphins (so-called Euainetos type, taken over from Syracuse); \textit{rev.} leopard, legend: \textit{ΚΕΝΤΟΡΠΙΝΩΝ} (Head, \textit{HN}² 135; \textit{SNG Cap. Italy} 209).

---

32. \textit{Kephaloidion} (Kephaloiditas) Map 47. Lat. 38.00, long. 14.00. Size of territory: ? Type: Cty. The toponym is \textit{Κεφαλοίδιον}, τό (Diod. 14.56.2; C5l–C4e coins, \textit{infra}); or \textit{Κεφαλοίδις} (Archestratos of Gela fr. 35.6, Olson and Sens; Strabo 6.2.5); \textit{Ptol. Geogr.} 3.4.3 has \textit{Κεφαλοίδης}, η \textit{Κεφαλοίδης}. The city-ethnic is \textit{Κεφαλοίδιτας} (C5l–C4e coins, \textit{infra}); schol. \textit{Theod.} 1.118b gives \textit{Κεφαλοίδιος}.

No source calls Kephaloidion a \textit{polis} (though \textit{πατής} at Diod. 20.56.3 (1307) may mean “this \textit{polis}”; a \textit{chora} is referred to at Diod. 20.77.3 (1306)); it is included here on account of a coinage presumably struck by/in the community and on stylistic grounds dated to C5l–C4e (Cutroni Tusa and Tullio (1987) 211). Both silver (drachms, hemidrachms and litrai) and bronze coins were struck: \textit{obv.} head of Herakles; \textit{rev.} butting bull (from C4m replaced by a Pegasos on bronzes). The legends are unusual and difficult to interpret; the following variants are found: (a) \textit{obv.} \textit{ΕΚ ΚΕΦΑΛΟΙΔΙΟΥ}, \textit{rev. ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΩΤΩΝ}; (b) \textit{obv. ΚΕΦΑΛΟΙΩΤΑΝ}, \textit{rev. ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΩΤΑΝ}; (c) \textit{ΚΕΦΑΛΟΙΩΤΑΝ}. While (c) can be interpreted as an ordinary legend of a civic coinage of Kephaloidion, (a) and (b) seem to involve a foreign group, the \textit{Herakleiotai}, of unknown origin. \textit{Ek Kephaloidiou} of (a) probably means “based on Kephaloidion” (Kraay (1979) 29) and suggests that the \textit{Herakleiotai} had been admitted to Kephaloidion as a group; the double legend of (b), naming both the Kephaloidians and the Herakleiotans, suggests that the latter had been admitted to citizenship by a block grant but kept their individual identity; this would suggest that Kephaloidion was a \textit{polis} at the time of the minting of these coins (Head, \textit{HN}² 118; Consolo Langher (1961); Cutroni Tusa and Tullio (1987) 210–11). (Bernabò Brea (1975) 24–29 assigns the issues to a period of autonomy, independent from Carthaginian rule, after the treaty with Himilkon (\textit{infra}); cf. also Jenkins (1975) 92–99 for a downwading of some of the issues to the period of Timoleon.)

Kephaloidion was originally a settlement located on the confines of Himeraian and Sikel territories. In 396, Himilkon of Carthage concluded a treaty of friendship with Himera and “those settled at the \textit{phorurion} of Kephaloidion” (τοὺς τὸ \textit{Κεφαλοίδιον} φορούσαν κατοικούντας: Diod. 14.56.2). Whether these latter were Greeks is not clear, but they were presumably not Hermians. At Diod. 14.78.7 (1396) Kephaloidion is implicitly described as Sikel, but the Greek-style coinage discussed above suggests Hellenisation; it was captured \textit{διὰ προδοσίας} by Dionysios I in 396 (Diod. 14.78.7) and is not met with again before the time of Agathokles (Diod. 20.56.3 (1307), 77.3 (1306)). The archaeological evidence at the site is mainly Hellenistic, but the
massive circuit wall in polygonal technique may go back to C4; the layout of the mediaeval city may in its main lines coincide with that of the ancient city (Cutroni Tusa and Tullio (1987) 211–14).

33. Leontinoi (Leontinos) Map 47. Lat. 37.15, long. 15.00. Size of territory: 4. Type: Αα. The toponym is Λεοντίνοι (IG 1ος 54.1; Thuc. 6.3.3). The city-ethnic is Λεοντίνος (Thuc. 3.86.2–3).

Leontinoi is called a polis both in the urban sense (Thuc. 5.4.3–4; Hdt. 7.154.2) and in the political sense (Thuc. 3.86.2; Arist. Pol. 1316b35–39). The territorial sense is a connotation at Thuc. 5.4.3, and the political sense is a connotation at Hdt. 7.154.2 (cf. Hansen (2000) 175–76, 205). Politai is used at Thuc. 5.4.2, and so is demos. The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is attested on C5f coins (infra), and the external collective use by Hdt. 7.154.2, Thuc. 5.4.2 and IG 1ος 54.18 (C5m). The external individual use of the ethnic is found at Xen. An. 2.6.16, Pl. Ap. 19E and CEG 2 830.1 (C4f).

Leontinoi was one of the early Chalkidian colonies in Sicily, founded by Chalkidians from Naxos under the leadership of Theokles five years after the foundation of Syracuse (i.e. traditionally 729; Thuc. 6.3.3; cf. Hellan. fr. 82). However, Theokles can hardly have been the oecist of Leontinoi, as noted by Strabo (6.2.7, the territory (γῆ, Thuc. 5.4.2; χώρα, Diod. 5.8.2) of Leontinoi, called ἡ Λεοντίνη (Thuc. 5.4.4, 6.65.1) or τὸ Λεοντίνων/Λεοντίνων πεύκων (Theopomp. fr. 225a.60; Diod. 4.24.1), belonged to the Naxians; this must refer to the Naxian origin of Leontinoi. The territory of Leontinoi probably encompassed most of the modern plain of Catania, about 400 km². It is not possible to define a borderline between Katanaean and Leontinian territory. The sources stress the beauty of Leontinoi’s chora (Diod. 4.24.1) and the importance of grain crops (Diod. 14.58.1 (rC4e)). The north gate of Leontinoi led to the Leontine plain (Polyb. 7.6). The Chalkidian dominion reached far inland along the Simeto and the Dittaino river valleys, possibly as far as Monte San Mauro, Grammichele, Morgantina and Kenturipe (Procell (1989); see Katane (no. 30)).

The population history of Leontinoi was eventful: according to Thuc. 6.4.1, the group of Megarians led by Lamis who eventually founded Megara (no. 36) for some time lived as citizens (ευμητολιστεύων) at Leontinoi but were expelled (ἐκπεσεῖν). In 476, Hieron of Syracuse transplanted the populations of Naxos (no. 41) and Katane (no. 30) to Leontinoi (Diod. 11.49.2). After the Congress of Gela in 424, new citizens (πολιται) were enrolled in Leontinoi, and the demos contemplated a redistribution of land. The result was civil war, in which οἱ δυνατοὶ summoned the Syracusans. The demos was expelled, whereas οἱ δυνατοὶ moved to Syracuse (no. 47), where they obtained citizen rights, although “later” (ὑστερον) some returned to the old city (Thuc. 5.4.2–4; cf. Dreher (1986)). Leontinoi ceased to be a polis, and its site was turned into a phourion of Syracuse (Diod. 12.54.7); the Athenians had the refoundation of Leontinoi as one of their principal alleged motives for undertaking the expedition to Sicily in 415 (Thuc. 6.3.3, 48.1, etc.). In 405/4 Leontinoi was resettled by citizens of Gela (no. 17) and Kamarina (no. 28; Diod. 13.113.4), and the treaty concluded that year between Dionysios I and Carthage stipulated that like, e.g., Gela, the city was to be autonomos, and this must have meant the refoundation of the city (Diod. 13.114.1). Two years later (403/2), Dionysios conquered Leontinoi and moved all its inhabitants to Syracuse (Diod. 14.14–15); in 396 Dionysios resettled Leontinoi with, allegedly, 10,000 mercenaries (Diod. 14.78.2). In 339, the population was transplanted to Syracuse by Timoleon (Diod. 16.82.7).

From Thuc. 3.86.2–3 it appears that in 427 Leontinoi had treaties of symmachia with “the Chalkidian poleis”, Kamarina and Rhegion (no. 68), and that these were also allied with Athens (by individual treaties; see ML 63–64 with comm.), and that they were capable of acting as a body (HCT ad loc. on οἱ τῶν Λεοντίνων ἔφυμοχοι). Thuc. 4.24.9 attests to a treaty of symmachia between Leontinoi and Naxos in 425. During the reign of Dionysios II, Leontinoi seceded from Syracuse and twice resisted attempts to reconquer the city, the first by Philistos in 356/5 (Diod. 16.16.1), the second in 342/1 by Timoleon (Diod. 16.72.2).

Leontinian φυγάδες are mentioned at Thuc. 6.19.1. Several wars fought by Leontinoi are attested: a C6 war with Megara peri ges horon is referred to by Polytaen. 5.47.1, and a C5s war with Syracuse by Thuc. 3.86.2. Campaigns are mentioned at, e.g., Thuc. 4.25.10, and a στράτευμα τῶν Λεοντίνων at Thuc. 4.25.11. The Κήλ-C6e tyrant Panaitios served as polemarchos (Polytaen. 5.47.1). Leontinoi was conquered by Hippokrates and made a dependency of Gela (Hdt. 7.154.2 c.496/5 (Luraghi (1994) 128–9, 148–50).

Reception of envoys is attested by Diod. 14.14.3; IG 1ος 54.4–6 (C5s) names three Leontinian presbeis, and Gorgias was sent as an envoy to Athens in 427 (Pl. Hp. mai. 282B). A citizen of Leontinoi served as theodorokos of Epidauros (no. 348) in 356/5 (IG 1ος 3.1 95.11.66).
In the Archaic period Leontinoi was sometimes ruled by a tyrant; two are mentioned by our sources: Panaetios, who in C7
changed the oligarchy (Arist. Pol. 1315b34–37) to tyranny

*ek demagogias* (Arist. Pol. 1310b29, 1316b37; Luraghi (1994)

11–20) and Ainesidamos (Paus. 5.22.7). A C6 stasis between
the *demos* and the ruling oligarchs is reported by Polyxen.

5,47.1 and another stasis in 424 between the *dynatoi* and the
demos by Thuc. 5.4.2–3 (Berger (1992) 25–26). Symbolic oratory (en toi demoi) at Leontinoi is mentioned by Pl. Hp.
mai. 128A.

The urban form of Leontinoi is known in some detail
from the description given by Polyb. 7.6. The defensive sys-
tem of the city is among the best preserved in Sicily. The C6

circuit wall enclosed the San Mauro and Metapiccola hills and the central valley with gates at either end (Rizza (1978);

for chronology, see Trzyni (1986) 187; for the fortification of
the Leontinian acropolises, cf. Diod. 14.58.1 (r396)). The

C6e(? ) outer ashlar circuit wall of the east and south side of
Colle San Mauro crossed the narrow San Mauro valley with
a pincer-like gateway (the Syracusan gate of Polybios) and
continued along the west and south sides of the Metapiccola
plateau. The defences were destroyed by Hippokrates

a pincer-like gateway (the Syracusan gate of Polybios) and
continued along the west and south sides of the Metapiccola
plateau. The defences were destroyed by Hippokrates

585–87; Rizza (1982)).

From the evidence of the coins, Artemis or Demeter (cf.
Diod. 5.4.2) and Apollo were venerated at Leontinoi. An
external collective dedication of a silver *phiale* at Delos is
recorded in I.Delos 104.93 (366) and IG ΙΙι 1643.21 (C4m).

The earliest coinage, based upon the Syracusan–Attic
standard, was issued in connection with Hieron's settlement
of the inhabitants of Katane and Naxos at Leontinoi in 476
(C. Boehringer (1998) 43–44). This first series of
tetradrachms use the Syracusan *lambda* in the legend and
reveal strong Syracusan stylistic influence: obv. quadriga

and Nike; rev. lion's head (a pun on the city's name) sur-
rrounded by four grains of barley, legend: *AEONTINON*
(C. Boehringer (1998) pl. 10.1–5, 7–10, etc.; SNG Cap. Sicily
334–37). A second series, from c.466, have similar obv. but
with a running lion in exergue (as in the Syracusan
“Demarateion” coinage); rev. female head (Artemis or Demeter),
or head of Apollo wearing laurel wreath, legend: *ΛΕΟΝΤΙΝΟΝ*
tetradrachms belong c.450: obv. laureate head of Apollo; rev.
lion head surrounded by barley grains, legend: *ΛΕΟΝ, ΛΕΟΝΤΙΝΟΝ, ΛΕΟΝΤΙΝΟΣ* (with Chalkidian *lamb-
C.Boehringer (1998) 47, pl. 11.33–37, etc.). Lower denomina-
tions carry related types, and on rev. of litrai a naked youth
(river-god or Apollo) offering a libation at an altar (SNG
change in the system of denominations with refs. to plates).
The issue of tetradrachms may have continued until c.415
(C.Boehringer (1998) 50–51). For an issue of hemidrachms
possibly indicating collaboration between Leontinoi and
Katane or Leontinian dependence upon Katane, see entry
for Katane. Bronze coins were issued from c.405 (SNG Cap.

Leontinoi founded the colony of Euboia (no. 15) (Strabo
6.2.6) at an unknown site in the Chalkidian hinterland,
perhaps as early as C8 if it was contemporaneous with the foundation of Mylae (no. 38; the two sites are coupled by Ps.-Skymnos 287–88); Euboea seems to have been a settlement of some importance in C5f, since it was worthy of being relocated by Gelon (Hdt. 7.156.3; Camassa (1989a)).

34. **Lipara** (Liparaioi) Map 47. Late 38.30 long. 14.55. Size of territory: 2 (= size of island). Type: A.w. The toponym is Λιπάρα, η (SEG 37 414 (C5f)); Antiocchos (FGrHist 555) fr. 1; Thuc. 3.88.2; cf. Λιπάραι in Polyb. 34.11.19, where the plural “die Stadt Lipara [i.e. in contradistinction to the island] zu bezeichnen scheint, da Polyb. sonst Λιπάρα sagt” (Ziegler in RE xiii. 719; cf., however, Diod. 5.7.1 claiming homonymy between island and polis); Μελεγονίς is said by later sources to have been an earlier name of Λιπάρα (Callim. Hymn. 3.47; Strabo 6.2.10). The city-ethnic is Λιπαραίος (C5s coins, infra; Thuc. 3.88.2), although Κνίδος (ἐλλ Λιπάρα) seems to have been used as well (SEG 37 414 (C5f)).

Lipara is called a polis in the urban sense by Antiocchos (FGrHist 555) fr. 1 = Paus. 10.11.3 (r time of foundation) and Arist. Mete. 367β6. In later sources Lipara is called a polis in the political sense at Polyb. 1.21.5 and in the urban sense at Diod. 14.56.2 (1396). The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is attested by C5s coins (infra) and the external collective use in Thuc. 3.88.2, Arist. Mete. 367β6 and presumably on the C5f Liparan dedication at Delphi (Syll. 3 14 (C6–C5e) = SEG 34 405, 37 414; cf. BTcGl 9: 101ff). The individual use of the ethnic is found in F.Delphes 111.4 401 (315) and IG III2 9214 (C3e).

Mythology told of a settlement of the island by Liparos (Diod. 5.7.5), who founded the polis and was joined by Aiolos (ibid. and 4.67.4; cf. Hom. Od. 10.1). The historical community was founded by apoikoi from Knidos (no. 903; Thuc. 3.88.2; Antiocchos (FGrHist 555) fr. 1; Strabo 6.2.10; cf. Hornblower (1991) 496). However, according to Diod. 5.9.2–5, the foundation was the outcome of a joint Kniadian-Rhodian expedition to western Sicily under the leadership of Pentathlos of Knidos, in the fiftieth Olympiad, i.e. 580–576. Pentathlos was killed in war supporting Selinous (no. 44) against Segesta, and the leadership of the group was taken over by Gorgos, Thestor and Epithersides; the expedition found at Lipara 500 indigenous inhabitants of Aiolos’ line whom they joined. Antiocchos of Syracuse (FGrHist 555, fr. 1 as preserved in Paus. 10.11.3), while agreeing on the leadership of Pentathlos, differs inter alia from Diodorus’ account in naming only Knidians as colonisers (as does Thuc. 3.88.2), and in stating that before settling at Lipara the expedition had founded a polis at Cape Lilybaion (Pritchett (1999) 98–100), from which they were expelled by Elymians and Phoenicians. For the role of Knidians in the venture, see also the C5f Delphic dedicatory inscription: τοι Κνίδοι [ε] Λιπαράι (F.Delphes 111.1 142; LSAG 351 n. 1; Syll. 3 14; SEG 37 414; Bernabò Brea and Cavalier (1991) 102–3). According to the Eusebian chronology, the foundation took place in 630/29, but Diodorus’ date is supported by the chronology of the votive material from the urban sanctuary and by mortuary evidence (Bernabò Brea and Cavalier (1991) 137, 150).

Lipara was the centre of habitation among the Ionian Islands (Thuc. 3.88.2: οἱ κοινοὶ δ’ ἐν μιᾷ τῶν νῆσων ὀν μεγάλη, καλεῖται δὲ Λιπάρα), of which there were seven in all (Diod. 5.7.5; Strabo 6.2.10), known also as αἱ Λιπαραίων νῆσοι (ibid. and 1.3.10; Polyb. 1.25.4; Diod. 12.54.4, 14.103.2, cf. Syll. 3 14). Lipara itself, measuring 37.5 km², is fertile (cf. καρπόθορος at Diod. 5.10.3 and εὖκαρπος at Strabo 6.2.10), and there is sporadic evidence of single farmsteads and agricultural activity from C6. However, the area exploited for agricultural purposes was not limited to Lipara but included the other islands (Thuc. 3.88.2; Diod. 5.9.4–5); Diodorus gives a detailed account of the socio-economic development of the community, referring inter alia to such institutions as syssitia, absence of private property and close community control of the agricultural areas which were publicly owned (ibid. without source reference).

In 427/6 the Liparaians were symmachi of Syracuse (no. 47), and in that year the Athenians and Rhegians raged their territory (Thuc. 3.88.1–4; Diod. 12.54.4). According to Diod. 5.9.4, the community maintained a fleet which was manned by a group of citizens devoting themselves specifically to that duty, while the rest were occupied with agriculture. The existence of a fleet may also be inferred from the repeated defeats of Etruscan forces (infra). A stratēgos is attested in 393 (Diod. 14.93.4). The Liparaians fought several wars against the Etruscans, at least until the battle of Kyme (474), and they won several victories which were commemorated by monuments at Delphi (Diod. 5.9.5; Strabo 6.2.10; Paus. 10.11.3; cf. Rota (1973) and Colonna (1984)), dedications that may be taken as evidence of extreme wealth on the island (Paus. 10.16.7). At the time of Hieron, but before 474, the Etruscans besieged and captured Lipara (Callim. fr. 93, Pfeiffer; Tszet. Chil. 8.889–92). In 396 Himilikon occupied the polis of Lipara and exacted 30 tal. from the inhabitants (Diod. 14.56.2). In 393 (396 according to Roman chronology) the Liparaean stratēgos Timositheos liberated Roman ambassadors taken prisoner by Liparaian pirates while on
their way to Delphi; for this service the Romans conferred on Timothoeus the right of public hospitality (Diod. 14.93).

Lipara’s relations with Delphi seem to have been close: consultation of the oracle in the face of the Etruscan threat is attested by Paus. 10.16.7; in C5–C4 the city put up votives and dedicated booty taken from the Etruscans (Diod. 5.9.5; Paus. 10.11.3, 16.75; cf. Syll.3 14; Rota (1973) and Colonna (1984)); a Delphic grant of prophyx to two Liparians is recorded in F.Delphes iii 4 401 (315), and Lipara was among the cities visited by the theoroi of Delphi in C3s (Manganaro (1964a); SEG 22 455, col. 4.117).

The city was founded on a promontory c.65 m above sea level; the “acropolis” of the city (a modern designation) comprised habitation, but there was also a lower city on the western slope of the “acropolis”. The site had two harbours, probably north and south of the promontory (Diod. 5.10.1). The circuit wall built in a polygonal technique and raised c.500 enclosed the acropolis and part of the lower city; however, the exact course is not wholly clarified (Bernabò Brea (1987) 20). In C4f the perimeter of the circuit wall was enlarged to incorporate the C4 expansion of the lower city; the new wall was built in ashlar, isodomic technique as a double curtain-wall with internal fill, 3.80 m wide, strengthened with towers (ibid. 20–23). The most extensive cemetery with c.2,000 tombs lay to the north of the city (Bernabò Brea and Cavalier (1991) 146–54).

No Greek remains of habitation from the Archaic and Classical periods are extant, but early Greek presence is evidenced by votive deposits. The only known public building is the C4 prytaneion (Diod. 20.101.2 (r304)). Votive deposits testify to sanctuaries within the urban area (Bernabò Brea and Cavalier (1977) 89–91). Further votive deposits delimited by primitive peribolos walls indicate simple temene. Sporadic finds of architectural terracottas testify to a temple or naiskos (Bernabò Brea and Cavalier (1991) 139). There is evidence of suburban sanctuaries, one probably dedicated to Demeter (Bernabò Brea and Cavalier (1977) 133–35; (1991) 158–59).

A C6m inscription restored AIO[ΔΟΥ] (Bernabò Brea and Cavalier (1977) 90) may testify to a cult of this mythical figure (cf. Diod. 20.101.2 (r304) for dedications allegedly set up by Aiöl and kept in the prytaneion). A cult of Hephaistos is attested from C5s coins, easily explained in the light of volcanic activity on the Lipari islands. Coins also testify to a cult of Apollo. A C4–C3 dedication probably attests to a cult of Artemis (Manganaro (1979); Bernabò Brea and Cavalier (1991) 90, 158), and there is epigraphic evidence for a cult of Aphrodite (Bernabò Brea and Cavalier (1991) 90; cf. 168 for refs. to iconographic testimonies). A cult of Dionysos is sometimes inferred from the abundant New Comedy terracottas (Bernabò Brea and Cavalier (1991) 161–62).

Lipara struck a bronze coinage based upon the litra from C5s (survey in Bernabò Brea and Cavalier (1991) 109–21). The obv. depicts a male head with helmet or, more likely, a pilos and therefore Hephaistos; rev. ship’s stern; legend: ΑΙΠΑΡΑΙΟΝ; lower denominations lack the stern (SNG Cop. Sicily 1084–85). A rare issue of Lipara and Mytitras with the legends ΑΙΠΙ and ΜΥ suggests some agreement or understanding between the two cities, but the nature of this is uncertain (Bernabò Brea and Cavalier (1991) 112–13). A second issue, probably of C4 rather than C3, is bronze, based on the litra but of reduced weight, with lower denominations, has obv. young, naked seated Hephaistos holding hammer and kantharos; rev. dolphin, among variants: head of Apollo(?), rev. legend: ΑΠΑΡΑΙΩΝ (SNG Cop. Sicily 1088–96; for the date, see Bernabò Brea and Cavalier (1991) 117–18). Another C4 issue may indicate cultural and political kinship with Taras (Bernabò Brea and Cavalier (1991) 114).

35. *Longane (Longenaioi) Map 47. Lat. 38.05, long. 15.10. Size of territory: ? Type: C:B. The forms of the city-ethnic suggest such forms for the toponym as *Λογγαναῖος or *Λογγώνη, but the only attested form is Λογγώνη, in Steph. Byz. 418.19, who gives the corresponding ethnic as Λογγωναίων; Steph. cites Philistos (= FGrHist 556, fr. 38), but for which detail is unclear. The city-ethnic is Λογγαναῖος in IG xiv 319 (= IGDS no. 200; cf. Hornbostel and Hornbostel (1988) 234), a C5m kerykeion inscribed Λογγαναίος ἐμὼ δεμόσιος(ι); it is Λογγωναίος on C3 coins (infra).

On the basis of Polyb. 1.9.7, Longane is located near Mylai (no. 38), and the river Longane (ibid.) may be the river Loitanos of Diod. 22.23. The city has been tentatively identified with the considerable remains of a settlement on Monte Ciappa, above modern Rodi and Milici, where C5 evidence of Hellenisation is found in the form of aslar technique in the circuit wall, a rectangular building complex outside the walls (perhaps a sanctuary), and, finally, mortuary evidence (Ryolo di Maria (1950–51); Massa (1991); Bernabò Brea and Carettoni (2000)). However, other sites with urban remains have been put forward as candidates for the site (Wilson (1988) 125).

No Archaic or Classical source calls Longane a polis, but the kerykeion (supra) and the Greek-style coins (infra) suggest that it was a polis and suggest Hellenisation as well.
Longane minted bronze litrai from C3l, a date suggested by the similarity with Geloan coins of c.415–405; *obv.* Herakles wearing lion skin, legend: $\Lambda OΓΓΑΝΑΙΩΝ$; rev. personification of river-god, Longanos (Jenkins (1975) 99–101; Massa (1991) 250–51). (Manganaro (1984) 36–37 argues for a C4m date for this coinage and therefore reads the legend not as an ethnic but as an adjective.) If Longane is correctly located inland somewhere between Milazzo and Tyndaris (no. 49), its coinage is virtually the only coinage in that area.

36. Megara (Megareus) Map 47. Lat. 37.10, long. 15.10. Size of territory: 4. Type: Aa. The toponym is $\textit{Μέγαρα}$, τά (Thuc. 6.49.4, 75.1), or $\textit{Μεγαρίς}$ (Ps.-Sky Pax 13) (it is unclear what is meant by τά $\textit{Μεγαρικοί}$ at Polyaen. 1.27.3 (1483)); this is the simple name which is qualified in different ways to distinguish it from Megara Nisia (no. 225): Thuc. 6.94.1 has $\textit{Μέγαρα}$ τά ἐν Σικελί, and Theopomp. fr. 70 has $\textit{Μέγαρα}$ τῆς Σικελίας. In addition to the toponym proper, the plural of the city-ethnic may be used to designate the city (in contradistinction to the community): Thuc. 6.4.1: $\textit{Μεγαρέας}$ φίλεσα (cf. Ziegler in RE xxv.1. 206; see also HCT on Thuc. 6.94.1). According to Eroph. fr. 137a/b (as paraphrased by Strabo 6.2.2 (a) and Ps.-Skymnos 264 (b)), the original name was $\Upsilonβλα$ (presumably from the Sikel king Hyblon (Thuc. 6.4.1)). The city-ethnic is $\textit{Μεγαρεύς}$ (Hdt. 7.156.2; Philistos (FGHHist 556) fr. 5), which is also qualified in different ways to distinguish it from the ethnic of Megara Nisia: $\textit{Μεγαρεύς}$ ὁ ἐν Σικελί (Hdt. 7.156.2; cf. Pl. Leg. 630A); Thuc. 6.4.1: $\textit{Μεγαρεύς}$ ὁ $\Upsilonβλαίος$.

Megara is called a polis in the urban sense at Thuc. 6.4.2 and Ps.-Sky Pax 13; Hdt. 7.156.2 does not explicitly call it a polis in the political sense, but that it was so is the obvious implication of the passage, which discusses Megara alongside other communities that were obviously poleis. At Thuc. 6.4.3 metropolis almost certainly applies to Megara Nisia (no. 225) (HCT ad loc.). Pl. Leg. 630A uses πολίτης about one of its citizens. The external collective use of the city-ethnic is found in Hdt. 7.156.2, Philistos (FGHHist 556) fr. 5 (rC6m) and Pl. Leg. 630A.

The name of the territory was presumably $\textit{Μεγαρίς}$ (cf. IvO 22, fr. ab.1 (C6l) with Dubois ad loc. in IGDS p. 34; cf. Diod. 4.78.1 and Steph. Byz. 588.7); it is termed χώρα at Thuc. 6.4.2 and γῆ at 6.94.1. It consisted of the coastal lowland on both sides of the city facing the bay of Augusta and was demarcated by the territories of Leontinoi (no. 33) and Syracuse (no. 47), i.e. by the valleys of the river Porcaria (ancient Pantakyas) and the river Anapo (ancient Anapos) respectively. It measured c.400 km$^2$ (Vallet, Villard and Auberson (1983) 149–50; De Angelis (1994) 92–93).

According to Steph. Byz. 588.7, Styella was a $\textit{πρωιονία}$ in the territory of Megara (cf. Steph. Byz. 645.4 citing Philistos (FGHHist 556) fr. 20). Styella has been tentatively located on the western confines of Megara’s territory (Bernabò Brea (1968) 178–79). In C3l, Megara was involved in war περί γῆς ὃρων with Leontinoi; it was fought during the reign of Panaitios of Leontinoi (Polyaen. 5.47; for the C3l date of Panaitios: Luraghi (1994) 11–14).

According to Thuc. 6.4.1–2 Megara was founded by a colonising expedition from Megara Nisia (no. 225) led by Lamis. The expedition at first settled at Trotilos on the river Pantakyas, whence it moved on to Leontinoi and settled (ξυμπολιτεύμεν) there with the Chalkidians for a while; it was, however, expelled (ἐκπεσεῖν) and went on to settle at Thapsos. Here Lamis died; the remnants of the expedition left Thapsos and founded Megara ($\textit{Μεγαρεύς}$ ὁ ‘Υβλαίος) on land put at their disposal by the Sikel king Hyblon (for an analysis of the textual transmission of the tradition of the Sikels and the foundation of Megara, see Graham (1988)). According to Thucydides the Megarians were driven out by Gelon (in 483) 245 years after the foundation, giving a foundation date of 728, thus later than the foundation of Syracuse. A different tradition was followed by Eroph. fr. 137, whose account is preserved in Strabo 6.2.2 (and Ps.-Skymnos 264–77). According to this tradition, Megara (given the initial name of $\Upsilonβλα$) was founded ten generations after τά Τρωικά by the same expedition, led by Theokles of Athens, which also founded Naxos (no. 41). The Athenian origin here ascribed to Theokles (who was from Euboian Chalkis (no. 365)) undoubtedly reflects later Athenian claims to have played a role in the early colonial enterprises in Sicily (Bérard (1957) 78–79); Theokles’ expedition included both Ionians, who founded Naxos, and Dorians (mostly Megarians), who founded Megara, and according to Ps.-Skymnos 276–77 this double foundation was the result of status (along ethnic lines?) among the colonisers. According to Strabo 6.2.4, the foundations of Megara, Naxos and Syracuse were roughly contemporary, but a group of Dorians who had left the group settling at Megara were picked up by Archias and joined his group of colonists in founding Syracuse; so in this tradition the foundation of Megara preceded that of Syracuse (ibid.; cf. Ps.-Skymnos 276–77). Archaeological evidence has revealed Greek presence at Megara from C8m (Villard and Vallet (1964) 15–32) and therefore contemporary with the earliest Greek presence at Syracuse (Pelagatti (1978c) 130–33); the
evidence for C8m Greek contacts in the hinterland of Megara at Villasmundo is not necessarily associated with the foundation of the colony (Voz a (1973b)).

A C6m treaty of symmachia with Syracuse is attested by Philistos (FGrHist 556) fr. 5, and Megarian troops assisted Syracuse in a war against Kamarina. In C6e Megara initiated a war against Syracuse (Hdt. 7.156.2) but with disastrous results: Megara was unable to withstand a siege by Gelon, partly because of stasis (Polyaen. 1.27.3), and c.483 the city had to accept terms whereby the demos was sold into slavery whereas the pachées were relocated to Syracuse and received citizenship there (Hdt. 7.156.2); Megara ceased to exist as a polis, its site lay abandoned in 415 (Thuc. 4.94.4), and the territory was held by Syracuse (Thuc. 6.94.1). The city must have been refounded by Timoleon c.338; admittedly, Megara is not specifically mentioned as a Timoleontic refoundation, but archaeology proves a refoundation, which must be related to Timoleon’s programme of refoundations (Talbert (1974) 149).

We know next to nothing of the type of constitution at Megara. A C6 stasis may be hypothesised as causing the expulsion of citizens received as exiles at Selinous (IVO 22; IGDS no. 28). One Diegnetos was ἀγρόκων when the city was attacked by Gelon in 483 (Polyaen. 1.27.3). The term αἰσιμνάτας in IVO 22 (C6b) refers to a magistracy attested also in Megara Nisia (no. 225) and other Megarian colonies (cf. Dubois on IGDS no. 28 fr.b.5–6 with refs.); however, from the context it is not discernible whether the reference is to Selinous (no. 44) or to Megara. For the office in general, see Asheri (1979b) 490. IVO 22 mentions a ἁλία (|h|a|λ|ί|α διαίτεσ|ι|ς|ς|e|); Arena (1989) no. 52 fr. B.4; Asheri (1979b)), but again it is uncertain whether the reference is to Megara and whether ἁλία should be interpreted as an ekklesia or as a special court (Asheri (1979b) 490). IGDS no. 20 is a lex sacra of C6e.

The evidence for cults is meagre: a dedication to heroes theoi (Arena (1989) no. 78) and an uncertain C3 dedication to Aphrodite (Manni Piraino (1975) 150). Apart from this there is the indirect evidence of a C6f sacrificial law set up by one Pasaratos, or for a local, otherwise unknown, hero Pasaratos (SEG 26 1084 = IGDS no. 20; cf. Sartori (1980–81) 267). Cf. also Manni (1975) 190–91 and Vallet (1991) 515 for numismatic evidence of doubtful provenance.

Megara was founded on a flat coastal plateau of c.81 ha, previously uninhabited. Only a small part of the total area of habitation has been investigated. Soon after the foundation the urban area was laid out with habitation, public spaces and main lines of communication, respected by the later C7 urban phase, when the city was organised according to major and minor transversal axes with insulae organised in five districts laid out around a central agora (Vallet et al. (1976)). The five districts may mirror different contingents among the early settlers, reflecting the five komai of the metropolis Megara Nisia (Strabo 8.6.22; cf. Vallet et al. (1981) 145–46); or they may simply be the successors of early scattered habitation areas, each with public spaces and sanctuaries (Polignac (1999) 227), superseded in C7l by a centralised urban layout implying standardised modules for the habitation lots (Tréziny (1999)). The earliest habitation remains are C8l houses of a type known also at Syracuse and Naxos. Yet a habitation area has been investigated on the southern plateau, c.500 m south of the main urban area. Remains of a gate and a C7m double-faced circuit wall in rough stones with internal fill, strengthened on the outside by a trench, have been laid bare. C8 habitation, a C7 potters’ workshop and a sanctuary of C7–C6 reveal the impressive extent of the early colony: a settlement measuring c.60 ha (Broise et al. (1983)); Gras (1984–85); Tréziny (1999) 76–79. On the assumption that about half of this area was urbanised, the C7 population has been estimated at c.2,000 (De Angelis (1994) 97–99), probably a much too pessimistic assessment (Hansen (1997b) 74 n.153). The C7m circuit wall was replaced in C6s by a well-built ashlar wall, of which a stretch is preserved on the northern side of the city and landwards by stretches of a long curving wall, in all c.1,500 m, with semicircular towers on the outside (Vallet et al. (1983) 97–101).

The C6 building near the agora, unconvincingly identified as a pryptaneion (Vallet et al. (1983) 62–69; cf. S. G. Miller (1978) 229–30), is undoubtedly a public structure; another monumental structure from c.640 on the south side of the agora is also furnished with banquet rooms and may have had a public function (Vallet et al. (1983) 77–81; Kiderlen (1995) 14–17, 215). C7s stoas lined the agora on its north and east sides.

A number of sacred buildings were located adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, the agora: a two-cella heroon facing the agora may have housed a cult of the oecist Lamis (Vallet et al. (1976) 209–11, (1983) 62). Two C7s naiskoi, one with an internal row of columns but both without peristasis, delimited the agora on its south side (Vallet et al. (1983) 48–49, 69–70); small single-cella temples, naiskoi, are known from various locations in the vicinity of the agora (Vallet et al. (1983) 44, 62; Polignac (1999) 215). The C6e Doric temple located on the central part of the plateau (Orsi (1921) 153–76; Villard and Vallet (1954) 13–24) and C6 temples on the sea front
reveal a belt of sanctuaries encircling the habitation area (Polignac (1999) 216–20; for sanctuaries and cults, see also Hinz (1998) 141–43). The Timoleontic foundation occupied primarily the north-eastern corner of the Archaic city and was later restricted to an area of 12 ha by the C3l fortification erected before the final destruction of the city by Marcellus in 213 (Livy 24.34.2). Timoleon’s city followed, with modifications, the layout of the Archaic city, the agora was re-established, and sanctuaries and a stoa were erected in the vicinity (Vallet et al. (1983) 168–74).

The Archaic cemeteries were located to the north, west and south of the city: the graves are mainly of C7–C6 with very few C8 graves. A social elite is indicated by rich, monumental cella tombs (Shepherd (1995) 56–60 with refs.), and social differentiation is also attested by Herodotos’ distinction between the demos and hot pachées (7.156.2).

Megara did not issue coins during its Archaic existence, and the attribution of a silver litra inscribed METΑ to the Timoleontic refoundation (Head, HN Polyv. 151) is far from universally accepted (Vallet (1991) 515 with refs.).

Megara was the metropolis of Selinous (no. 44), founded in 649 according to Diod. 13.59.4, or in 628 according to Thuc. 6.4.2.

Messana (Messanios) See below 51. Zankle.

37. Morgantina (Morgantinos) Map 47. Lat. 37.25, long. 14.30. Size of territory: ? Type: Cβ. The toponym is Μοργαντίνη, η (Thuc. 4.65.1; 36.5.7); Μοργαντίνα, η (C3m coins, infra; Diod. 11.78.5); or Μοργαντινον (Diod. 14.78.7); Strabo 6.1.6 has Μοργαντίνα, η. The city-ethnic is Μοργαντινος (C4s coins, infra).

Morgantina is called a polis in the urban sense at Diod. 11.78.5 (r.459), where the political sense may be a connotation. The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C4 coins.

Most scholars have identified Morgantina with the Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic town investigated on the c.3 km-long Serra Orlando ridge, near Aidone (an identification based mainly upon numismatic evidence: Dubois, IDGS pp. 226–27). The Classical and Hellenistic city occupied the lower ridge, whereas the Archaic town was situated on the Cittadella hill which rises to the east, and which, in itself, consists of an upper acropolis and two lower plateaux.

Morgantina was originally a non-Greek community (Tsakiris (1995) 125; Antonaccio (1997) 168–70), and at Diod. 14.78.7 (r.396) it is implicitly described as Sikel. The Archaic settlement of Morgantina has revealed Greek contacts primarily from the mid-sixth century. The Cittadella and adjacent areas have yielded valuable evidence of sanctuaries and naiskoi of Greek type. Foundations of a mid-sixth-century hekatompedon have been excavated on the upper plateau and a rich harvest of architectural terracottas found on the lower plateaux are evidence of a naiskos in this part of the Archaic settlement too (Barletta (1983) 49–67; Antonaccio (1997)). A fortification wall was added to the already considerable natural defences of the site in C5e, possibly in response to the expedition of Hippokrates of Gela (Sjöquist (1973) 45–46; cf. Hdt. 7.154).

The cemeteries, situated on the slopes of the Cittadella hill, have revealed clear evidence of Greek contacts and acculturation from the Archaic period (Lyons (1996)). However, tomb typology suggests continuity of Sikel culture, albeit with some Hellenisation of tomb architecture and typology, and Archaic Morgantina may not have been a mono-ethnic community (Lyons (1996); see also Antonaccio (1997)). Architectural terracottas and other remains of buildings attest to important C6m–C6l religious structures, some in Greek style (Barletta (1983) 49–67; for sanctuaries, see Hinz (1998) 124–34). A survey of the archaeological evidence, with bibliography, is found in Tsakiris (1995); cf. also Antonaccio (1997). By c.460, Greek-style coinage was introduced with types that attest to Greek cults (infra). Moreover, a kylix of c.460 carries an inscription (SEG 38 949) indicating the existence of Greek-style civic subdivisions (eikades).

The C5e destruction phase of Morgantina is most often linked to the activities of Hippokrates of Gela in north-eastern Sicily. When captured and refounded by Douketios in 459/8, it became an axiologos polis according to Diod. 11.78.5. The new settlement on Serra Orlando was a city founded according to Greek customs: a formal urban layout with plateiai and stenpoi has its origin in this period, though the rich evidence for public buildings dates primarily to the Hellenistic period (Bell (1988) 314–16; Tsakiris (1995) 126–27). The acts of foundation and the terminology employed by Diodorus in connection with Douketios’ foundations in the period 459–458 are similar to those known from Greek colonial foundations: the presence of an oikistes, the planning of an urban centre, and the division of the chora into lots (cf. Rizzo (1970) 58–66; Bell (1984–85) 505–6; (1988) 320–21).

The peace concluded between the Sicilian cities at the Congress of Gela in 424 implies that Morgantina had been within the sphere of influence of Syracuse prior to 424 (Thuc. 4.65.1); but by the Peace, Syracuse (no. 44) handed over Morgantina to Kamarina (no. 28) in return for a speci-
fied payment (ἀργύριον τακτόν). Morgantina is next listed among the cities taken by Dionysios I during his campaign against the Sikels in 396 (Diod. 14.78.7), and later the city is mentioned in connection with the war between Magon and Dionysios I (Diod. 14.95.2).

Morgantina issued an unusually rich coinage which has been divided into the following main groups by Erim (in Buttrey et al. (1989) 3–67): (1) silver litrai from c.465–450, stylistically related to contemporary litrai of Gela: obv. bearded head wearing taenia (an unidentified local divinity); rev. ear of grain, legend: MOP'ANTINAN (retrograde, gamma and rho written in early forms); (2) c.370–350: tetradrachms of Syracuse type with legend MΟΡΓΑΝΤΙΝΩΝ in exergue on rev., known in two specimens only; (3) silver litrai, three issues, 344–317: (a) 1/4 litra: obv. head of Athena in triple-crested helmet, en face, legend: MOP'ANTINON; rev. Nike seated on rock (rev. type reveals stylistic affinities with coins of Terina), legend as on obv.: SNG Cop. Sicily 471; (b) litra: obv. female head in profile (Persephone or Artemis, or long-haired Apollo?), legend: MOP'ANTINON; rev. horseman in chlamys thrusting spear (SNG Cop. Sicily 472); (c) a rare issue known from two specimens, a variant of (3a) above: (4) bronze coinage, 330–317: (a) obv. head of Athena in Attic helmet, legend: MOP'ANTINON; rev. lion devouring head of stag (SNG Cop. Sicily 473–74); (b) obv. head of Sikelia (?) or male divinity; rev. eagle standing on snake, legend: MOP'T, MOP'GAN (SNG Cop. Sicily 475); (c) obv. head of Apollo(?). legend: ΛΑΒΟΣ; rev. tripod, legend: MOP'GAN. The latter issues are probably Timoleontic (Erim in Buttrey et al. (1989) 14–29; Karlsson (1995) 155, 166 n. 3)).

38. Mylai (Mylaios) Map 47. Lat. 38.15, long 15.15. Size of territory: 2. Type: Α. The toponym is Μυλαία, α’ (Hecat. fr. 79 = Steph. Byz. 461.6; Thuc. 3.90.2). The city-ethnic is Μυλαιος (SEG 24313–14 (C56); Diod. 12.59.5).

Mylai is described as a πόλις Ἑλληνικής . . καὶ λιμήν in Ps.-Skylax 13 (cf. Hansen (2000) 198); it is also called a polis in the urban sense at Diod. 14.87.3 (1394) and by Ps.-Skymnos 288 (r time of foundation). The external collective use of the city-ethnic is found in SEG 24313–14 (C56) and in Diod. 12.54.4 (1427).

Even so, Mylai is often thought not to have been a polis but simply a fortified outpost (phrourion) of Zankle/Messana (no. 51; Ziegler in RE xvi: 1042; Bernabò Brea and Cavalier (1992) 118; Dubois in IGDS ad no. 5). Certainly, relations between Mylai and Zankle/Messana seem to have been close. (a) Mylai was founded by Zankle (Ps.-Skymnos 287; cf. Strabo 6.2.6) in 716 (Euseb. Chron. sub Ol. 16.1). (b) Thuc. 3.90.2 describes it as Μυλαία αἱ Μεσσηνίων and states that ἑτέρων δόλῳ φυλαί ἐν ταῖς Μυλαιίς τῶν Μεσσηνίων φρουρούσα. (c) The term phrourion is applied to the site in Diod. 12.54.5 bis (1427) and 19.65.3 (1315). Finally (d), Theophr. Hist. pl. 8.2.8 uses the phrase ἐν Σικελία τῆς Μεσσηνίας ἐν ταῖς καυσόμεναι Μυλαι, which seems to indicate that Mylai was conceived of as situated in the territory of Messana (so Ziegler in RE xvi. 1042).

However, the following should be noted. Re (a), the report on the foundation does not state the purpose of the foundation and there is no compelling a priori reason why Mylai should not have been planned as an ordinary colony and thus as a polis; but even if it is assumed that it was planned as a military outpost, the examples of Kasmnenai (no. 29) and Akrai (no. 10) indicate that this need not militate against its being a polis (cf. Hansen (1997a) 36), although then presumably a dependent polis. Much more importantly, our earliest sources on Mylai are two dedications of spoils by Messana (no. 51) at Olympia that are inscribed ΜΕΣΣΕΝΙΟΙ ΜΥΛΑΙΟΙ (SEG 24313–14 (C56)); this of course indicates military confrontation(s) between Mylai and Messana and that “Mylai, at least before being defeated, had been a self-governing community and undoubtedly a polis” (Hansen (2000) 198); see also below on colonisation. Re (b+c), the application of the term phrourion does not exclude polis status for Mylai (cf. Thuc. 8.62.3 describing the uncontroversial polis of Sestos (no. 672) as a phrourion), and in fact Diodorus varies between phrourion (12.54.5, 19.65.3) and polis (14.87.3). The fact that Mylai in 426 was garrisoned by Messanian forces indicates close military collaboration and suggests again that Mylai was a dependency of Messana, as does Thucydides’ phrase Μυλαία αἱ Μεσσηνίων. Describing the events of 426, however, Diod. 12.54.2 classifies the inhabitants of Mylai as Μυλαιοὶ not as Μεσσηνίου, and this indicates that it was a community with an identity of its own, distinct from that of Messana. Re (d), the fact that Mylai may have been conceived of as situated in Messanian territory does not mean that it cannot have been a polis, since small poleis situated inside the territory of larger poleis are a well-attested phenomenon (Hansen (1997a) 31). If Mylai was thus situated, this may help to explain Thucydides’ statement (6.62.2) that Himera (no. 24) was the only Greek polis on the Tyrrenian coast of Sicily (a statement which in any case may refer primarily to north-western Sicily), since a dependent polis inside the territory of another polis may have counted as a polis only in internal matters (Hansen (1995) 73–74). To conclude, the Messanian dedications at Olympia indicate
that Mylai was a polis in C5e, and Ps.-Skylax that it was still a polis in C4; it seems to have been a dependent polis of Zankle/Messana, and it is conceivable that its political status may have been subject to change (Hansen (2000) 198).

Although presumably situated in the territory of Zankle/Messana (supra), the existence of a separate name—ή Μυλαίις χώρα (Polyb. 1.23.7) or τὸ Μυλαῖον πεδίον (Polyb. 1.9.7)—indicates that at least by C3m, and presumably before, Mylai had its own territory (Hansen (2000) 198). The size of Mylai’s territory is uncertain, but the fertile coastal plain east and west of the city comprises about 75 km². The border with Zankle may have been defined by the famous sanctuary of Artemis Phakelitis located somewhere east of Mylai (Saporetti (1979); Bernabò Brea and Cavalier (1992) 116; cf. also the entry for Zankle). To the west, Mylai bordered upon the territory of Tyndaris from 396 (cf. Strabo 6.1.2), and to the south-west upon the territory of the indigenous city of Longane.

In 427 the Athenians occupied Mylai, forcing upon it an alliance against Messana (Thuc. 3.90.3: ἣνάγκασαν ὀμολογία). In 394 the Rhegians settled at Mylai those Naxians and Katanaians who had survived Dionysios I’s exandrapodismos of their cities in 403 (Diod. 14.87.1). Later the same year the city was captured by Messana, and the Naxians (and presumably the Katanaians) were allowed to leave hypospontoi (Diod. 14.87.3).

The town of Mylai was situated on a high promontory, the acropolis (mentioned at Thuc. 3.90.3) crowning the 6.5 km-long alluvial peninsula joining it to the inland plain. The settlement was founded on an indigenous site. The original Greek settlement seems to have occupied only the upper plateau, though in a later period habitation may have progressed to the slopes below, closer to the sea and the harbour known from the sources (Ps.-Skylax 13). There are no structural traces of the Archaic or Classical city, nor of the defences mentioned by Thuc. 3.90.3 (ἐρύματα, cf. the poliorka at Diod. 12.54.4 (r427)). Mylai was still fortified in C4l (Diod. 19.65.3 (r315)). The cemetery located along the principal route across the isthmus took over the site of the indigenous, Bronze Age settlement. The earliest tombs are of C8l, thus confirming the Eusebian date (716) for the foundation; this cemetery continued in use also in the late Archaic period (Bernabò Brea and Cavalier (1959), (1992)).

According to Strabo, “the Zanklaians in Mylai” founded Himera (6.2.6: τὴν Ἰμέραν οἱ ἐν Μυλαίαις ἐκτίσαν Ζαγκλάειον (1648)). If this means that Mylai was the metropolis of Himera (no. 24), it will support the suggestion that Mylai itself was a polis in the Archaic period.


Mytistratos is called a polis (in the urban sense) only by Diod. 23.9.4 (r258), but it is included here on account of the Greek-style coinage (infra).

Mytistratos is, on numismatic evidence, identified with Monte Castellazzo di Marinopoli. The few C6–C5 and C4 urban remain, including a circuit wall built in an ashlar technique, are classified as Greek; the later phase with evidence of formal layout is probably Timoleontic (Fiorentini (1992) 303–4). The main settlement was destroyed in C3f, but habitation continued on an adjoining terrace. Tombs of the investigated cemetery are dated to C4s (Fiorentini (1992) 302–5).

Three series of C4 bronze coins are attributed to Mytistratos, the first two probably Timoleontic: (1) obv. head of Hephaistos, legend: ΜΥΤΙΤΙ; rev. free horse; (2) obv. head of Hephaistos; rev. wreath and pellets, legend: ΜΥ (retrograde). A coin of the latter series carries the legends ΑΙΠΙ (sc. Lipara (no. 34); retrograde) and ΜΥ on rev., and is evidence of C4m collaboration between the two cities (cf. entry for Lipara). The third issue (C4s): obv. head of Hephaistos; rev. flowers, legend: ΜΥΤ (Fiorentini (1992) 301; Karlsson (1995) 165,166).

40. Nakone (Nakonaios) Map 47. Unlocated (Tegon (1993) 159–61). Type: Cβ. The toponym is Νακώνη, ἦ (Steph. Byz. 468.3 = Philistos (FGHist 556) fr. 26). The city-ethnic is Νακωναῖος (C5l coins, infra) or Νακωναῖος (C4s coins, infra; SEG 30 1119.5 (C4l–C3m)).

No Archaic or Classical source calls Nakona a polis, but it is included here on account of its Classical Greek-style coinage (infra) and SEG 30 1119 (C4–C3), a Greek decree of Nakona attesting to the existence of a citizen body (polita: L.8), a boule (L.3), and an assembly (haliar:L.3), etc.; the decree concerns measures taken to restore civic order after a period of diaphora (l.10); cf. SEG 32 914 pp. 257–58. The internal selective use of the city-ethnic is found on Classical coins (infra) as well as in SEG 30 1119.5.

Nakone minted two series of bronze coins from C5 (Head, HNP 159): (1) obv. head of nymph, legend: ΝΑΚΩΝΑΙΟΝ; rev. Dionysos seated on ass and holding
The city-ethnic is found in Hdt. 7.9 combined at Hdt. 7.42 (Thuc. 4.25.7, 6.3.1; I.Delos 380.85 (rC5); cf. Rutherford (1998) 83). The city-ethnic is Náxios (coins c.525, infra), or Náxios (coins c.430, infra; Hdt. 7.154.2; Thuc. 7.57.11).

Naxos is called a polis in the urban sense at Thuc. 4.25.8, 9 and 6.3.1, 50.3, and it is listed, with Tauromenion, as a polis Hellenis by Ps.-Skylax 13, although presumably it no longer existed by the time this treatise was compiled (cf. Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 137); polis in the political sense is found at Thuc. 7.14.2, and the urban and political senses are combined at Hdt. 7.154.2 (cf. Hansen (2000) 205). Patris is found at Diod. 11.49.2 (r476).

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on coins from c.525 (infra); the external collective use is found in Hdt. 7.154.2 and Thuc. 6.50.3 and IG x1.2.245b4 (rC5; cf. Rutherford (1998) 82–83). Externally and individually the ethnic is applied to the oecist Theokles (Suidas s.v. ἐλεγεῖνεν: Θεοκλῆς Náxios; cf. Bérard (1957) 77 n. 1) and to the Olympionikes Teisandros (Pind. fr. 23, Mahler).

The name of the territory is unknown; it is termed γῆ at Thuc. 4.25.8. Its extent is not fully known. However, Naxian influence penetrated above all southwards across the Santa Venera and Alcantara river valleys, as borne out by the foundation of the colonies at Leontinoi (no. 33), Katane (no. 30) and Kallipolis (no. 27). The site of Kallipolis is unknown, but the listing of the city with Katane and Leontinoi suggests a location either in the plain coastal south of Naxos or on the slopes of Mt. Etna (see Kallipolis (no. 27)). The rich C6–C4 votive deposit from the Demeter and Kore sanctuary in the otherwise unknown secondary settlement at Francavilla c.4 km inland along the Akesines (modern Alcantara) river valley has revealed Naxian penetration north-westwards (Spigo (1989); Spigo and Rizzo (1993–94); Hinz (1998) 156–58). To the north the territory bordered upon that of Messana, by whose infantry and navy Naxos was attacked in 425 (Thuc. 4.25.7). Naxos may have had a sanctuary or a secondary settlement also on the higher area of the later foundation of Tauromenion (no. 48) (Bacci (1980–81b) 742, (1984–85) 722–23; according to Diod. 14.88.1, the original colonists had expelled the native population from the site of Tauromenion.

Naxos was the earliest Greek colony in Sicily (for the sources for its history, see Cordano (1984–85)). It was founded by settlers from Chalkis (no. 365) on Euboia one year before the foundation of Syracuse, i.e. traditionally 735/4 (Thuc. 6.3.1; cf. Diod. 14.88.1), and the traditional date (as well as ties with Euboia) is confirmed by ceramic finds from the earliest period of settlement, 740–730 (Pelagatti (1981) 304–11; Lentini (1993–94) 1009). The oecist was Theokles (Thuc. 6.3.1). The primary status of Naxos is borne out by the tradition that the theoroi of the Sicilian colonies offered sacrifice in the sanctuary of Apollo Archegetes at Naxos before setting sail from Sicily (Thuc. 6.3.1). Ephor. fr. 132 (cf. Ps.-Skymnos 273–74) describes the oecist Theokles as an Athenian, but that undoubtedly reflects later Athenian claims to have played a role in the early colonial enterprises in Sicily (Bérard (1957) 78–79). Later sources mention Ionian and Megarian participation (Ephor. fr. 137). Some of the settlers may have come from Cycladic Naxos (cf. Hellan. fr. 82). The Cycladic origin of some of the settlers is supported by the similarity between the coin types used by Sicilian Naxos and by Cycladic Naxos, above all the prominence of Dionysos (Leschhorn (1984) 10 n. 7). In addition, the lettering of the Enyo inscription from the Scalìà sanctuary matches that used in Cycladic Naxos (Guarducci (1985)).

Naxos was subdued by Hippokrates of Gela, who took the city after a siege (Hdt. 7.154). In 476, Hieron of Syracuse transplanted the population of Naxos (and Katane) to Leontinoi, where they were presumably granted citizenship (Diod. 11.49.2), and it seems that he settled new colonists at Naxos (Diod. 11.49.2: ἰδίους οἰκίτορας ἀπέστειλεν, though the interest here seems to centre on Katane; but see infra). The expatriated Naxians presumably returned after Hieron’s death, as did the Kata nanoparticles (Diod. 11.76.3; Asheri (1980)).

According to Thuc. 3.86.2, the Chalkidikai poleis to which Naxos belonged were symmachoi of Leontinoi in its conflict with Syracuse in 427, and the allies seem to have acted as a single body on an embassy to Athens (no. 361) (HCT ad loc.); Leontinoi is specifically named alongside ἄλλους Ἐλληνες ἐξήγαγοι at Thuc. 4.25.9 in reference to Messana’s attack on Naxos in 425. During the Athenian attack on Syracuse, Naxos was allied with Athens (Thuc. 7.14.2), and at the battle of Epipolai at Syracuse in 414 hippeis from Naxos supported the Athenians (Thuc. 6.98.1; cf. 7.57.11).

In 403 Naxos was betrayed by one of its own citizens, Prokles, described as ὁ τῶν Ναξίων ἄφηγοιμενός, and so
presumably a military commander. He surrendered Naxos to Dionysios I, who subjected the city to an exandrapodismos from which it never recovered; the chora of the city was handed over to the Sikels (Diod. 14.15.2–3). A C5 genos of the Amphikleidai organising Naxian theorai to Delos is argued by Rutherford (1998). Naxian survivors were settled at Mylai (no. 38) during the period of Dionysios, Rhegion (no. 68) and Messana (no. 51) in 394 (Diod. 14.87.3; cf. McKechnie (1989) 37), but had to find new homes after the Messanians took Mylai (ibid.). In 358 the Naxians were finally settled at Tauromenion (no. 48) by Andromachos (Diod. 16.7.1); Tauromenion had been a site in Naxian territory (supra), but was constituted as a Greek polys only in C4f. Andromachos himself was its leading citizen when Timoleon arrived in Sicily (Diod. 16.68.8; Plut. Tim. 10.6–8); Marcellin, Vita Thucydidis 27 describes him as exercising monarchia. See further the entry for Tauromenion. Naxos itself, however, may not have been completely abandoned: C3 habitation and cult activity is attested there (Pelagatti (1976–77) 544–45, 1980–81 706).

So far, the only evidence of civic subdivisions at Naxos consists of inscriptions on two clay tablets with patronymika, implying citizen groups possibly matching a system of phylai or phratriai. The chronology of the inscriptions, of C5e and C5l, indicates continuity of this civic organisation from before until after the period of Hieron (Cordano (1988)).

The cult of Dionysos was of major importance at Naxos, as shown by the coin types (Cutroni Tusa (1984–85) 296–97) and the number of Silenos antefixes (Pelagatti (1977) 50–55). A C7l cippus carries a dedication to a warrior-goddess Enyo (Guarducci (1985)), and other evidence points to a cult of the armed Athena (Lentini (1993–94) 1016–17).

Teisandros of Naxos was victorious four times at the Olympic Games (Olympionikai 94 (572) with refs.) and achieved the same number of Pythian victories (Paus. 6.13.8).

The town of Naxos was founded on a low coastal peninsula, Capo Schisò, and material from the initial C8l habitation phase extend over an area of c.10 ha (Pelagatti (1981) 295–97; survey in Pelagatti (1993); bibliography in Lentini (1998) 99–100). The earliest evidence of urban layout is of C7, with main street axes linking the central part of the city westwards with sanctuaries, eastwards with the harbour, and northwards with a kerameikos (Pelagatti (1981) 297–302). The exceptional character of habitation near the harbour reveals social differentiation (Lentini (1984–85) 815–21).

Though a stretch of a Bronze Age fortification laid bare in the Archaic city near the coast (“Castello area”) may have been reutilised by the first Greek settlers (Lentini (2001) 7), Naxos was apparently not fortified before C6m or C6l, probably as a result of the threat posed by the expansion of Gela (no. 17) in north-eastern Sicily (Naxos eventually had to accept Gelaon hegemony (Hdt. 7.154.2)). The walls, built in polygonal masonry with the use of local black lava basalt rock, are preserved on three sides: along the river Santa Venera and along the two coastlines of the peninsula; northwards the course remains to be clarified. Gates protected by towers were located in alignment with streets of the C7 city which covered an area of c.35 ha. The earliest, C7l, polygonal temenos wall of the sanctuary south of the city may have functioned also as a dyke along the river Santa Severa (Pelagatti (1964); (1972); Gras (1998)). Thuc. 4.25.8 attests to the existence of fortifications in 425 (Flensted-Jensen (1995) 128); the fortifications were destroyed (κατασκάπτειν) by Dionysios in 403 (Diod. 14.15.2).

The conquest of the city by Hippokrates in 493 (Hdt. 7.154) has left no clear traces in the archaeological record, apart from its possible reflection in a C5e structural phase of the circuit wall (Lentini (1984–85) 813).

It is not entirely clear from Diod. 11.49.1–2 whether he meant to imply the settlement of a new population at Naxos after the deportation of the inhabitants by Hieron in 476, but the archaeological evidence attests to replanning and resettlement. The Hieronian city was laid out in accordance with a unitary, strictly orthogonal system with narrow insulae and with a new orientation (Pelagatti (1976–77) 537–43; Belvedere (1987) with refs.; Lentini (1998) 72–86). Rectangular bases found at the crossing of plateia and stenopoi have been interpreted as horoi marking the confines of city districts (Pelagatti (1977) 44–46) or as altars (Spagnolo (1991) 66 n. 78). For the archaeological evidence for the destruction in 403 and the C4e history of Naxos, see Lentini (2002).


A C7l sanctuary in the south-west corner of the city, near the estuary of the river Santa Venera, at first within the urban area, was superseded by a C6s hekatompedon outside the city wall. Altars, bases for votive stelai, and ovens for ceramic production go back to the early phase of the sanctuary. The identification of the cult as that of Aphrodite, as yet
uncertain, rests upon the testimony of App. B. Civ. 5.109, but
the river Onobalos mentioned by Appian is normally taken
to be the river Serina or Selina near Taormina and not the
river Santa Venera (cf. Ziegler, RE vi.1.2. 2078; Valenza Mele
(1977) 504–5). Other interpretations: a Heraion, though
with no clear evidence (pace ibid. 505–6); sanctuary of
Apollo Archegetes (Guarducci (1985)), but this was situated
outside the city according to Thuc. 6.3.1; cf. HCT ad loc. A
location for the Apollo sanctuary near the harbour on the
north side of the peninsula, closer to the C8 phase city, seems
most logical (Pelagatti (1978a) 138; Valenza Mele (1977) 505),
a location also supported by App. B Civ. 5.109, which situates
the altar of Apollo north of the city near an anchorage. At
least four C7–C4 small urban shrines were located within the
301, (1984–85) 680–83). The cults of these are uncertain. An
important suburban sanctuary extended over a vast area west
of the city across the river Santa Venera (Lentini
shrines, altars and votive deposits (prime period: C6m). The
two shrines were protected by peribolos walls or embank-
ments. The architectural terracottas, of local production,
indicate richly decorated buildings.

The C8l–C5f cemetery was situated north of the city
(Pelagatti (1980–81) 697–701; Lentini (1986)). The C5
cemetery is located west of the city, on the other side of the river
Santa Venera, south west of the sanctuary (Pelagatti

Naxos minted coins from c.525 on the Chalkidian–
Euboian standard (Cahn (1944)). The main denomina-
tion is the drachm, the smaller denomination the obol
(litrai) (C. Boehringer (1984–85) 113–16); obv. head of
Dionysos; rev. bunch of grapes, legend on both denomina-
tions: the ethnic NAXION (SNG Copp. Sicily 485). This issue
most likely terminated in 493, when the city was taken by
Hippokrates. In 461, when the expatriated Naxians (presum-
ably) returned from Leontinoi, a new coin type was commis-
sioned: a magnificent tetradrachm on the Syracuse–Attic
standard; obv. head of Dionysos; rev. squatting Silenos, leg-
end: NAXION (Head, HN² 160; Kraay (1976) pl. 44.756);
lower denominations are drachms and litra inscribed
NAXI, NAXION (SNG Copp. Sicily 486–92). New issues in
430 carry similar types, legend: NAXION, NAXION,
NAEION (Head, HN² 160; SNG Copp. Sicily 493). The last
issue of 403 has obv. Apollo or Silenos, legend: NEOPOLAI;
rev. river-god Assinos on the smaller denominations (Head,
HN² 160–61; SNG Copp. Sicily 495–96). Bronze coinage was
introduced c.410 (Rutter (1997) 152).

Naxos became the metropolis of Leontinoi (no. 33) and
Katane (no. 30) shortly after its own foundation (Thuc.
6.3.3); other sources list also Kallipolis (no. 27; Strabo 6.2.6)
and even Zankle (no. 51; Ps.-Skyynos 286).

825–26, 830–31; Guletta (1994) 495–96; Gargini (1997)).
Type: Cγγ. The toponym is Πέτρα (Ptol. Geog. 3.4.7). The
city-ethnic is ΠΕΤΡΙΝΟΣ (C4s coins, infra. SEG 30 1121.39
(C4–C3m); Diod. 23.18.5). Diod. 23.18.5 (1254) describes
the Petrinai as in possession of an urbancentre, implicitly
described as a polis. Petra merits inclusion here on account
of its C4s Greek-style coins, restruck on litrai of Dionysos I:
obv. bearded short-haired male head (Zeus?); legend:
ΠΕΤΡΙΝΟΣ; rev. seated Aphrodite playing with dove
(Robinson (1948); Cutroni Tusa (1982b) 843–44; Karlsson
(1995) 166 n. 3(L)).

43. Piakos (Piakinos) Map 47. Unlocated, but possibly to
be identified with Mendolito, near Adranon (Jenkins (1975)
90; Manni (1981) 210; see also entry for Adranon (no. 6)).
Type: Cγγ. The toponym is Πιακός (Steph. Byz. 522.1). The
city-ethnic is ΠΙΑΚΟΣ (C5s coins, infra). No literary source
apart from Steph. Byz. mentions Piakos, which is included
here on account of its Greek-style coinage, consisting of C5s
bronze coins, fractions of litra: obv. head of river-god; rev.
dog attacking deer, on smaller denominations simply a dog;
obv. legend: ΠΙΑΚΩΝ or ΠΙΑΚ (Head, HN² 164; Jenkins
(1975) 87–92; Manganaro (1984) 34). A silver litra of c.400 is
inscribed with the names of both Piakos and Adranon (no.
6), suggesting proximity and collaboration between these
two communities: obv. head of nymph, legend: ΠΙΑΚΩΝΟΣ; rev. butting bull and fish in exergue, legend:
ΑΔΡΑΝΟΣ (Jenkins (1962), (1975) 90, 92).

44. Selinous (Selinousios) Map 47. Lat. 37.35, long. 12.50.
Size of territory: 5. Type: Αχα. The toponym is ΣΕΛΙΝΟΣ, η
(IvO 22.9 (C6l)); ΣΕΛΙΝΟΣ (Hdt. 5.46.2; Thuc. 6.4.2). The
city-ethnic is ΣΕΛΙΝΟΝΤΙΟΣ (C6l coins; IGDS no. 78 (c.450));
ΣΕΛΙΝΟΝΤΙΟΣ (Thuc. 7.58.1); ΣΕΛΙΝΟΝΤΙΟΣ (Hdt. 5.46.2;
Xen. Hell. 1.2.10); or ΣΕΛΙΝΟΝΤΙΟΣ (CID 114.14.46 (361/60)).

Selinus is called a polis in the urban sense by Xen. Hell.
1.1.37 and is listed by Ps.-Skyynos 13 under the heading πόλεις
Ελληνιδῶν αἱδῆ; it is referred to as a polis in the political
sense at Thuc. 6.20.2–3 and 6.48.1. A C6l legal text from
Olympia dealing with exiles from Megara (no. 36; IvO 22;
IGDS no. 28) in fr. f.3 refers to ἀ πόλι ῳ[A]ρλί (cf. according to Asheri
(1979b), the inscription records a treaty between the polis
of Selinous and a group of exiles from Megara; however, the
fragmentary state of the inscription does not allow us to
determine whether the reference is to Megara or to Selinous. A C5m lex sacra refers to τὰ ἱερὰ τὰ δαμασία (A.18) and τοῖ βοµῶν τοῖ δαµασίοι (B.10; Jameson et al. (1993)).

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is attested on C5m coins (infra) and in IGDS no. 78 (c.450; Arena (1989) no. 53); the external collective use is attested in Diod. 5.9.2 (rC6f), Hdt. 5.46.2, Thuc. 6.20.4 and Xen. Hell. 1.2.10. The external individual use is found in IGDS no. 67 (C6l), IG XII.5 444.65.79b (C5f (rC5l)), and F.Delphes III.1 391.2 (c.360).

According to Thuc. 6.4.2, Selinous was founded 100 years after the foundation of its metropolis Megara, i.e. c.628/7. The oecist Pammilos was possibly from the original mother city, Megara Nisaia (no. 225), although the text is ambiguous (cf. HCT ad loc. and Casevitz (1985) 105, 109 n. 27), and a Megara Hyblaian origin cannot be excluded. Diod. 13.59.4 supports the Eusebian date for the foundation of Selinous: 242 years before its destruction in 409/8, i.e. c.651/50 (source: Béard (1957) 244–46). Diodorus’ date is consistent with the chronology of the recently excavated Buffa and Manuzza cemeteries (Tusa (1982) 191–94; Rallo (1982)).

Selinous was the westernmost Greek colony on the south coast of Sicily, founded on the confines of Phoenician and Elymian territories. The size of Selinous’ territory varied, and borders changed (see La Genière (1978)). The C7l immediate hinterland may have comprised 300–400 km². A sanctuary of Herakles near the Hellenised Elymian settlement at Monte Castellazzo di Poggioreale, c.30 km north of Selinous, is deduced from the C6e dedication to Herakles by one Aristylos in the Selinountian alphabet and in Doric dialect (IGDS no. 84; Falsone (1992) 307–8); stone quarries in the catchment area of Selinous served the early building programmes in the sanctuaries of the colony (Peschlows-Bindokat (1990)). With the foundation of Minoa in C6f/m (infra) the area within Selinountian influence may have encompassed c.1,200–1,800 km², and there is clear evidence of Selinountine architects at work by C6 in the Condrada Mango sanctuary at Segesta (Tusa (1961); de La Genière (1978)). The original, indigenous settlement of Monte Adranone, situated on the western border of Selinountine territory, c.30 km north-west of Selinous, resettled by Selinountines in C6m, served as a fortified outpost until C5l (Fiorentini (1995)). The site is perhaps the kome Adranon mentioned by Diod. (23.4.2) in connection with the Punic wars, not to be confused with the Adranon (no. 6) founded by Dionysios.

After initial peaceful co-existence (Tusa (1983) 302–14; Zahrnt (1993) 355–57), a long history of conflicts with the non-Greek populations can be traced: an alliance of Selinous and a colonising expedition led by Pentathlos of Knidos (c.580–576) was defeated by the Elymians (Diod. 5.9.2–3), and conflicts between Greeks, Elymians and Phoenicians are also reflected in the failed expedition of Dorieus in 510 (Hdt. 5.46.1), if not already by the C6 inscription commemorating Aristogeiton, who fell at Motya (IGDS no. 73; Mafoda (1995)). In 480, however, Selinous was the only Greek city of Sicily supporting Carthage against Theron of Akragas and Gelon of Syracuse (Diod. 11.21.4–5, 13.55.1). In 466, Selinous assisted Syracuse in expelling the tyrant Thrasyboulos (Diod. 11.68.1). A victory of uncertain date is mentioned in the 460–409 inscription (IGDS no. 78) from temple “G” (infra) revealing conflicts c.53m with Elymians and/or Phoenicians. Not all relations with the non-Greek populations were hostile, however, and there may have been epigamia between Selinous and Segesta (Thuc. 6.1.2 with HCT).

In 416 the conflict with Segesta (supra) led Selinous to ally itself with Syracuse (Thuc. 6.6.2), and accordingly it supported Syracuse in its war with Athens (Thuc. 6.6.1, 67.2, 7.58.1; cf. Diod. 13.4.2 (1415)). The territorial disputes between Segesta and Selinous in 416 (Thuc. 6.6.2; Diod. 12.82.3) and 410 (Diod. 13.43.1–4) ultimately led to the destruction of Selinous in 409 by Carthage (Diod. 13.55–57), when the houses were burnt or torn down, 16,000 were killed, 5,000 taken prisoners, and 2,600 escaped to Akragas (no. 9; Diod. 13.57.6–58.3). The city was recaptured and fortified by Hermokrates, who also laid waste the territories of Motya and Panormos (Diod. 13.62.3–5 (1409)). As an outcome of adversities suffered by the Carthaginians, Himilcar was forced to sign a peace treaty with Dionysios I in 405, in which, however, it was stipulated that Selinous (and several other cities) were to be unfortified and pay tribute to Carthage (Diod. 13.11.4.1; Staatsverträge no. 210). Yet conflicts between the Greek cities and Carthage continued, and Dionysios, with Selinous and Himera (no. 24), attacked Motya in 397 (Diod. 14.47.7), which implies that, in addition to the eastern Sicilian cities, Himera and Selinous had also come within Dionysios’ hegemony. A second peace treaty of 392 was in most matters similar to that of 405 (Diod. 14.96.3; Staatsverträge no. 233). It seems, however, that Selinous (and the other cities subjected to Carthage by the previous treaty) were now handed over to Dionysios I (see Stylianou (1998) 207). In a peace treaty of c.374 Selinous, its territory, and Akragas were again ceded to the Carthaginians (Diod. 15.17.5 with Stylianou (1998) ad loc.; Staatsverträge no. 261). Selinous was recaptured by Dionysios in 368, but an
Armistice was agreed and the old borders were re-established (Diod. 15.73.2–4), and when Dion visited Herakleia Minoa (west of Selinous) in 357, this city was controlled by Carthage (Diod. 16.9.4). In the 339 treaty between Timoleon and Carthage, Selinous was left within the Carthaginian sphere of interest (Diod. 16.82.3; Staatsverträge no. 344; cf. Talbert (1974) 83–85), and this was confirmed by the treaty between Agathokles and Carthage in 314 (Diod. 19.71.7).

A few scattered sources shed some light on the military strength of Selinous and the size of its population. A contingent of hoplites from Selinous fought alongside the Syracusans in 415 (Thuc. 6.67.2); later, Selinontine psiloi and hippaeis marched to Syracuse under the command of Glyppros (Thuc. 7.1.3–5; cf. Diod. 13.4.7 (1414)); hippaeis are mentioned also in Diod. 11.21.4 (1480). A navy is implied by Thucydidès’ reference to two nees . . . Selinontiai at 8.26.1 (cf. Xen. Hell. 1.2.8 for another two). In reference to 410, Diod. 13.44.3 describes Selinous as a polis polyandrousa, and a hint of the C3l size of population is found in the figures of 16,000 inhabitants killed and 5,000 captives taken by the Carthaginians in 409 (Diod. 13.57.6); this had already been preceded by the loss of 1,000 men in an ambush (Diod. 13.44.4 (1410)). Even so, 2,600 escaped to Akragas (Diod. 13.58.3). A full mobilisation of forces is mentioned in Diod. 14.47.7 (1397).

Diplomatic activities include the reception of envoys (Diod. 11.68.1 (1466)) as well as the sending of envoys (Diod. 11.21.4 (1480), bibliaphoroi, cf. 13.54.3 (1409), 13.43.7, 44.4 (1409)). F. Delphes III.1 391 (c.360–355) is a grant of various privileges by Delphi (no. 177) to a man of Selinous. A grant of politeia to Selinontians by Ephesos (no. 844) is recorded by Xen. Hell. 1.2.10; it was prompted by the destruction of the city.

What we know about the constitution indicates that Selinous was mostly governed by tyrants, at least in the Archaic period. Tyranny is attested in connection with the C6l expedition of Dorieus, whose συγκτιστής Euryleon liberated the Selinontians from the mounarchos Pythagoras but went on to assume monarchical power himself (Hdt. 5.46.2; cf. Luraghi (1994) 54–55; Mafoda (1995)). An earlier tyranny at Selinous (C5m or C6f) may be suggested by the anecdote of “Theron, son of Miltiades” assuming tyrannical power by a stratagem (Polyaen. 1.28.2; full discussion: Luraghi (1994) 52–54). The αἰσιµνάτας of Ivo 22 (IGDS no. 28 (C6l)) refers to a magistracy attested also in Megara Nisaia (no. 225) and other Megarian colonies (Dubois ad IGDS no. 28 fr.b.5–6 with refs.); however, the context does not make clear whether the reference is to Selinous or to Megara (for the office in general, see Asheri (1979b) 490). The text may mention a ἁλία διαίτης (see Arena (1989) no. 52 fr. h.4; Asheri (1979b)). Whether this Selinontine (?) hali̇a should be interpreted as an ekklesia or a special court is uncertain; Asheri opts for an ad hoc tribunal (Asheri (1979b) 490). Two C5 public enactingments are preserved: a lex sacra of C5m (Jameson et al. (1993)) and IGDS no. 78 = IG xiv 268 (C5m/s), which lists Selinontine divinities and incorporates a decree. A metoikos at Selinous is mentioned by Callim. fr. 201 (Pfeiffer) Dieg. ix.15–16 (referring to the period before Timaios wrote, cf. FGrHist 566, fr. 148). A C6–C5 dedicatory inscription attests the existence of a πατριά whose members are given as two groups of women (Lazzarinii no. 880e; cf. Jameson et al. (1993) 96); it is not clear whether this was a public or a private institution.

A C6f dedication by the citizens of Selinous and the metopes of Temple C testify to the Selinontian pantheon in which the principal divinity seems to be Zeus (IG xiv 268; SEG 38 960; SEG 43 628; IGDS no. 78; see also Jameson et al. (1993)).

Selinous had a thesauros at Olympia (Paus. 6.19.11 (rC5)). The foundation of the building has with some probability been identified, and C5e architectural terracottas have with some uncertainty been associated with it (Mertens-Horn and Viola (1990) 240).

The town of Selinous was founded on a vast plateau, c.1.3 km long, oriented roughly north–south between the ancient river Selinous, from which the city took its name (Douris (FGrHist 76) fr. 59), to the west, and the river Cotone to the east. The site comprises three hills separated by the river valleys, the city occupying the central plateau, while the two lateral plateaux, the Gaggera to the west and the Marinella to the east, were dedicated to sanctuaries (Martin et al. (1979) 637–53; cf. Parisi Presicce (1984) fig. 2 and 127–32 for topographical surveys). The southern plateau, facing the coast and often regarded as the acropolis of the city, owes its acropolis-like appearance to an artificial accentuation of the morphology of the site due to C4l and C3l defensive structures (Di Vita (1980)).

C5m/s habitation remains on the northern, Manuzza plateau (Rallo (1976–1977), (1984)) and on the “acropolis” (Fourmont (1984–85)) have revealed an overall coherence in the urbanisation of the two areas. Unusually, a cemetery is situated within the urban area on the Manuzza. A large part of the “acropolis” was laid out as a temenos from C7. There is also coherence between the three major plateaux of the site.
from C7: the Manuzza plateau and “acropolis”, the Marinella plateau east of the river Hypsas with a C7 shrine (Gullini (1993)), and the Gaggera plateau west of the river Selinous with the Malophoros sanctuary and the C7 megaron (Romeo (1989) 40, no. 64). The main east–west axis on the “acropolis” joined the estuaries of the two rivers and the harbours of Selinous, the eastern harbour possibly military, the western harbour possibly commercial.

In the second urban phase, from c.C6e, the habitation area and urban layout encompassed also the east and west slopes of the central plateau with parts of the confining valleys (de La Genière and Rougetet (1985); Mertens (1999) 188–90). Habitation on the northernmost part of the Manuzza plateau was laid out on a different orientation to that employed on the “acropolis” and on the southern part of Manuzza plateau, and an agora at the junction of these separate urban districts is similar to the location of the agora at Megara (Mertens (1999) 190–93). Rallo (1976–77) 731 has suggested that the differences in orientation could reflect different populations, and a Corinthian ethnic group has been deduced from epigraphic and tomb evidence (cf. de La Genière (1977) 257; IGDS nos. 72 and 79). The C6–C5 urban area comprised about 100 ha (Mertens (1989) fig. 4, (1999) fig. on p. 188).

A theatre, possibly serving as the meeting place for the assembly, is mentioned in Callim. fr. 201, Pfeiffer, Dieg. 1.x.22–23 (referring to the period before Timaios wrote, cf. FGrHist 566, fr. 148).

So far none of the defensive walls of the “acropolis” can be dated earlier than the C5l Hermokraten structures of 409, when the Syracusan exiles seized Selinous for a short period in connection with the Carthaginian war (Diod. 13.63.3–4; ibid. 185–86). By contrast, the outer circuit wall and gates in the Hypsas valley, marking the eastern limit of the city, are of C6f and C5e (Mertens (1989) 138–39). A circuit wall across the Manuzza plain was probably raised by Hermokrates in 409 (ibid. 139–43). The sophisticated fortification and gate system on the north side of the acropolis, comparable with the Euryalos fortification at Syracuse, may in its final phase be the work of Agathokles during his short occupation of Selinous in 307 (Diod. 20.56.3; cf. Lawrence (1979) 295; Mertens (1989) 110–31, 151).

The central and south-eastern part of the “acropolis” was from early on occupied by at least two temene (Gabrici (1929)); the south temenos with two parallel temples of C5f, “O” and “A” (divinities unknown). The central temenos has traces of simple C7l–C6e naiiskoi. There is no structural evidence for a major C6 peripteral temple, but architectural terracottas are taken as evidence for one. As part of the C6f regular urban plan, the sanctuary was enclosed by peribolos walls from 580 to 560 (Ostby (1995)). A large artificial terrace supported by a huge, stepped retaining wall of ashlars are taken as evidence for one. As part of the C6f regular urban plan, the sanctuary was enclosed by peribolos walls from 580 to 560 (Ostby (1995)). A large artificial terrace supported by a huge, stepped retaining wall of ashlars are taken as evidence for one. As part of the C6f regular urban plan, the sanctuary was enclosed by peribolos walls from 580 to 560 (Ostby (1995)). A large artificial terrace supported by a huge, stepped retaining wall of ashlars are taken as evidence for one. As part of the C6f regular urban plan, the sanctuary was enclosed by peribolos walls from 580 to 560 (Ostby (1995)). A large artificial terrace supported by a huge, stepped retaining wall of ashlars are taken as evidence for one. As part of the C6f regular urban plan, the sanctuary was enclosed by peribolos walls from 580 to 560 (Ostby (1995)). A large artificial terrace supported by a huge, stepped retaining wall of ashlars are taken as evidence for one. As part of the C6f regular urban plan, the sanctuary was enclosed by peribolos walls from 580 to 560 (Ostby (1995)). A large artificial terrace supported by a huge, stepped retaining wall of ashlars are taken as evidence for one. As part of the C6f regular urban plan, the sanctuary was enclosed by peribolos walls from 580 to 560 (Ostby (1995)). A large artificial terrace supported by a huge, stepped retaining wall of ashlars are taken as evidence for one. As part of the C6f regular urban plan, the sanctuary was enclosed by peribolos walls from 580 to 560 (Ostby (1995)). A large artificial terrace supported by a huge, stepped retaining wall of ashlars are taken as evidence for one. As part of the C6f regular urban plan, the sanctuary was enclosed by peribolos walls from 580 to 560 (Ostby (1995)). A large artificial terrace supported by a huge, stepped retaining wall of ashlars are taken as evidence for one. As part of the C6f regular urban plan, the sanctuary was enclosed by peribolos walls from 580 to 560 (Ostby (1995)). A large artificial terrace supported by a huge, stepped retaining wall of ashlars are taken as evidence for one. As part of the C6f regular urban plan, the sanctuary was enclosed by peribolos walls from 580 to 560 (Ostby (1995)). A large artificial terrace supported by a huge, stepped retaining wall of ashlars are taken as evidence for one. As part of the C6f regular urban plan, the sanctuary was enclosed by peribolos walls from 580 to 560 (Ostby (1995)). A large artificial terrace supported by a huge, stepped retaining wall of ashlars are taken as evidence for one. As part of the C6f regular urban plan, the sanctuary was enclosed by peribolos walls from 580 to 560 (Ostby (1995)). A large artificial terrace supported by a huge, stepped retaining wall of ashlars are taken as evidence for one. As part of the C6f regular urban plan, the sanctuary was enclosed by peribolos walls from 580 to 560 (Ostby (1995)). A large artificial terrace supported by a huge, stepped retaining wall of ashlars are taken as evidence for one. As part of the C6f regular urban plan, the sanctuary was enclosed by peribolos walls from 580 to 560 (Ostby (1995)). A large artificial terrace supported by a huge, stepped retaining wall of ashlars are taken as evidence for one.
Meilichyos bordered on that of Demeter (Gabrici 1927: 91–107; Tusa 1977), with a cult that is characterised by a number of C6s–C5 crude and simple stone stelai carrying votive inscriptions (earliest C6m: IGDS nos. 45, 50; Jameson et al. 1993: 89–107, 132–36) and by later defixiones (IGDS nos. 35, 39, 40). To the south, a peribolos wall, parallel to that of the Demeter sanctuary, enclosed yet another temenos and temple of uncertain cult (Parisi Presicce 1984: 21–24). A C6 temple “M” marks the north end of the row of sanctuaries (Sguaitammati 1993).

The inscription from temple “G” (IGDS no. 78) mentions Zeus, Phobos, Heraclès, Apollo, Poseidon, the Tyndaridai, Athena, (Demeter) Malophoros and Pasikrateia (Persephone?). The second part of the dedication, the inscription from temple “M” marks the north end of the row of sanctuaries (Sguaitammati 1993).

The earliest cemetery is the one situated in the south-east of the Manuzza plateau dating from before C7m and in use throughout C7, the early material reflecting the Megarian origin of Selinous (Rallo 1982). Contemporaneously and in subsequent periods cemeteries were laid out on the hills surrounding the urban site: C7m on the Buffa hills north-east of the Manuzza plateau (Tusa 1982: 196–202); C6e and C5, mainly inhumation tombs, some cremation and a few child enchytrismos burials on the Gaggera hills west of the Manuzza plateau, and C7s tombs on the Galera hills north of the Manuzza plateau (Vallet and Villard 1958).

Selinous was one of the first Sicilian cities to issue coins, c.540–530: staters probably initially on the Corinthian standard but at the end of the Archaic phase on the Attic. Types: obv. celery leaf (σάλπυρον); rev. patterned punch-mark in incuse square (SNG Cop. Sicily 591–93; SNG Cop. Suppl. 73). Later issues have rev. celery leaf in incuse square, legend: ΣΕΛΙΝΟΣ with variations (SNG Cop. Sicily 594). Three smaller fractions carry rev. celery leaf, or flower, or pellets (Cutroni Tusa 1975); C.Boehringer (1984–85) 116–19; SNG Cop. Sicily 595–96). A unique drachm carries the unabbreviated city-ethnic as legend (Cutroni Tusa 1988–89: 370–71). Confirmation of Corinthian influence on early Sicilian coinage and imports of bullion from the Aegean area is given by a C6l coin and bullion hoard found near Selinous (ibid. 1988–89: 397–98). Minting of Syracuse-inspired tetradrachms began c.450: obv. sacred chariot with Apollo and Artemis, legend: ΣΕΛΙΝΟΝΤΙΩΝ; rev. naked youth, the river-god Selinous, offering a libation at an altar in a sanctuary, l. below cock, on r. celery leaf and statue of bull, legend: ΣΕΛΙΝΟΝΤΙΩΝ (SNG Cop. Sicily 597). The types of the lower denomination (didrachms) are: obv. Heraclès fighting Cretan bull, legend: ΣΕΛΙΝΟΝΤΙΩΝ; rev. river-god Hypsas, legend: ΗΥΨΑΣ (SNG Cop. Sicily 601); on smaller denominations, obv. nymph seated on rock (SNG Cop. Sicily 602–3). The issues continue with variants until 409 (SNG Cop. Sicily 604–6). Bronze coinage was issued at least from c.420 (Price 1979); Rutter (1997) 142); however, an issue of cast coins may go back to 450–440 (Cutroni Tusa 1997–98: 646–47).

Selinous founded the colony of (Herakleia) Minoa (no. 20) (Hdt. 5.46.2) on the estuary of the river Platani c.66f/m to secure its eastern territory against Akragantine expansion, but after the short-lived rule of Euryleon, the colony was taken by Akragas (no. 9); during Theron’s reign (488–473) it seems to have been a city within Akragantine dominion, possibly after conquest by Theron (cf. Diod. 4.79.4 with Fontana 1978); see further Herakleia (no. 20).


The Stielanaioi struck coins from c.460 onwards; they may have been based at the Στύελλα of Steph. Byz. 588.7, but see Manni (1974) 64 and (1981) 227, who points out that a form such as *ΣΤΥΕΛΑΛΩΣ is to be expected on the basis of the ethnic Stielanaioi. The Stielanaioi are included here on account of their Greek-style coinage: this coinage began with an issue of silver litrai c.460: obv. forepart of man-headed bull, legend: ΣΤΙΕΛΑΝΑΙΟΣ /Ν (retrograde); rev. male figure (river-god?) sacrificing at altar. Later issues (drachms and lower denominations): obv. male head laureate (river-god or, perhaps more likely, Apollo); rev. forepart of man-headed bull, legend: ΣΤΙΛΑ (Head, HN2 171; Bernabò Brea 1975: 49–51; Holloway 1975: 142–43; Manganaro 1984: 35–36; survey of find-places: Cutroni Tusa 1997–98: 650; cf. AIN 42 (1995) pl. 26, fig. 2). The types reveal strong influence from the contemporary mints of Katane and Leontinoi. The Stielanaioi are considered a Greek community by Mirone (1928), followed by Ziegler
(1940), founded Cē in the hinterland of Katane (no. 30) and Leontinoi (no. 33) in the aftermath of the Deinomened aggression against these cities.

47. Syrakousai (Syrakosios) Map 47. Lat. 37.05, long. 15.15. Size of territory: 5. Type: Λαν. The toponym is Συράκουσας (σύ) at (Hecat. fr. 74; Thuc. 5.4.3; IG IV 2, 1951.1.39 (356/5)) or Συρήκοσις (Hdt. 7.156.1; Pind. Ol. 6.6 and Bacchyl. Ep. 5.104 have Συρακόσια; Συράκοσια is found at Pind. Pyth. 2.1. The city-ethnic is Συράκοσιος (C5 coins, infra; Thuc. 3.103.1; IGDS no. 94 (474)) and Συρηκόσιος (Hdt. 7.155.2). Also spelled Συράκοσιος (Cēl–Cē coins, infra; IGDS no. 93 (4.480); cf. IG VII 1, 217 (C5e): [Συρ][ακοσιον].

Syracuse is called a polis both in the urban sense (Hdt. 7.155.2; Thuc. 6.65.3; Ps.-Skylax 13) and in the political sense (Hdt. 7.154.2; Thuc. 6.36.2 and Xen. Hell. 1.1.28). Its politeia was described by Aristotle (Arist. fr. 602.1). Politeusthai is found at Arist. Pol. 131b39, polites at Arist. Pol. 130b38, politeuma at Arist. Pol. 130b26, damosios at SEG 38 368 (c.475), and demos at Thuc. 6.35.1. Aostoi referring to the citizens is found at Pind. Pyth. 3.71 and asty referring to the city occurs in AG 13.15 (C4e). For Patris, see Thuc. 6.68.8; 69.3 and Isoc. 3.23.

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is attested on coins from Cēl onwards (infra); the external collective use is found in IV O 661 (C6), IGDS no. 89 (485–470), Hdt. 3.125.2 and Thuc. 3.103.1. The external individual use is attested in Egypt-Delta 1 694/511 (C6–C5), IV O 266 (c.480), Thuc. 4.58, IG II 2 101.2 (372/1) and CID 1 4.1 40 (360).

Syracuse was founded by Archias, a Heraklid from Corinth (no. 227; Thuc. 6.3.2; cf. Strabo 8.6.22). According to Strabo 6.2.4 and Ps.-Skymnos 279–82 the founders included a group of Dorians who had come to found Megara (no. 36) but fell out with the other colonists and then joined the Corinthian founders of Syracuse. The exact date of the foundation, as well as its date relative to those of the other early colonies in Sicily, is much debated: according to Thuc. 6.3.1 (probably based on Athionios of Syracuse), the city was founded only a year after Naxos, the earliest of the Sicilian colonies. On the other hand, Ephor. fr. 137a (apud Strabo 6.2.2) stated that Naxos (no. 41) and Megara (no. 36) were the earliest colonies, and the unemended text of Strabo 6.2.4 presupposes that Megara was founded shortly before Syracuse. Thuc. 6.3.2 gives the foundation date as 733/2 (supported by Eusebius, cf. Béard 1957) 120 with refs.). However, a date c.838 is indicated by Marmor Parium (FGrHist 239) A 31, which places Archias seven generations after Temenos and the return of the Herakleidai.

The name of the territory was τῇ Συρακοσίᾳ (Thuc. 6.52.2); it is termed γῆ at Thuc. 7.42.6 and χώρα at 6.45. After its foundation, Syracuse quickly expanded its territory; by Cēl it extended as far to the south-west as Heloros (no. 18), a Syraccusan colony founded in Cēl–Cē; by 664 it extended inland as far as Akrai (no. 10), a colony founded in that year (Thuc. 6.5.2); by Cēs it had expanded further westwards to Kasmenai (no. 29), a colony founded in 644 (Thuc. 6.5.3). To the north, Thapsos formed the border with Megara (no. 36); Kamarina (no. 28) was founded in 598 on the border between the areas of influence of Syracuse and Gela (Di Vita 1956; 1987). Heloros, Akrai and Kasmenai were possibly constituted as dependent poleis in the territory of Syracuse (see the respective entries); Kamarina was also in one way or another dependent on Syracuse. Herodotos reports that Kamarina of old belonged to Syracuse (7.154.3), and Thucydides refers to a Cēm apostasis from Syracuse by Kamarina (6.5.3). The Cē–Cē Syraccusan dominion comprised an area of about 3,000–3,500 km². During the Cēf rule of the Deinomenedai, Syracuse incorporated or exercised influence over the territories of Kamarina, Megara, Leontinoi and Naxos; by 440 all native communities were ruled by Syracuse (Diod. 12.29.2–4); after Dionysios I’s peace with Carthage in 392, Syracuse ruled over all of central and eastern Sicily (Karlsson 1992 map 2.a), and over parts of South Italy including Rhegion (no. 68) and southern Calabria.

The size of the population is unknown, and it must have been subject to constant changes due to the many relocations carried out during the Classical period. The known incorporations of foreign groups into the Syraccusan citizen body are the following: (1) Gelon transplanted and granted Syraccusan citizenship to (a) all the Kamarinais, (b) half of the Gelons, (c) the pachées of Megara, (d) the pachées of the city of Euboia (Hdt. 7.156.2–3); (e) he also granted citizenship to more than 10,000 mercenaries (Diod. 11.72.3). (2) After the congress in Gela in 424, the dynatoi of Leontinoi were relocated to Syracuse and were granted citizenship (Thuc. 5.4.2; cf. Xen. Hell. 2.3.5). (3) Dionysios I enlarged the citizen body by enrolling (a) eleutheromenoi as neopolitai (Diod. 14.7.4); (b) the inhabitants of Leontinoi, who were granted citizenship (Diod. 14.15.4); (c) the inhabitants of Italian Kaulonia, who were granted citizenship and ateleia for five years (Diod. 14.106.3); (d) the inhabitants of Italian Hipponion (though it is not specified at Diod. 14.107.2 that these received citizenship). (4) Timoleon (a) made the people of Agyrion (and possibly Kentoripa) citizens of Syracuse (Diod. 16.82.4); (b) relocated the population of Leontinoi to
Syracuse (and presumably granted them citizenship, though this is not specified at Diod. 16.82.7); (c) settled 5,000 new colonists (Diod. 16.82.3; cf. Plut. Tim. 23); and (d) later several myriads more (40,000 according to Diod. 16.82.5; perhaps 60,000 according to Athanis (FGrHist 562) fr. 2; cf. Talbert (1974) 30). In the Classical period, Syracuse was the largest city of Sicily (Hecat. fr. 74; Thuc. 7.58.4), in extent second only to Agragae, for which city Diodoros (13.84.3 (1406) gives the figure of 20,000 citizens. Drögemüller (1969) 100 suggests an urban population of 40,000–45,000 for Syracuse, a guessestimate which may be a little on the high side in view of the size of the C3 habitation area, c.150 ha (infra). It is impossible to estimate the number of citizens from the few hints given by Thucydides about the size of the Syracusan army in 415 (6.67.2: πανδηµείας, number of cavalry given as 1,200).

Treaties of C6m with Megara, Enna (Kasmenei? cf. the entry for Kasmenei) and presumably Gela are strongly implied by Philistos (FGrHist 556) fr. 5, who refers to a war between Syracuse and Kamarina and their allies. In 492 a treaty with Hippokrates of Gela after his defeat of the Syracusans came about through arbitration by Corinth (no. 227) and Korkyra (no. 123) (Hdt. 7.154.3; cf. Thuc. 6.5.3). Gelon’s victory at Himera induced nearly all the cities of Sicily to recognize his power and to enter into a symmachia with him (Diod. 11.26.2). Syracuse was a party to the pan-Sicilian agreement concluded at the Congress of Gela in 442 by which it ceded Morgantina (no. 37) to Kamarina (no. 28) in return for a specified payment (Thuc. 4.65.1). During the war with Leonintoi (no. 33) in the 420s, Syracuse had treaties of symmachia with the Dorian cities of Sicily (except for Kamarina) and with Italian Lokroi (no. 59; Thuc. 3.86.2–3) and Lipara (no. 34) (Thuc. 3.88.3), and it ruled a number of Selk communities kata kratos (103.1), receiving aparche from them (Thuc. 6.20.4).

Numerous Syracusan exiles are on record; the earliest are the Myletians mentioned at Thuc. 6.5.1 who joined the Zanklaians (no. 51) in founding Himera (no. 24) in 648. Exiles are attested under Deinomenid rule (Diod. 11.67.5), and in C5m seven sentences of exile were decreed by petalismos (Diod. 11.87.4 (rC5m)). Exiles collaborated with the Athenians during their attack (Thuc. 6.64.1). A collective sentence of exile was passed on the strategoi after the battle of Kyzikos (Xen. Hell. 1.1.27). In 406 a general recall of exiles was voted by the assembly (Diod. 13.92.4–7).

The city waged numerous wars; the earliest known is the C6m war with its colony Kamarina in which both were supported by allies (Philistos (FGrHist 556) fr. 5). Apart from the military victories of the Deinomenidai, the most spectacular triumph was that of the democracy which, eventually joined by all Sicilian poleis except Akragas (no. 9) (Thuc. 7.33, 58), defeated the invading Athenians (Thuc. 6–7). The Deinomenidai raised huge armies, but these can hardly have been recruited from Syracuse alone, and Deinomenid employment of mercenaries was extensive (Parke (1933) 10–13); in 480 Gelon raised 50,000 foot and 5,000 horse (Diod. 11.21); Thrasyboulos raised 15,000 soldiers (Diod. 11.67.7 (1466)) and controlled a navy (Diod. 11.68.3 (1466)). But even during Deinomenid rule there are references to civic forces proper (Diod. 11.67.5; politikai dunameis). In 471, 2,000 Syracusans fell in battle against Akragas (Diod. 11.53.5).

In 439, the democracy had 100 triremes constructed (Diod. 12.30.1), and Thucydides twice refers to eighty ships in action (7.22.1, 38.1). Trierarchoi are attested at Xen. Hell. 1.1.28 (cf. IG II¼ 105.37 (368/7)), naval commanders at Thuc. 7.25.1, and a nauarchos at Diod. 11.88.4 (1453). Navies are mentioned also at e.g. Thuc. 7.52.1 (seventy-six ships); Xen. Hell. 1.2.10 (twenty-five ships), and Diod. 13.13.1 (1431) (seventy-four ships). Hoplites are mentioned at Thuc. 6.67.2, (pandemei, but no figure); a corps of 600 epelektos is attested for 461 (Diod. 11.76.2; cf. Thuc. 6.66.3 for 600 logades hoplites) and 3,000 stratiotai epelektos are attested for 409 (Diod. 13.59.1). Akontistai are attested at Thuc. 6.67.2 and psiloi at 6.52.2, 7.78.3. Hippies are mentioned at e.g. Thuc. 6.67.2, where they are said to number not less than 1,200. The democracy too hired mercenaries (Thuc. 7.48.5). During the democracy the board of strategoi had fifteen members (five from each tribe?); but during the Athenian invasion it was reduced to three strategoi autokratores (Thuc. 6.73.1), perhaps one from each tribe. Strategoi are referred to also at e.g. Thuc. 6.40.2; Xen. Hell. 1.1.27; IG II¼ 105.36 (368/7); and Diod. 11.91.2 (1451). Dionysios I in 405 raised 30,000 foot, 1,000 horse and 50 ships (Diod. 13.109.2).

Sending of envoys is attested at Diod. 11.68.1 (1466), Thuc. 4.58 (Congress of Gela), 73.2, 75.2; reception of envoys is attested at Diod. 12.8.4 (446) and 13.44.4 (1410). A grant of prozexy by Delphi (no. 177) to a citizen of Syracuse is recorded by F. Delphes 111.1 437 (331/30); IG II¼ 101 (375/2) is an honific decree for a citizen of Syracuse by Athens (no. 361). The inhabitants of Antandros (no. 767) decreed honorific citizenship to the citizens of Syracuse in recognition of military help in an Athenian invasion (Xen. Hell. 1.1.26). For block grants of Syracusan citizenship, see below. A citizen of Syracuse served as theorodokos of Epidaurus (no. 348) in 356/5 (IG I¼ 1.95.139); cf. 11.61.

The constitution of Syracuse is known almost exclusively from literary sources, and the only relevant inscriptions are
a few dedications found in Olympia and Delphi (infra). Hippys of Rhegion (FGrHist 554 fr. 4 refers to a Pollis Argeios describing him as having been king (ἐβασίλευε) of Syracuse, presumably before C5 (Carlier (1984) 467; he is described as tyrannos in Arist. fr. 602.1). However, the original constitution of the city was an aristocracy of Gamoroi (Marmor Parium (FGrHist 239) 36 (rC7)—C6e; cf. also IGDS no. 219 with Dubois’ comm.; Diod. 8.11), who ruled both the demos (Hdt. 7.155.2) and a serf population called the Kylyrioi (ibid. and Arist. fr. 603). In C5 the Gamoroi were expelled by the demos and retired to the Syracusan colony of Kasmenai (no. 29), whence they were brought back by Gelon, to whom the demos handed over both itself and the polis (see E. W. Robinson (1997) 120–22 with Arist. Pol. 3.2.3–32 for democracy at Syracuse at this stage). Gelon moved his seat from Gela (no. 17) to Syracuse, and from that point the city was ruled by the tyrant dynasty of the Deinomenidai: Gelon (485–478/7; see Berse (1967) 142–47), Hieron (478–466; see Berse (1967) 147–52), and Thrasyboulos (466/5). The assembly is attested during Gelon’s reign (Diod. 11.26.6). The tyranny was brought to an end in 466/5, when the Syracusans revolted against Thrasyboulos (Arist. Pol. 3.121.10–16) and expelled him in collaboration with forces from Gela (no. 17), Akragas (no. 9), Selinous (no. 44) and Himera (no. 24) (Diod. 11.67.5–68.5); Arist. Pol. 3.132.10–11 suggests that the Deinomenidai may have been weakened by internal rivalry. Democracy was now reintroduced (Arist. Pol. 3.131.62–33; Diod. 11.68.6), and at least some of the population relocations carried out by Gelon were reversed (Diod. 11.76.3–5; Strabo 6.2.3). The assembly (ekklesia) passed a decree (epsephisanto) to the effect that only archaioi politai were entitled to hold office (Diod. 11.72.2). Seven thousand of the mercenaries enfranchised by Gelon were thus excluded from office (Diod. 11.73.1), though they remained citizens (Arist. Pol. 13.91.1); this led to civil war (ibid.), which the mercenaries lost (Diod. 11.76.2; cf. Arist. Pol. 13.93.8ff). A koinon dogma by all the poleis of Sicily then reversed all population relocations of C5 and assigned Messana (no. 51) to the mercenaries (Diod. 11.76.5 (1460)). The democracy lasted until the tyranny of Dionysios I (for the democracy in this period, see Rutter (2000)); during the democracy, the working of the assembly is attested (Thuc. 6.32.3, 72.1; Diod. 11.72, 92.2; cf. Thuc. 6.35.2 for a demou prostates and Diod. 11.92.2 (1451) for a hint of the procedure of probouleusis (Rutter (2000) 145)), and foreign policy was among its responsibilities (Thuc. 7.2.1); magistracies were originally filled by election (Diod. 11.73.1); Thuc. 6.38.5 suggests that a law specified a minimum age for office holding. The procedure of petalismos was instituted in imitation of Athenian ostracism to prevent the appearance of new tyrants; it led to several banishments, but had to be revoked because it alienated the upper class (Diod. 11.86–87; Rutter (2000) 146–48). After the victory over Athens the demos assumed still greater power (Arist. Pol. 13.94–27–9: ὁ δήμος . . . ἐκ πολιτείας εἰς δημοκρατίαν μετέβαλε). An important revision of the legislative code took place in this period (412/11 according to Diodorus: a commission of nomothenai presided over by Diokles drew up the so-called Laws of Diokles (13.35); one reform changed the procedure for appointing magistrates from election to sortition (13.34.6). Tyranny returned to Syracuse with Dionysios I, who ruled the city from his appointment as strategos autokrator in 406 (Diod. 13.95.1) to his death in 367 (see further Caven (1990)). Dionysios presumably carried out a γῆς ἀναδασµός to consolidate his grip on power (Diod. 14.7.4–5 (1404)). IG ii2 105.35–37 (368/7) suggests that in formal terms the democratic constitution remained in existence during Dionysios’ reign (cf. Arist. Oec. 1349–14.26, 34 for the ekklesia during his reign). After his death several tyrants were in power until the intervention of Timoleon in 344 put an end to a period of unrest and reintroduced democracy (see Talbert (1974)). By the later C4 the city was ruled by “the oligarchy of the Six Hundred” until tyranny returned once more with Agathokles (see Wickert in RE iv.2, 1518–23).

Syracuse experienced perhaps more stases than any other Greek polis (Berger (1992) 34–49 studies nineteen cases from the Archaic period down to the age of Timoleon. One stasis occurred prior to the foundation of Himera in 648: Thuc. 6.5.1 mentions that a group of phygades from Syracuse στάσεις νικηθέντες joined the Zanklaians in founding Himera (Berger (1992) 34). Another stasis occurred “in ancient times” and developed from a conflict between office-holders into a conflict involving all citizens; it led to a change in the constitution (Arist. Pol. 13.93.20–26; cf. Berger (1992) 35). Plut. Mor. 825C, relating this event, mentions a βουλή convened to solve the political differences.

One of the earliest known public enactments is a law regulating funerary expenses which is attested during Gelon’s reign (Diod. 11.38.2). A death sentence and execu-
tion are recorded by Diod. 11.91.2 (1451); confiscation of property of convicts is attested by Diod. 13.93.2 (1406).

An eponymous epipolos is attested from the time of Timoleon onwards (Diod. 16.70.6 (1344)). Arist. Pol. 13.93.23 has a general reference to archai “in ancient times”; the boule is attested in the same period (by Plut. Mor. 825C (supra))
and is mentioned in IG II² 105.36 (368/7). Thucydides provides some general references to officials (7.73.3: οἱ ἐν τέλει ὄντες; 7.73.4: οἱ ἄρχοντες); and Diod. 11.92.2 (1451) has a general reference to archontes convening the assembly (cf. 13.91.4 (1406)). IG II² 105.35 (368/7) also provides a general reference to archontes.

A system of phylai is attested by Thuc. 6.100.1; it served inter alia as the basis for the army organisation (cf. Plut. Nic. 14.6). The number of strategoi indicates that there were three phylai; they were presumably the traditional Dorian set of Hycleis, Dymanes and Pamphylloi (Jones, POAG 173–76). A roster of all Syracusan citizens as organised into their phylai was stored in the Olympieion (Plut. Nic. 14.6 (1415), see 229).

Eisphora is attested during the reign of Dionysios I (Arist. Pol. 1313b26ff, Oec. 1349b6); tribute received from subjected natives is attested in Thuc. 6.20.4. According to Diod. 14.46.1 (1398), a sizeable body of Carthaginians lived in Syracuse as free non-citizens.

The splendidly celebrated Panhellenic victories of Hieron (Olympionikai 221, 234, 246; Find. Ol. 1, Pyth. 1–3; Bacchyl. Ep. 3–5; cf. Harrell (2002)) were not the only victories won by Syracusans; see Olympionikai 51 (648), 219 (476), 248 (468), and 334 (420). In C5f, Astylos of Kroton was proclaimed a Syrakosios at several of his Olympic victories (Olympionikai 186–87), and Diod. 11.1.2 describes him as such. Dikon of Kaulonia must have been among the Kaulonians relocated to Syracuse by Dionysios I (supra); he was proclaimed a Syrakosios at his subsequent victories (Olympionikai 388–89) and is described as such by Diod. 15.14.1 (cf. Stylianou (1998) ad loc.). For a C4l victor in the Arkadian Lykaia, see IG V.2 550.20.

The principal divinities of Syracuse seem to have been Apollo, Artemis, Athena and Zeus (Olympios), to all of whom temples were erected in the Archaic period (infra).

All preserved communal dedications are of C5. IG v.1 217 is presumably a C5f dedication by Syracuse at Sparta (no. 345). Whereas Gelon dedicated spoils from the battle of Himera (480) at Delphi in his own name (ML 28 = IGDS no. 93; cf. Diod.11.26.7; for the structure: Krumenich (1991)), spoils from the victory at Kyme in 474 were dedicated jointly at Olympia by Ηνδρόν δέ Εὐανεμένος καὶ τοῦ Συρακόσιοι (ML 29 = IGDS no. 94; cf. Horos 1 (083) 59; Yalouris (1980) 14–15; O. Hansen (1990); Harrell (2002)). A treasury was built at Olympia from the spoils of Himera (Paus. 6.19.7; οἱ Καρχηδόνων θησαυρός; for the structural remains: Mallwitz (1956–58)); in it were housed offerings by, presumably, “Gelon and the Syracusans” (ibid.). For a dedication at Olympia by the Syracusans of spoils taken from Akragas, see IGDS no. 95; Yalouris (1980) 16; and SEG11 1212a (cf. SEG 15 252). A herald’s staff was also dedicated at Olympia (SEG 38 368 (c.475)). At Delphi a treasury was constructed from the spoils taken from the defeated Athenians (Paus. 10.11.5). For attempts to identify both an Archaic and a Classical treasury of the Syracusans in the architectural remains at Delphi, see Partida (2000) 77–80, 135–46.

The town was founded on the island of Ortygia, an ideal site with harbours on either side: in the east the Lakkios, the Small Harbour, in the west the Great Harbour (for a geomorphological survey of settlement and territory, see Mirisola and Polacco (1996)). Traces of Sikeli habitation confirm the tradition that the first Greek settlers ousted the original inhabitants (Thuc. 6.3.2; cf. Martin et al. (1979) 655–57; Frasca (1983)).

Archaeological evidence confirms a C8s foundation date, and C8 habitation remains on Ortygia are similar to contemporaneous remains from Megara and Naxos. A north–south artery, joining the major sanctuaries, and with orthogonally laid out stenopoi, has an early origin (Pelagatti (1982) 135–38; Voza (1984–85) 669–72, (1993–94) 1283–87). The city expanded on to the mainland, the coastal plain of Achradina, from C8 (Voza (1976–77) 551–53), and from C7l–C6c a narrow isthmus may have joined Ortygia with its hinterland (cf. Strabo 1.3.18; Kapitan (1967–68)). The main east–west plateia of the Achradina originated in the C8–C7 as a route linking Ortygia with the Fusco cemetery. There is C5–C4 evidence of orthogonal town planning (Voza (1976–77) 551–61, (1980–81) 681–82). Ortygia and the inner Achradina comprised an area of c.50 ha.

The C4 extension of the city northwards—obliterating the C7–C4 cemeteries and joining the areas of the Achradina and Neapolis—is probably to be connected with the Timoleonist settlement of new colonists (Diod. 16.82.3). The periphery of the city was taken up with public buildings, and the outskirts of the Neapolis by theatres. Tyche, located to the east, with the sanctuary of Tyche and the upper plateau of Epipolai, were not urbanised; however, from the time of the conflict with Athens, the size of the city was about 150 ha, and in the Hellenistic period as much as 200 ha.

The island of Ortygia and the coastal plain of Achradina were probably fortified during the Archaic period (implied by the mention of a siege by Hippokrates of Gela in the 490s (Hdt. 7.154.2) and by the mention of walls during the revolt against Thrasyboulos in 465 (Diod. 11.67.8; see also 11.73.1)); however, the archaeological evidence is poor (Drögemüller

The plateau of Epipolai was probably not fortified before forts were laid out there by the Athenians, and the various counter walls and cross walls were raised by the Syracusans during the war of 414/13 (Thuc. 6.99–100, 7.4–7). Dionysios I fortified Epipolai, first along the northern scarp (Diod. 14.18.2–8 (1401)), later along the southern scarp; it was a circuit wall running for c.9 km, and according to Diod. 15.13.5 the “greatest possessed by a Greek city” (Winter (1971) 314–15; Karlsson (1992) 21, fig. 1, 23–38, 71). The west gate and the Euryalos fort were probably begun by Dionysios, but the fully developed system of bastions and ditches belong to the time of Timoleon, with the final complex from C3m (Winter (1963); Lawrence (1979) 295–99).

The Archaic agora has with some uncertainty been located west of the Athenaion (modern Piazza del Duomo) (Pelagatti (1982) 136–37). A Classical (and Roman) agora is normally taken for granted in the southern part of the Achradina (modern Piazza Marconi/Foro Siracusano), but the evidence is inconclusive (Bernabò Brea (1947); Martin et al. (1979) 675).

The island of Ortigia was the seat of at least three major sanctuaries: (a) in the north, the sanctuary of Apollo, with a C6e Doric temple (Cuiltera (1951); Barletta (1983) 72–78), with a history going back to C8; (b) the so-called C6i Ionic temple is located on the elevated central part of the island (G. V. Gentili (1967); Barletta (1983) 86–90); it is uncertain to whom the temple was dedicated (G. V. Gentili (1967) 80 suggests Artemis); it was not completed, perhaps as a result of a revision of building programmes by the Deinomenidai, who initiated instead the construction of the adjacent Athenaion; (c) the Doric temple of C.480–470, now incorporated into the Renaissance cathedral, probably built by Gelon to replace earlier structures (Orsi (1919); T. Van Compernolle (1989) 45–48, (1992) 51–55). It is normally taken for granted that this is the temple dedicated to Athena (Cic. Verr. 2.4.124–25), and according to Gras (1990) the two temples mentioned in Gelon’s treaty with the Carthaginians (Diod. 11.26.2) were temples of Athena in Syracuse and in Himera. Remains from the temenos include traces of a stepped altar, parapet and architectural fragments in Ionic style (Barletta (1983) 78–86). Investigations have recently revealed a monumental entrance to the temenos and evidence of a C7l–C6e naïskos(?), altar and votive pits south of the Athenaion (Voza (1993–94) 1286–87). A sanctuary of Olympian Earth was located on the tip of Ortigia (Ath. 462B).

Large quantities of C5l–C4e votive deposits (Martin et al. (1979) 680–86; Hinz (1998) 102–7) found in the mainland Achradina district (modern Piazza Victoria) provide evidence of a sanctuary of Demeter and Persephone, perhaps the one embellished with two temples by Gelon after the victory at Himera in 480 (Diod. 11.26.7), located in the suburbs (proasteion) and destroyed by the Carthaginians in 396 (Diod. 14.70.4). A C4 graffito with a dedication to Artemis Pheraia points to a cult also of Artemis in this sanctuary (Voza (1973c) 106–7). A proasteion is not compatible with a location so near the city centre according to Polacco (1986) 23 n. 6, who suggests that the Demeter sanctuary should rather be located west of the city near the Olympics. An Apollo sanctuary was located near the theatre in the Temenites, a locality on the outskirts of Achradina (Thuc. 6.75.1, 7.5.1; for history and terminology: Drogemüller (1969) 48 n. 36, 56–57). The sanctuary is now tentatively identified with the remains of an Archaic temple laid out on a terrace above the theatre (Voza (1993–94) 1289–90).

After the fall of the tyranny, the Syracusans raised a statue of Zeus Eleutherios and founded an annual festival of eleutheria (Diod. 11.72.2 with Barrett (1973) 30 n. 20; for a survey of other festivals, see Trojani in Polacco and Anti (1981) 26–29). The major suburban cult was that of Zeus Olympios west of the river Anapos (Diod. 10.28.1 (1491)). The extant remains are those of a C6m gigantic Doric temple, with evidence of a C7 predecessor (Orsi (1903); Lissi (1958)). A neighbouring hamlet, Polichne at Thuc. 7.4.6 but Polichne at Diod. 13.7.6, was fortified by the Athenians in 414. A suburban Artemis sanctuary was located on the north-east outskirts of the Epipolai plateau, at the Hexapylon gate leading northwards to Megara and Katane (Orsi (1900)).

Two Greek theatres are known at Syracuse. (1) The larger is situated on the outskirts of the Neapolis district, the Temenites, on the slope of the Epipolai. In its main construction phase, the period of Hieron II (271–216), it had a seating capacity of 14,000–17,000; earlier Archaic or Classical phases have not been demonstrated convincingly (Polacco and Anti (1981); Polacco (1990)). However, literary sources attest to an earlier phase of this theatre at least from C5e, and at least from C4m it was built of stone (Trojani in Polacco and Anti (1981) 41–43 with refs.). A C5b architect by the name of Damokopos was associated with the building of
the theatre (cf. Eust. Od. 3.68), and Aischylos produced the *Women of Aitna* for Hieron in 476 (see Trojani in Polacco and Anti (1981) 34–36 with refs.). A theatre is mentioned by Diod. 13.94.1 (r406), and was used as ekkelesterion in 336 (Plut. *Tim.* 34.3, 38.3). (2) About 100 m to the west, rock cuttings from a rectangular structure are evidence of a *theatron* with rectangular seating and a *cavea* with a diameter of 27.5 m; its seating capacity was about 1,000. Its chronology is uncertain, though possibly C6–C5e (G. V. Gentili (1952); Drögemüller (1969) 48–49); according to Bernabò Brea (1967) 99, the interpretation of the rectangular structure as a predecessor of the large theatre is quite uncertain, and it cannot be excluded that this building served as the meeting place for smaller political bodies or even as a *bouleuterion* (Ginouvès (1972) 61–62; Kolb (1981) 92). A prison is attested in Diod. 11.86.5 (rC5m) and in Plut. *Dio* 57.3 (Hansen (2002) 36–37).

The earliest, Fusco, cemetery laid out east of the city was later followed by an arc of cemeteries lying around the city from there to Tyche in the west. The Archaic cemeteries in the outer Achradina district were taken over by habitation when the Classical city expanded, pushing the Hellenistic cemeteries further out. (For a survey with bibliography: Lanza (1989); add Voza (1993–94) 1292; Shepherd (1995) 52–56; see also Frederiksen (1999)).

Minting began about 510/500 (C. Boehringer (1984–85) 122–24) with coins on the Euboic–Attic standard and the tetradrachm as the main denomination: *obv.* quadriga, legend: ΣΥΡΑΚΟΣΙΩΝ or ΣΥΡΑ; *rev.* an incuse mill-sail design with a female head, probably the nymph Arethusa, in the centre (SNG *Cop. Sicily* 614; standard corpus of Syracusan coins until c.425; E. Boehringer (1929); recent survey: Rutter (1997) 114–16, 121–29). The lower denomination is a didrachm with *obv.* rider and side-horse; *rev.* similar to the tetradrachm issue (C. Boehringer (1984–85) pl. 13.8–9). A new issue was probably introduced by Gelon c.480 with basically the same types though more developed in design: the charioteer crowned by a Nike, and Arethusa on the *rev.* occupying the whole field and surrounded by four dolphins, legend: ΣΥΡΑΚΟΣΙΟΙ (Rutter (1997) 124 fig. 121; SNG *Cop. Sicily* 617–18; SNG *Cop. Suppl.* 74; C5f chronology, followed here: Rutter (1998)). Lower denominations (didrachms and drachms): *obv.* horseman; *rev.* Arethusa (SNG *Cop. Sicily* 615–16). The next phase, from shortly before 470, saw a rich issue of tetradrachms with the now canonical types; types of the lower denominations: drachms, *obv.* horseman, *rev.* Arethusa; obols, *obv.* Arethusa, *rev.* four-spoked wheel (with ΣΥΡΑ between the spokes); litrai, *obv.* Arethusa, legend: ΣΥΡΑ, *rev.* Cuttlefish (SNG *Cop. Sicily* 620–34). This issue culminated in a series of tetradrachms and an innovative issue of decadrachms, now dated 470–c.466 and no longer connected with the 480 victory of Gelon at Himera in 480: *obv.* as above but with lion in exergue, *rev.* Arethusa wearing wreath, legend: ΣΥΡΑΚΟΣΙΟΙ (Rutter (1993), (1998) pl. 67.3–4). From c.460 the *obv.* type carried ketos in exergue (SNG *Cop. Sicily* 635–51). The Attic weight standard and the *obv.* design came to exert great influence on the coinages of the neighbouring cities of Gela, Katane and Leontinoi (Kraay (1976) 210–11; Rutter (1998)).

By C5, tetradrachms with the canonical types in a free style were produced by workshops at times operating with engravers who signed their dies (Rutter (1997) 144–46; SNG *Cop. Sicily* 666). One issue of the die-cutter Kimon has two letters on the *obv.: Ω*, possibly a reference to a cult of Arethousa Soteira (Cahn (1993)). C5f also saw large issues of smaller denominations; of special interest are drachms with *rev.* type showing the legendary Sikanian hero Leukaspis (SNG *Cop. Sicily* 665, 673). Before 400 the standard legend becomes ΣΥΡΑΚΟΣΙΟΙ (Head, *HN*2 175; SNG *Cop. Sicily* 674, 681, etc.). Bronze and gold issues belong to the end of C5 and should be seen in the light of first the Athenian and later the Carthaginian invasions under Dionysios I, with high denominations in silver, decadrachms signed by engravers (C. Boehringer (1993); Rutter (1997) 146–47, 154–58; bronzes: Morcom (1998); SNG *Cop. Sicily* 683–700, 720–22). 100-litrai electrum coins were minted by Dionysios I and II: *obv.* Apollo; *rev.* Artemis, legend: ΣΩΤΕΙΠΑ; smaller denominations were minted as well (SNG *Cop. Sicily* 701–10). Under Timoleon the Corinthian connection is underlined by Corinthian-type pegasoi minted at Syracuse (SNG *Cop. Sicily* 711–12); later the Zeus Eleutherios and the free horse types become common for the cities under Timoleon’s hegemony (Tabert (1974) 182–90; Karlsson (1995); SNG *Cop. Sicily* 725).

Syracuse founded several colonies. The earliest was Heloron (no. 18), founded in C8–C7e. Akrai (no. 10) was founded in 664, and Kasmenai (no. 29) in 644 (Thuc. 6.5.2). Kamarina (no. 28) was founded c.598 (Thuc. 6.5.3), and within a few decades waged war on its *metropolis* (Philistos (FGrHist 556) fr. 5). The tyrant Hieron founded the city of Aitna (no. 8) in 476 (Diod. 11.49.1–2); and Dionysios I founded Adranon (no. 6) (Diod. 14.37.5 (399)), probably Adria (no. 75), possibly Ankon (no. 76), certainly Issa (no. 81); cf. Stylianou (1998) ad 13.4–5 at p. 196), Lissos (no. 82) (Diod. 15.13.4 (r c.385); see Stylianou (1998) *ad loc.*), and
Tyndaris (no. 49). Tauromenion (no. 48) too may possibly be a Dionysian foundation.

48. **Tauromenion** (Tauromenitas) Map 47. Lat. 37.50, long. 15.15. Size of territory: ? Type: [A]:β. The toponym is *Ταυρομένιον*, 70 (Timaios (FGrHist 566) fr. 33; Theophr. fr. 165); or *Ταυρομενία*, ἰ (Diod. 22.7.4). The city-ethnic is *Ταυρομενίτας* (I.Delos 103.60 (372–367); C4 coins, infra; Diod. 16.7.1 (1358)); or *Ταυρομενίτης* (Diod. 16.68.8 (1344)). See further Ziegler (1934) 28.

Ps.-Skylax 13 lists Tauromenion under the heading πόλεις Ἐλληνίδες αἰδέ, side by side with Naxos (no. 41), although the two cities did not exist contemporaneously; this presumably means that the text has been compiled from sources of different dates. Diod. 14.59.3 calls it a polis in the urban sense, but the reference is to the year 396, at which time the site was not yet a Greek city (see below on the foundation). As a Hellenic community it is called a polis in the urban sense at Diod. 16.7.1 (1358) and in the political sense at Diod. 16.68.8 (1344).

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C4 coins (infra); the external collective use is found in I.Delos 103.60 (372–367; cf. IG IV 1638B.43); Diod. 16.68.9 and Plut. Tim. 11.4 (1344); the external individual use is found in Diod. 16.7.1 (1358), and is often applied to the historian Timaios (cf. FGrHist 566, tt. 1, 4e, 5, 13); see also IdiCos ED 52A.13 (C3).

Tauromenion became a Greek polis in C4f. At 16.7.1, Diodorus describes what would appear to be the foundation: in 358 Andromachos, the father of the historian Timaios, gathered the remnants of the Naxians whose city had been destroyed by Dionysios I in 403 (Diod. 14.15.2–3), had them settled on the Monte Tauro above the abandoned site of Naxos, and named the place Tauromenion. The city soon became populous and wealthy. There is reason to believe, however, that this was not the point at which the Greek polis of Tauromenion originally came into being: not only is Andromachos described as *Tauromenites* at this very point, but, much more importantly, a communal dedication by the *Tauromenitai* at Delos is listed in Delian inventories which antedate by several years the event described by Diodorus: see I.Delos 101.40 (372–367), 103.60 with Rutherford (1998) 83, and this indicates that the polis existed prior to the enfranchisement of the Naxians and prior to 364 (ibid.). Nor was the site created *ab novo* in 358, at least not according to Diodorus himself, who gives the following information on Tauromenion prior to 358: in 403, upon his destruction of Naxos, Dionysios handed its *chora* over to the neighbouring Sikels (14.15.3); in 396 the Carthaginian Himilkon induced the Sikels to create a fortified centre on the Monte Tauro, a site which they named *Taurumonion* (but see Bennet (1977) 85) and which Diodorus describes by the term *polis* (14.57.2); in 394/3 Dionysios attempted without success to take the Sikel *polis* of Tauromenion by siege (14.87.4–88.4); however, by the treaty in 392 between Dionysios and Carthage, Tauromenion was assigned to Dionysios, who proceeded to expel most of the Sikels and settle selected mercenaries at the site (14.96.4). If this Dionysian settlement of mercenaries was not in fact the foundation of the Greek *polis* (it may have struck coins, infra), then the *polis* must have come into being after this event and before the inscribing of the Delian inventories c.374–367. The reason why Diodorus seems to think of the foundation of Naxians at Tauromenion in 358 as the foundation of the city may be that he drew his information from Timaios, the son of Andromachos, who may have described the event “in maiorem gloriam patris” (so Ziegler (1934) 30; cf. Bennet (1977) 86–87; Timaios was reputedly partial to his father, see Marcellin. *Vita Thucydidis* 27). So as a Greek *polis* Tauromenion was a C4f foundation; however, there is some archaeological evidence of C7 Greek presence at the site; Ps.-Skymnos 289 lists Tauromenion, with Himera (no. 24), among the Chalkidian foundations, thus implying an early date, but this is most probably an error. Strabo 6.2.3 lists Tauromenion as a city founded by the Zanklaians of Hybla; the passage is confused, but may be explained on the assumption that Zanklaians (=Messanians) who had been ousted from Messana in 396 by Himilkon (Diod. 14.58.3) took refuge in Atinaian Hybla (although there is no direct evidence for this), and later participated in the foundation of Tauromenion (Strabo 6.2.3; cf. Consolo Langher (1996c) 542 for this suggestion). For a survey of research and interpretations, see Ziegler (1934), Bennet (1977) 84, and Consolo Langher (1996c).

The size of the territory is unknown. It may have remained Sikel although under Greek suzerainty (Diod. 14.96.4; cf. Consolo Langher (1996c) 538 n. 6). By C4f there were a number of *phrouria* in the territory (Polyaen. 5.3.6; cf. Steph. Byz. 168.15).

Not much is known about the institutions and political structure of C4f Tauromenion. When Timoleon arrived at Tauromenion, its leading citizen was Andromachos: Diod. 16.68.8 describes him as ὁ τῆς πόλεως ἡγούµενος, and Plut. Tim. 10.6–8 as ὁ τῆν πόλιν ἐξουσιοδοτήσας καὶ δυναστεύων; Marcellin. *Vita Thucydidis* 27 describes him as exercising *monarchia*; he may, then, have been a tyrant (so Talbert


The site of the Sikels, later Greek city of Tauromenion north of Naxos, and originally in the *chora* of this city (it had been conquered by force at the foundation of Naxos; cf. Diod. 14.88.1), was well chosen: it is an easily defendable site on the Monte Tauro, 200–300 m above sea level.

The urban remains are mainly Hellenistic and Roman. The Greek city was undoubtedly fortified: remains of a circuit wall are extant near the agora (cf. also Freeman 1891–94 iv. 109–10). The settlement was fortified already during the Sikels C₃e phase according to Diod. 14.87.4–88.4. The settlement comprises c.65 ha, excluding the upper part of Monte Tauro above the city (perhaps a fortified acropolis). C₇–C₅i Greek presence has been revealed by sherds found in the area of the agora, spanning the period from the early history of Naxos until its destruction by Dionysios in 403 (Bacci 1980–81b 742, 1997). C6 architectural fragments of Naxian type attest to an extra-urban sanctuary in the territory of Naxos (Bacci 1984–85 722–23), situated within the later city in which was to become the agora of Tauromenion on the plateau west of the theatre. Epigraphic and architectural evidence, and similarities with the theatre at Syracuse, point to a C₃e Greek origin for the famous Roman theatre (Polacco 1982 438–40). Tauromenion may have had a C₄ overall urban scheme of habitation and public structures laid out on terraces along the slopes of Monte Tauro (Bacci 1997).

A rare silver dilitron with Naxian types: *obv.* laureate head of Apollo (Archagetae); *rev.* squatting Silenos; legend: ΝΕΟΠΟΛΙΠΩΝΩΝ (Cahn 1944 146 no. 149), has been attributed to the mercenaries of Dionysios’ 392 settlement, although the issue may have been made only after the death of Dionysios (S. Calderone 1956); followed by Consolo Langher (1996c) 538–39). A large bronze coinage in three denominations was struck in the reign of Andromachos c.357–344. Types: *obv.* head of Apollo Archagetae laureate, legend: ΑΡΧΑΓΕΤΑΣ; *rev.* bull walking or galloping, at times man-headed, or bull-head protome, legend: ΤΑΥΠΟΜΕ, ΤΑΥΠΟΜΕΝΙΤΑΝ, with variations (SNG Cop. Sicily 916–20). The type and legend of Apollo Archagetae (cf. App. B Civ. 5.12.109) testify to Tauromenion’s ambition to be the heir of Naxos (for the period of Timoleon, see Brugnone 1980 279). The type of Apollo, influenced by a type known from earlier issues of the Chalkidian cities, is crucial testimony to the importance of the Tauromenian mint (Consolo Langher 1996c) 550–55). The issues of the Timoleontic period (345–358) were a symmachia coinage with two groups of hemilitra: *obv.* head of Apollo laureate, legend: ΑΡΧΑΓΕΤΑΣ(Σ) or head of Zeus Eleutherios; *rev.* lyre, tripod, galloping bull or bunch of grapes, legend: ΤΑΥΠΟΜΕΝΙΤΑΝ (Consolo Langher 1996c) 555–67; cf. also Karlsson 1995; SNG Cop. Sicily 921–26).

49. Tyndaris (Tyndarites) Map 47. Lat. 38.10, long. 15.05. Size of territory: ? Type: Bα. The toponym is Τυνδάριος, ἃ (BCH 45 (1921) iv. 93 (230–210); Strabo 6.2.1), or Τυνδάριον (Ptol. Geog. 3.4.2). The city-ethnic is Τυνδαρίτης (IGUR II 823 (Hell.); Diod. 13.69.3) or Τυνδάριος (Diod. 23.5 (1263/2)).

Tyndaris is called a *polis* in connection with its foundation in 396 in Diod. 14.78.5, a passage which presumably uses *polis* primarily in the urban sense although the presence of the terms πολιτογραφοῦντες and πολιτογραφοῦντες indicates that the term may carry the political sense as well (cf. Hansen 2000 175–76). According to the text, the community πολλοὺς πολιτογραφοῦντες quickly grew to number more than 5,000: this implies grants of citizenship and registration of citizens, and thus shows that Tyndaris was a *polis*; the city furthermore struck coins in C₄m (infra), concluded a treaty of symmachia with Timoleon (Diod. 16.69.3, a passage which also mentions armed forces of the city) and had a Delphic theovrodokos in C₃s (BCH 45 (1921) iv. 93 (230–210)). The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C₄m coins (infra); the external collective use is found in Diod. 16.69.3 (1344); and the external individual use is found in IGUR II 823 (Hell.).

Tyndaris was founded as a fortress by Dionysios I in 396 (Diod. 14.78.5; cf. Consolo Langher 1996b) on the coast c.60 km west of Messana (no. 51). The city was populated with 600 Peloponnesian Messenians expelled from Zakynthos (no. 141) and Naupaktos (no. 165; Asheri 1983). Territory for the new community was taken from that of the city of Abakainon (no. 5; Diod. 14.78.5), and the defeat of Magon at Abakainon by Dionysios finally secured the territory of Tyndaris (Diod. 14.90.4). The Messenians named their city
Tyndaris after the cult of the Tyndaridai. By admission of new settlers shortly after the foundation the population of Tyndaris grew to more than 5,000 (Diod. 14.78.6).

The territory bordered inland upon that of Abakainon; to the east it was delimited by the territory of Mylai, and further inland by the Sikel site of Longane. The territory may have comprised some hundreds of km², but that is difficult to ascertain. A close relationship with the neighbouring site of Agathyrrnon is suggested by C4l (C3 according to Consolo Langher (1965)) bronze coinage with types obv. head of Apollo, legend: ΤΥΝΔΑΡΙ∆ΟΣ; rev. armed warrior, legend: ΑΓΑΘΥΡΝΟΣ (the eponym of Agathyrrnon; cf. Diod. 5.8.2); however, the coins may be a reference to annexation of Agathyrrnian territory by Tyndaris, rather than testimony of an alliance (Consolo Langher (1965) 82 n. 66; Lacroix (1965) 46–47).

The city was built in a strong military position on the top of a rocky promontory with precipitous cliffs facing seawards and with access only from the east. The town was located on a narrow plateau with three plateiai oriented north-east–south-west laid out on three levels along the length of the plateau, orthogonally crossed by stenopoi. The size of the city was about 14 ha. The extant remains are Roman, but there are traces of a Timoleontic C4m phase, and the origin of the town plan probably goes back to the time of its foundation (Bernabò Brea and Cavalier (1964) 50). A cult of the Dioskouroi, the Tyndaridai, is not explicitly attested, but coin types give clear evidence that such a cult was of major importance (Ziegler (1943) 1785; Consolo Langher (1965) 66). A second, Timoleontic, series of coins have as type a head of Apollo (Consolo Langher (1965) 81). A Zeus cult is attested by C3 bronze coin types depicting a statue of Zeus, possibly the Messenian Zeus Ithomatas (Ziegler (1943) 1785). Athena, Poseidon, Dionysos and Kore (?) are shown on C4 coin types (ibid.), and Artemis Eupraxia on a C2 dedicatory relief (Fischer-Hansen (1992) no. 12).


50. (Tyrrenhoi) Map 47. Unlocated. Type: C:y. The Tyrrenhoi are known exclusively from their C4s Greek-style bronze coinage: obv. head of Athena wearing Attic helmet, legend: ΤΥΡΡΗΝΟΣ; rev. standing armed Athena (Head, HN² 190; Cutroni Tusa (1970) 264–65). The coins, whose types reveal Athenian influence, are restruck on C4s Syracusan issues. They may belong to an anti-Syracusan ethnic group, perhaps Tyrrenian mercenaries fighting Timoleon (cf. Diod. 16.82.2 (1339/8); Cutroni Tusa (1970) 266). A settlement site of the Tyrrenhoi has tentatively been identified with sporadic habitation remains at modern Alimena in the territory of Himera (no. 24) (Bejor (1984b) with refs.); other proposals include a location in the region of Syracuse–Aitna (Cutroni Tusa (1970) 266).

51. Zankle (Zanklaioi)/Messana (Messanios) Map 47. Lat. 38.10, long. 15.35. Size of territory: 4. Type: A:a. The toponym is, for Zankle, Δαίμονες (SEG 11 1180.8 (C6); coins of C6, infra) or Ζάγκλης (HN 391, 72; Hdt. 17.164.1). A stretch of the wall descending obliquely north-west protected access to the harbour below the city (Barreca (1957)). An agora was probably located on the south-east side of the habitation area in the region of the later Roman forum. No buildings of the Greek phase are extant, but near the forum a theatre with its back to the circuit wall and facing the upper, principal plateia has a Greek phase dating to c. 300; the koilon had a diameter of 76 m and a seating capacity of c. 3,000 (Bernabò Brea (1964–65)).

A cult of the Dioskouroi, the Tyndaridai, is not explicitly attested, but coin types give clear evidence that such a cult was of major importance (Ziegler (1943) 1785; Consolo Langher (1965) 66). A second, Timoleontic, series of coins have as type a head of Apollo (Consolo Langher (1965) 81). A Zeus cult is attested by C3 bronze coin types depicting a statue of Zeus, possibly the Messenian Zeus Ithomatas (Ziegler (1943) 1785). Athena, Poseidon, Dionysos and Kore (?) are shown on C4 coin types (ibid.), and Artemis Eupraxia on a C2 dedicatory relief (Fischer-Hansen (1992) no. 12).

in _IGDS_ no. 2 (C5e), Hdt. 6.22.2 and Antiochos of Syracuse (_FGrHist_ 555) fr. 9; the external individual use is found in Paus. 5.25.11 (rC61); the city-ethnic of _Messana_ is found in the internal collective use on C5 coins (infra) and in the external collective use in _IGDS_ nos. 4–5 (488–485) and Thuc. 5.5.1; the external individual use is found in _SEG_ 28 431 (c.467–450) and Diod. 14.40.4 (1999).

According to Thuc. 6.4.5, Zankle was originally settled by pirates from the Chalkidian colony of Kyme (no. 57), possibly implying some early pre-colonial phase (see Antonelli 1996) for a full discussion). At a later date a number of (1996 b) probably implying some early pre-colonial phase (see Antonelli 58 43–5) and was the result of tumultous events: at the time when the Zanklaian forces were laying siege to a Sikel town; the Rhidian tyrant Anaxilas persuaded the Samians to capture the undefended town of Zankle, which they did (Hdt. 6.23.2–3). The Zanklaian called upon their ally, Hippokrates, the tyrant of Gela (at this time Zankle was presumably a subordinate ally of Hippokrates, who had defeated the city in an earlier war, cf. Hdt. 7.154.2), Hippokrates arrived with an army and deposed Skythes, the ruler of Zankle (called _basileus_ (Hdt. 6.23.1) or _mounarchos_ (Hdt. 6.23.4); cf. Carlier (1984) 469–70). Hippokrates then negotiated with the Samians and betrayed the Zanklaian to them in return for “half of all the moveable property and slaves in the town, and everything in the open country” (Hdt. 6.23.5). He enslaved the greater part of the betrayed Zanklaian, but turned the 300 “leading men among them” over to the Samians (6.23.6). Later, Anaxilas of Rhigion drove out the Samians, founded a city of mixed ethnicity, and changed the name to _Messana_ after his own original homeland (Thuc. 6.4.6).

The treaty of 405 between Dionysios and Carthage stipulated that _Messana_ be _autonomos_ (Diod. 13.114.1; _Staatsverträge_ no. 210). In 399 the Messanian army deserted their generals in a war against Dionysios because the _demos_ had not ratified the campaign (Diod. 14.40 5; Costabile (1978)). In 396 Himilkon captured _Messana_, which was now allied with Dionysios (Diod. 14.57), but in 395 the city was repopulated by Dionysios, who settled 1,000 Lokrians, 4,000 Medmaian and 600 Peloponnesian Messenians (who were, however, quickly relocated to Tyndaris), and the city became practically a _Syracusan_ colony, above all of military stamp (Diod. 14.78.5). The pro-Dionysian faction, however, was expelled again in 394 (Diod. 14.88.5).

Monarchy is attested at Zankle in the time of Skythes (_supra_), who, however, seems to have been a subordinate of Hippokrates of Gela (_supra_). Diod. 11.48.2 (1476) describes Anaxilas as being at his death tyrant of both _Rhegion_ and Zankle (cf. Berve (1967) 156). In 461, “the Rhegians with the Zanklaian” expelled the sons of Anaxilas and liberated their cities (Diod. 11.76.5). The _koinon dogma_ agreed upon by the Sicilian cities after the fall of the tyranny at _Syracuse_ stipulated that all the mercenaries installed by tyrants in the cities of the island were to settle _ἐν τῷ Μεσσηνία_ (Diod. 11.76.5; cf. _CAHP_ v. 157; Freeman (1891–94) ii. 316–17). _A stasis_ broke
out in 424–422 during which one party called in help from Lokroi; the Lokrians sent some epoikoi who were later driven out (Thuc. 5.5.1). Another stasis is mentioned for the year 415 (Thuc. 6.7.4, cf. Polyen. 5.2.18). Ethnic animosities seem to have played a role in these staseis (Berger 1992 54–55). In 337, Timoleon deposed the tyrant Hippon (Plut. Tim. 34.3).

IGDS no. 2.9, C6 = SEG 11 1180) reads [τοί]ς συμμά[χια], and the inscription presumably recorded or referred to a treaty of symmachie between Zankle and one or more unknown partner(s). In 426 Messana entered into a symmachia with Athens (Thuc. 3.90.4). The alliance was short-lived, and the next year Syracusans and Lokrians occupied Messana, which had revolted from Athens (Thuc. 4.1.1).

A Messenian army and navy are mentioned at Thuc. 4.25.7; Diod. 14.40.4 (r399) mentions an army of 4,000 foot and 400 horse, in addition to thirty triremes. The organisation of the army was probably based on a system of phylai, since at 3.90.2 Thucydides says that there were δύο φυλαὶ ἐν ταῖς Μυλαιΐς τῶν Μεσσηνίων φρουρούσαι. Commanders (strategoi) are mentioned at Diod. 14.40.5 (r399).

Olympic victories were achieved by Leonistkos in 456 and 452 (Olympionikai 271, 285) and by Symmachos in 428 (Olympionikai 325). A C6 communal Zanklaian dedication of spoils at Olympia is found as SEG 11 1180, 1205 and 15 246 (= IGDS no. 2); Messenian dedications are attested by SEG 24 313–14 (C5e). In communal mourning the Messenians dedicated a bronze statue at Olympia to commemorate a chorus of boys who drowned on their way to a festival at Rhegion (Paus. 5.25.2–5 (rC5m); Cordano (1980); Pritchett (1999) 252–54). In 356/5, a citizen of Messana served as Epidaurian theorodokos (IG iv² 95.11.78).

Zankle was founded near the narrowest point of the Straits c.10 km south of Cape Pelorus on a low coastal plateau facing a natural, sickle-shaped harbour from which the city took its Sikel name (Thuc. 6.4.5). The ancient city has suffered heavily from the later urban history of the site and from numerous earthquakes and landslides; the Archaic and Classical remains are often 4–5 m below the present surface. The settlement lay along the inner harbour and upon the sickle-shaped peninsula that enclosed the harbour. The main area of habitation seems to have been the area west and south of the harbour, stretching c.1 km inland from the coast in an area confined to the south by the river Cammaro and to the north-east by the harbour—in all c.50–60 ha (Vallet 1958 113–16, pl. 1; Scibona 1986)). No remains of the Archaic or Classical circuit wall are known (for poliorkiai, see Hdt. 7.154.2 (4908); Plut. Tim. 34.3 (r337); cf. Diod. 14.56.4, 57.3, 58.3, 78.5 and 87.1 attesting the existence of fortifications in the 390s). During C3 the size of the habitation area may have been somewhat restricted compared to the Archaic city; the C5 cemetery is located inside the area of the Archaic city, though this may simply indicate a change in location of habitation area (Scibona (1986) 450, 453). There is some evidence of an overall orthogonal plan from the early period of the settlement (Bernabò Brea (1972–73) 176–77; Scibona (1986) 449–52). The harbour is known from early coin types, some of which seem to show it equipped inside with buildings or wharves. Several kilns attest to an extensive industrial quarter inside the urban area (Bacci (1995) 640). A theatre is mentioned by Plut. Tim. 34.4. (r337); the same passage refers to schools (didaskaleia).

On the outermost part of the sickle-shaped peninsula was a sanctuary; the cult is unknown, but the finds show that its history goes back to the period of foundation (Orsi (1929) 38–46). This is the main archaeological testimony of cult from the city itself, apart from the C5 votive relief from a sanctuary(? ) dedicated to the chthonic divinities (Orsi (1912)). For extra-urban sanctuaries, there is the tradition of the Poseidon sanctuary on Cape Pelorus (Diod. 4.85.5–6 (r time of foundation)). The striding Zeus shown on the obv. of the single known tetradrachm from an issue struck probably in 461 commemorating the liberation from tyranny may refer to the cult of Eletheria (cf. infra).

Coinage began c525 with drachms based upon the Euboian standard, with as lower denominations obols and onkiai (C. Boehringer (1984–85) 108–19). The first issue is known in four series, lasting to the conquest of Zankle by Hippocrates. The obv. type, a dolphin within a sickle-shaped harbour, refers to the name and setting of the city (Belloni (1977)), legends: ∆ΑΝΚ, ∆ΑΝΚΑ, ∆ΑΝΚΑΒ, rev. incuse squares with shell in centre (SNG Cop. Sicily 387–88). An example with incuse repetition of the obverse is a unique example of the incuse fabric of Magna Graecia used in Sicily (C. Boehringer (1984–85) 109, pl. 11.3).

The Samian occupation 494/3–489/8 is reflected in tetradrachms struck on the Euboian–Attic standard, the obv. with a frontal lion scalp, the rev. with a prow of a ship (the samainata), and on some a retrograde letter of the sequence A to E. Each letter probably represented one year’s coinage, and the letter sequence therefore corresponds to the five years of Samian occupation. Of the lower denominations the diobols carry the additional symbol of a helmet on the rev. (Barron (1966) 40–43; SNG Cop. Suppl. 68).

The first issues of Anaxilas’ regime, spanning the period 488–480, were tetradrachms struck on the Euboian–Attic
standard with *obv*. lion’s head facing; rev. forepart of calf, legend: ΜΕΣΣΕΝΙΟΝ (Caccamo Caltabiano (1993) 17–31). From 480 Anaxilas struck tetradrachms with *obv*. biga of mules; rev. running hare, in commemoration of his victory at Olympia, legend: ΜΕΣΣΕΝΙΟΝ; this becomes the canonical Cs type, with smaller denominations—mainly litrai and its fractions (ibid. 31 ff; *SNG Cop. Sicily* 389–90).

The fall of the tyranny in 461 allowed for a short period the re-establishment of the Zanklaian faction, which struck a commemorative issue known from a unique tetradrachm: *obv*. Zeus at altar hurling thunderbolt; rev. dolphin, shell, legend: ΔΑΝΚΛΑΙΟΝ; litrai have the legend ΔΑΝ (Caccamo Caltabiano (1993) 63–66, 238; cf. also Lacroix (1965) 24–25). These were soon followed by Messanian issues. The legend of the reverse changed the earlier Ionic spelling to Doric ΜΕΣΣΑΝΙΟΝ or ΜΕΣΣΑΝΙΩΝ c.450 (SNG Cop. Sicily 393–94). Later issues use the four-stroke sigma instead of the rounded Chalkidian letter (Caccamo Caltabiano (1993) 68–69; *SNG Cop. Sicily* 396–97). The rare issue of a gold coinage c.455 may reflect the demands of a military campaign (Stazio (1988) 506–7; Caccamo Caltabiano (1993) 73–75). An issue from c.425 carries on the *obv*. the personification of the city (a female charioteer) and the legend ΜΕΣΣΑΝΑ (Caccamo Caltabiano (1993) 101–3; *SNG Cop. Sicily* 399–406). Bronze coinage with related types and the legend ΜΕΣΣΑΣ began c.425 (Caccamo Caltabiano (1993) 111–14; *SNG Cop. Sicily* 417–19).

Zankle founded Mylai (no. 38) in 716, presumably as a dependent polis (*supra*); in collaboration with Syracusan exiles, it founded Himera (no. 24) in 648; and it also participated in the foundation of Rhegion (no. 68) c.730.
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ITALIA AND KAMPANIA

TOBIAS FISCHER-HANSEN, THOMAS HEINE NIELSEN, CARMINE AMPOLO

I. The Region

In antiquity, two different names were used to designate (most of) the area under consideration in this chapter: Italia and Megale Hellas. Neither of them, however, regularly included the Greek communities (Kyme, Neapolis and Pithekoussai) in Kampania (ἡ Καµπανία (Ps.-Skylax 10)) which are included here as well. Whereas Italia was certainly used in the Classical period, Megale Hellas may be a post-Classical formation.

(i) Italia

The usual toponym is Ἰταλία (-η), Ἱ (IG 112 1 951.146 (359); IG 112 1 10438 (C4); Hdt. 6.127.1; Arist. Pol. 1274ν24). The name seems to designate, primarily, the Greek cities in South Italy and their territories; similarly, the ethnic Ῥαλιώτης designates the Greek inhabitants of these cities (Hdt. 4.15.2; Plin., Ep. 7.327B; Arist. Rh. 1398b15; Thuc. 6.44.3, 7.57.11). This ethnic is used almost exclusively externally and collectively (preceding refs.), but a single instance of the external individual use is found in the epitaph IG 112 1 8942 (365–340).

The definition and delimitation of Italia has been and still is a controversial issue, especially among Italian scholars (cf. Ronconi (1997); Musti (1996) with further refs.). By the Hellenistic and Roman periods, Italia comprised all of Italy from the tip of the toe as far north as the Alps, including even Massalia (no. 3) (Polyb. 2.14). A detailed discussion of the gradual expansion of the concept of Italia is omitted here, and the following account focuses on the Classical period. It is based on contemporary sources, and it excludes Hellenistic and Roman sources unless they can be shown to be quotations or reliable paraphrases of Classical authors.

Luca Soverini, University of Pisa, collaborated with the authors in the compilation of the site databases, contributing valuable references and insights. The authors would like to thank Dr. Keith Rutter for commenting on a draft of this text.

1 Cf. Herennius Philo, De diversis verbis significationibus 98.1: Ἰταλοὶ καὶ Ιταλίωται διαφέρει. Ἰταλοὶ γὰρ εἶναι οἱ ἐξ ἀρχῆς χώραν οἰκίσαντες. Ἰταλίωται δὲ διὸ τῶν Ἐλλήνων ἐπίκεισαν μετὰ ταύτα.

2 For surveys, see Lepore (1988); Musti (1996); Ameruoso (1996).

It is impossible to say anything about Hekataios’ conception of Italia. Citing Hekataios (Ἑκαταῖος Ἐυρώπης), Steph. Byz. applies the classification πόλεως Ἰταλίας to Capua (fr. 62), Medma (fr. 81), Lokroi (fr. 83), Kaulonia (fr. 84) and Krotalla (fr. 85), and Kapri[ne] is called a νῆσος Ἰταλίας (fr. 63). Whereas Stephanos undoubtedly found the toponyms (Medma, etc.; cf. fr. 80) in Hekataios’ work, we have no guarantee that the site classification πόλεως Ἰταλίας stems from Hekataios as well (Hansen (1997a) 17–18). In Steph. Byz. there are close to 100 occurrences of πόλεως Ἰταλίας, and it is used with reference to, e.g., Rome (548.11), Spina (584.12) and Genoa (202.19). Now, considering what we know about the concept of Italia in, e.g., Antiochus and Herodotos (infra), it is most unlikely that Hekataios would classify Capua as a πόλεως Ἰταλίας (fr. 62) and Capri as a νῆσος Ἰταλίας (fr. 63), although explanations for this usage, based upon political and archaeological evidence, have been put forward (Ronconi (1997) 111). It follows that πόλεως Ἰταλίας in frs. 62–63, and consequently in frs. 81, 83–85 too, must be Stephanos’ own classification of the toponyms he found in Hekataios’ work. It follows that we have no information whatsoever about the extent of Italia according to Hekataios. We do not even know whether he used the toponym Ἰταλία at all.

In the Περὶ Ἰταλίας of Antiochus of Syracuse (FGrHist 555, frs. 2–5, 9, 12), the ancient name of Italia is said to have been Oinotria, the region only later taking its name from the eponymous hero Italos (fr. 2). The Italia of Antiochus extended across the peninsula from the river Laos to Metapontion (fr. 3), thus excluding, e.g., Taras and its hinterland, Iapygia (frs. 3, 12; see Prontera (1986) 307–9 fig. 4). On the other hand, Soph. fr. 598 (Radt = Pearson fr. 598) as transmitted in Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 1.12.2 seems to include Taras in Italia, since Italia is there said to stretch ἄπ’ ἀκρας Ἰαπυγίας μέχρι πορθµοῦ Σικελικοῦ. See further Lepore (1988) 134–37.

3 In fr. 80 Ἰταλίας has been restored by Meineke.
For Herodotos, *Italia* seems to have covered the Greek colonial region from Krotos (5.43) via Sybaris, Siris (1.145, 5.43, 6.127.1, 8.62) and Metapontion (4.15.1) as far as, and including, Taras (1.24.7, 3.136.1), i.e. to the border between Greek and Iapygian territory, without a precise indication of the geographical limits. For Herodotos the northern boundary of *Oinotria* was in the region of Hyele (1.167), and perhaps as far north as the river Sele (as in Strabo 6.1.1), as argued by Ronconi ((1988–89), (1997) 116), though this is less certain.

In Thucydides, *Italia* signifies the coastal region from the promontory of Rhegion (4.24.4) to lapygia (7.33.4), settled with Greek colonies, of which the following are mentioned as being Italian: Rhegion (3.86.2, 5, 4.24.4, 6.44.2), Lokroi (3.86.2, 5.5.1, 6.44.2, 7.25.3, 8.91.2), Kaulonia (7.25.2), Thourioi (6.104.1–2, 7.57.11), Metapontion (7.33.4, 57.11) and Taras (6.44.2, 6.104.1, 8.91.2); in addition, at 6.104.2 (on which see *HCT ad loc.*), Terina is implicitly described as in *Italia*.

Another historical account of the concept of *Italia* is found in Strabo 5.1.1, where *Italia* (= *Oinotria*) is said originally to have comprised the area from the straits to the Gulf of Taranto in the east and as far as Poseidonia to the north. The sources for this concept are not given by Strabo, but they will have been of C5 and C4 (Musti (1996) 38; Ronconi (1997) 116–18).

(ii) *Megale Hellas* The meaning of the expression ἡ Μεγάλη Ἑλλάς is likewise controversial; 4 in view of the cultural level and the economic and political strength of the Greek colonies of South Italy in the Archaic period, the designation could have been coined in C2 or C6, but there is no direct evidence for so early a use of the expression, the first occurrence being in Polybios (infra).

The area covered by the designation is uncertain, and different definitions are found in different ancient authors. According to Ps.-Skymnos 304ff, Μεγάλη Ἑλλάς comprised South Italy south of a line joining Terina to Taras (cf. Steph. Byz. 617.5–6; Musti (1988) 83). In Athenaios (523E) it is used synonymously with Ἰταλία about all the Greek settlements in South Italy. For Pliny (HN 3.95), Μάγνα Γραεία comprised only the region around Lokroi Epizephyrioi and Taras, whereas in Servius (ad Aeni. 1.569) it extended as far north as Kyme. In the course of time the Latin translation Magna Graecia came to be used by the Roman authors, much as in scholarship today, to designate the region of the Greek colonies in South Italy (Livy 31.7.11).

According to Strabo 6.1.2, *Megale Hellas* comprised not only the Gulf of Taranto, the coast as far as the straits and an unspecified part of the interior, but also Sicily. Strabo is the only author to include Sicily in *Megale Hellas*, and his Σικελία is therefore often explained either as a later gloss or as an extension of the designated area by a local, patriotic author—such as Timaios or Antiochos—or as evidence of a gradual chronological extension of the concept to comprise first *Italia* and then *Sikelia*. However, the concept of *Megale Hellas* is of little or no importance in Strabo, who hardly makes use of it. For a rather strained interpretation of Strabo 6.1.2 that avoids subsuming Sicily under *Megale Hellas*, see Maddoli (1981) 16–19. 5 The question must remain open. 6

Finally, in a Strabonian context, the concept of *Megale Hellas* comprised also various non-Greek ethne in so far as they were Hellenised (Ameruso (1996) 42–45, 92–97).

The earliest extant use of *Megale Hellas* is found in Polybios, in an account of an anti-Pythagorean incident of C6–C5m (Polyb. 2.39.1; cf. Maddoli (1981) 10, 91). The use of the expression by Athenaios (523E) in connection with the history of Siris may, with Polybios, support a C6 origin (Maddoli (1981) 28). On the other hand, there is no support for the common assumption that the expression was used in a C6 context by Timaios (FGrHist 566, fr. 13); the fragment is found in a schol. Pl. Phdr. 279C which quotes Timaios verbatim; however, ἡ Μεγάλη Ἑλλάς introduces the quotation without being part of it (cf. Cantarella (1967) 16 n. 23; Musti (1988) 80, 88, 91; Ameruso (1996) 13–21).

The prevalent explanations of the expression tend to assume that it existed in the Archaic and Classical periods, an assumption for which the evidence is weak (supra). It has been seen as relating to the growth, the increase (*auxesis*) in power and in cultural and economic importance of South Italy after the Greek foundations. 7 More generally, it has been explained by the wealth and power of the area (cf. Strabo 6.1.2 and Ath. 523E, connecting it with the great size

---

4 See Mustilli (1964) 36; Cantarella (1967); Maddoli (1981); Mele (1981); and Musti (1988); a Forschungsberichte is found in Ameruso (1996) 3–11.

5 Maddoli suggests reading Strabo as referring to two correlative units, Megale Hellas and Sicily, two objects of the verb ἀδυνάτωρ. The idea put forward by Momigliano (1929)—that the extension of Megale Hellas to comprise Sicily goes back to Antiochos and is accordingly earlier than its restriction to the Greek part of South Italy—has not won adherence; cf. Cantarella (1967) 13 n. 8 and Maddoli (1981).


of the population), possibly in comparison with Greece proper, as stressed by some modern scholars (cf. Musti (1988) 82, 84–85). The designation maius Graecia is employed by Livy (31.7.11) and does seem to imply some comparison with Greece itself; also, the contrast between the rich Achaian colonies and their poor metropolis in Peloponnesian Achaia should not be overlooked. However, according to Cantarella (1967) 16–19, Megale Hellas was used in an absolute sense, and not comparatively: in fact, Megale Hellas was used about Greece itself by Euripides (Med. 440; Tro. 1115), and Hellas about western Greece by Pindar (Pyth. 1.75), and so there is no apparent difference in meaning between the two expressions (Hellas/Megale Hellas) during C5 (Cantarella (1967) 16–17).

Some scholars, again assuming an Archaic origin for the expression, have tied the concept of a western Megale Hellas to the spread of Pythagorean customs and philosophy. According to Calderone (1975) 45–46, a concept of Megale Hellas based upon the extent of Pythagoreanism would explain Strabo’s inclusion of Sicily, which is not attested in other sources. Cantarella (1967) adds a further dimension: a religious connotation—a sort of “Graeca sacra”.

To conclude: even if it is correctly transmitted, the isolated passage in Strabo is not enough to show that Μεγάλη Ἕλλας was ever a common designation of what we today call “the Western Greeks”. Furthermore, the sources we have indicate that the concept of Megale Hellas took shape only after the Classical period, and grew in importance from C2 onwards. In Archaic and Classical sources innumerable attestations show that Italia was the predominant designation of that part of the coast of South Italy which was inhabited by Greek settlers. If the designation Megállη Ἕλλας was coined in C6 in, e.g., Pythagorean circles, it did not catch on until much later and should be regarded as insignificant in the Archaic and Classical periods.

The Inventory below describes three Greek poleis situated in Kampania: Kyme, Neapolis and Pithekousai. The region of Kampania probably took its name from the important city of Capua (cf. Polyb. 3.91.2–4, 118.3) or from the campus: the fertile coastal plain (cf. Diod. 12.31.1; Plin. HN 3.65). In Roman times, the region extended from Sinuessa in the north to the Gulf of Naples and the Sorrento peninsula in the south, but the cities of Kampania listed by Strabo 5.4.3–11 and Ptol. Geog. 3.1.6 are of little relevance in the present context. The name Kampania occurs for the first time at Ps.-Skylax 10, where the Greek cities of Kyme, Neapolis and Pithekousai are listed as poleis Hellenides, presumably reflecting a pre-Samnite situation. According to Diod. 12.31.1 (r.438), the ethnus of the Kampanoi was formed in C5, but the ethnic identity of the Campani is more uncertain (Frederiksen (1984) 134–57; Cerchiai (1995) 187–94). Rutter attributes the C5t coins of the Kampani (Rutter, HN 7 p. 64) to the inhabitants of Capua, arguing that the ethnus of the Kampanians in Diodorus (loc. cit.) means the people of Capua and its neighbourhood, Kampania only later acquiring its wider geographical connotation (Rutter (1979) 81–83).

Earlier sources attributed the two (related) Oscan ethnē of the Ausonians and the Opikians to the areas which later constituted Kampania (cf. Steph. Byz. 479.15; Νήσωλα, πόλεις Αἰσονών = Hecat. fr. 61). Whether these were one and the same people or two different ethnē is discussed by Strabo 5.4.3, with reference to (i) Antiochos (FGrHist 535.fr. 7), who considered them one and the same; (ii) Arist. Pol. 1329b19–20, who probably followed Antiochos; and (iii) Polyb. 34,11,5–7, who believed they were distinct. Kyme was founded in Opikia, according to Thuc. 6.4.5 (cf. also Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 1.53.3), and in Ps.-Skylax (15) the Opikians constitute one of the Samnite subgroups (for the term Opici, see Dubuisson (1985))). The Ausonians too were most likely a distinct entity, to be identified with the Latin Aurunci (Festus, De verborum significatione 18M; cf. Livy 2.16.8; Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 6.32.1).

Inside the areas outlined above, Greek communities begin to appear c.750–725, the earliest being Kyme and Pithekousai in Kampania, founded from Euboea at this date. In C8l Achaian founded Sybaris (725–700) and Kroton (c.709/8), Spartans founded Taras (c.706), and Chalcidians Rhegion. In C7e Lokroi Epizephyrioi was founded by Lokrians; c.660 Siris was founded, possibly by Ionians from Kolophon (no. 848); and c.650 Metapontion was founded by Achaianas who responded to an invitation from Sybaris; and Thurii was founded in the later 440s by an Athenian-led Panhellenic expedition. Such “primary”

---

8 Ciaceri (1927) 1 i. 188–90; Mele (1981); Maddoli (1981) 11; Musti (1988) 88–89, 91 with refs. to, above all, lambli. VP 29–30; 166; Gc. De or. 2.154, 3.139, etc.

9 Recent attempts to discard or downplay Euboian colonisation in the West, on the basis of argued lack of archaeological evidence (cf., e.g., Papadopoulos (2000) 153) are disregarded in this chapter. At Naxos, for instance, the influence of Euboian pottery has been amply demonstrated (Pelagatti (1981) 305–11; Lentini (1990) v.11–14, 35), and evidence such as the spread of the Euboian alphabet to Etruria (Ridgway (1998a) 315–16) and the evidence of the calendars (Triumph, Monat. 39–43) support the literary sources for Euboian colonisation.

10 The earliest Greek finds from Sybaris and Kroton are, apparently, East Greek rather than Peloponnesian (Ridgway (2001) 137).

11 For the details of the foundation dates, see the entries in the Inventory infra.
colonies as these went on to found “secondary” colonies of their own: Lokroı founded Hipponion and Medma (in C7); Kroton founded Kaulonia (presumably in C75) and Terina (ante 460); Kyme founded Neapolis (c.470); Sybaris founded Laos (ante 510) and Poseidonia (c.600); Pandosia was founded by Sybaris or Kroton (contemporary with the foundation of Metapontion), and Pyxous was a foundation by Mirkhos, the ruler of Rhegion and Messana (c.471). Herakleia, the last Greek foundation in Italia, was founded in 433/2 as a joint enterprise by Taras and Thourioi, and replaced Siris, whose inhabitants were expelled. Finally, colonists from other parts of the western Mediterranean founded secondary colonies in Italia: in C7, Zankle is reported to have founded Metauros in Bruttium, and Hyele was founded by Phokaians who had left Alalia on Corsica shortly after the battle of Alalia c.540–355.

The dates of foundation given in the previous section are derived partly from the literary tradition, partly from archaeological investigations, two types of evidence that generally produce roughly similar dates. Obviously, there is a risk of circular argument when a chronology of Greek Geometric pottery based upon the colonial dates furnished by the literary tradition is in its turn used to confirm the literary tradition (Burn (1935) 134–35; Béraud (1957) 279; Van Compernolle (1992) 776–78). This danger can only be avoided by employing a chronology of Geometric wares based on Near Eastern archaeology or on Near Eastern finds from South Italy, such as the scarab with the name of Bocchoris found at Pithekousai (cf. most recently Hannestad (1996) and Morris (1996)). This is not the place for a detailed discussion of this problem, and three points must suffice.

1) The study by Béraud, though dated in matters of detail, is still valid as regards its overall conclusion: that the chronological sequence of the foundation dates, established by archaeological investigations, is well in keeping with that established on the basis of literary traditions (Béraud (1957) 279–99, esp. 299). The recent study of the foundation chronology of Lokroı EpizephyriOI by Van Compernolle (1992) merely confirms this conclusion.

2) The establishment of a chronology based solely upon archaeological data such as the Bocchoris scarab found in Pithekousai and the Near Eastern contexts of Greek Geometric pottery (although these are still somewhat uncertain, cf. Hannestad (1996) 44–49) do seem to confirm the traditional chronology, and a skeleton outline of the earlier foundation dates can be established on the basis of (i) Pithekousai: founded 750–740 (most recent discussions in Neef (1994) 150 n. 9 *c.740*; Coldstream (1995); d’Agostino (1999a) 56–58; (ii) Kyme: the archaeological evidence indicates Greek settlers at Kyme from c.750–725, thus suggesting a first settlement phase contemporary with the settlement of Pithekousai (d’Agostino (1999a) 54); (iii) Taras: founded in 681, according to the literary tradition (706 according to Eusebius; cf. Antiochus (FGrHist 555) fr. 13; Ephor. fr. 216; Arist. Pol. 1306b27–31; cf. Van Compernolle (1992) 774). The archaeological evidence confirms the traditional foundation chronology (Lo Porto (1970) 357–58; De Julis (1983) 429; Boschung (1994) 177); (iv) Lokroı EpizephyriOI: according to Strabo 6.1.7, the foundation took place a little after the foundation of Kroton (trad. 709/8) and Syracuse (trad. 734/3); according to Polyb. 12.6b.9, at the time of the First Messenian War (c.735–717); according to Eusebius, at the time of the Olympiad 25.1 or 26.4 (679/8 or 673/2). A foundation in the first decades of C7 is now confirmed by the archaeological evidence (Van Compernolle (1992) 779–80).

3) The chronological divergences found in several of the literary sources rarely amount to more than ±25 years, for instance in the figures given for the foundation of Kroton, founded 709/8 (contemporary with the foundation of Sybaris) according to Eusebius, but contemporary with the foundation of Syracuse (734/3) according to Antiochus, a discrepancy that is hardly significant for early Archaic history (Asheri (1979) 94), and that is also acceptable in the classification of ceramic styles (Morris (1996) 58).

Another caveat is that the different literary “dates of foundation” may possibly refer to different moments in the process of colonisation of the different colonies; accordingly, a rigid chronological framework should be avoided (Gras (1986) 11–13; Morris (1996) 55–57): sites may have been colonised in phases, as were Gela (no. 17) and Siris (no. 69); foundations may have been the result of colonial processes evolving over longer periods of time, as in the case of Sicilian Megara Hyblaia (with the preliminary failed settlements at Trotilon and Thapsos), Taras (with a first settlement of Satyrion) and Lokroı (with a tradition for early settlers at Cape Zephyrion); see the respective entries infra. Pre-colonial Greek contacts with indigenous communities further complicate the issue: there is evidence of Greek presence in the colonial regions prior to the traditional foundation dates.¹³ The chronological framework of these early

contacts may depend on a revision of the dating of the “pendent-semicolon skyphoi” (Snodgrass (1994) 5).

Alongside the “historical” accounts of the foundation of colonies, there existed traditions of heroic foundations and foundation myths that served to legitimise or ennoble the colonial foundations, by projecting the history of the Greek cities back in time into the Heroic Age of the Trojan War and traditions of the nostoi (Bérard (1957) 301–83), or to the more distant period of the Argonauts (ibid. 392–97) and to the exploits of Herakles, the latter obviously evidence of later, mainly Dorian colonial propaganda (Giangiulio (1983)). There are traditions connected with the foundations of Diomedes in Daunia (Musti (1984); see also introduction to the Adriatic region in this volume); the foundation of Metapontion was ascribed to Nestor (Bérard (1957) 325); one of the early foundation phases of Siris was considered to be Trojan (Ronconi (1974–75); Moscati Castelnuovo (1989) 47–56); Philoktetes and Epeios were connected with foundations of settlements such as Lagaria and Petelia in the regions of Kroton and Sybaris, and Philoktetes died at Krimisa according to the same traditions (Musti (1991); Giangiulio (1991a)); the Athenian Menestheus was held to be the oikistes of Skylleton, certainly an example of later Athenian self-assertion.¹⁴

Whether there is any direct connection between these heroic traditions and the widespread evidence of Mycenaean contacts with the West (Vagnetti (1992), (1996) 152–59) remains an open question (Leighton (1999) 184–86). However, whereas Minoan contacts are not so far document- ed, Mycenaean contacts with South Italy (and Sicily), sporadic from Cα6 to Cα5, increased significantly in Cα4–Cα3 with a Mycenaean presence attested, for instance, at Scoglio del Tonno (Taras), on Lipari, and at Thapsos near Syracuse (Vagnetti (1991), (1996) 141–43, 152–53, 168). The late Bronze Age maritime trading posts and the hunt for metal resources and other trade goods were pioneering activities for the later western Greek expansion. Indeed, trade must have played a paramount role in the early colonisation of the West: the development of the concept of trade, the significance of the historical trade links of Euboian and Phokaian traders, and the commercial aspect of C8–C6 colonisation have been traced in studies by Mele (1979), (1988)).

Metal resources such as iron played an important role from early times, as already mentioned, and did so again later, when Pithekoussai presumably acted as an intermediary in this trade (Ridgway (1992) 109–10). Timber also became an important commodity: it could be obtained from several regions, but the Sila mountains in Bruttium were a particularly important supplier (Meiggs (1982) 462–66). Commerce was at times closely associated with piracy and trade in slaves (for which see Morel (1984) 143). According to Thuc. 6.4.5, Zankle was founded by pirates from Kampanian Kyne, and according to Ephor. fr. 137α (= Strabo 6.2.2), Tyrrenian pirates had created difficulties for early Greek commerce in the region of the straits. The importance of the trading route through the Straits of Messina has been discussed on several occasions by Vagnetti (most recently in Vallet (1988)) and need not detain us here, but the links across the straits between Zankle and Rhegion, between Naxos and Lokroi, and between Mylai and Metauros played a significant role as well in joining together the two coastal territories and creating a cultural and political koine (Vallet (1988) 172). Indeed, Rhegion and Zankle/Messana are most often treated together in regional studies.

Although there are obvious geomorphological differences between the sites of the various colonies, e.g. between Metapontion and Hyele, the traditional division of colonies into “trading colonies” (Hyele) and “agricultural colonies” or “population colonies” (Metapontion) is no longer tenable: workshops played a major role in Metapontion (see entry and Fischer-Hansen (2000) 101–2 with refs.), and Hyele did have a chora (see entry); even Pithekoussai has in recent years been shown to have had a large population and a chora (see entry). The commercial and maritime activities of the “agricultural colonies” are revealed by their location near the coast, often near rivers offering harbour facilities and access to the hinterland populated by indigenous peoples favourable to trading contacts, as well as by the lack of evidence of a monopoly over contacts with their metropoleis: imported Corinthian, East Greek and Attic pottery is found at the same sites.

The formation of extensive dominions inter alia by the foundation of secondary settlements is a central element in the Archaic history of the powerful Italiote poleis of Sybaris, Kroton, Lokroi and, to a lesser extent, Metapontion. Sybaris, for example, founded at least Laos and Poseidonia, and seems to have controlled an area of some 3,000 km² (Ampolo (1992) 247); according to Strabo 6.1.13, the city ruled four neighbouring ethne and had twenty-five poleis hypekoos. One of these dependencies of Sybaris was the Serdaioi, whether it was an ethnos or a polis hypekoos.

¹⁴ For full discussions and lists of “Gründungsmythen”, see Prinz (1979) 138–65 and Leschhorn (1984) 360–86; for the importance of oecists in numismatic iconography, cf. e.g. Lacroix (1965) esp. 75–100 and Guarducci, EG ii. 660–61.
C.550–525, this community concluded a treaty of friendship “for ever” with Sybaris and its allies (ML 10), and this seems to indicate that a hegemonic league was one of the mechanisms employed by Sybaris to control its dominion. The dependencies seem to have persisted as individual political communities. To the Serdaioi, for instance, has been ascribed a series of C5l coins: the silver coinage, of which only eight or nine specimens are known, is on the Achaian standard: obv. Dionysos standing with kantharos and vine, legends ΣΕΠΙΣΕΠΔΙ; rev. grapes. An obol has obv. bearded head; rev. legend ΣΕΠ (Rutter, HN³ 1717–20). The issue is connected with South Italy, because the weight standard is Achaian and the letter san is used for sigma, but the double-relief fabric differs from the Achaian incuse fabric which was normal at the time (Rutter, HN³ pp. 3–4; and infr). However, a date in C5e, i.e. after the treaty ML 10 and the fall of Sybaris, might explain the fabric.¹⁵ Most scholars now attribute the series to the Serdaioi of the treaty, and the location of the mint in South Italy is confirmed by a specimen from a coin hoard found in Calabria composed of otherwise exclusively South Italian issues (IGCH 1887; Rutter, HN³ p. 142). The Serdaioi probably resided somewhere on the Tyrrhenian coast in the hinterland of Laos and Skidros; for recent discussions, see E. Greco (1990) and Ampolo (1992) 245–53 with refs.

Strabo’s report (6.1.13) that Sybaris ruled four neighbouring ethne suggests that Sybaris in its heyday controlled non-Greek communities. Other Greek colonies, however, faced difficulties in their relations with the indigenous populations. The early history of Taras, for example, is characterised by conflicts with the Daunians and Messapians,¹⁶ and several armed clashes are on record (see Taras (no. 71)). In general, the literary tradition depicts the initial contacts between Greeks and indigenous populations as ranging from enmity and conflict to peaceful co-existence; and at Pithekoussai there is archaeological evidence for inter-marriage with indigenous women.¹⁷

However, the process of colonisation did have profound effects on the indigenous settlement pattern: settlements disappeared or moved to locations further inland as the colonising process led to Greek occupation of large tracts of land, control of which was also marked by the establishment of extra-urban sanctuaries. Indigenous cities within the dominion of the larger Greek foundations developed into what can best be classified as “satellite cities”.¹⁸

The early Greek foundations seem to have developed rapidly into poleis, and the very process of colonisation may have been of paramount significance here (Hansen (2000) 147–48). Thus, the earliest Greek lawgivers, Charondas and Zaleukos, may have been active in the West already from C7m, and these (and later) legislators from Sicily and South Italy won a certain renown. Zaleukos of Lokroi Epizephyrioi is a shadowy figure, but he was known to Ephor. fr. 139 (= Strabo 6.1.8) and Demosthenes (24.139–41; cf. Musti (1976) 48–50, 72–81; Link (1992)); the legislation of Charondas of Katane was used also in other Chalkidian cities in Sicily (Arist. Pol. 1274ª23–24) and is attested at Rhegion before the tyranny of Anaxilas (Cordano (1978)). In fact, the evidence for urban planning, territorial divisions and political architecture in the early colonies has prompted the suggestion that the early development of the poleis as an institution took place, or at least was accelerated, in the colonial foundations (cf. e.g. Snodgrass (1977) 33, (1994) 8–9; Ridgway (1992) 108–9; Polignac (1995) 118–27).

In terms of interaction, political unity was a development of C5l in Italia. Prior to the formation of the Italiote League in C5l, the larger poleis struggled with each other for influence. During C6, Lokroi and its ally Rhegion defeated Kroton at the battle of Sagara (Strabo 6.1.10); Siris, though allied to Lokroi, was sacked by an alliance of Metapontion, Kroton and Sybaris (Just. Epit. 20.1.10); and C510 Sybaris itself was severely defeated by Kroton (see Sybaris (no. 70)). It is doubtful whether the alliance comprising Kroton, Metapontion and Sybaris—all three Achaian foundations—represents political unity based on shared Achaian ethnicity; since it is unknown how long the alliance existed and since such shared identity, if it did exist, did not prevent the sack of Sybaris by Kroton. C5 is characterised by a series of hegemonies by the major poleis first by Kroton, later by Lokroi, and finally by Taras. Pythagoreanism has been seen as a movement linking the Greek colonies of the area, though internal unrest and stasis also kept them apart.


¹⁶ See Introduction to the Adriatic 321–25.

¹⁷ For the relationships between indigenous women and the colonists, see Van Compernolle (1983), who discusses the evidence in relation to the different types of colony. Even in Syracuse, normally taken to be a foundation where the indigenous population was oppressed or expelled, there is evidence of local influence on the burial rites of the Greek colonists (Leighton (1999) 235–37); a too simplistic picture should be avoided, since the evidence is often ambiguous: de La Genière (1983) 257; Morel (1984) 124–35; Asheri (1996) esp. 88–92, 96–98.

¹⁸ De La Genière (1983) 263–69 citing evidence mainly from Calabria-Basilicata; Polignac (1995) esp. 89–127. See also the descriptions of the territories/dominions of the individual poleis in the Inventory below. For the indigenous peoples of eastern Apulia and Calabria, the Daunians, Peuketians and Messapians and the few Greek settlements in these territories, see the Introduction to the Adriatic.
However, in C51 federalism appeared. A league of the Achaian colonies Sybaris (no. 70.V), Kroton (no. 56) and Kaulonia (no. 55) was set up c.430–420, or at least some time before 417, reportedly in imitation of a league of the Achaian metropoleis (Polyb. 2.39.6; for full discussion, see De Sensi Sestito (1984a) 90–93 and (1994) 197–205; Lombardo (1987)). This league had a common seat in the sanctuary of Zeus Homarios, which has, however, not yet been identified with certainty; see De Sensi Sestito (1982a,b), (1984b); Osanna (1989); later, it developed into a league comprising all the Italiote Greek cities. The emergence of the Italiote League was caused by the pressure which Samnite-Oskan peoples brought to bear on the Greek poleis. Kyme was conquered in 421, Poseidonia c.410, and Laos and Skidros c.390.19 Samnite-Oskan invasions caused Leukanian pressure further south, with incursions into Thurian territory (Diod. 1.411.1 (r390)). It should be noted that instances of C5m federalism are attested among the indigenous peoples of Central and South Italy, for instance among the Kampanians in control of several of the Greek cities on the Tyrrhenian coast (Frederiksen (1984) 137–38) and among the Brettians during C4m (Lombardo (1996) 209–15).

The policies of Dionysios I in South Italy, his ambition to control the straits and his imperialistic designs in the Adriatic, contributed to the renewal of the Italiote League in 393 (Diod. 1.411.1), with the inclusion of Thurioi (Diod. 1.411.1 and probably also of Rhegion (cf. Diod. 1.410.1; cf. Vallet (1958) 379; Lombardo (1987) 60) and Hipponion (Lombardo (1989) 438). But in spite of this, Kaulonia and Hipponion succumbed to Dionysios’ aggression, as did for a period Kroton and Rhegion, whereas the position of Lokroí, an ally of Dionysios, was strengthened (cf. Diod. 1.415.13; 44, 78, 87, 90, and 91.1 for the symmachia of 393).20 The Italiote League was defeated by Dionysios at the river Eleporos in 389, and although some of the major poleis preserved their independence, the smaller poleis of Kaulonia and Hipponion were razed to the ground (Diod. 1.414–7 (r389)). However, continued Dionysian aggression was interspersed with Carthaginian involvement on the side of the Italiote cities, and a refoundation of the Italiote League in 383 may be implied by Diod. 15.15.2, with a restoration of Hipponion shortly afterwards (Diod. 15.24.1; cf. Stylianou (1998) 203). After the conquest of Kroton by Dionysios in 379 (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 20.7.3), Taras took over the leadership of the Italiote League, though the seat of the league was placed in Herakleia (De Sensi Sestito (1994) 211–16). Taras, under the leadership of Archytas, may have entered into an alliance with Syracuse, securing its own influence over Herakleia and Metapontion and its dominant role in the Italiote League (Brauer (1986) 43–59).

In C4m the Leukanians conquered several Italiote cities and large tracts of the region (Diod. 14.101–5, 15, 5; Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 20.7.3), but recent research has revealed a picture of co-existence between Leukanians and Greeks, as evidenced for instance by the C4 settlement of Laos,21 and Oskans were peacefully admitted to Neapolis, where they shared citizenship with the Greek communities (cf. Frederiksen (1984) 139–40).

The Inventory below describes twenty-three poleis situated in Campania (Kyme, Neapolis and Pithekoussai) and in Italia as outlined above. In addition, there existed in the area under consideration the following Archaic/Classical settlements/communities which cannot be shown to have been poleis.22

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis

AMI (…) (AMI (…)) Some scholars read the second letter as a sigma. This otherwise unknown community is attested by five C60 incuse coins (four staters and one drachm) on the Achaian standard. The type is the Sybarite bull looking back, with, on the staters only, a locust in full above, legends written retrograde on obv. and rev.: AMI (or AΣI(?); Parise (1972) 104; Gorini (1975) 13, 115; Parise (1984); Rutter, HN3 1356–7. The type suggests that Ami(…) was, prior to 510, a community within Sybaris’ dominion (see Sybaris (no. 70.1)). However, only one coin has a certain provenance: a specimen in IGCH 1889, found at “Cittanuova 45 km northeast of Reggio”; for the coinage as testimony of a Sybarite dominion, see Parise (1984) 253, (1988) 307–8; and Guzzo (1981) 49. The legends have been seen as tenuous evidence for a site, “Amina” or “Aminaia”, situated in Poseidonian–Sybarite territory, and reflecting the presence of the Aminiaioi, a people of Thessalian origin mentioned by

20 For a full discussion, see De Sensi Sestito (1984a) 103–21 and (1994) 205–11.
21 See the entry for Laos in the Inventory below, and cf. Tréziny (1983) for the difficulty of distinguishing Greek and non-Greek sites.
22 Benettoni is treated in the Inventory of the Adriatic (no. 78), and the following nine Messapian and Daunian settlements are found in the Introduction to the Adriatic chapter: Egnatia, Elpiaia, Hydrous, Hyria, Hyrion, Kallipolis and Rhodiap, and the two unnamed foundations planned by Dionysios the Younger. For introductory remarks to the Adriatic region and the types of non-poleis sites there, see also the Introduction to the Sicilian Inventory.
Kerilloi (Κηρίλλοι) Strabo 6.1.4. According to Strabo, near Laos (no. 58); possibly a harbour controlled by Laos, see E. Greco (1986) 128. It has been identified with modern Cirilla (Roman Cerilli). A Sybarite origin is implied by von Stauffenberg (1963) 69. Barr. 46, H, but an earlier origin could be argued.

Krimissa (Κρίμισσα) Lycoph. Alex. 911 (βραχύπτολις); schol. Lycoph. Alex. 911 (πόλις); Strabo 6.1.3; Steph. Byz. 385.1 (πόλις); cf. Giangiulio (1987) and (1991a) for sources. Strabo mentions a palaia Krimissa founded by Philoktetes, but goes on to cite Apollodoros for the information that Philoktetes colonised the promontory (ἄκρα) of Krimissa. According to Steph. Byz. 385.1–2, Krimissa was a polis Italías near Kroton (no. 56) and Thourioi (no. 74); the precise location, however, is unknown. A conjoining of the akra (Apollodoros apud Strabo) and the “sacred Krimissa” mentioned in connection with the foundation of Kroton by Myskellos (Diod. 8.17) has prompted the identification of Krimissa with the sanctuary of Apollo Alaios at the promontory Cirò (Punta Alice). However, the city proper may rather have been located in the vicinity of the sanctuary (at modern Cirò Marina; cf. Giangiulio (1987)). A bronze plaque dated c.475 and “found near Krimissa” is dated by reference to an eponymous demíourgos (Arena (1996) no. 53 = LSAG 261.30), but it is unclear in which community he held office. Barr. 46, AC.

Krotalla (Κρόταλλα) Hecat. fr. 85; Steph. Byz. 386.18 (πόλις); unknown from other sources. Not in Barr.

Lagaria (Λαγαρία) Strabo 6.1.14 (φρούριον). According to legend, Lagaria was founded by Phokians led by the hero Epeios (Strabo 6.1.14). It was located “after” (μετά) Thourioi (no. 74), according to Strabo (loc. cit.; cf. Bérard (1957) 336–39). The site of Lagaria has not been identified with any certainty, but various suggestions include Amendolara (supra; de La Genière (1990), (1991b)) and S. Maria d’Anglona, in the territory of Siris (no. 69) (Osanna (1992) 94). Barr. 46, AC.

Lametinoi (Λαμετίνοι) Hecat. fr. 80 (toponym only); Steph. Byz. 409.9 (πόλις). According to Steph. Byz. 409.9–11 as emended by Meineke, Lametinoi took its name from the river Lametos near Kroton (no. 56); the precise location is uncertain, however, and various locations have been suggested in the Lamentine Plain (the Lamentine Gulf was opposite that of Skylletion: Arist. Pol. 1329b12–13; Strabo 6.1.4; cf. Spada (1990b)). An inscribed bronze plaque (IGSII no. 21, “non ante IV.um saec. a Ch. n.”) found near S. Eufemia Lamezia, is normally attributed to Terina (no. 73; so IGSII and Spada (1979); see also the entry for Terina). Barr. 46, A.

Makalla (Μάκαλλα) Arist. Mir. ausc. 107; Lycoph. Alex. 927; Steph. Byz. 427.4 (πόλις); Etym. Magn. 574.19 (πόλις); schol. Thuc. 1.12.2; Hude (πόλις); cf. Giangiulio (1991b) 293. A legendary foundation by Philoktetes, Makalla has not been identified with any certainty, but it was probably located, with other Philoktetan sites, somewhere between Kroton (no. 56) and Sybaris (no. 70) (Bérard (1957) 344–46; Giangiulio (1991b) with refs.). Musti (1991) has argued that the (mainly) C4 (?) traditions of heroic foundations in Magna Graecia, e.g. those of Philoktetes, most often refer to partly Hellenised indigenous sites (cf. Lagaria, supra). Barr. 46, AC.

Molpa, see Palinouros (infra).

Palinouros (Παλινουρος) and Molpa (Μόλπ(σ)α) Palinouros is known primarily as the location of the death of
Palaiouros, the pilot of Aeneas (Strabo 6.1.1). Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 1.53.2 refers to a *limen ho Palaiouros*, but this need not imply an urban settlement, and the tradition is, in any case, late and mythical. At the indigenous settlement investigated at Tempa della Guardia mortuary evidence has revealed some Hellenisation and contacts with the Greek world. The settlement was abandoned in C56, but a sanctuary continued in use until C3 and finds of coins of Hyele (no. 64) suggest that the area became part of the territory of Hyele (E. Greco (1975) 100–8). A coinage on the Achaean standard and in the incuse fabric, inscribed with the retrograde abbreviations ΠΑΛΑ and ΜΟΑ on *obv.* and *rev.* respectively (*infra*) has been attributed to Pal(ainouros)—either to the indigenous settlement at Tempa della Guardia or to an as yet unidentified Greek settlement on the promontory, and even to the promontory as such (E. Greco (1975) 94–99, (1987b); Mafetone (1994) esp. 284–87)—and to a city Moli(p)a, -pe), identified with Città di Molpa, a rocky plateau south of the river Lambro (ancient river Melpes, cf. Plin. *HN* 3.72), to the south of the Palaiouros peninsula. On the plateau a few indigenous habitation remains have been found, but there are no Greek remains. The *ΠΑΛΑ–ΜΟΑ* coins are known only in three specimens: *obv.* and *rev.* type is a wild boar, the two known staters have legends *ΠΑΛΑ–ΜΟΑ* (*supra*); the single known drachm has the legend *ΠΑΛΑ* on *obv.* in exergue, while the *rev.* is anepigraphic (Gorini (1975) 13, 117–18; Giacosa (1994); Rutter, *HN* 1105–6). On the basis of fabric and standard, the coins are normally connected with the coinage of Sybaris, and the two communities are thought to have been part of Sybaris’ dominion (Parise (1988) 308–9; cf. Sybaris (no. 70.1)), though a dependence upon Siris has been argued by other scholars on account of the Ionic style of the wild boar (Neutsch (1980) 164; cf. Parise (1972) 106 n. 57; E. Greco (1975) 96–97). Palaiouros: *Barr*. 46, AC; Molpa: *Barr*. 46, A.

**Parthenope** (Παρθενώπη) Strabo 14.2.10; Steph. Byz. 504.7 (πόλις). According to legend as transmitted by Strabo (14.2.10) and Steph. Byz. 504.6–7, Parthenope was a Rhodian foundation (Bérard (1957) 63–64). The more consistent tradition is that Parthenope was either an *apotokia* or, like Dikaiaarchea (*supra*), an *epineion* of Kyme (no. 57), and that the site was later destroyed by its *metropolis* (Lutatius *apud Serv. ad Verg. G.* 4.565 (= fr. 7, Peter); Bérard (1957) 56; Raviola (1990)). Parthenope became the district of *Palaiopolis* when Kyme founded neighbouring Neapolis (no. 63) in C5, and by C45 the two distinct, neighbouring urban nuclei—(Parthenope =) Palaiopolis and Neapolis—formed one political community (Livy 8.22.5) by the name of Neapolis, which suggests that Neapolis absorbed the earlier site (see the entry for Neapolis, *infra*). However, the sources do seem to suggest an early, autonomous settlement of Parthenope (Raviola (1990) 59–60). The settlement was maritime and the location on a promontory just south of ancient Neapolis, present-day Pizzofalcone on the Gulf of Naples, offered no *chora* or only a very limited one. The settlement site (c. 25 ha) was situated on the extreme spur, with steep slopes on three sides and with a saddle joining it to its hinterland and its cemetery. The tombs are mainly cist-slab tombs dated 675–550. Of special interest is the presence of Italo-Corinthian vases of a type known from Kyme and Pithekoussai (Frederiksen (1984) 85–87, 90–95; De Caro (1974), (1985)). Part of a C6 circuit wall (i.e. of the pre-Neapolis phase) located between the hill of Parthenope and the coast is taken as evidence of a fortified harbour or perhaps even of a protected harbour settlement (Napoli (1967) 380–83). The cult of the eponymous siren Parthenope (Dionys. Per. 357) was of early origin; the ancient sources locate it by the sea near the river Sebeto (see Canciani (1994)). The cult was later taken over by Neapolis, where the siren Parthenope is represented on C55 coins (Rutter (1979) 44–45; for games held in her honour, cf. Strabo 5.4.7). *Barr*. 44, AC.

**Petelia** (Πετηλία) Strabo 6.1.3 (*μητρόπολις τῶν Λευκανῶν*; cf. Lasserre *ad loc.); *BCH* 45 (1921) col. IV.86; Steph. Byz. 519.15 (πόλις). One of the legendary foundations of Philoktetes situated somewhere between Kroton (no. 56) and Sybaris (no. 70) and the *metropolis* of the Leukanians, according to Strabo 6.1.3. The city is now identified with modern Strongoli (for the site: Osanna (1992) 198). A C45 inscription from this site carries a text dated by reference to an eponymous *demiourgos* (*SEG* 4 74; *LSAG* 261.28; Arena (1996) no. 51); since there is limited evidence for independent communities in this region, the text suggests a close relationship with Kroton (Giangiulio (1989) 44–45). The sources for the mythical foundation of Petelia are late (Bérard (1957) 344; Intrieri (1989)), and the site may have had a primarily Leukanian C4 history. *Barr*. 46, C.

**Plateis** (Πλατείς) In Ps.-Skylax 12, the chapter on Leukania, the sixth toponym listed after the heading *πόλεις εἰσὶν αὐτῶ* is Πλατείς. The text may be corrupt (Müller, *ad loc*; Bérard (1957) 148 n. 4); however, Giangiulio (1996) finds confirmation of a settlement with the name of Plateis in the episode recorded in Iambl. *VP* 261 of a flight of a group of *epheboi* Πλατέας (cf. Giangiulio (1996) 39). Not in *Barr*. 
Skidros (Σκίδρος) Hdt. 6.21.1; Steph. Byz. 575.1 (πόλις); Steph. Byz. 575.1–2 cites the C4–C3e historian Lykos of Rhegion for the ethnic Σκίδρανος (= FGrHist 570, fr. 2). According to Hdt. 6.21.1, Sybarite refugees settled at Skidros (and Laos) after 510. The location of Skidros is unknown, but it was in the dominion of Sybaris (no. 70.1), probably on the Tyrrenian coast in the vicinity of Pyxous and Laos. Various identifications have been suggested, principally Belvedere Marittimo, originally put forward by Bérard ((1957) 146–47); however, the evidence is tenuous (Luppino (1985)). Other propositions (such as San Nicola Arcella, a small harbour c.3 km north of Laos (no. 58)) are discussed and rejected by Di Vasto (1992). E. Greco (1992a) 473–77 suggests Sapri near Pyxous, a location tentatively followed by Barr. 46. Skidros may have been either an indigenous settlement with settlers from Sybaris after 510 or a town or a military installation (cf. Bérard (1957) 146) with mainly Greek inhabitants. Barr. 46, A.

Skylletion (Σκυλλήτιον, Σκυλάκιον) Diod. 13.3.5 (r415); Strabo 6.1.10 (πόλις); Ptol. Geog. 3.1.10 (πόλις); Steph. Byz. 579.7 (πόλις); the curious description of Skylletion as a πόλις Σκυλήτας by Steph. Byz., though he cites Eudoxos of Knidos (fr. 320, Lasserre), is attributed to Steph. Byz. himself by Lasserre ad loc. Legend attributed the foundation of Skylletion to Athenians returning from Troy (Strabo 6.1.10; cf. Plin. HN 3.95 and Solin. 2.10). Historically, Skylletion was probably founded in the Archaic period, on the route of Krotoniate interests on the Ionian side of the peninsula: black-figured sherds from the site (Spadea (1989) 70 fig. 1) and the tradition of a heroic foundation may reflect a history going back into the Archaic period. In the Classical period, it was a Krotoniate possession, but was handed over to Lokroi (no. 59) by Dionysios I (Strabo 6.1.10). A survey of the site is found in Arslan (1969–70); archaeological evidence for Greek Skylletion is very scarce, and there are no structural remains. Sporadic finds of Attic red-figured sherds indicate a settlement of c.16 ha (Spadea (1989) 69–71). A cult of Athena Skylatia has been conjectured on the basis of the perhaps corrupt Athena Skylaia in the Alexandria of Lykophron (852–55). The name of Scoculion Minervum assumed by the Roman foundation of Scoculium also seems to confirm an earlier Greek cult of Athena Skylatia (Giannelli (1963) 176–78; architectural terracotta: Orlandini (1977)). A series of anepigraphic bronze coins of C4s has, on the basis of its rev. type and provenance, been attributed to Skylletion: obv. young male head; rev. Skylla swimming left, rarely Σ (or Μ) (Visonà (1990); Rutter, HN 2565); SNG Cop. Italy 1992–93). Barr. 46, C.

SO (…) (ΣΟ (…)) This Archaic community is known only from a rare C3 silver coinage struck on the Euboic standard, but employing the Achaian incuse fabric. The type is the Sybarite bull looking back, with legend ΣΟ retrograde on obv. (Gorini (1975) 12, 115–16; Parise (1972) 105 n. 55 for specimens, one with the known provenance of Roggliano; Rutter, HN 1728). The issue has been connected with a hypothetical Archaic site “Sontia”, thought of as the main city of the Leukanian Sontini (Plin. HN 3.98). The coinage may attest a settlement within the dominion of Sybaris (no. 70.1; cf. AMI (…, supra), but the weight standard employed points to other interpretations, such as an issue struck with special regard to Sybarite, Etruscan or Rhodian border trade (E. Greco (1990) 43 n. 19; Parise (1988) 308). Not in Barr., but cf. Barr. 45 Sontini, R.

2. Unidentified Settlements

Amendolara A settlement on the hill of S. Nicola halfway between Sybaris (no. 70) and Siris (no. 69). The indigenous site was strongly Hellenised by C7–C6, as attested by material finds, sanctuary (?), habitation structures and urban planning; it may have been a dependent settlement of Sybaris and it was apparently destroyed along with Sybaris in 510. Amendolara has been tentatively identified with Lagaria (supra; cf. de La Genière (1984); Osanna (1992) 132–34, 163–64). Barr. 46, A.

Incoronata A settlement on the hill of Incoronata in southern Basilicata, above the river Basento, c.7 km west of Metapontion (no. 61), on the border between Sirite and Metapontine territory. Habitation and other structures, as well as rich finds of Greek ceramics, point to a Greek settlement of some importance from c.700. Earlier finds attest contacts with the Greek world from c.750. The settlement phase came to an end c.630, probably as a result of the foundation of Metapontion. The site is normally taken to be an unknown “emporion” on the confines of Greek colonial territory (that of Siris (no. 69)) and the indigenous hinterland. Also, Incoronata has been tentatively identified with settlements known from the written sources, such as Lagaria (supra). Greek graffiti and stylistic affinities of the ceramics point to an East Greek origin of the settlers. See Orlandini (1986b); De Siena (1990); Lombardo and Giannotta (1990)). Barr. 45, A.

Some of these settlements/communities may indeed have been polis: e.g. Skylletion may have struck coins. On the other hand, the ethnic identity of the communities listed is
not always obvious. On the status of the communities which were not poleis we are poorly informed.

II. The Poleis

52. Herakleia (Herakleios) Map 45. Lat. 40.15, long. 16.40. Size of territory: 4. Type: A. The city may initially have been called by another name (Antiochos (FGrHist 555) fr. 11), but the only known toponym is Ἡράκλεια, Ἡ (Antiochos (FGrHist) fr. 11 apud Strabo 6.1.14; IG xiv 645.11.2 (C4l)); or Ἡράκλεια (IG xiv 645.11-32 (C4l)); Ps.-Skyrax 14 has Ἴρακλεων. The city-ethnic is Ἡράκλειος (C4 coins, infra; IG xiv 645.11.11 (C4l)), also spelled Ἴρακλειος (C4 coins, infra). Only after the Classical period does Ἴρακλεώτης appear (BE (1964) no. 247 (C1); Diod. 13.3.4 (1415); Strabo 6.1.14), but Ἴρακλειος is none the less often qualified by ἰταλίας to distinguish it from the ethnics of other cities of the same name (CID 11.6.B.2 (c.358); BCH 23 (1899) 501 nos. 16–17 (both C4l)).

Herakleia is called a polis in the urban sense at IG xiv 645.1.64 (C4l) and implicitly at Ps.-Skyrax 14, where Herakleion is the first toponym listed after the heading πόλεις εἰσὶν αἵδε (cf. Diod. 12.56.4 (1432)); it is called a polis in the political sense at IG xiv 645.1.2, 1.95 (C4l), etc. Damos is found at IG xiv 645.1.119 (C4l). The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C4 coins (infra) and at IG xiv 645.1.11 (C4l); the external collective use is found in CID 11.6.B.2 (c.358) and Diod. 13.3.4 (1415); the external individual use is found in BCH 23 (1899) 501–2 nos. 16–17 (C4) and BCH 65 (1939–41) 150 (C4). Patris is found in Anthologia Lyrica Graeca i p. 11, Diehl.

Herakleia was a joint foundation of Taras (no. 71) and Thourioi (no. 74): after a war for influence in the Siritis (Antiochos (FGrHist) fr. 11; cf. IvO 254–56 (c.440) and Diod. 12.23.2 (1444)) these two cities made an agreement to found a joint colony (Antiochos loc. cit. = Staatsverträge 158). According to Antiochos (loc. cit.), however, the city was founded in the name of Taras (τὴν ἄποικιαν κριθήματι Ταραιτίων), and confirmation of Tarantine predominance may be seen in the fact that Herakleia’s eponymous official was an ephor (IG xiv 645.1.1 (C4l); SEG 30 1162–70 (C4l–C5e); cf. also IG xiv 645.1.166 (C4l) for the term ῥήτρας = laws). Diod. 12.36.4 dates the foundation to 433/2 and treats it as a purely Tarantine enterprise (as does Strabo 6.1.14; cf. 6.3.4 (1330s), where Herakleia is described as “in Tarantine territory” and a war between Taras and the Messapians περὶ Ἡρακλεῖας is mentioned). According to Diodorus (loc. cit.), the city was founded at the site of Siris (no. 69), whose inhabitants were deported. According to Antiochos (FGrHist 555) fr. 11, “Herakleia” was not the original name: the city was thus named only after having changed its location (᾿Ἡράκλειαν δ’ ύστερον κληθήναι, μεταβαλόντας καὶ τοῖσιμα καὶ τῶν τόπων), and a combination of Diodorus and Antiochos would suggest that the city was originally founded as Siris at the site of Siris, but later relocated and then named Herakleia. Such a reconstruction is not, however, supported by the archaeological evidence, which clearly shows Herakleia to have occupied the site of Siris (infra). According to Strabo 6.1.14, Siris served as the epineion of Herakleia, but the reference is not to the historical Siris but to the legendary polis Tiroik of the same name.

In the chora, traces of land division have been examined by Guy (1995). Sacred land belonging to Dionysos and Athena Polias is attested by IG xvi 645.1.11 (C4l) respectively. These Tabulae Herculenses (C4l) deal with the recovery and the measuring of the fields belonging to the two divinities, probably from the time of the foundation in 433/2 (Sartori (1967) 37–76). To the north along the river Cavone (ancient Akalandros) the territory of Herakleia bordered upon Metapontine territory, the western border being constituted by the natural strongpoint of the hills of Anglona with the settlement of Santa Maria d’Anglona. This originally indigenous site with a history of C7–C6 Hellenisation (see Siris (no. 69)) has revealed sporadic C5 settlement remains and a C4 sanctuary of Demeter and Artemis (Rüdiger (1969); Osanna (1992) 98, 109–10 no. 10). A city (polis) of Pandosia is mentioned by Plut. Pyrrh. 16.5 in connection with Pyrrhos’ encampment near Herakleia in 280 and at IG xiv 645.12, 54, 64, etc.). This Pandosia is now commonly identified with the settlement of Anglona (Sartori (1967) 28 n. 52, 95; E. Greco (1992b) 34, 37; Barr. 45). Other C5–C4 sanctuaries are known in the chora (Bini (1989); Osanna (1992) 97–105). Farmsteads seem to have been concentrated mainly along the valley of the river Sinni (ancient Siris) and to a lesser degree in the valley of the river Agri. In C4e a line of border fortifications was laid out along south-western hills bordering upon Leukanian territory. Harbour settlements near the estuary of the river Sinni are inferred from cemeteries. To the south the territory of Herakleia was delimited by rural sites in the valley of the Torrente S. Nicola. In total the territory comprised about 350 km² (overall view: Osanna (1992) 97–114).

Herakleia was a member of the Italiote League (Staatsverträge 230), and in C4 the city became the seat of
the League, which had previously been centred on Kroton (no. 56; Polyb. 2.39.5–6). Alexander the Molossian transferred the seat to Thourioi (no. 74) (Strabo 6.3.4); he also reconquered the city from the Leukianians, who must then have taken it (Livy 8.24.4 (r326)).

Several citizens of Herakleia were appointed proxenoi by Delphi (no. 177) in C4: BCH 23 (1899) 501 no. 16, 502 no. 17, and BCH 63 (1939–41) 150; the latter two were appointed the-orodokoi as well.

A system of civic subdivisions, involving two different kinds of groupings, is attested for C4l by IG xiv 645; see further Jones, POAG 162–64 with refs. A tyranny at Herakleia is mentioned by Phainias fr. 16, Wehrli, but its historicity is doubtful since the story associated with it is located in BCH and recorded by IG orodokoi as well.

IG xiv 645.1.49–50 (C4l) refers to legal proceedings initiated by the ὄρισταί against private citizens who had encroached upon sacred land. The inscription (e.g. at 1.55) distinguishes between ἱερά and Φίλια land. The following officials are attested: an eponymous ἐφορός (IG xiv 645.1 (C4l); SEG 30 1162–70 (C4l–C3e)); an annual board of two πολιανόμοι (IG xiv 645.1.96–97, 1.104, 1.164–65 (C4l)); an annual board of σταγερταί in charge of a public granary (IG xiv 645.1.102 (C4l)); two boards of ὄρισταί (IG xiv 645.1.2 (C4l)) presumably elected (haustéyntes; IG xiv 645.1.9 (C4l)) ad hoc; a γραμματεύς (IG xiv 645.1.188 (C4l)). The assembly = ἄλια, is mentioned at IG xiv 645.1.12, 11.9–10 (C4l), and qualified as κατάκλητος “specially summoned” (Sartori (1953) 96; Ghinatti (1996) 87). The work carried out by the ὄρισταί and recorded by IG xiv 645 (C4l) was decreed by the katukletos alia (1.12). Two month names (Ἁπελλαίος, Πάναμος) are attested by IG xiv 645.1.2, 101 (C4l). The onomastics of IG xiv 645 indicate that non-Greeks had been absorbed into the citizenry (Lomas (2000) 178–79).

The city was situated on the low and narrow east–west-oriented plateau (modern Policoro), between the estuaries of the rivers Akiris and Siris, the site of the C8 foundation of Siris (no. 69). The evidence suggests some measure of occupation of the Policoro plateau from the Siris phase to the C55 foundation of Herakleia (Hänsel (1973) 491; Adamesteau (1985a) 63).

Herakleia occupied two main areas of habitation: an upper city and a lower plateau to the south, divided from the upper city by a depression occupied already from the Archaic period by sanctuaries. A C5 ashlar circuit wall has been revealed on the south and south-east side of the “acropolis”, on the northern side of the plateau, and sporadically along its southern side, implying a primary habitation of the plateau. A subsequent phase comprising the lower city was previously seen as a result of the growing importance of Herakleia in C4e as head of the Italiote League (Adamesteau (1985b) 98). Recently an overall, contemporary 433/2 occupation of the whole site has been argued, comprising an urban area of c.140 ha (Giardini (1998) 192–93). Habitation on the central part of the upper plateau was laid out on both sides of the east–west plateia which crossed the middle of the plateau. The area has been interpreted as a kerameikos with workshops inserted into the domestic structures, and in use from C5 to early third century AD. The interpretation of the urban layout of the lower city is based upon aerial photography; this has revealed a plan of at least eight plateiai, although the orientation is generally east–west, it is different from that of the upper city. The lower city is protected on its southern, eastern and western sides by C4–C3 ashlar circuit walls, strengthened with towers and an outer ditch. The slope and valley between the upper and lower plateau were reserved for sanctuaries and areas of public use, such as the agora, lying outside the urban plans of the upper and lower city (Neutsch (1967) 110–50; Hänsel (1973); Adamesteau (1985b); Giardini (1992), (1998)). Cult had continued uninterrupted in the sanctuary of Demeter from the Siris phase through C3 to C4, when structures were laid out on a system of terraces, an architectural sophistication reflecting the status of Herakleia as head of the Italiote League (Pianu (1989)); for the cult: Neutsch (1967) 134–36, (1980) 158–65; Sartori (1980); Hinz (1998) 187–93. The sanctuary housed also the cults of Artemis Soteira (Neutsch (1967) 134), and Artemis Bendis was venerated in her role as divinity of asylia (Pianu (1989) 108; Curti (1989) 28–29). Other votive material indicates a cult of Athena, attested also by the coin types (infra); Athena Polias is attested at IG xiv 645.11.5 (C4l). The central area of the valley was occupied by the sanctuary of the “Archaic Temple”, of uncertain cult, which was enlarged in C5–C3 to comprise various religious buildings, treasuries, a hestiatorion(?), as well as a vast public space interpreted as the agora (Pianu (1991)). The sacred lands of Athena and Dionysos attested by the Tabulae probably occupied the area north of the city, since this area has been shown to have been unoccupied. The cemeteries were located to the east, south and west of the city; rites were mainly inhumation in cist-slab tombs, and some graves are rich in tomb gifts reflecting the city’s ceramic production (Degrassi (1967); Da Leukania a Lucania 151–97). Cults of Hestia and Aphrodite are attested by IG xiv 646 (C4–C3).
Herakleia minted silver coins from the time of its foundation on the Achaian–Thourian standard, but with the Tarantine system of denominations (Van Keuren 1994). The first series, c.432–420, were diobols: obv. head of Herakles, or Athena in Attic helmet; rev. lion, legend HE (SNG Cap. Italy 1098–1100), or Herakles strangling lion, legend: HE, ἡΠΑΚΛΗΙΩΝ, ἡΠΑΚΛΗΙΩΝ (Van Keuren 1994 nos. 23–40; Rutter, HN³ 1358–60). Staters were issued c.430–400(?): obv. head of Athena, helmet decorated with olive wreath; rev. Herakles seated on a rock pouring a libation, legend ΗΡΑΚΛΗΙΩΝ, sometimes retrograde (Van Keuren 1994 no. 1; Rutter, HN³ 1362). Later series of staters and diobols c.420–C4l have types: obv. head of Athena wearing Attic helmet, decorated with hippocamp or Skylla, on one die the legend ΑΘΑΝΑΣ; rev. Herakles standing or kneeling, fighting the Nemean lion (Rutter, HN³ 1363ff; SNG Cap. Italy 1101–4, 1115–32). The dies of some issues are signed ΑΠΙΣΤΟΧΕΝΟΣ, a die-engraver also known from Metapontion (Rutter, HN³ 1373). From c.334 a new issue of diobols and staters, possibly related to Alexander the Molossian (Van Keuren 1994) 28–29, 32), have rev. Herakles standing, holding club and lion skin (Rutter, HN³ 1381, 1383; SNG Cap. Italy 1105–14). The types with Herakles are obviously connected with his cult in a city named after him, and on the reverse of the early staters he may be pouring a libation in the role of oikistes (Rutter 1997) 47). A single issue of gold (quarter-stater) of C3e has been attributed to Herakleia (Van Keuren 1994) no. 124; Rutter, HN³ 1421); bronze coinage was introduced in C4 (Rutter, HN³ 1436ff; SNG Cap. Italy 1133–43). Herakleian and Tarantine C4l–C3 silver fractions have similar types and suggest federal production.

A communal donation towards the rebuilding of the Delphic temple is recorded by CID 11 B.2 (c.358).

53. Hipponion (Hipponieus) Map 46. Lat. 38.40, long. 16.05. Size of territory: 3. Type: [A]. The toponym is Εἰπωνίων, τό (Archestratos fr. 35.8, Olson and Sens). The corresponding city-ethnic is found as Εἰπωνιεύς in SEG 11 1211 (525–500), and C4 coins (infra) use the form Εἰπωνιεύς (abbreviated as ΕΠΙΕΙ in the earliest C4 coins: RE viii.A. 2005: Lombardo (1989) 452); Ps.-Skyllax 12 and Douris (FGrHist 76) fr. 19 have ΙΠΠΟΝΙΟΝ for the toponym (‘ΙΠΠΟΝΕΟΣ is found at App. B Civ. 5.91). The corresponding city-ethnic ‘ΙΠΠΟΝΙΟΣ is found at Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 20.7,3 (1388) and F.Delphes 111.179 (C4l–C3e); at Thuc. 5.5.3 the MSS have ΙΤΩΝΕΑΣ, which is commonly and probably correctly emended to ΙΠΠΟΝΕΑΣ or ΙΠΠΟΝΙΑΣ (cf. Hornblower 1996) 434–35; Lombardo (1989) 452); but Steph. Byz. 342.10 does mention an ΙΤΩΝΕΑΣ . . . ΙΤΑΛΙΑΣ (which may, however, be identical with Hipponion: RE viii.A. 2004–5; contra Lombardo (1989) 452). Finally, Diod. 15.24.1 (1379) has ‘ΙΠΠΟΝΝΕΣΤΗΣ, and ‘ΙΠΠΟΝΙΕΥΣ is found in SEG 2 635 (Hell.).

Hipponion is one of ten toponyms listed at Ps.-Skyllax 12 after the heading πόλεις εἰσιν Ἐλληνικὲς αἱδὲ, where polis is used in the urban sense (cf. Douris (FGrHist 76) fr. 19 and Diod. 14.107.2 (1388)); Thuc. 5.5.3 calls the Hipponieus apoikoi of the Lokrians. The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is attested on C4 coins (infra); the external collective use is attested by SEG 11 1211 (525–500), probably by Thuc. 5.5.3 (supra) and by Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 20.7,3 (1388) and Diod. 15.24.1 (1379); the external individual use is found in F.Delphes 111.176 (C4l–C3e), which describes a man as ΛΟΚΡΟΣ ἐκ τῶν ἘΠΩΝ[ΙΕΥ]ΜΩΝ ἹΠΠΟΝΙΕΥΣ (infra).

Hipponion was a colony founded by Lokroi (no. 59) (Thuc. 5:5:3; cf. Ps.-Skymnos 308 and Strabo 6.1.5). Archaeological evidence points to a foundation in C7l (infra). The scanty evidence shows very varied relations between Hipponion and its metropolis (a) SEG 11 1211 (525–500), a joint dedication by Hipponion, Medma (no. 60) (also a Lokrian colony), and Lokroi (cf. Lombardo (1989) 429) at Olympia of spoils taken from Kroton (no. 56), implies a military alliance between colony and mother city, but has nothing on its origin or duration (Hornblower 1996) 434–35), and nothing about the political status of Hipponion vis-à-vis Lokrois (Lombardo (1989) 428–31); (b) Thuc. 5.5.3 attests to a war between Lokrois and Hipponion and Medma but gives no explanation of the issues involved (see further Lombardo (1989) 431–40); (c) F.Delphes 111.176 (C4l–C3e) is a Delphic grant of proxeny etc. to a man described as ΛΟΚΡΟΣ ἐκ τῶν ἘΠΩΝ[ΙΕΥ]ΜΩΝ ἹΠΠΟΝΙΕΥΣ; this unique combination of city-ethnics presumably indicates some kind of political interdependence between the two communities (Graham (1964) 94; Savalli (1989) 467), but (pace Graham (1964) 94–95) this evidence can hardly be retrojected into the Archaic and Classical periods (cf. Hornblower (1996) 434–35).

Evidence from cemeteries and sanctuaries points to a C7l foundation date for Hipponion (infra), confirmed by Greek influence in local, indigenous tombs—for instance at Torre Galli (Arslan (1986) esp. 1031–32, 1042, 1052–54; Lombardo (1989) 424 n. 29). Evidence of Greek presence in the territory of Hipponion comes primarily from the area between the city and the coast, where ceramic evidence indicates Greek presence from C6 (see also the entry for Medma). The
coastal chora of Hipponion was consolidated by C5: the evidence is a coastal sanctuary (dedicated to Persephone?) and C5–C4 remains of, presumably, agricultural and maritime structures (Ianelli (1989); Givigliano (1989) 745–46). The coastal plain, between Nicotera and the river Angitula, covers about 120 km², but the territory of Hipponion would have comprised about 200 km² if the valleys south of the city were part of the territory. Agathokles of Syracuse built an epineion (Strabo 6.1.5), and remains of this have been identified on the coast below Hipponion between the rivers S. Anna and Trainiti at Castello Bivona and Porto Salvo (Lena (1989) 601–7). The route between Hipponion and the coast was consolidated by C5, with an extra-urban sanctuary near the coast at Castello Bivona (Givigliano (1989) 748–51).

Hipponion may have been a member of the Italiote League (Lombardo (1989) 438). An alliance of Hipponion with Lokroi (cf. Lombardo (1989) 429) and, presumably, Medma in C6 is implied by SEG 11 1221 (525–500), a joint dedication by these three cities of spoils taken from Kroton. Thucydid's phrasing at 5.5.3 (ὁ πρὸς Ἰππωνιᾶς καὶ Μεδμαίους πόλεµος καὶ Ἔριδιδός πόλεµος) suggests that Hipponion and Medma were allies in the war against Lokroi c.422.

In 388 Hipponion was conquered by Dionysios I of Syracuse, who relocated the inhabitants to Syracuse (no. 47), razed the city, and handed over its territory to the Lokrians (Diod. 14.107,2; cf. Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 20,7,3). Apparently, not all Hipponieis were relocated; at least, when describing the refoundation of the city at 15.24.1 (1379), Diodorus states that the Carthaginians restored the city to the "Hipponiates in exile", and these may have been exiled when Dionysios took the city; Diodorus' phrasing leaves open the possibility that exiles other than Hipponieis were settled in the refounded city (Lombardo (1989) 439). In 356, the city was subjuged by the Brettians (Diod. 16.15.2); but any long-lasting Brettian possession of the city is hardly to be assumed (cf. Lombardo (1989) 440–43).

_F.Delphes_ 111.1 176 (C4l–C3e) is a grant of proxeny etc. by Delphi (no. 177) to a man described as _Ἀλκρός ἕκ τῶν Ἐπιζευγμένων Ἰππωνιών_ (supra).

Hipponion was founded on a steep-sided plateau c.500 m above sea level. There are no traces of the Greek urban layout or habitation structures, which have all been obliterated by the mediaeval city. However, the extant remains of the c.6 km-long circuit wall and the morphology of the site indicate a fortified area of about 80 ha; the urbanised area, presumably about the size of the mediaeval city, comprised about 40 ha (Aumüller (1994) 248 fig. 1). The city probably had an urban layout similar to that of other Greek colonies, with open unoccupied spaces (Ianelli and Givigliano (1989) 677–81). The circuit wall has four structural phases (Aumüller (1994); Ianelli (2000a)): the first phase ("A"), C6s–C5f, had foundations roughly constructed of boulders, possibly supporting a brick superstructure. The second phase ("B"), C5s–C4f, is an ashlar wall with rectangular towers, unusually placed inside the curtain-wall. The destruction and later enlargement of this phase is possibly connected with destruction by Dionysios I in 388 and the later Carthagian-sponsored refoundation of the city. Later phases are connected with the incursions of the Brettians and possibly with the wars of Agathokles. The eastern part of the city, the Cofino plateau, though not urbanised, was fortified from the early history of the city, but may have been separated from the central area by a transverse wall, a sort of _diateichisma_, at a later date (Aumüller (1994) fig. 1 "a–a" and "b–b"; cf. also Ianelli and Givigliano (1989) 672–77, 679 pl. 53). The sanctuaries are, primarily, situated along the east and north edge of the plateau, a system of _sacra cintura_ known, for instance, from Akragas and Lokroi (Parra (1996b), (2000)): to the north on the top of "Belvedere-Telegrafo" is a C6m _temenos_ with _naiskoi_ and a monumental, C6l peripteral Doric temple; to the east is the _temenos_ "Contorno del Castello"; a C5l–C4e Ionic temple is located on the Cofino plateau; c.150 north-west of temple are remains of a small _temenos_ with votive deposits and _naiskos_ (?) and a _via sacra_ (Quilici (1990)). The evidence for the cults is above all C5f _pinakes_ of Lokrian type with Persephone–Kore iconography (cf. Strabo 6.1.5), though one type is unique, with an Aphrodite iconography not known from the Lokroi _pinakes_ (Parra (1989) 559–65, (1996b) 142–43; Hinz (1998) 211–12). C4 figurers indicate a Demeter cult (Ianelli (1996c) 147). A very rich votive deposit in "località Scrimbia" covers the period c.570–C5 and testifies to a wealthy aristocracy (Sabbione (1996); Hinz (1998) 212). Cults of Zeus, Athena and Hermes seem to be indicated by the coin types (_infra_), as does one of a local nymph Pandina. The C7–C6 cemeteries were located on the western outskirts of city, originally outside the circuit walls, perhaps later within (Arslan (1986); M. D’Andria (1989); Ianelli (2000b)).

Like its _metropolis_ Lokroi, and the other Lokrian sub-colony of Medma, Hipponion did not issue coins until C4m, when it initiated a bronze coinage. The first phase is dated before the Brettian conquest in 356 or after, on the basis of Brettian influence on letters in the legend _F.EI_ or _F.EIII_ (cf. Lombardo (1989) 441–43, who argues for periods of Hipponian autonomy in C4s–C3e). _Obv._ head of Hermes;
rev. eagle, or ampchora or kerykeion (Rutter, HN\textsuperscript{9} 2243–54; SNG Cop. Italy 1829–30). Later issues have obv. head of Zeus, or Apollo, with rev. types similar to those of the earlier issues; legend: \textit{ΕΠΙΩΝΙΕΩΝ} (Rutter, HN\textsuperscript{9} 2246ff; SNG Cop. Italy 1831–34). One issue depicts a goddess Pandina (possibly influenced by Terina: Rutter (1997) 78), legend: \textit{ΠΑΝΔΙΝΑ} (Rutter, HN\textsuperscript{9} 2251; SNG Cop. Italy 1834). A small issue of staters on the Corinthian standard has been attributed to Hipponion on the basis of the \textit{kerykeion} symbol on the rev. (Rutter, HN\textsuperscript{9} 2242).

54. Hyele (Hyeletes)/Elea (Eleates) Map 46. Lat. 40.40, long. 15.10. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The earliest form of the toponym is \textit{’Υελής, ἦ} (possibly on C5 coins, cf. Masson, REG 108 (1995) 231; Hdt. 1.167.3; cf. Antiochos (\textit{FG\textsubscript{Hist}} 555) fr. 8 apud Strabo 6.1.1). The corresponding city-ethnic is \textit{’Ελεάτης} (C5 coins, infra). This form is replaced in the Classical period by \textit{’Ελαέα, ἦ} (Antiochos (\textit{FG\textsubscript{Hist}} 555) fr. 8 apud Strabo 6.1.1; Pl. Soph. 216A; Ps.-Skylax 12). The corresponding city-ethnic is \textit{’Ελεάδης} (IG iv\textsuperscript{2}.1 258 (C4); Arist. Rh. 1400\textsuperscript{b}7), also spelled \textit{’Ελαιάδας} (BE (1987) no. 758 (C4)) and possibly in SEG 24 303 (C6–C5) as re-interpreted by G. Cordiano (1995a).

Hyele is called a \textit{polis} in the urban sense at Hdt. 1.167.3 (where Rosén’s conjecture \textit{ἐκτίσαντο} is preferable to codd. \textit{ἐκτήσαντο}); and \textit{Elea} is one of ten toponyms listed at Ps.-Skylax 12 after the heading \textit{πόλεις εἰσίν Ἑλληνίδες αἵδε}, where \textit{polis} is used in the urban sense. \textit{Polites} is found in Speusippos fr. 3. The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C5 coins (infra); the external collective use is found in Arist. Rh. 1400\textsuperscript{b}7 and possibly in SEG 24 303 (C6–C5) as reinterpreted by G. Cordiano (1995a); and the external individual use is found at IG iv\textsuperscript{2}.1 258 (C4) and BE (1987) no. 758 (C4).

Hyele was founded by Phokaian \textit{(= Alalians (no. 1))} who had abandoned the Phokaia colony of Alalia on Corsica shortly after the battle of Alalia (c.540–535) in which they had defeated Etruscan and Carthaginian forces but suffered severe losses themselves (Hdt. 1.166–67); according to Ps.-Skymnos 250, a contingent from Massalia (no. 3) participated in the foundation. The site on which the city was founded was uninhabited before the arrival of the Hellenes (Bencivenga Trillmisc (1990) 365).

The territory of Hyele was delimited by the hills of Mt. Gelbison and Mt. Cavallara and the Classical fortresses located there, such as that of Moio della Civitella (E. Greco and Schnapp (1986); Bencivenga Trillmisc (1990) 366–67 fig. 367). The earlier contention that Hyele had no \textit{chora} (Pugliese Carratelli (1970b) 12–14) has been abandoned (cf. for instance Morel (1988) 438–40); Gras (1985) 422–23 calculates the arable hinterland of Hyele as c.13 km\textsuperscript{2}, suggesting that a large part of the \textit{chora}, above all the wooded slopes of the inland hills, was exploited for timber. E. Greco and Schnapp (1983) 382–83 suggest that the territory within a distance of 4–5 km of Hyele was suitable for farming. The largest territorial extension, as bounded by Poseidonian territory to the north, and at the Palinuro peninsula, delimiting the territory of Pyxous (no. 67) on the south, is c.400–500 km\textsuperscript{2}; however, the degree of Hyele’s control over this larger area is uncertain; Strabo 6.1.1 hints at armed conflicts with Poseidonia (no. 66) and the Leukianans, but supplies no date. No sanctuaries or second-order settlements are known in the territory (Bencivenga Trillmisc (1990) 366).

According to Strabo 6.1.1, the offshore islands of the Oinotrides offered good anchoring places, while the estuaries of the rivers Alento and Fiumarella north and south of the acropolis also offered harbour facilities (cf. Johannowsky (1982) 234). Apart from these mercantile aspects the city has all the appearances of a “population-colony” with a \textit{chora} (cf. Morel (1988) 438–40, 461).

Attempts have been made to estimate the size of Hyele’s population at the time of its foundation from the number of Phokaian ships that survived the battle at Alalia: twenty \textit{pentekonteres} according to Hdt. 1.166.2. A crew of eighty with families gives a figure of between 240 and 320 per ship, in all c.4,800–6,400 persons (Gras (1985) 421–2); other calculations have reached a similar figure of c.6,000 (Johannowsky (1982) 225). However, it is important to bear in mind that the limited agricultural resources were not the sole means of support for the population, which had important commercial contacts as well (Morel (1982); Gras (1985) 421–25; cf. also the remarks by Strabo 6.1.1 on the city’s reliance on the sea.

Hyele was member of the Italiote League against Dionysios in 387 (Polyaen. 6.11). A squadron of twelve triremes is attested in Polyaen. 6.11 (r389). Two citizens of Hyele were involved in the Timoleontic reoundation of Akragas (no. 9) (Plut. Tim. 35.2).

There are few sources for the political organisation of Hyele; but a C5 tyranny is reported by Diod. 10.18.1–2 and Diog. Laert. 9.26. Parmenides was allegedly the legislator at Hyele, his native city, and each year the head of Zeus, or amphora or eagle, or amphora or kerykeion (Rutter, HN\textsuperscript{9} 2243–54; SNG Cop. Italy 1829–30). Later issues have obv. head of Zeus, or Apollo, with rev. types similar to those of the earlier issues; legend: \textit{ΕΠΙΩΝΙΕΩΝ} (Rutter, HN\textsuperscript{9} 2246ff; SNG Cop. Italy 1831–34). One issue depicts a goddess Pandina (possibly influenced by Terina: Rutter (1997) 78), legend: \textit{ΠΑΝΔΙΝΑ} (Rutter, HN\textsuperscript{9} 2251; SNG Cop. Italy 1834). A small issue of staters on the Corinthian standard has been attributed to Hipponion on the basis of the \textit{kerykeion} symbol on the rev. (Rutter, HN\textsuperscript{9} 2242).
Hyele was founded on a coastal plateau, more prominent in antiquity when the coastline reached further inland on both sides of the promontory. The city comprised four main zones (overview: Krinzinger (1994)): (a) the acropolis, at first used for habitation and later the site of Hyele’s main cults; (b) the western slope of the acropolis, “Weststadt”, divided from the main urban zone (c) by the north–south circuit wall (“Krinzinger-wall-B”), and protected on the north by “wall-A”; (c) the main urban zone in the southern plain, “Südstadt” (“Unterstadt”) and Vignale (“Oststadt”), protected westwards by “wall-C”, northwards by “wall-A”, and southwards towards the coast by “wall-E”; (d) a smaller zone on the north slope, “Nordstadt”, protected by a separate circuit wall, “wall-D” (Krinzinger (1979), (1986)). The whole site was fortified c.520 shortly after the foundation, but obviously not fully urbanised, thus offering plenty of space for farming and husbandry. The division of the city into quarters by diateichismata walls goes back to the early history of the site, suggesting some sort of social division or a division based upon different functions such as habitation, commerce or workshops (survey of research: Gassner and Sokolicek (2000) 95–97). The circuit wall follows the crest of the hill from the acropolis to the top of Casteluccio, whence it turns southwards to incorporate a large part of the southern plain to the coast. The walls run for c.4 km and enclose an area of c.64 ha, comprising the “Nordstadt”; but during the early history of the site the habitation area was probably confined to the acropolis and the adjacent hill, and covered c.9 ha. The walls were of sun-dried brick upon a foundation of local sandstone in polygonal masonry. The C5e witnessed a monumentalisation of the early structure, with the use of accurate ashlar masonry and with towers raised at intervals of about 40–60 m, the upper structures still in sun-dried bricks, with a C5 course that comprised also the “Unterstadt” (Gassner and Sokolicek (2000)). A third phase in C4–C3 saw various repairs and reinforcements (Krinzinger (1979), (1986)). The Archaic habitation, or “polygonal phase”, is known above all from the acropolis and its southern slope. The urban aspect is irregular, but there is some evidence of orthogonal planning, with a plateia along the south flank of the acropolis, cutting obliquely into the hill, and houses laid out on terraces on both sides of short stenopoi. On the acropolis the streets were laid out not orthogonally but in accordance with the morphology of the terrain. The lower wall structures are in local sandstone in a polygonal technique, whereas the upper structures are in sun-dried brick; there is evidence of a water supply and drainage (Velia iii; Krinzinger and Gassner (1997)). A large residential building, perhaps a ruler’s house from C6l, was located further along the crest of the hill (Bencivenga Trillmich (1983)). The lower city, “Südstadt”, was also extensively occupied from the Archaic period, and there is evidence of urban planning from the C6l–C5e phase (Krinzinger (1992–93) 29–37). The Vignale zone in the lower city reveals urban organisation and orthogonal layout of the per strigas type from C5m (Krinzinger (1992–93); Krinzinger et al. (1999)). The morphology of the site may have favoured a system of habitation on terraces, a system of urbanisation well known in the Ionian cities, such as Ephesos and others.

The cavea structure under the C5 and later Roman theatre has, without substantial evidence, been interpreted as the remains of a bouleuterion of c.470–460 (Bencivenga Trillmich (1994) 93–94). A Greek phase of the Roman theatre is perhaps evidenced by a C5e polygonal analemma wall (ibid. 90–92). In a later phase the cavea may have had a wooden covering, ikria (ibid. 89–90, 92–93). The Archaic habitation structures on the acropolis gave way to a monumental temenos probably already by the late Archaic period (for a survey of the archaeological evidence for sanctuaries at Hyele, see Hinz (1998) 180 n. 1046). A large quasi-isodomic terrace wall (“Ionic-Lemnian technique”) gave space for a C5e Ionic temple, probably of Athena Polias (Bencivenga Trillmich (1990) 371 n. 26; Miranda (1982)). The terrace north-east of the temple with the sanctuary of Poseidon Asphaleios (Guarducci (1966) 280–82) is part of this reorganisation of the acropolis.

The foundations of a C6 cult building on the western extremity of the acropolis in conjunction with votive material and inscriptions are all taken as evidence of a cult of Hera going back to the foundation of the city (Tocco Sciarelli (1997) 228–29). Another sanctuary, situated further along on the crest north-east of the acropolis, with an open paved space with stoas on three sides, is attributed to Poseidon Asphaleios by a C4m inscription (Guarducci (1966) 280–82). A well-built ashlar temenos wall and steps of access on the north slope belong to a C5 sanctuary of Zeus, identified by a C5m cippus inscription (Krinzinger (1994) 37, 54 n. 52 “Zeus Agoraios”; LSAG 464 E); Miranda takes the Zeus inscriptions from the “Altar-terrasse” as evidence of a Zeus Polieus cult (Miranda (1982) 171–72; cf. IGDGG no. 53). The C5 cemetery was possibly laid out on the top of Castelluccio (Bencivenga Trillmich (1990) 369–70), but the evidence is meagre. Early excavation maps indicate a cemetery outside the south wall (“section E”), between the city and coast.

Hyele began minting silver coins on the Phokaia standard in C6s, with issues of drachms, diobols and, possibly, obols and eighth-obols (Williams (1992)): obv. forepart of a
lion devouring its prey; rev. an incuse pattern. No legends name the mint, but the attribution to Hyele rests on both provenance and obv. type (Rutter, HN³ 1259–63; SNG Cop. Italy 1521–22). The so-called auriol-class of diobols is less certainly attributed to Hyele (Rutter (1997) 33; cf. IGCH 2352). A new series from c.465 consists of dirhams on the Italic–Tarantine standard (Rutter, HN³ p. 118): obv. lion roaring, rev. head of the nymph Hyele; legend: YEΩH (cf. Masson, REG 108 (1995) 231), YEΛΗΤΩΝ, YEΛΗΤΩΝ, at times retrograde, at first on obv. in exergue, later on rev. (Rutter, HN³ 1264; SNG Cop. Italy 1523–26); later types: obv. female head; rev. lion (SNG Cop. Italy 1527–28). Lower denominations from c.465: drachms, diobols and obols: obv. head of the nymph Hyele, the dies of the drachms marked with a letter in an alphabetical sequence; rev. owl; legend: YEΩH (Rutter, HN³ 1265–67; SNG Cop. Italy 1529–34). After C5m, dirhams of a more advanced style were introduced: obv. Athena wearing richly ornamented Attic helmet similar to the type at Thourioi; rev. lion seizing stag; legends as above (Rutter, HN³ 1270; SNG Cop. Italy 1535–37); the drachms, diobols and obols have the same types as before. This series too has letters in an alphabetical sequence. Various silver issues were continued from C4e into Cl: rev. lion crouching (Rutter, HN³ 1277ff; SNG Cop. Italy 1538–92); sophisticated dies depict the head of Athena en face and with the signature perhaps of the engravers (SNG Cop. Italy 1560); the obv. type sometimes depicts Athena in Phrygian helmet (Rutter, HN³ 1291, 1295). Bronze coinage was introduced in C5s: obv. head of nymph, or of Herakles; rev. owl (Rutter, HN³ 1320–21; SNG Cop. Italy 1554–55). Later bronze types: obv. head of Herakles, or Athena, or Zeus; rev. lion, or owl, or tripod; legends as above (Libero Mangieri (1986) 116–23; Rutter, HN³ 1323ff; SNG Cop. Italy 1593–1611). The late silver and bronze issues indicate cults of Athena, Apollo, Zeus and Herakles in addition to that of the nymph Hyele (Breglia (1966); Ebner (1978); Williams (1992)).

55. Kaulonia (Kauloniàtis) Map 46. Lat. 38.25, long. 16.35. Size of territory: 3. Type: [A]. The toponym is Καυλονια, η (Ps.-Skylax 13); an earlier form was Αυλωνία (Hecat. fr. 84; Strabo 6.1.10; cf. Ps.-Skymnos 320–22 and Steph. Byz. 147.8–10; cf. also the legend ΑΥΛ on a C5e coin (infra)). The city-ethnic is Καυλονιανάτας (C5–C4e coins; Polyb. 2.39.6 (rC5)); ΑΥΛ on a C5e coin (infra) may abbreviate an earlier *Αυλονιανάτας.

Kaulonia is the second toponym listed at Ps.-Skylax 13 after the heading πόλεις εἶδοι αἴδε, where polis is used in the urban sense, cf. Diod. 14.103.3; Ps.-Skymnos 320 (r foundation) calls it apokia. The internal collective use of the city-ethnic in found on C5s coins (infra); the external collective use is found in Iambl. VP 262 and Polyb. 2.39.6 (both rC5). For the external individual use of the city-ethnic, see Paus. 6.3.11, commenting on the C4f athlete Dikon of Kaulonia.

Kaulonia was an Achaean foundation (Strabo 6.1.10; Paus. 6.3.12); it was founded by Kroton (no. 56) (Ps.-Skymnos 318–19; Steph. Byz. 147.9–10). The oikistes was Typhon from Aigion (Paus. 6.3.12; Morgan and Hall (1996) 209). Serv. ad Aen. 3.553 describes it as a colony of Lokroi (no. 59). The existence of a C6e circuit wall (Tréziny (1989) 129) points to a foundation in C7s, though Greek finds go back to C8f (Tréziny (1988) 205).

The name of the territory was Καυλονιανάτας (Thuc. 7.25.2). The territory of Kaulonia functioned as a buffer zone between Lokroi and Kroton. The border between Lokrian and Kaulonian territory was probably formed by the river Sagra (Giangiulio (1989) 221–24, 251–52), whereas the border between Krotonian and Kaulonian territory must remain more uncertain, perhaps to be located somewhere in the region of Skylletoion, in which case the territory would measure c.200 km². There is some archaeological evidence for an ancient harbour near the estuary of the river Assi (Ianelli, Mariottini and Lena (1993)). C6m–C5m architectural fragments of about six roofs found on the hill of Passoliera c.1 km to the south of Kaulonia testify to an important extrurban sanctuary (Barello (1995) 65–86).

A federation of Kaulonia, Kroton (no. 56) and, presumably, Sybaris on the Traeis (no. 70.V) was established at some uncertain date in C5 with the foundation of a federal sanctuary of Zeus Homarios (Polyb. 2.39.6; Walbank, HCP ad loc. and (2000) 24). The location of the federal sanctuary of Zeus Homarios is uncertain, but the sanctuary of Punta Stilo is one of the more convincing suggestions (infra). The find of a heavy limestone cover from a container in the sanctuary has been taken as evidence of a treasury or archive similar to that known from Lokroi (Ianelli (1992a)). In C5s, Kaulonia was, with Taras (no. 71) and Metapontion (no. 61), involved in arbitration between Kroton and returning exiles (Iambl. VP 262).

In 389 Kaulonia was besieged and taken by Dionysios I of Syracuse (Diod. 14.103 ff), in spite of help from Kroton and from the Italiote League. The citizens of Kaulonia were relocated to Syracuse (no. 47), granted citizenship and exempted from taxes for five years (Diod. 14.106.3); the city was razed to the ground, and the territory handed over to Lokroi.
(no. 59; Diod. 14.106.2). This may perhaps explain the tradition of a Kaulonia of the Lokrians (Steph. Byz. 569.19), and the tradition (in Serv. Aen. 3.553) that Kaulonia was a foundation of Lokroi. A refoundation c.357 by Dionysios II of Syracuse may be inferred from Diod. 16.10.2, 11.3: cf. Plut. Dion. 26.7. The C₄m–s circuit wall also implies a refoundation (infra).

The Pythagoreans probably played a political role during C₆l–C₅f, but the evidence is not very good (Dicaearchus fr. 34, Wehrli: Pythagoras in Kaulonia; Iambl. VP 267: list of Pythagoreans in Kaulonia). Nothing else is known about the political organisation, unless one accepts the attribution to Kaulonia of a C₅ε inscription (IGSII 20 = SEG 4.71) testifying to civic subdivisions (Jones, POAG 168) and to the existence of an eponymous damiorgos; its provenance, however, remains uncertain (Arena (1996) no. 52).

Kaulonia was founded on sloping terrain facing the sea (survey of evidence: Ianelli (1992b)). There is little archaeological evidence for the Archaic or Classical city, but it extended inside the area of the later circuit wall, possibly in three separate areas, with an early settlement on the Faro of the city-ethnic is Olympiakai (survey of evidence: Ianelli (1992b)). Nothing else is known about the Pythagoreans in Kaulonia. A refoundation of Syracuse may be inferred from Diod. 16.10.2, 11.3: cf. Plut. Dion. 26.7. The C₄m–s circuit wall also implies a refoundation (infra).

The identity of the deity honoured there is uncertain. The main coin type suggests that the chief deity of Kaulonia was Apollo (Lacroix (1965) 159–61), possibly with the epithet Daphnephoros (Caccamo Calabiano (1990)), but see Giannelli (1963) 179–82 and Kraay (1976) 68–69. An alternative suggestion is a cult of Zeus Homarios established by the Achaean League of Kaulonia, Kroton and Sybaris perhaps already in C₅s (Torelli (1988) 593); Osanna (1989) interprets the rectangular theatre-like structure in the temenos as the seat of the Achaean League, though this should perhaps rather be looked for in neutral territory (Giannelli (1963) 182–83). Substantial walls, votives and architectural terracottas on the hill of the Faro di Punta Stilo inside the urban area belong to a major C₆ sanctuary, possibly the earliest of Kaulonia (Barello (1995) 19–29). The cemeteries were located outside the circuit wall, north-west of the city (Orsi (1914)).

Dikon of Kaulonia was a successful athlete who won victories at all four Panhellenic festivals (Paus. 6.3.11). At his earlier victories he was proclaimed a Kaulonian Olympiakai (379 (392)), but he was probably among the Kaulonians relocated to Syracuse by Dionysios I (infra), and he was proclaimed a Syrakosios at his subsequent victories (Olympiakai 388–89) and is described as such by Diod. 15.14.1 (7384) (cf. Stylianou (1998) ad loc.).

Kaulonia struck an incuse silver coinage from c.525, on the Achaean standard (Kraay (1960), (1978); Rutter, HN³ 2035ff), according to some scholars possibly from as late as 510 (Montani Pertosa (1993)). Initially, only stater were struck, but smaller denominations were issued in the late incuse phase. The type (on which see Rutter (1997) 30–31) is a striding, naked Apollo (infra) with a branch in his raised right hand, and on his outstretched left arm a small running naked figure holding a similar branch in each hand; in a field a stag. Legends are the abbreviated ethnic, often retrograde, KAI ᴴ A YΛ, KAYΛO (Rutter, HN³ 2035–43; SNG Cop. Italy 1698–1702). A single triobol die carries the earlier form of the name AYŁ (Kraay (1976) 169; Rutter, HN³ 2041). A double-relief coinage was introduced 480–475, with the same obv. type as on the incuse coinage; rev. stag: legends: KAI ᴴ A YΛ, KAYΛOΝIATΑΣ, KAYΛOΝIATAN; the double-relief coinage carries a complex system of letters or symbols (Rutter, HN³ 2044ff; SNG Cop. Italy 1703–32). Similar types appear on some smaller denominations (Rutter, HN³ 2060ff). Bronze coinage was issued from C₅s: obv. head of horned river-god (the Sagra?); rev. stag (Rutter, HN³ 2069). Kaulonian coinage comes to an end with the conquest by Dionysios I in 389/8.

56. Kroton (Krotoniatas) Map 46. Lat. 39.05, long. 17.05. Size of territory: 4 (dominion: 5, infra). Type: A. The toponym is Κρότων, η (Hdt. 3.131; IG tv.2-1 95.42 (358/5)). The city-ethnic is Κροτονιάτας (LSAG 104.22 = SEG 40 426 (510–470)), sometimes spelled Ῥωτονιάτας (SEG 11.1211)
(525–500); coins, *infra*), *Κροτωνιάτης* (Thuc. 7.35.2; Arist. fr. 600.1), or *Κροτωνιώτης* (Hdt. 3.137.1).

Kroton is called a *polis* in the urban and political senses combined at Hdt. 3.137.3, and in Hdt. 8.46.1 it is subsumed under the heading *polis*, where *polis* occurs in the political sense (Hdt. 8.42.1, 49.1); Kroton is the third toponym listed at Ps.-Skylax 13 after the heading *πόλεις εἰσίν αἱδέ*, where *polis* is used in the urban sense. The Aristotelian collection of *politeiai* seems to have included a *Κροτωνιάτων πολιτεία* (Heracl. Lemb. 68; Arist. fr. 523, Gigon).

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on coins from C5 (infra); the external collective use is attested in a C6l–C5e Delphic inscription (*LSAG* 104.22 = *SEG* 40 426), and in *SEG* 11 1211 (C5), Hdt. 3.137.2 and Thuc. 7.35.2. The external individual use of the city-ethnic is attested in Hdt. 3.125.1, 5.47.1; *CID* II 51.111.9 (339); Arist. *Gen. an.* 752b25.

Kroton was an Achaian foundation (Hdt. 8.47; Peloponnesian in Ps.-Skymnos 328; Spartan participation (Paus. 3.3.1) is a tradition probably no older than the victory over Sybaris and the expedition of Dorieus (C6l)). The colony was founded in 709/8 (Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.59.3; Jer. *Chron.* also gives Ol. 17.3, and the foundation is here treated as contemporary with that of Sybaris, as in other sources, e.g. Strabo 6.2.4, cf. 6.1.12; the Armenian Eusebios gives Ol. 17.4, i.e. 708/7). A date not long after the foundation of Syracuse (733) is implied by Antiochos' statement that the oecist Myskellos of Rhypes in Achaia (cf. Hippys (*FGrHist* 554) fr. 1) received support from Archias the oecist of Syracuse (*FGrHist* 555, fr. 10). See also Giangiulio (1989) 134–48 for a reappraisal of the Delphic traditions and Myskellos. The verse oracles relating to Myskellos (Diod. fr. 8.17; Antiochos and Hippys (*loc. cit. supra*)) are not genuine but “quasi-historical” according to Fontenrose (1978) Q28–30, Q739–140. However, Delphi probably did play an important role in the foundation: the Delphic tripod is depicted already on the earliest Krotoniate coinage (*infra*). Herakles is named as the mythical founder on C5s coin legends (Lacroix (1965) 76–79 pl. 5.7–8; cf. Diod. 4.24.7 and Heracl. Lemb. 68). Cf. further Morgan and Hall (1996) 206–8.

The name of the territory is Ἄ Κροτωνιώτες γῆ at Hdt. 5.45, or simply Ἅ Κροτωνιάτης (Thuc. 7.35.1; Alkimos (*FGrHist* 560) fr. 2). To the north-east the river Hylias (modern Fiumenica?) formed the border with the territory of Sybaris (no. 70)/Thourioi (no. 74) (Thuc. 7.35.2). The Lakinian promontory and the rivers Aisasor and Krimisa may mark the limits of the early territory. Later the *chora* of Kroton was delimited to the north by the sanctuary of Apollo Alaios, to the south by that of Hera Lakinia, and inland by the adjoining hills (Giangiulio (1989) 215–32). In a 1984 survey 238 settlements and single farmsteads were recorded; by 450–350 the territory measured about 270 km² (Carter and D’Annibale (1984); Carter et al. (1990)).

The tradition of Philoktetes (Apollodorus (*FGrHist* 244) fr. 167 = Strabo 6.1.3), and that of the Krotoniate possession of the bow of Herakles (*Mir. ausc.* 84020), may reflect Krotoniate expansion or ambitions on the confines of Sybarite territory (Mele (1983a) 36–39) or in regard to the indigenous populations (Giangiulio (1991a) 49–53). The expansion of Kroton is indicated by the foundation of two colonies in C7: Kaulonia (no. 55) on the Ionian Sea (Ps.-Skymnos 318–22), comprising also the territory of Skyletton; and Terina (no. 73) on the Tyrrhenian Sea (Ps.-Skymnos 306–7). The territorial ambition of Kroton towards the south-west was blocked at the river Sagre, the theatre of the C6m war between Kroton and Lokroi (no. 59) (Strabo 6.1.10) in which Kroton was surprisingly defeated. The maximum territorial expansion of Kroton was attained after the victory over Sybaris c510, and for this period a Krotoniate dominion is attested by coins with two ethnicss: in addition to that of Kroton, those of Sybaris (no. 70) (ΠΟ–ΣΥ), Pandosia (no. 64) (ΠΟ–ΠΑΝΔΟ) and Temesa (no. 72) (ΠΟ–ΤΕ); cf. also coins inscribed ΣΥ–ΛΑΔ (infra). As shown by Paris, this numismatic evidence points not to an alliance but to a dominion controlled by Kroton (Parise (1982); cf. Stazio (1983b) 967–70). Kroton may have treated the cities in the dominion as dependencies, since there is evidence of a Krotoniate governor (*exarchos*) at Sybaris (Iambl. VP 74; Minar (1942) 70). In C5, Kroton opposed the refoundation of Sybaris (Diod. 11.90.4, 12.10.2, cf. 11.3) and waged war against Thourioi (no. 74) with the help of the Pythagoreans returning from exile (Polyb. 2.39.4; Iambl. VP 264). In C55, however, its dominion disintegrated (Kahrstedt (1918) 185; *RExi*. 2024–25).

A number of important sanctuaries were located in the territory: that of Hera Lakinia on the promontory c10 km to the south of Kroton had a C6 origin and had developed into a pan-Italic sanctuary by C5l. The Classical temple was a major structure of unparalleled splendour in Magna Graecia (Orsi (1911b); Spadea (1996)). The other major sanctuary in the territory, at Cirò (Punta Alice), is probably that of Apollo Alaios founded by Philoktetes (Lycoph. *Alex.* 920; dedication of the bow of Herakles, *Mir. ausc.* 84020); it secured the territorial interests of Kroton southwards (Maddoli (1983) 336; Musti (1991) 25–27). Inland sanctuaries in the *chora* of Kroton have been found at Giammigione.
and at S. Anna (Spada (1983) 137–38; Osanna (1992) 177–79). In 413, the city denied an Athenian army passage through the territory (Thuc. 7.35.2). Control of the territory may also be implied by Hdt. 5.45.2 mentioning a presumably public grant of land to Kallias of Elis. A C6l exile is attested in Hdt. 5.47.1; cf. Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 20.1.7 for C3e exiles. A C5s recall of exiles is reported in Iambl. VP 263.

The military forces of Kroton at the C6 battle on the river Sagra reputedly numbered 130,000 or 120,000 men (Strabo 6.1.10; Just. Epit. 20.3.4–5) and 100,000 men in 510 (Diod. 12.9.5). These, obviously, are unreliable figures, but it seems correct that, after the victory over Sybaris, Kroton had the largest population of the Greek cities in Italy (cf. Diod. 14.103.4 (r389)); 10,000 citizens, the estimate of Beloch (1922) iii.1 306–7, may be correct.

Kroton was of Achaian origin, but relations with homeland Achaia are almost invisible in our sources (Morgan and Hall (1996) 211–14). By C6m the Achaian cities of Italy seem to have formed an alliance, e.g. in the war against Siris (no. 69), which was defeated by Kroton (no. 56), Metapontion (no. 61) and Sybaris (no. 70.1) (Just. Epit. 20.2.4). In C5l, Kroton with Kaulonia (no. 55) and Sybaris on the Traeis (no. 70.V) organised the first Italiote League (Polyb. 2.39.5–6; Walbank (2000) 23–24), later enlarged or refounded in opposition to Dionysios I of Syracuse and the Leukanians (Diod. 14.91.1 (r393), describing it as a symmachia with a synedrion, cf. 101.1; Staatsverträge 230). However, Dionysios’ victory on the river Eleporos in 389 was followed by a twelve-year period of dependency on the tyrant of Syracuse (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 20.7).

In 356/5, a citizen of Kroton served as theorodorokos of Epidaurus (no. 348) (IG IV2.1 95.42); IG III 2 406 (C4s) is possibly a fragment of a grant of procony for a Krotoniate. Reception of envoys is attested in Diod. 12.9.3 (rC6l). Sending of envoys is reported in Phylarchos (FGrHist 81) fr. 45 (rC6l) and Iambl. VP 263 (rC5s).

The constitution of Kroton is known only from late sources of doubtful value, principally Lamblicos’ De Vita Pytagorica of the third to fourth century BC. It was aristocratic/oligarchic until C5m (Iambl. VP 255), from C6l to C5m seemingly under strong Pythagorean influence (Minar (1942) 70–71), though both democratic and tyrannical interludes are recorded. A gerousia with its archeion as well as archontes are attested for C6l (Dicaearchus fr. 33, Wehrli; Timaeus (FGrHist 566) fr. 44; cf. Iambl. VP 126: archeion of the 1,000), but such constitutional details are all that is known (Minar (1942) 8), though it may be inferred from the democratic revolution of C6l (infra) that, e.g., access to offices was denied the demos. A meeting of the ekklesia is attested for C6l (Diod. 12.9.4); the synkletos, which in connection with this meeting is distinguished from the demos (ibid.), may possibly be identical with either the gerousia or with the “1,000”, a body attested in Iambl. VP 45,126 (rC6l). For the interpretation of the 1,000 as the original Archaic assembly, see Sartori (1953) 116 and Ghinatti (1996) 82–86. Another possibility is that the 1,000 were a/the council (Val. Max. 8.12.15. Ext. 1; cf. Minar (1942) 8). Democracy was introduced in C6l (Robinson (1997) 76) shortly after the victory over Sybaris, since one of the causes of the revolution reported by Iambl. VP 255 was dissatisfaction with the arrangements proposed for the conquered Sybarite land) after a violent uprising against the Pythagoreans (Iambl. VP 257–62); the initial demands for reform included popular access to magistracies and assemblies, and euthynai of officials by representatives chosen by lot ἐκ πάντων (ibid. 257); some of these constitutional demands may have been met (Minar (1942) 56). After the final democratic victory there followed sentences of exile, a redistribution of land and a cancellation of debts (Iambl. VP 262), though these measures have been thought to have occurred only in C5m (Minar (1942) 57–60); see also Robinson (1997) 76–77, who accepts the whole account as referring to C6l. A tyrant, Kleinas, is with some uncertainty dated to C5e (Minar (1942) 72; Luraghi (1994) 72–75). All that is known of him is that he secured his tyranny with the aid of exiles (presumably non-Krotoniate) and slaves, and proceeded to execute and exile the epiphanestatoi; he may also have brought other poleis under his sway (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 20.7.1); his revolt seems to have been against a reconstituted oligarchy (cf. epiphanestatoi), though it is not known how it replaced the C6l democracy (Berger (1992) 20). A prytanis is attested in C5e (Ath. 522C); the office of strategos is attested as well (Kratinos fr. 223, Kock). Oligarchs were in power again in C5m, when the Pythagoreans were overthrown, but the constitutional history after Kleinas is obscure (Minar (1942) 73ff).

Kroton was founded on a coastal plain, delimited on one side by the Castello hill, the acropolis of the ancient city. There is no clear evidence of a pre-Greek indigenous settlement (Sabbione (1982) 251, 259), but according to Ephor. fr. 140 it had been inhabited by Iapygians. A C4–C2 circuit wall is known from various locations along the hills delimiting the urban centre. The morphology of the Collina del Castello and the S. Lucia hills suggests a coherent fortification system similar to Euryalos at Syracuse. The C4 evidence suggests a continuous circuit (cf. the siege of 317 reported in Diod.
19.3.3), the river Aisaros being fortified along the banks or/and with chains across the river, in all 13 km in length (cf. Livy 24.3.1). The fortified area comprised 260 ha (cf. Diod. 21.4 (r295)); Livy 23.30.2 refers to an are, probably the acropolis comprising the S. Lucia hills (Spada (1983) 158–61).

The evidence suggests that the Greek colonists settled simultaneously over the whole of the later urbanised area, from the acropolis near the coast to the north circuit wall, i.e. including the area north of the river Aisaros. The character of the urban layout in the different zones suggests an initial settlement pattern organised in several kleroi (Spada (1983) 124–27; Lattanzi (1988) 554). The earliest urban organisation with a regular layout has a C7-C6 origin. There are indications that Kroton was provided with a new town plan after Dionysios’ defeat of the Italiote League at the river Eleporos in 389, but the alterations relative to earlier grid systems are unclear (Spada (1983) 152–54). The harbour mentioned by Strabo (6.11.12) may have been located on the estuary of either the river Aisaros or the river Neaithos.

According to Diod. 12.9.3, Sybarite exiles sought refuge at altars in the agora c.510 (cf. Hdt. 3.137.1).

The archaeological evidence for urban sanctuaries is limited to the C6 Hera Eleutheria (?) sanctuary “Vigna Nuova” on the outskirts of the city (Spada (1983) 144–50) bridging polis and chora (Lattanzi (1981) 224–25). Other urban sanctuaries, however, are indicated by sporadic finds of C7-C6 architectural terracottas (Spada (1983) 136–37). A cult of Zeus Soter is inferred from coin legends (infra), and the seat of the Achaian League in the sanctuary of Zeus Homarios has tentatively been located in the sanctuary of Hera Lakinia (De Sensi Sestito (1982b)). A festival at Kroton with monetary prizes is mentioned in Timaios (FGHist 566) 45 (rC6); cf., however, Ath. 522A with Dunbabin (1948) 370.

Remains of an ashlar structure in the area of the Nuova Vigna is interpreted as part of a theatre of uncertain date (Cristofani (1970) 269), but structural remains of a theatre have not been substantiated (Todisco (1990) 149–51). A theatre used for public games is mentioned by Iamb. VP 126 (rC5). Kroton’s major cemetery on the Carrara hill, delimiting the city on its eastern side, goes back to C8l. The house of the athlete Astylus who had himself proclaimed as a Syracusan after victories at Olympia was on that account turned into a prison (Paus. 6.13.1 (r480s); Hansen (2002) 36–37).

Attested cults include those of Hera Lakinia (LSAG 261 no. 21 (C6s); Diod. 13.3.4), with an important festival (Mir. asuc. 96), Apollo (Mir. asuc. 109; Iambl. VP 261; cf. also coinage, infra), the Muses (Iambl. VP 264), Demeter (Timaeus (FGHist 566) fr. 131) and Zeus Melichios (SEG17 42 (C6–C5)).

Participation in the games at Olympia is attested from 672 to 480. Kroton was famous for its athletes (Strabo 6.1.12), who achieved an amazing number of victories (cf. Miller (2000) 286–87; Mann (2001) 164–91), of which twenty-six are mentioned in our sources (Olympionikai 38, 87, 90, 92, 100, 104, 109, 115, 122, 126, 129, 133, 135, 139, 145, 148, 153, 166, 172, 178, 179, 186, 187, 196, 197, 198). Astylus, however, the winner of various races in 484 and 486, was on both occasions proclaimed a Syrakovios (cf. Mann (2001) 188–89, 246–48). One of the most famous Krotoniate athletes, Phayllos, never achieved an Olympic victory, but was a triple Pythionikes prior to 480 (Hdt. 8.47 (twice in the pentathlon and once in running: Paus. 10.9.2); cf. RE XIX.2. 1903–4).

Architectural fragments of Krotonian type from Olympia and Delphi may testify to Krotonian theseauroi (Heiden (1990) 44; Mertens-Horn and Viola (1990) 244–45). LSAG 104.22 = SEG 40 426 (510–470) is an external communal dedication to Pythian Apollo, presumably of spoils taken from Sybaris. SEG 11 1211 (C5), on the other hand, is a dedication at Olympia of spoils taken from Kroton and dedicated by the Hipponians (no. 53), the Medmaian (no. 60) and the Lokrians (no. 59) (cf. Lombardo (1989) 429). C5s Krotonian publication of a public document at Delphi is attested at Iamb. VP 263. Communal consultation of the Delphic oracle is reported by Just. Epit. 20.2.5, 3.1–3 (rC6s).

Kroton minted an incuse coinage on the Achaean standard from c.530, mainly stater and drachms. The principal type, and sole type initially, is the Delphic tripod, legend: ὶΠΟΟΤΟΠΟΤΟΠΟΣ (Stazio (1983a) 369–74; Parisé (1990b); Rutter, HN³ 2075–94, 2100–6; SNG Cap. Italy 1735–64). The tripod refers to the importance of the cult of the Pythian Apollo, alluded to more specifically on C6l types (infra). For Apollo Pythisos at Kroton: Iambl. VP, 28.9–10, 35.261, discussed by Maddoli (1983) 336. A variant type with a flying eagle on the rev. (Stazio (1983a) 375–77; Rutter, HN² 2095, 2108; SNG Cap. Italy 1765–69) is either an “alliance” or “dominion” coin (unknown alliance city; Kraay (1976) 168 suggests Hipponion) or a reference to Zeus at Kroton or to special ties between Kroton and Olympia—an interpretation perhaps supported by later issues with a seated eagle on a column (infra) (Stazio (1983a) 375–76). The dominion issues (supra; Rutter, HN³ p. 168) all have the Krotonian tripod on the obv., with legend ὶΠΟ whereas the rev. type varies: Sybaris (no. 70; II): bull standing r. looking back, legend: ΣΥ ΣΥ (Rutter, HN³ 2098); Pandosia (no. 64): bull standing r. looking back (relief in incuse square), legend:
Kyme was the earliest of the Greek colonies in Italy and Sicily (Strabo 5.4.4). The archaeological evidence indicates Greek settlers at Kyme from c.750–725, which is contemporary with the earliest Greek evidence from Pithekoussai, thus suggesting a first settlement phase contemporary with that site (d’Agostino 1999a) 54, (1999b) 207–11). The city was founded by Euboian Chalkis (no. 365) (Thuc. 6.4.5; Χαλκιδικῆς πόλεως) or by Chalkis and Eretria (no. 370) (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.3). According to Strabo 5.4.4, there were two groups of settlers: one led by Hippokles from Euboian Kyme, and one led by Megasthenes from Chalkis.

Kyme’s hinterland was fertile, but the city was a maritime settlement (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.3.2 (1524/5)). There is a tradition of harbour stations in Kymeian territory, such as Dikaiaarcheia, which may have been an epineion Kymeion during its early history (Strabo 5.4.6 (rC8–C7)); however, at this site mineral extraction may also have played a role (cf. Mele (1979) 43–45; and Dikaiaarcheia in the list of non-polis sites; supra). Kymeian territory extended southwards to the city of Parthenope, perhaps originally one of the epineia of Kyme (Strabo 5.4.7; cf. Parthenope in the list of non-polis sites, supra). Neapolis (no. 63) was probably founded as a C5 colony of Kyme. Kymeian territory extended northwards to the river Klanios, the border between the Greek and Etruscan areas of influence (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.3.3 (1524/5)). The territory comprised c.280 km² (Frederiksen (1984) 68–69 map 2). There is little evidence of sanctuaries in Kymeian territory; however, the Demeter sanctuary on the north–west plateau of Neapolis predates the foundation of this city and may perhaps be taken as evidence of a rural sanctuary in Kymeian territory (E. Greco (1987a) 488–89), and traditions about the travels of Herakles point to rural sanctuaries dedicated to this hero. The cultural influence of Greek Kyme in theItalic regions should not be underestimated, a salient point being the Euboic–Kymeian origin of the Etruscan alphabet. The political influence of Kyme in Central Italy was considerable already in C6l, as indicated by the embassy sent by Aricia to Kyme asking for help against the Etruscans (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.5.1).
Numerous military confrontations with non-Greek populations are on record (cf. Mele (1987)): in 524, the city defeated an invading force of Etruscans, Umbrians and Daunians (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.3); in 504, Kyme successfully supported Arcia and defeated Etruscan forces (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.5); in 474, Kyme in alliance with Hieron of Syracuse defeated Etruscans in a great naval battle off Kyme (Diod. 11.51; cf. ML 29); and in 421, Kyme fell to the Samnites, who subjected the city to an exandrapodismos and resettled it themselves (Diod. 12.76.4), while surviving Kymaians fled to Neapolis (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 15.6.5; Lomas 2000 178).

An alliance with Arcia is attested by Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.5.2 (rC6l). An alliance with Hieron of Syracuse is attested by Diod. 11.51.1, and this alliance defeated Etruscan forces in the great naval battle at Kyme in 474 (Diod. 11.51.2 (rC474); cf. ML 29).

Kyme was conquered by Kampanians in 421, but although the city was subjected to exandrapodismos and resettled with Kampanians, Greek culture survived (Diod. 12.76.4; Strabo 5.4.4), and Ps.-Skylax 10 lists Kyme as a polis Hellenis.

Exiles during the tyranny of Aristodamos are mentioned at Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.10.4. Sending of envoys is attested at Diod. 11.51.1 (r c474); reception of envoys is attested at Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.5.1 (rC6l).

According to Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.3.4, Kyme in C6l, during the conflicts with the Etruscans, raised an army of 4,500 foot and 600 horse; the city also possessed a navy at this time (ibid., cf. 7.5.3 for a navy amounting to ten ships). A hipparches is mentioned at Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.4.4 (rC6l). A strategos is mentioned by Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom.7.5.2 (rC6l).

Information on the C6l constitution and political institutions is found in the account by Dionysios of Halikarnassos of the tyranny of Aristodamos (504–490); this account is influenced by stereotypical perceptions of tyranny (Berve 1967 160), and it is uncertain to what degree the information on the political organisation of Kyme found in it is historical. With that caveat, it may be noted that according to Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.4.4, Kyme before the rise of Aristodamos was an aristocracy (described as an oligarchy at 7.6.4; Ghinatti (1996) 120–22). Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.4.4–5 refers to a boule (cf. 7.5.2), and a bouleuterion is mentioned at 7.7.3. The citizen body is depicted as divided into oí δυνατοὶ and oí δήμος which was oú πολλῶν τινων κύριος (7.4.4–5). At Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.7.3 is a general reference to oí ἐν τέλει. After the C6l victory over the Etruscans, Aristodamos emerged as prostates tou demou (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.4.5) by demagogia, and this implies the existence of an assembly (cf. 7.5.2 and ἐκκλησία at 7.7.5). After a successful command in war against the Etruscans in support of Arcia (7.5–7), Aristodamos launched a coup d'état and took power as tyrant, and, according to Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.8.1, carried out a γῆς ἀναδασμός καὶ χρεών ἀφέσεως etc. as a stereotypical tyrant. After the overthrow of Aristodamos, the patrios politia was restored (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.11.4).

Death sentences passed by the C6 aristocracy/oligarchy are mentioned in Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.7.4 (rC6l).

Kyme occupied a high, isolated plateau in the Phlegraian Fields north of Cape Misenum. The settlement was founded on the saddle between the acropolis near the coast and Monte Grillo inland. The Greeks replaced an indigenous settlement, though it is uncertain whether they did so directly or after some hiatus (d’Agostino (1999a) 61). The acropolis and the settlement plateau were fortified from at least C6m, and possibly already from C6e, by a circuit wall built in isodomic ashlars, a double curtain-wall with internal fill (Pagano (1993); d’Agostino (1999b) 208–9). Southeast and eastwards along the Monte Grillo the walls exploited the natural steep slopes; to north and south the plateau was accessible from the hinterland and the wall was strengthened and provided with fortified gates, and probably also with an external ditch along the stretch facing Capuan and Etruscan territories (d’Agostino (1999a) 54; Fratta (2002) 61). The walls enclosed an area of c.80 ha, including the acropolis and part of the Monte Grillo which has revealed some traces of habitation in the Archaic period (Fratta (2002) 68).

There are few urban remains from the Greek period, but it is likely that the agora preceded the Roman forum and that the Roman road system followed an earlier Greek system. There is also some evidence of a diasteichisma wall dividing the western and eastern city quarters (D’Onofrio (2002) 136–40). From the description of Aristodamos’ homecoming after the victory at Arcia in 504 (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.7.1) it is apparent that Kyme had at least two harbours. These were probably located below the acropolis, but any evidence has been obliterated by the Roman harbour structures, by silting and by bradyseisms (Paget (1968) 152–59; Morhauge et al. (2002)). Kyme had other harbour facilities in the bay of Misenum (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.3.2 (rC524/3)).

Part of the substructures of the Roman “Temple of Zeus” on the acropolis is from a C5m monumental Greek temple (Burelli and Valenza Mele (1989) 19). The sanctuary of Apollo (Paus. 8.24.5) was located on the lower terrace of the acropolis (cf.; however, Clark (1977) 483 n.8); the only Greek
remains are those of the C5 stereobate of a peripteral temple (Frederiksen (1984) 75). On the south-eastern slope of the acropolis the subterranean galleries, “Cave of the Sibyl”, is at least in part C6–C5, but the function of the structure (an oracular cult, a heroon or tomb) is uncertain (Clark (1977) 484, fig. 1). The only identified sanctuary on the city plateau is an Archaic shrine in the outermost south-western corner of the city, inside the circuit wall, probably a C7 Heraion (Valenza Mele (1977) 500, 524; Pagano (1993) fig. 1.2; Fratta (2002) 49, 69). The epigraphic evidence for a Hera cult at Kyme goes back to c.650; she was possibly an oracular divinity with precedence over Apollo (IGDGG no. 14; cf. no. 15).

The cemeteries are of the utmost importance for the study of Kymaian history (Gábrici (1913)). They define the limits of the city from the C8, occupying quite an extensive area already from this period, and with single tombs, among the most ancient, found up to 3 km from the city without evidence of smaller Greek satellite settlements. Rich, aristocratic C8–C7e tombs show close similarities with aristocratic tombs in Eretria, thus revealing close ties between the two cities in a period not long after the foundation of Kyme (Albore-Livadie (1979)).

Kyme began striking coins c.475. Three weight standards were employed in the early coinage of Kyme, the earliest issues being drachms on the Chalkidian (a single specimen is known) and dirachms on the Euboic–Attic standard (Rutter (1979) 15–16; Rutter, HN3 p. 66). The Attic standard most likely derived from Syracuse and may reflect the alliance with Hieron and the establishment of a Syracusan garrison on Pithekoussai in C5f (cf. Strabo 5.4.9; Rutter (1979) 93). Types: obv. lion’s scalp flanked on either side by boar’s heads; rev. mussel shell; legends: KYME, KYMAION (Rutter (1979) 9–10; Rutter, HN3 513–14). Shortly after the initial coinage, Kyme adopted the Phokaian standard from Hydæ; the same types were employed in the different issues. The heraldic motif was probably an allusion to the temple of Apollo where the Kymaians kept the teeth of the Erymanthan boar killed by Herakles (Paus. 8.24.5; Lacroix (1965) 142–46; Rutter (1979) 9–10; Rutter, HN3 515).

The type was revived on C5i issues. The lion’s scalp is above all known as a Samian type and may reflect Samian participation in the settlement at Dikaiarchea in C6l (see Dikaiarchea in the list of non-polis sites, supra). To the same early period are attributed two gold issues: obv. female head, or helmet; rev. on both, mussel shell (Rutter (1979) 17–18; Rutter, HN3 511–12). Later issues of dirachms: obv. lion’s scalp and boar’s heads; rev. female head, perhaps a nymph personifying the city (Rutter (1979) 11; Rutter, HN3 520; SNG Cop. Italy 357). Smaller denominations are drachms and obols. The rendering of some rev. types reveals Syracusan artistic influence. The most consistent issue has as obv. type the female head (Rutter, HN3 521, 528, SNG Cop. Italy 358–68). An obv. type of Athena with Corinthian helmet is modelled on Corinthian types and must also reflect Syracusan influence (Rutter (1979) 11, 94–95; Rutter, HN3 524; SNG Cop. Italy 369). Nearly all series have a mussel shell as rev. type, though with different secondary motifs such as a crab—of special interest as evidence of Himeran–Akrangaine influence or even of an otherwise unknown alliance (Rutter (1979) 12, 92; Rutter, HN3 524; rev. legends: KYME or KYMAION. After the Samnite occupation of Kyme, c.430–420, the mint was closed and minting for Kyme and other Kampanian cities was transferred to Neapolis, where coins continued to be struck in the name of Kyme (Rutter (1979) 8–41, 91–96).

A public festival is attested for C6l in Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.11.3. The numismatic evidence (supra) suggests cults of Athena, Herakles and Apollo, and possibly the nymph Kyme. Communal oracle consultation in C5e is implied by Ps.-Skymnos 243.

According to Thuc. 6.4.5, leistai from Kyme were the original settlers of Zankle (no. 51). Neapolis (no. 63) was probably a C5 foundation of Kyme (Strabo 5.4.7).

58. Laós (La[w]inos)  Map 46. Lat. 39.45, long. 15.50. Size of territory: 2 (?). Type: [A]. The toponym is Λάος (Hdt. 6.21.13; Strabo 6.1.1; Ps.-Skylax 12 (emended, infra)). The city-ethnic is Λαώνος or Λαίνος (C6l coins, infra).

In Ps.-Skylax 12, under the heading πόλεις Ἑλληνιδῶν αἰώνες, the text [Ἐλαὰ Θουρίων ἀποικία] has been emended to read: ‘Ἐλέα, Δαοὶ Θουρίων ἀποικία; if the emendation is accepted, Laos is here classified as a polis type [A] in the urban sense as well as an apoikia. After the defeat of Sybaris by Kroton in 510 but before 494 (Hdt. 6.21.11), refugee Sybarites settled at Laos (a Sybarite colony; Strabo 6.1.1 and infra), being τής πόλος ἀπεστηρημένως; whether this implies polis status for Laos is uncertain. Polis in the urban sense is found in Diod. 14.101.3 (1390). The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C4l bronze coins (infra); earlier legends employ the nominative singular of the city-ethnic (Guarducci, EGII: 618).

Laos was a colony of Sybaris (no. 70.1) (Strabo 6.1.1; see further below on coinage) and refugee Sybarites settled there (and at Skidros) after the Krotoniaste defeat of Sybaris in 510 (Hdt. 6.21.1). If correctly emended, Ps.-Skylax 12 (supra) describes Laos as a colony of Thouriol (no. 74); the
text may confuse Thourioi with Sybaris, or it may refer to a Cretan refoundation of Laos by Thourioi or more generally to Thourian influence at Laos. The date of foundation is unknown; the *terminus ante quem* for the existence of the Greek community is c. 510, when it commenced minting (*infra*). Prior to 510, Laos may have been an Oinotrian community dependent upon Sybaris and subsequently, from C6l to C5f, a mixed Oinotrian–Greek settlement.

The size of the territory of C6 Laos amounted to c. 100 km² when calculated on the basis of the deserted indigenous settlements and of Sybarite influence in the territory from Orsomarso to Grisolia (bordering on the territory of Kerilloi) and including some of the territory on the right bank of the river Lao (E. Greco (1995a)).

Diod. 14.101.3 (1390) seems to describe Laos as a Leukanian settlement, and so Laos may have been conquered by the Leukaniasts in C5l. The city, however, seems not to have lost its Greek identity completely, and the C4 Leukanian town was mixed Greek and non-Greek (E. Greco and Schnapp (1989) 45–46); if correctly emended, Ps.-Sklavix 12 (*supra*) lists Laos under the heading _poles Hellenides_, and the city issued C4s bronze coins inscribed _ΛΑΙΝΩΝ_ and with both Greek and Leukanian magistrates' names (*infra*).

The site of the Archaic city is unknown, but it is here taken for granted that Archaic C5 Laos was located in the vicinity (E. Greco and Schnapp (1989) 49–51) of C4 Leukanian Laos (*infra*). According to Strabo 6.1.1, Laos was a river and a *polis* a short distance from Hyle on the Tyrrhenian coast, but this reference may be to the C4 site, even though Strabo describes it as a colony of Sybaris (cf. E. Greco and Schnapp (1989) 51; Caruso (1977)). C4 Laos has been identified with the settlement on the hill of S. Maria del Cedro, c. 3 km to the south of the estuary of the river Lao (E. Greco (1995a); E. Greco, Luppino and Schnapp (1989)). The desertion of the C6 indigenous settlements in the hinterland of Laos was probably the result of Sybarite expansion, and the “heroon of Drakon” (Strabo 6.1.1) may reflect Greek control over the territory, though the source is late (E. Greco and Schnapp (1989); E. Greco (1995a) 71–73). The urban site excavated on the Marcellina hill has not (yet) revealed remains earlier than C4s (E. Greco and Schnapp (1989) 51), and so the history of the Greek city is known primarily from the literary sources and from the numismatic evidence. Diod. 14.101.3 (1390) suggests that Laos was fortified.

Laos initiated coinage c. 510 with issues of incuse staters, drachms and triobols on the Achaian standard (Rutter, _HN_ 3 p. 176); the types were based upon the Sybarite bull type with some variations: _obv._ man-headed bull looking back (river personification), legend: _ΛΑΙΩΝ_, rev. same type but incuse, and _obv._ legend completed by _ΝΟΣ_ (retro), i.e. _Λα/γυνος_ (the city-ethnic (Guarducci, EGII. 618) and not the locality Laino, as suggested by Zancani Montuoro (1949); Sternberg (1973); Gorini (1975) 13; Rutter, _HN_ 3 2270–72; _SNG Cap. Italy_ 1145). Double-relief staters and triobols dating to c. 475–450 have _obv._ man-headed bull looking back and acorn in exergue, legend: _ΛΑΙΩΝ_, rev. similar but no acorn (Sternberg (1973); Rutter, _HN_ 3 2275–76; _SNG Cap. Italy_ 1145–49); an issue of triobols and smaller issues carries acorn as rev. type (Rutter, _HN_ 3 2278–81). The acorn is a type on the triobols of Sybaris (no. 70.III); see further Rutter (1997) 43 for connections between the coinages of Sybaris and Laos. An issue of drachms and triobols is dated after 453: _obv._ man-faced bull, legend _ΚΑΙΑΙ_, rev. similar (Rutter, _HN_ 3 2286–88). These types cease in C3m—that is, c. 50 years before the Leukanian occupation. A punch with the type of Sybaris has been found at Laos (unpublished). In C4l Laos, now a mixed Leukanian–Greek community, issued bronze coins inscribed _ΛΑΙΩΝ_ and with magistrates names (Cantilena (1989); Rutter, _HN_ 3 2289ff; _SNG Cap. Italy_ 1550–51, 1155–57).

A series of C6l double-relief staters have types: _obv._ Krotoniate tripod and legend _ΣΥ_; _rev._ bull looking back, legend _ΛΟΚΡΟΙ_ (Gorini (1975) 26; Rutter, _HN_ 3 2273). These are attributed by Kraay to Sybaris (no. 70.II), the Krotoniate tripod revealing the status of Sybaris (no. 70.II) as within the political sphere of Kroton though partly maintaining its own influence on Laos (Kraay (1958) 35; Parise (1982) 106–7; cf. Cantilena (1989) 32, who sustains the attribution to Laos). An issue of diobols (Rutter, _HN_ 3 2284–85) may be an “alliance coinage” reflecting Laos’ participation in the refounding of Sybaris (no. 70.III) in 453.

59. **Lokroi** (Lokros) Map 46. Lat. 38.15, long. 16.15. Size of territory: 3 (cf. *infra*). Type: A. The toponym is _Λοκροί, οἱ_ (Hdt. 6.23.1; Thuc. 6.4.2; IG IV.2.1 95.41 (356/5); Ps.-Sklavix 13), qualified by (_οἱ_) _'Επιζεφύριοι_ at Hdt. 6.23.1, possibly by Hecat. fr. 83 _apud_ Steph. Byz. 419.3, and by Thuc. 7.1.3; at Pl. _Tim._ 20A, _Λοκρῖς_ is possibly the toponym (50 RE vii.2. 1304). The city-ethnic is _Λοκρῶς_ (Ivo 144.1 (c.472); Thuc. 4.1.2; Pl. _Leg._ 638B), qualified by _Ζεφύριος_ at Pind. _Ol._ 10.13, 11.15; by _άπο_ _Ζεφύριον_ in _Ivo_ 144 (472); and by _οἱ_ _'Επιζεφύριοι_ at Arist. _Pol._ 1274*22. On onomastics, see further Niutta (1977) 257–58.

Lokroi is called a *polis* in the political sense at Pind. _Ol._ 10.13, 98; Pl. _Tim._ 20A, _Leg._ 638B; Dem. 24.139, and _I Locri_ 1.1,
etc. (C4m–C3m); and in the urban sense at Thuc. 7.35.2 and Ps.-Skylax 13, where Lokroi is the first toponym listed after the heading πόλεις εἰς ἄιδ. A Λοκρῶν πόλις was included in the Aristotelian collection of 138 politeia (frs. 547–48, Rose; Heracl. Lemb. 60); πολιτεύεσθαι is found in Arist. Pol. 1273\(^{3}\)31, 1274\(^{2}\)22. Patris is found in SEG 29 951 (C4; CEG II 855).

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C4m coins (infra) and in I. Loci 9.5 (C4m–C3m); the external collective use is found in SEG 11 1211 (525–500), cf. Lombardo (1989) 429; SEG 24 304–5 (C6–C5), 311–12 (c.480s); Thuc. 3.115.6, 4.1.2; Arist. Pol. 1274\(^{4}\)22, 1307\(^{3}\)38. The external individual use is found in Ἰἔριον 144.1.3 (c.472); IG II\(^{2}\) 3052 (328/7) and Timaios (FGrHist 566) fr. 43.

Lokroi was founded by Lokrians, but already in antiquity it was debated whether the founders had been West or East Lokrians (Ephor. fr. 138 apud Strabo 6.1.7; Ps.-Skymnos 312–16). The colonists first settled at Cape Zephyrion (modern Capo Bruzzano), but a few years later they moved to a permanent site at the “hill of Epopis” with the co-operation of Syracusans and possibly of others (Strabo 6.1.7); the passage in Strabo is corrupt, and it is uncertain whether he named others as participating in the relocation; however, Tarentines may have participated, and Pausanias’ statement (3.3.1) that Lokroi was a Lakedaimonian foundation may be a reflection of (alleged) Tarantine participation (cf. Sourvinou-Inwood (1974) 189; Van Compernolle (1992) 762–63; see further Béard (1957) 199–209 and Niutta (1977) 260–61).

According to Strabo 6.1.7, the foundation took place a little after the foundation of Krotón (710) and Syracuse (733), and according to Polyb. 12.6.9 at the time of the First Messenian War (c.735–717); according to Eusebios at the time of Olympiad 25.1 or 26.4 (679/8 or 673/2). A foundation in the first decades of C7 is now confirmed by archaeological evidence (survey: Sabbione (1982) 277–93). Perhaps as early as C6m a foundation legend modelled upon that of Taras was in existence; it is discussed by Sourvinou-Inwood (1974).

The name of the territory was ἦ Λοκρῖς (Thuc. 3.99, 103.3). The southern border between the territories of Lokroi and Rhegion (no. 68) was marked by the river Halex (modern Galati) (Strabo 6.1.9; according to Paus. 6.6.4 by the river Kaikinos; cf. Costabile (1992) 166–68). The river Sagra, theatre of the C6 battle between Lokroi and Krotón (no. 56) (Strabo 6.1.10), separated Lokrian from Kaulonian territory; the Sagra is identified with the modern river Allaro near Kaulonia (no. 55) or with the modern river Torbido near Gioiosa Ionica (Osanna (1992) 214, 222 n. 47).

The choρα of Lokroi comprised at first only the c.110 km\(^{2}\) coastal plain within the line of foothills of the Sila mountains, although for the moment there is a lack of agrarian structures from the Archaic period that might be associated with Lokroi (Sabbione (1982) 293–97; Osanna (1992) 205–7). Lokrian territory soon extended to the borders of Rhegion and Kaulonia, and by C7–C6 Lokrian dominion extended to the Ionian Sea, where Medma (no. 60), Metauros (no. 62) and Hipponion (no. 53) were founded (Musti (1976) 108–20; Cordiano (1995b) 88–91; and the respective entries). In 389 Dionysios I of Syracuse handed over to Lokroi the territory of Kaulonia, whose inhabitants had been relocated to Syracuse (no. 47; Diod. 14.106.3); in 388 the inhabitants of Hipponion were relocated to Syracuse, and its territory handed over to Lokroi (Diod. 14.107.2); Skylletion was also handed over to Lokroi (Strabo 6.1.10), and Medma may also have been given to Lokroi (RE xiii.2. 1333). Hipponion was lost again in 379 (Diod. 15.24); and Kaulonia seems to have been refounded c.357 by Dionysios II of Syracuse, as may be inferred from Diod. 16.10.2 and 11.3 (cf. Plut. Dio 26.7). A Κ4m war with the Leukanians is reported in Just. Epit. 31.3.3. A kome in Lokrian territory is very likely referred to in FGrHist 577, fr. 2.10 (r427/6). A peripolion, i.e. military fortress in the territory, is mentioned in Thuc. 3.99.

A C6 alliance with Siris (no. 69) is reported by Just. Epit. 20.2.10, and a C6 alliance with Rhegion (no. 68) by Strabo 6.1.10. An alliance with Syracuse is attested by Thuc. 3.86.2. A treaty was concluded with Athens (no. 361) in 422 (Thuc. 5.5.2–3); a treaty with Sparta (no. 345) in 411 is indicated by Thuc. 8.91.1, which attests to Lokrian naval forces serving with the Peloponneseans. After the congress of Gela in 424, Lokroi sent ἐποίκοι to Sicilian Messana (no. 51), which was experiencing a stasis at that point, one faction inviting the Lokrians; the ἐποίκοι were, however, soon expelled, but during their residence Messana was dependent on Lokroi (Thuc. 5.5.1). In 396, 1,000 Lokrians were relocated by Dionysios I of Syracuse to Sicilian Messana (Diod. 14.78.5).

The existence of a Lokrian navy is attested by Thuc. 4.1.2 (ten ships), 8.91.1, and Diod. 12.54.4 (r427) (five ships). A contingent of 300 soldiers is mentioned at Thuc. 3.103.3. Later sources report 15,000 (Just. Epit. 20.3.4) or 10,000 (Strabo 6.1.10) Lokrian troops as having fought in the C6 battle at the Sagra. Polemarchoi are attested in the Lokroi Tables (I. Loci 21.5 (C4m–C3m)).

Sending of envoys is attested in Diod. 8.32.1 (rC6); reception of envoys is attested in Diod. 14.44.6 (r398). E. Delphes 111.176 (prior to 280) is a grant of proxeny etc. by Delphi (no. 177) to a man described as Λοκρός ἐκ τῶν...
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277–98. Lokroi was not, therefore, founded on virgin soil, but on the site of an
indigenous community (RE xiii.2. 1310); C8l contacts between the indigenous population and Greeks are attested by
ceramic evidence (Sabbione (1982) 279). The city was
founded on the slopes of a mountain ridge, the hill of Epops
according to Strabo 6.1.7, with three peaks Mannella,
Abbadessa and Castellace (Foti (1976) pl. 27; survey of site:
Costamagna and Sabbione (1990)), incorporating the
coastal plain between the Portigliola and Ficaretro river
valleys. It must have had harbour facilities, now possibly
identified on the Ficaretro estuary (infra).

The 7 km circuit wall (overall plan in Costabile (1992) 36, pl. 13) encircled a vast area of c.240 ha, of which the area
south of the “Dromos” comprises c.80 ha. The upper part of
the city, though enclosed by the circuit wall, is morphologi-
cally irregular and not readily accessible for habitation. The
extant wall is mainly Hellenistic, but stretches of it use earlier,
c6 elements in their structure, particularly in the areas of
Centocamere and of the Marasà sanctuary (Barra Bagnasco
(2000) 11–12, 30); lengths of isodomic structure are dated to
C5m–C4m, whereas the curtain-wall in ashlar strengthened

After the constitutional reforms of the 340s, the epon-
ymous official was an archon (see SEG 30 1172; I.Locri i.1, etc.
(C4m–C3m)). A βωλά is mentioned in I.Locri 1.2, etc.
(C4m–C3m). The following boards of officials are attested
(all C4m–C3m): ἐπισκευαστήρες (I.Locri 21.2), ἐπιστάται
(I.Locri 3.13), ἱερομνάµονες (I.Locri 2.1), λογιστήρες
(I.Locri 32.7), πρόβολοι (I.Locri 2.3), πρόδικοι (I.Locri 2.5)
and τουχτοι (I.Locri 3.8). A φάταρχος is mentioned in
I.Locri 8.6 and a βευκόλος in I.Locri 21.6 (both C4m–C3m).
Whether the βασιλείς mentioned in I.Locri 1.2, etc.
(C4m–C3m) was a civic magistracy is unresolved (SEG 45
1443). Decrees of the assembly are referred to in I.Locri 12.7, 9,
10, etc. (C4m–C3m). A probouleutic procedure is indicated
by the formula δόγμαι βωλά καὶ δάμιοι (I.Locri 2.7, 9, 10,
etc. (C4m–C3m)) or ἐδοξε ταί βωλά καὶ τῶν δάμιων
(I.Locri 4.7, etc. (C4m–C3m)).

The literary tradition mentions a first settlement of
Locrians at Cape Zephyrion, but as yet there is no archaeo-
logical evidence for such a settlement (Van Compernolle
(1992)). After a few years the colonists relocated to the
historical site of Lokroi, with evidence of Greek settlers from
c.700, which fits Strabo’s chronology (6.1.7) but is earlier
than the Eusebian foundation date (Van Compernolle
(1992)). According to Foti (1976) 358 there is evidence of
indigenous “cohabitation” with the Greek settlers, reflecting
the tradition of a period of peaceful co-existence found in
Polyb. 12.5.10 (Sabbione (1982) 277–98). Lokroi was not,
therefore, founded on virgin soil, but on the site of an
indigenous community (RE xiii.2. 1310); C8l contacts between the indigenous population and Greeks are attested by
ceramic evidence (Sabbione (1982) 279). The city was
founded on the slopes of a mountain ridge, the hill of Epops
according to Strabo 6.1.7, with three peaks Mannella,
Abbadessa and Castellace (Foti (1976) pl. 27; survey of site:
Costamagna and Sabbione (1990)), incorporating the
coastal plain between the Portigliola and Ficaretro river
valleys. It must have had harbour facilities, now possibly
identified on the Ficaretro estuary (infra).

The 7 km circuit wall (overall plan in Costabile (1992) 36,
pl. 13) encircled a vast area of c.240 ha, of which the area
south of the “Dromos” comprises c.80 ha. The upper part of
the city, though enclosed by the circuit wall, is morphologi-
cally irregular and not readily accessible for habitation. The
extant wall is mainly Hellenistic, but stretches of it use earlier,
c6 elements in their structure, particularly in the areas of
Centocamere and of the Marasà sanctuary (Barra Bagnasco
(2000) 11–12, 30); lengths of isodomic structure are dated to
C5m–C4m, whereas the curtain-wall in ashlar strengthened
with towers is dated to C4m–C3e (Foti (1976) 346–49; cf. De Francisics (1972) 163–69 on *pyrgopoia* in the Lokrian Tables). A siege is reported for C4m by Strabo 6.1.8. The vast area encircled by the circuit wall was never fully urbanised. The main zones of habitation comprised the two main urban complexes on the lower plain inside the city wall and the habitation area “Caruso” in the upper part of the city, where the theatre was also located—possibly in the vicinity of an (unidentified) agora (*infra*). The “Dromos”, a road of ancient origin apparently preserving the ancient name, divided the city into an upper and a lower part. Extensive habitation areas have been excavated south of the “Dromos”: to the west, the so-called Centocamere with several *insulae* and a regular, orthogonal layout, and to the east, the *insulae* near the Marasà sanctuary. The evidence points to a C5e origin, and to two later, C3 phases (for the extensive excavations of the lower city, see Barra Bagnasco (1977), (1989a, b, c)). Habitation extended up the slopes north of the “Dromos” (Osanna (1992) 218, fig. 16). The orientation of the *insulae* (lengthwise following the slope, the short side facing the sea) facilitated drainage.

To the south and nearer the coast—separated from the habitation area of Centocamere by a 14 m-wide *plateia*—*insulae* of irregular shape and various systems of drainage, basins and kilns have revealed an industrial and artisan quarter, primarily of C4 (Barra Bagnasco (1976) 380–82, pl. 35: H1–H3, 403–4). This area between the city wall and the *plateia* of the city to the north seems not to have been occupied in the Archaic period, apart from single stoas and the monumental gate; a mercantile agora related to the sea and harbour was situated here in this period (Osanna (1992) 215).

The chronological framework of the development of urbanisation is not very clear, but there is testimony of a C6m orthogonal urban organisation of the area between the theatre and the sea, and of the monumentalisation of the sanctuaries of Stoa ad U (*infra*), Marasà Sud, Marasà and Marafioti, a culminating point of urban development—reflected also in the territorial expansion in this period (Barra Bagnasco (1996a) 57; cf. however, Barra Bagnasco (1996b) 28–29 identifying it as a sanctuary of Adonis-Aphrodite). The theatre, situated in the upper part of the city, was built originally in C4m, but since it was rebuilt in later periods, its seating capacity of 4,500 can only tentatively be assumed for the original phase (Parra (1977–78), (1998)). It may have served democratic assemblies as well (Costabile (1992) 322 n. 11).

Several sanctuaries were scattered across the upper parts of the city and in the lowland areas, primarily in the vicinity of the circuit wall (surveys: Torelli (1976); Zuntz (1971) 158–73). The “Casa Marafioti” Doric temple of 540–530, with remains limited to parts of the foundation and foundation trenches (Orsi (1911a) 27–41, 49–62), was situated inside the circuit wall on a spur near the theatre and agora(?), and was part of a larger *temenos* overlooking the lower city (for an agora(?), theatre and *temenos*: Parra (1998) 311–12); the dedicatee of the sanctuary has been identified as Zeus Olympios (which is not accepted unanimously) on the basis of the Olympieion archive found in the vicinity (De Francisics (1972); SEG 29 950; Costabile (1992)). Votive deposits found near the theatre attest to cults of Athena, Artemis, Persephone, Dionysos and a local hero (Parra (1998) 315–17). The sanctuary of Persephone, and of Demeter and Aphrodite(?), at Mannella, probably “the most famous Persephone sanctuary in Italy” mentioned by Diodorus (23.4.3 (205)), is located north of the city, outside the city wall in the Mannella valley (see Torelli (1976) 158 n. 16 with refs.; Hinz (1998) 203–6). The sanctuary is above all known from the votive *pinakes* with the cultic representations of the rape of Persephone, *Hieros Gamos*, sacrificial scenes, etc. (Prückner (1968); Sabbione (1996)). An Athena sanctuary with a simple *naïskos* of uncertain date lies inside the circuit wall at the top of the Mannella hill, which may have formed the acropolis of the city (Orsi (1909) 323; (1911a) 62). The location could indicate a sanctuary of Athena Polias, but the votive terracottas show Athena primarily as a Promachos. The monumental C5 Ionic temple, placed within a larger *temenos* in the Marasà area in the lower city, can be traced back to C7 (De Francisics (1979); Gullini (1976) 411–36). It has without strong evidence been attributed to Aphrodite (Prückner (1968) 12), but the possible origin of the Ludovisi throne in the sanctuary may support this identification. In the area of the Centocamere, south of the circuit wall, a series of *oikoi* were laid out so as to form a U-shaped structure (conventionally called Stoa ad U); they formed a single sacred structure, built in C7e with two short wings which were prolonged and enlarged in C6m, on either side of a central space. In the open space inside the wings of the stoa...
371 bothroi with remains of sacred meals and some votive material indicate cult activity; C₄ graffiti suggest that the sanctuary was dedicated to Aphrodite (Torelli (1976) 147–56; cf. Musti (1976) 65–70). A bronze phiale from the Olympieion sanctuary with a dedication to Aphrodite may refer to this or to the Marasà sanctuary (Costabile (1992) 97–101, 113). Twenty single square rooms laid out along the south side of the circuit wall, with yet another complex further to the south, are probably part of this extensive C₄ sanctuary complex (Barra Bagnasco (1976) 379–80, pl. 35, “St–S₂”). An extra-mural sanctuary with remains of a C₆l–C₅ cult building north-east of the Stoà ad U and south of the circuit wall (Barra Bagnasco (1990b), (1996b) 28–30) is attributed to Aphrodite on the basis of dedicatory graffiti and a C₅f votive inscription (Barra Bagnasco and Pugliese Carratelli (1990)), and the cult is therefore to be seen in conjunction with the Stoà ad U and the Marasà sanctuary. Votive deposits discovered outside the city by the main route to the eastern cemetery attest a C₅–C₄ cult of Zeus (Barra Bagnasco (1996c)) and a sanctuary of Demeter, probably a Thesmophorion, delimited by a temenos wall outside the south-eastern corner of the city wall was in use from C₆s (Grattarola (1994); Milanesio (1996); Hinz (1998) 206–8).

The cemeteries are located mainly in the middle and lower plain encircling the city at the localities of Vallone di Canale, Contrada Lucifero (with 1,676 tombs, primarily C₆: Orsi (1909) 319, (1913)), Monaci (with Greek material from C₈l–C₇e); Parapezza and Tribona (Foti (1976) 359–61; Osanna (1992)).

The patron divinity was presumably Athena, who appeared to Zaleukos in a dream to give him his laws (Arist. fr. 555). A local calendar is attested by the Lokrian Tables, which name twelve months and attest to an intercalary month (see Niutta (1977) 266).

Communal oracle consultation is reported by Arist. fr. 555 and Aristox. fr. 117, Wehrli. Several citizens of Lokroi won Olympic victories: Euthykle in 488 (Olympionikai 180 (pentathlon)), Euthymos in 484, 476 and 472 (Olympionikai 191, 214, 227 (boxing)), Hagesidamos in 476 (Olympionikai 218 (boys’ boxing)) and Keton in 448 (Olympionikai 297 (pentathlon)). Eunomos won a Pythian victory in a musical contest (Timaeus (FGrHist 566) fr. 43). A communal dedication of 525–500 (cf. Lombardo (1989) 429) with Hipponion (no. 53) and Medma (no. 60) at Olympia commemorates a victory over Kroton (no. 56) (SEG 11 1211). Paus. 6.19.6 mentions an Archaic communal dedication of a boxwood image of Apollo, possibly in commemoration of the battle of the Sagra (LSAG 286). De La Genière suggests that the architectural remains of the so-called “Monoptoros of the Sikyonians” at Delphi are the remains of a Lokrian treasury (de La Genière (1986); Griffin (1982) 108 too is very doubtful about the traditional attribution of this building to Sikyon). The evidence, mainly iconographic, for a Western Greek origin of this treasury is strong, though the Lokrian candidacy must remain hypothetical.

Lokroi did not strike its own coins until C₄; the start of minting is dated with some uncertainty to 375–350 (survey of Lokrian mint: Pozzi Paolini (1976)). Staters and drachms with Corinthian types and on the Corinthian standard were issued from before C₄m to C₃e, revealing strong ties with eastern Sicily: obv. Pegasos; rev. head of Athena in Corinthian helmet, legends: Λ, ΑΟ, ΛΟΚ, ΛΟΚΡΩΝ (Pozzi Paolini (1976) 221–33; Rutter, HN³ 236ff; SNG Cop. Italy 1868–70). A contemporary issue of staters on an Italic standard has obv. head of Zeus, legend: ΖΕΥΣ; rev. seated Eirene, legend: EIPENE (Pozzi Paolini (1976) 242–47; Rutter, HN³ 2310); this was followed c.C₄m by an issue of staters with obv. head of Zeus with unkempt hair and beard, legend: ΛΟΚΡΩΝ; rev. eagle devouring hare, both types with many variants (Pozzi Paolini (1976) 247–52; Rutter, HN³ 231ff; SNG Cop. Italy 1858–59, 1861–62). Later issues have obv. eagle devouring hare; rev. thunderbolt with different symbols and legend: ΛΟΚΡΩΝ (Pozzi Paolini (1976) 255–61; Rutter, HN³ 2318; SNG Cop. Italy 1865–66). Lower denominations are triobols, diobols and obols (Pozzi Paolini (1976) 267–73; Rutter, HN³ 2329ff; SNG Cop. Italy 1860). The Lokrian Zeus type may reflect the Syracusan Zeus Eleutherios (supra; cf. also Cutroni Tusca (1993–94) 478–79 for Lokrian–Syracusan contacts). At the time of Alexander the Molossian or Pyrrhos, Lokroi also issued a gold coinage, denomination one-tenth of a gold stater on the Attic standard: obv. head of eagle, legend: ΑΟ; rev. winged thunderbolt (Pozzi Paolini (1976) 279–84; Rutter, HN³ 2345; SNG Cop. Italy 1857).

A unique tetradrachm on the Euboic–Attic standard has obv. biga of mules driven by a charioteer crowned by Nike, legend: ΑΟ; rev. running hare. It has been interpreted as a Messanian–Lokrian alliance coinage of 425 (cf. Thuc. 5.5.1), but see Pozzi Paolini (1976) 218–20 for typological and technical anomalies.

Bronze coinage commenced c.350; C₄s types show mainly Zeus and Athena, C₃e also Persephone, Apollo and Herakles (Pozzi Paolini (1976) 284–96; Rutter, HN³ 2353ff; SNG Cop. Italy 1871–98).

Lokroi was the metropolis of Hipponion (no. 53) and Medma (no. 60) (Thuc. 5.5.3; cf. Hornblower (1996) 434–35);
the former founded in C7l, the latter in C7 (see further the entries for these two cities). According to Steph. Byz. 437.3, Metauros (no. 62) was also a Lokrian foundation; see further the entry for this city.

60. Medma (Medmaios) Map 46. Lat. 38.30, long. 16.00. Size of territory: 2. Type: [A]. The toponym is Μέδμαιος, ἡ in Hecat. fr. 81 apud Steph. Byz. 440.5; Ps.-Skymnos 12 and C4 coins (infra) have Μέσμαιος Ps.-Skymnos has Μέθμαια and Strabo 6.1.5 has Μέδαιμα, ἡ. The city-ethnic is Μέθμαιοις in SEG 11 1211 (525–500) and presumably at Thuc. 5.5.3, where the MSS give Μελαιοι, which is commonly and probably correctly emended to Μεθμαιοι (Hornblower 1996) 434–35; Μεθμαιοις is found on C4 coins (infra).

Mesma is one of ten toponyms listed at Ps.-Skylax 12 after the heading πόλεις εἰς ἐν τῇ Ἑλληνίδῃ αἰδε, where polis is used in the urban sense. Thuc. 5.5.3 describes the Medmaians as apoikoi of Lokroi Epizephyrioi. The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C4 coins (infra); the external collective use is found in SEG 11 1211 (525–500), Thuc. 5.5.3 (infra); and Diod. 14.78.5 (r396). The external individual use has been restored in Hermendorus, De Platone fr. C.111.35, Lasserre (rC4–C3) (cf. Steph. Byz. 440.7 with Settis (1965) 131; Philopappos of Opous (FGrHist 1011) fr. 1; Test. 5 and fr. 15b, Lasserre).

Medma was a foundation of Lokroi (no. 59; Thuc. 5.5.3; Ps.-Skymnos 308; Strabo 6.1.5), bordering on Lokroi itself (Thuc. 5.5.3, infra). Archaeological evidence points to a foundation in C7 (Paoletti 1981b 147). The scanty evidence shows very varied relations with the metropolis: (a) SEG 11 1211 (525–500) is a dedication by Hipponion (no. 53), also a Lokrian colony, Medma and Lokroi (cf. Lombardo 1989: 429) of spoils taken from Kroton (no. 56) and thus a testimony to an alliance between colony and metropolis: (b) Thuc. 5.5.3 (infra) attests to a war between Lokroi and its two neighbouring colonies Medma and Hipponion c.422. See further Hipponion (no. 53).

The foundation of Medma (and Hipponion) was the result of Lokrian expansion across the Aspromonte through the Métramo valley to gain access to the Tyrrenian Sea by circumventing Rhegion (no. 68) and Messana (no. 51) at the straits (Béard 1957 209–10; Settis 1965 121–22). As a result of Lokrian expansion, the Chalkidian (Zankliaian) site of Metauros on the Tyrrenian coast near Medma came under Lokrian influence or even occupation (see Metauros (no. 62)). For the chronology of the Lokrian expansion there is useful evidence from local indigenous sites, such as that from Torre Galli, where the cemetery reveals Greek influence C7l–C6m, which probably coincides with the foundation of Medma and Hipponion (Guzzo 1982b 250). Studies in the hinterland of Medma have revealed Greek influence from C7 (Cantarelli 1974–75 34–37). The chora of Medma was the Rosarno valley and the lower slopes of the Aspromonte, the crest of these hills dividing Medma from Lokrian territory; in all, the territory measured c.100 km². According to Strabo 6.1.5, Medma had a harbour named Emporion, the location of which is uncertain (Settis 1989), though some locate it at Nicotera (cf. Pontrandolfo 1993).

An alliance between Lokroi (cf. Lombardo 1989 429), Hipponion and Medma is attested by SEG 11 1211 (525–500), a joint dedication by these cities at Olympia of spoils taken from Kroton (Settis 1965 122). Some kind of treaty with or dependency upon Kroton is probably indicated by C5e Krotonaitic coinage with the legend ME (Settis 1965) 123 and Gorini (1985); rejected by Moltrasio (1972–73 175; cf. infra). Thucydides’ phrasing at 5.5.3 (infra): ὁ πρὸς Ἰππωνίας καὶ Μεθμαιάους πόλεμος, suggests that Hipponion and Medma were allies in the war against Lokroi c.422.

In 396, Dionysios I of Syracuse relocated 4,000 Medmaians to Sicilian Messana (no. 51; Diod. 14.78.5); if this is correct (and it was disputed by, for example, Beloch (1923) iii.2 190), it probably meant a depopulation of Medma, but depopulation is not supported by the archaeological evidence (Paoletti 1981b 150). When the populations of Kaulonia (no. 55) and Hipponion (no. 53) were relocated to Sicily in 389 (Diod. 14.106.3, 107.2), Dionysios handed over their territories to Lokroi (no. 59), and it is not impossible that the same happened in the case of Medma (RE xii.2. 1333). The figure of 4,000 is the only indication of the order of size of the Medmaian population, and if it is historical, it probably refers to the entire population (Settis 1965) 125.

The settlement of Medma was located on the site of present-day Rosarno and has therefore been accessible to sporadic investigations only. The ancient site joined a larger plateau by a narrow, easily defendable isthmus. The larger plateau had an extent of about 130–140 ha, but the urbanised area in its western part comprised only about 30–35 ha (surveys: Paoletti 1981a 47–54 fig. 8; 2001)). There are traces of habitation from the Archaic and Hellenistic periods, with evidence of C5e urban layout joining habitation areas and sanctuaries (Sabbione 1981a; Paoletti and Parra 1985). The C4 remains conflict with the passage in Diodorus describing the C4e deportation of the inhabitants of Medma to Messana by Dionysios I (Diod. 14.78.5; cf. Paoletti 1981b)
Kroton, probably as early as C 6th century BC, an earlier coinage was issued as an ally or dependency of Kroton. The Athenian series of staters carrying the legend ΜΕΣΜΑΙΩΝ (Gorini (1985) 313) or alternatively: ΜΕΣΜΑΙΩΝ (Gorini (1985) 313) or alternatively: ΜΕΣΜΑΙΩΝ (Gorini (1985) 313) ΜΕΣΜΑΙΩΝ (Gorini (1985) 313). Euseb. Chron. Arm. under Ol. 1 dates the foundation to 733/2, but the archaeological evidence suggests a foundation c.670 (infra). The foundation legend was that the site had previously been occupied by a Greek city founded by Nestor and the Pylians on their return from Troy but later destroyed by the Samnitai (Strabo 6.1.15); in, e.g., Bacchyl. Ep. 11.14, Müller, Achaioi should probably be understood in the Homeric sense as referring to this mythical foundation (Pugliese Carratelli 1973: 51). According to Ephor. fr. 141, the oecist was Daunios, the tyrant of Krissa; according to Strabo 6.1.15, it was Leukippos of Achaia, and this seems to have been the eponymous name. Since his head is on some C4 coins (Head, HN² 78; Rutter, HN¹ 1552–53, etc.). The historicity of this foundation, however, is rendered suspect by Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 19.3, where the trick by which Leukippos obtained the site for his foundation is associated with Kallipolis (Morgan and Hall 1996: 211; see also Mele (1996)).

The territory is termed χώρη at Hdt. 4.15.2; Strabo 6.1.4 names it τῆ Μεταποντίνη, possibly deriving the name from Antiochos (FGrHist 555, fr. 3a); it is the area confined by the valleys of the rivers Cavone and Bradano, calculated to comprise about 200 km². The limit of the χώρα was inland about

In 525–500, Medma, with Hipponion (no. 53) and Lokroi (no. 59) (cf. Lombardo (1989) 429), dedicated at Olympia spoils taken from Kroton (no. 56) (SEG 11 1211).

61. Metapontion (Metapontinos) Map 45. Lat. 40.25, long. 16.50. Size of territory: 4. Type: A. The toponym is Μεταπόντιος, τό (Bacchyl. 11.116, Maehler; Hdt. 4.15.1; Antiochos (FGrHist 555) fr. 12; C5 coins, infra); Antiochos (FGrHist 555) fr. 12 gives Μέσμον as an earlier name. The city-ethnic is ΜΕΤΑΠΟΝΤΙΝΟΣ (Hdt. 4.15.1–3; Thuc. 7.33.5).

Metapontion is called a polis in primarily the territorial sense, with the urban sense as a connotation (Antiochos (FGrHist 555) fr. 12). It is listed as a polis in the urban sense at Ps.-Skylax 14, where Metapontion is the second toponym listed after the heading πόλεις εἰσιν αἵδε. At Bacchyl. 11.114, Maehler, polis presumably refers to legendary times (infra). Asy is found in Bacchyl. 11.12, Maehler. The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is attested abbreviated as METAPIKYTEN on C65 coins (Rutter (1997) 28); the external collective use is attested in Hdt. 4.15.2–3 and Thuc. 7.33.5; and the external individual use in IG II² 1007 (500–475), Syll. 25 (C56) and Arist. Metaph. 984b7.

Metapontion was, according to Antiochos (FGrHist 555) fr. 12, founded by Achaians (cf. Ps.-Skymnos 326ff) who had been sent for by the Achaean Sybarites (no. 70.1) who wanted support against Taras (no. 71). Euseb. Chron. Arm. under Ol. 1 dates the foundation to 733/2, but the archaeological evidence suggests a foundation c.670 (infra). The foundation legend was that the site had previously been occupied by a Greek city founded by Nestor and the Pylians on their return from Troy but later destroyed by the Samnitai (Strabo 6.1.15); in, e.g., Bacchyl. Ep. 11.14, Müller, Achaioi should probably be understood in the Homeric sense as referring to this mythical foundation (Pugliese Carratelli 1973: 51). According to Ephor. fr. 141, the oecist was Daunios, the tyrant of Krissa; according to Strabo 6.1.15, it was Leukippos of Achaia, and this seems to have been the eponymous name, since his head is on some C4 coins (Head, HN² 78; Rutter, HN¹ 1552–53, etc.). The historicity of this foundation, however, is rendered suspect by Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 19.3, where the trick by which Leukippos obtained the site for his foundation is associated with Kallipolis (Morgan and Hall 1996: 211; see also Mele (1996)).

The territory is termed χώρη at Hdt. 4.15.2; Strabo 6.1.4 names it τῆ Μεταποντίνη, possibly deriving the name from Antiochos (FGrHist 555, fr. 3a); it is the area confined by the valleys of the rivers Cavone and Bradano, calculated to comprise about 200 km². The limit of the χώρα was inland about
13 km from Metapontion at the border fortress at Cozzo Presepe (Osanna (1992) 54, 82). The area of influence may have been more extensive from C6m (Osanna (1992) 53–54), when the territory of Siris (no. 69) was taken over by the Achaian alliance of Metapontion (no. 61), Sybaris (no. 70.1) and Kroton (no. 56) (Just. Epit. 20.2.4). The _chora_ of Metapontion is above all known for the agrarian land division and scattered farmsteads, in evidence from C6s to C4, over an area of 20,000 ha (Carter (1990), (1993), (2000)). Sanctuaries are attested in the _chora_ of Metapontion from C7m–l. An Artemision (?) is documented at San Biagio (cf. votives and Bacchyl. 11.17, Mähler; Arena (1996) no. 64). A sanctuary of Hera, epigraphically attested (Arena (1996) no. 75), on the border of Tarantine territory has votive material going back to C7m; the temple (“Tavola Palatine”) is dated c.530. From C6 a number of spring sanctuaries were spread regularly across the territory, probably spaced according to the land division of the _chora_. The most important are at Incoronata, San Biagio and Pantanello (Osanna (1992) 40, 50, 54). The outermost border sanctuary at the site of Cozzo Presepe was monumentalised C5 (Carter (1994)).

A war (possibly C5m: Morgan and Hall (1996) 210) with Taras (no. 71) concerning control of territory is attested by Antiochos (FGrHist 555) fr. 12.

On the basis of the seating capacity of the _ekklesiasterion_ (infra), the total population of the _polis_ may tentatively be estimated at max. 40,000, of whom some 12,500 could be accommodated in the town itself (Carter (1990) 406 with n. 2).

Metapontion may have been a member of the Italiote League (Staatsverträge 230). An alliance with Sybaris (no. 70.1) and Kroton (no. 56) in a C6f war against Siris (no. 69) is reported by Just. Epit. 20.2.3–4. In C6s, Metapontion was, with Taras (no. 71) and Kaulonia (no. 55), involved in arbitration between Kroton and returning exiles (lamb. VP 262). A treaty of _symmachia_ with Athens (no. 361) is attested in Thuc. 7.33.5. Naval forces and akontistai are attested at Thuc. 7.33.5. Reception of envoys in C4f is attested in Polyaeon. 5.2.22. Two citizens of Metapontion are listed as _proxenoi_ of the Aitolian Confederacy in IG 11x¹ 1.17.A.11.74–75 (c.260–230). A citizen of Metapontion served as _theorodokos_ of Epidaurus (no. 348) in 356/5 (IG 11v² 1.95.49).

Sources for the political organisation of Metapontion are scanty, though there is some tenuous evidence of a tyranny by Archelaos at Metapontion in the Archaic period (Berve (1967) 610–11; Luraghi (1994) 76 with refs.; for archaeological evidence possibly supporting the tradition of Archelaos’ murder, see De Siena (1999) 234–35). An aristocratic or oligarchic regime at Metapontion may perhaps be inferred from the story that Pythagoras took refuge at Metapontion, where he died (Aristox. fr. 18, Wehrli). According to Thuc. 7.57.11, the Metapontines supported Athens against Syracuse in 413 because internal conflicts (stasiotikoi kairoi) left them no other choice (cf. HCT ad loc.); this may mean that in 413 democrats were in the ascendancy (Berger (1992) 28), and democracy may also be implied by the _symmachia_ with Athens mentioned at Thuc. 7.34.4. For a possible attestation of an eponymous official (rendered in Oscan as _meddius_ in C4e, see Tagliamonte (1994) 167–68. A board of officials called _δικεφαστηρεῖς_ is mentioned in Hesych. s.v. A private dedication of C4–C5e describes the female dedicator as [-]-a _Πολυγ. Θέαντω_, where _Πολυγ._ is interpreted as an “abbreviation of a deme or phyle, referring to the father of the dedicator Θεάντως” (SEG 38 997 comm.).

Metapontion was founded on a low plateau near the coast between the rivers Basento and Bradano. C7e evidence has revealed a mixed pre-colonial Greek (Ionic?) and indigenous settlement(s) (cf. De Siena (1986)), whereas the Achaian foundation can be dated to C650 (Adamasteanu (1982) 304–13). A C6m circuit wall with extensive use of sun-dried brick was raised on the edge of the settlement plateau enclosing an area of 140–45 ha. C5 saw some restructuring, and C4–C3 a strengthening with use of ashlar and reused blocks from older buildings, and a systematisation of drainage canals and city gates (Adamasteanu (1973b) 156–68). A sizeable agora (cf. Hdt. 4.15.4), delimiting the southern side of the large _temenos_, was part of the urban layout from its earliest phase. The main public monument is the _ekklesiasterion_ (theatre, with a history spanning C7–C3). The seating capacity of the C7e structure has been calculated at about 7,500–8,000 (Mertens and De Siena (1982)). The interpretation of the structure as an _ekklesiasterion_ is supported by the related, circular meeting places in Akragas and in Poseidonia (Hansen and Fischer-Hansen (1994) 65–67). The monumental size and the apparently excessive seating capacity imply a use also outside the purely political sphere (Mertens (1982); Carter (1994) 182). The _ekklesiasterion_ was replaced C4–C3 by a theatre with a seating capacity of c.6,500 (Paus. 6.19.12; Mertens and De Siena (1982)). A Zeus Agoraios cult is attested by a C6f inscribed stela found near the theatre (Adamasteanu (1979)); the inscription may refer to the function of the _ekklesiasterion_ and not to the agora as such, according to E. Greco (1995b) 89–90. Other sanctuaries are evidenced by walled enclosures, the larger with two altars, perhaps the sanctuary of Apollo mentioned by Herodotos (4.15); C5 coins depicting Apollo testify to the

There is numismatic evidence of athletic games at Metapontion: the first C5m series of Metapontine double-relief issues has as rev. type a standing figure of Acheloos, naked and pouring a libation, accompanied by the legend ΑΧΕΛΟΙΟ ΑΕΘΛΟΝ (infra).

The major urban *temenos* between the agora and the habitation area was laid out on vast dimensions at the time of foundation or shortly after; later it comprised four major temples and several minor temples or shrines; by C4 it was delimitated from the agora by a fence-like structure, from the *kerameikos* by a drainage canal, and from the habitation zone by a stoa-like building (Mertens (1985)). It was dedicated to Athena (Adamesteanu (1976) 163); an Archaic cippus has the epiklesis [H]y[l]i[α]s or [A]i[l]i[α]s (Arena (1996) no. 68; see Graf (1981) 171, suggesting a cult of Greek Polias). To Apollo Lykeios was dedicated the C6e "Peripteral temple A1", whence comes rich C6e votive material (Adamesteanu (1970); Arena (1996) nos. 56, 57, 58). For Apollo Lykeios Nikaios, possibly referring to a victory over Siris (no. 69) in 530, see Adamesteanu (1970) 319 and Arena (1996) no. 60. Stones shaped as anchors may reflect a cult of Apollo Archegetes (Adamesteanu (1974) 28). It is not known to which deity the C6m "Peripteral temple B1" was dedicated (Adamesteanu (1970) 319–20; Graf (1981) 170–71, 174 n. 61). The temple was reconstructed c.540 (= "Peripteral temple B2"; Adamesteanu (1974) 27; Mertens (1985) 658). The "Peripteral temple A2" was constructed c.540, but the dedicatee deity is unknown. "Οἶκος C2" c.500 replaces an earlier shrine. C60–C5e witnessed a monumentalisation of the sanctuary with the C5f "Temple D" (Mertens (1985) 661–63), where the cult is again unknown. In addition to Apollo, votives and various inscriptions mention Athena, Hera, Aphrodite, Artemis and Hermes (cf. Graf (1981) 171), and a C5 cult of Demeter is possibly attested as well (Hinz (1998) 217). For urban cults add Zeus Agoraios: Adamesteanu (1979); Arena (1996) no. 59 (C6f). For the Διός 'Αγιάοι cippus and the reading "Zeus Aglaioi", cf. Bottini (1989) 565–66. C5 coin types and votive deposits add further evidence of the cult of Apollo, Apollo Karneios, Demeter, Zeus Ammon, Athena, Hermes, Dionysos and Herakles (Stazio (1973) 84–86), but also of a number of lesser divinities and, in C48, the cult of the hero/oikistes Leukippos (Lacroix (1965) 85–89). Further epigraphic evidence: C5 sherd with graffiti naming Athene (Hygieia?) (Arena (1996) no. 68 (C5f)); Aphrodite (Arena (1996) nos. 73 (C6l) and 74 (C5e)); for an inscription naming Hermes, see Adamesteanu (1975a) 252.

Monumental drains delimiting the agora, *kerameikos* and *temenos* are probably C4; however, the morphology of the terrain presupposes a system of drainage at least from the C6m (cf. Adamesteanu (1975a) 247–48, 251–52). The overall layout and the delimitation of public spaces were in place by C7s, but the basic elements of the orthogonal town plan are C6m. The degree of development of the individual *insulae* is not clarified, but a gradual development, as known from most other sites, is probable (Adamesteanu (1973) 168–77, (1982) 309–11; Mertens (1982) 104–7). The *kerameikos* dates back to C6m (F. D’Andria (1975)). About 325 burials have been investigated at Pantanello, c. 3 km north of the city. C6e Greek burials, probably those of the first settlers in the chora, took over the originally indigenous burial place; from C6l the number of burials increased significantly, and the cemetery continued in use until C4 (Prohaszka (1995); Carter (1998) 167ff, 236ff). The Crucina cemetery, just outside the city wall, contained about 600 burials, including early, monumental chamber tombs, possibly also that of the tyrant Antileon (Carter (1998) 8, 26; De Siena (1999) 233–35; for the topography of the cemeteries of Metapontion, see Lo Porto (1966) 183–231).

Communal consultation of the Delphic oracle is attested by Hdt. 4.15.3. Bacchyl. 11, Mähler, celebrates a Pythonian victory by Alexidamos in boys’ wrestling. Metapontion had a treasury at Olympia (Paus. 6.19.11; cf. Polemo fr. 20, Pr.). Architectural remains at Olympia and at Delphi have been attributed to Metapontian *thesauroi* (Mertens-Horn and Viola (1990) 245–46). An image of Zeus was dedicated by the people of Metaponton at Olympia (Paus. 5.22.5) but cannot be dated. The famous golden harvest dedicated by the Pylian founders at Delphi according to Strabo 6.1.15 (cf. Courby (1927) 268; Lacroix (1965) 154–58) has been taken as evidence of a Metapontine communal dedication (Vatin (1991) 55–56, whose readings, however, must be treated with great caution).

The coinage of Metapontion began c.550, with silver staters in the incuse fabric on the Achaian standard; the type is an ear of barley, though some issues carry secondary symbols such as a grasshopper or a dolphin, and on later issues: ram’s head, mule’s head and lizard. Legends are MET, META, METAI at times retrograde (Rutter, HN3 1459; SNG Cap. Italy 1158–73; for the mint, see Stazio (1973); Noe and Johnston (1984); Johnston (1990)). The staters were struck in three phases on broad, medium and dumpy flans; smaller denominations were struck in a complex system which provides transitional issues between incuse and double-relief fabrics: drachms, triobols, diobols, obols and a
quarter-stater: types: obv. and rev. barley grain, sometimes with rev. ox-head, or head of man-faced bull (Rutter, HN3 1487, 1492; SNG Cap. Italy 1174–81, Suppl. 42). Double-relief coinage was introduced c.550; staters: obv. ear of barley; rev. five barley grains forming a star, legends: META, METAP on obv. and rev. respectively (Rutter, HN3 1490; SNG Cap. Italy 1182), followed by issues with obv. types and legends as above, but with denominations as rev. types (cf. Stazio [1973] 80–85 for interpretations of these): (a) river-god Acheloos, legend ΑΧΕΛΟΙΟ ΑΕΘΛΟΝ (Noe and Johnston [1984] 56–59, 90; Rutter, HN3 1491; SNG Cap. Italy 1183 (late)); (b) Apollo holding branch and bow (Rutter, HN3 1496; SNG Cap. Italy 1185); (c) Herakles with club over shoulder (Rutter, HN3 1495; SNG Cap. Italy 1184), or Herakles sacrificing at altar (Rutter, HN3 1494; Noe and Johnston [1984] no. 312). Diehols have obv. as above, rev. head of Acheloos (Rutter, HN3 1492; SNG Cap. Suppl. 42). A new C5l issue of staters has as obv. types heads of divinities (Rutter, HN3 1505ff): Apollo Karneios (or Hermes Parammon or Zeus Ammon), Apollo, Zeus (at times with epithet ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΙΟΣ, Dionysos, Demeter, and personifications such as Homonoia, Nike, Hygieia and Soteria identified by epithets; rev. ear of barley, legends as above and METAΠΟΝΤΙΩΝ, METAΠΟΝΤΙΝΩΝ (SNG Cap. Italy 1186–1207; Noe and Johnston [1984] nos. 481, 495, 523–24 for full toponym and ethnic). Some dies were signed, some unusually with the name Aristoxenos in full (Stazio [1973] 87; Noe and Johnston [1984] 62–65). Lower denominations C5l have obv. ear of barley; rev. crescents and pellets (Rutter, HN3 1498–99; SNG Cap. Italy 1230); later, from last quarter of C4 obv. with divinities as above (Rutter, HN3 1594ff; SNG Cap. Italy 1231–38). Bronze coins were introduced C5 (Johnston [1989]): obv. tripod, legend: META; rev. ear of barley (Rutter, HN3 1637; SNG Cap. Italy 1250, 1270); C4f issues have obv. Hermes sacrificing over thymiateron; rev. ear of barley, legend ΜΕ and an unusual identification of denomination, ΟΒΟΛΟΣ (Rutter, HN3 1639; SNG Cap. Italy 1242); also bronze coins with obv. head of Nike or Demeter, rev. ear of barley and ithyphallic herm (Rutter, HN3 1641; SNG Cap. Italy 1243). In C4m more silver issues were struck, depicting heads of divinities and personifications as above (Johnston [1990]); Rutter, HN3 1554ff; SNG Cap. Italy 1218–29). A reference to the origin of the city is found in an issue of staters and gold coinage with the head of Leukippos (Lacroix [1965] 85–86; Stazio [1973] 89–91; Rutter, HN3 1552; SNG Cap. Italy 1208–17). Gold tetrobols were struck from c.340–330, perhaps at the time of Alexander the Molossian to pay mercenaries: obv. head of Leukippos, or of Nike, legend METAΠΟΝ (Stazio [1973] 91–92; Johnston [1990] 41–45; Rutter, HN3 1629; SNG Cap. Suppl. 43).

62. Metauros (Mataurinos) Map 46. Lat. 38.25, long. 15.55. Size of territory: 1. Type: C. The toponym is Μεταυρός (Strabo 6.1.5) or Μεταυρός (Steph. Byz. 437.3). The city-ethnic is Μεταυρίνος (Steph. Byz. 437.4).

No Archaic or Classical source calls Metauros a polis. It is included here as a type C on account of Steph. Byz. 437.4, which describes the C6 poet Stesichoros as a native of Metauros. Στησίχορος Εὐφήµου παῖς Ματαυρίνος γένος, ὁ τῶν μελῶν ποιήτης. Stephanos does not provide a source reference, but the fact that Stesichoros was normally considered a Himeraian (cf. Stesichoros TA 333, 35–36, Davies) tends to suggest that he drew this information from a written account and not from memory. If this source really described Stesichoros by the city-ethnic of Metauros (see Musti [1976]), then the city may have been a polis in C6 since such use of the city-ethnic often indicates that the site to whose toponym the ethnic is related was a polis (Hansen [1996] 182–87), especially in external contexts as in this case.

Metauros was a foundation either of Zankle (no. 51) (Solin. 2.11) or of Lokroi (no. 59; Steph. Byz. 437.3). As indicated above, the political status of Metauros is highly uncertain, and it is not clear whether we should envisage a river-harbour settlement in Lokrian territory or a polis, at least for a period, founded by Zankle and later subject to Lokroi. The prevailing interpretation takes Metauros to be an originally Chalkidian, i.e. Zanklean, foundation later occupied by Lokroi, at about the time when that city founded Hipponion (no. 53) and Medma (no. 60), i.e. C7s (De Franciscis [1960]; Settis [1965] 116–17; Musti [1976]) 88–89. The archaeological evidence (infra) suggests a Greek settlement rather than a Hellenised non-Greek site.

The river Metauros delimited the territory of Rhegion (no. 68) and Metauros, which may have been founded by Zankle (and Rhegion?, infra) in opposition to Lokrian expansion, later becoming part of Lokrian territory (supra). The territory of Metauros is delimited to the south by the Petracco (river Metauros) and to the north by the territory of Medma. There is indirect evidence of an extra-urban sanctuary 500 m to the south-east of the city (Orsi [1958], 192). Sporadic finds of arulae c.1 km to the south may indicate another extra-urban sanctuary, though habitation or a cemetery cannot be ruled out (Sabbione and Soverini [1950] 145). Architectural terracottas of a Greek temple have been reported near Gioia Tauro (Gagliardi [1958]).
The settlement of Metauros occupied a flat plateau, c.1 km from the coast and c.2 km to the north of the river Metauros. The extent of the settlement is unknown: it may have comprised about 60 ha. De Franciscis (1960) 59 suggested that the settlement was located on the plain and that the upper plateau was the acropolis of the city; however, the few remains in the lower city are Roman.

The settlement was delimited northwards and south-eastwards by cemeteries, where a large number of tombs have yielded useful evidence of the cultural connections of Metauros: the C7–C8 tombs contained mixed Greek and indigenous grave goods indicating a mixed population; the Greek wares reveal ties with the Chalkidian cities of Zankle and Rhegion and above all with Mylai, but overall a wide commercial network is revealed by the tomb material (De Franciscis (1960); Sabbione (1981b), (1986)). Later, Greek acculturation was total, and a period of Lokrian influence is revealed by Lokrian and Medmean coroplastic finds and a change in funeral rites (Sabbione (1987); Cordiano (1995b) 91 n. 29). Burials cease C6, and very few tombs are known from C5. Such evidence may point to a termination of settlement C5–C4, perhaps due to Leukanian pressure.

63. Neapolis (Neapolites) Map 44. Lat. 40.50, long. 14.15. Size of territory: 1 or 2 Type: A. The toponym is Νεόπολις (C5 coin, infra) or Νεάπολις (Ps.-Skylax 10; Strabo 5.4.7), Ναύπαλις (Dion. Hal. 15.6.2 (rC45)). The city-ethnic, always on coins, is Νεαπολίτες, Νεάπολιτος, Νεόπολιτος, Νεοπολιτος, Νεοπολίτης, or Νεοπολίτης: see Head, HN59; Rutter (1979) 142–58. Νεαπολίτης is found in Dion. 16.181 (1356) and Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 15.5.6 (rC45).

Neapolis is called a polis in the urban sense (Ps.-Skylax 10), whereas the sources for polis used in the political sense are late (SEG 12 378.6 (242); Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 15.5.1, 6.5 (rC45)). The internal collective use of the city is found on C5l coins (Rutter, HN57 557); the external collective use is found in Timaiso (FGrHist 566) fr. 98 and Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 15.6.4 (rC45); and the external individual use in Dion. 16.181 (1356).

Neapolis was founded c.470 on the initiative of Kyme (no. 57; Ps.-Skymnos 242–43; cf. Strabo 5.4.7); the date is based on the chronology of Syracusan involvement in Kymaian history and upon evidence from the Castel Capuano cemetery (Frederiksen (1984) 94, 101–7; Valenza Mele (1993) 197–98). The city was subsequently settled also by Chalkidians (no. 365), Pithekoussaians (no. 65) and Athenians (no. 361), taking its name “Neapolis” only at this time (Strabo 5.4.7; cf. Lomas (2000) 174). Euboian involvement in the foundation, via Kyme or Chalkis, is supported by evidence from the calendar (Trumpy, Monat. 42–43). Exactly how these later arrivals merged with the earlier Kymaian foundation is uncertain (Raviola (1991) 20–23). Neapolis had a C7 predecessor, Parthenope, but the relationship between the two settlements is not wholly clarified. Parthenope (Παρθενόπης; Strabo 14.2.10; ethnic Παρθενοπαῖος; Steph. Byz. 504.7) is called a polis in a late source (Steph. Byz. 504.6), but its polis status is highly uncertain. Parthenope was probably originally an epineion of Kyme, comparable with the settlement of Dikaiarcheia (see entry in list of non-polis sites supra). The identification of Parthenope on the hill of Pizzofalcone, adjoining the later settlement of Neapolis, is based upon evidence from its cemetery with tombs dating to 675–550, implying that Parthenope became the district of Palaiopolis when Kyme founded neighbouring Neapolis in C5f, with an as yet unexplained hiatus in the chronology of the early and later settlement (cf. Raviola (1990) 19). The more consistent tradition is that Parthenope was either an apoikia or an epineion of Kyme, and that the site was later destroyed by its metropolis (Lutatius apud Serv. auct. ad Verg. G. 4.653 = fr. 7, Peter; sources: Béard (1957) 56; Raviola (1990)); but the sources also seem to suggest that the settlement was autonomous during its early history and not just an early stage of the later Neapolis (summary of evidence: Raviola (1990) 59–60). By C4s the two distinct, neighbouring urban nuclei, Parthenope (= Palaiopolis) and Neapolis, formed one political community (Livy 8.22.5), suggesting the absorption of the earlier site by the later settlement of Neapolis (cf. Lomas (2000) 174; see further Parthenope in list of non-polis sites supra).

Neapolis was founded within the Kymaian dominion (cf. Strabo 5.4.7). Its territory was not extensive: c.20 km² (Lepore (1967) 142, 146–48). The city was a maritime settlement and had a narrow chora bounded by a number of Oscan sites situated not far inland (Polyb. 3.91.4). The city was separated from its hinterland by the river Clanis. Apart from the uncertain evidence of a sanctuary of Athena at Sorrento (Sorrento) (Strabo 5.4.8), perhaps reflected in the numismatic evidence (Rutter (1979) 94–95), extra-urban or suburban sanctuaries are not attested. The Demeter sanctuary of the “Convento di S. Gaudioso” within the urban area of Neapolis had an Archaic pre-foundation phase and is therefore interpreted as situated in the chora of Kyme prior to the foundation of Neapolis, perhaps demarcating the
southern limit of the territory of Kyme (E. Greco (1985a) 188–89). At some point after the Hieronian teichos on Pithekoussai had been abandoned, Neapolis assumed control of the island (Strabo 5.4.9).

Neapolis may have obtained some understanding with Rome as a bulwark against Dionysios of Syracuse (Timaios (FGrHist 566) fr. 32; but see Jacoby, comm. ad loc.); in 327 the city entered into a foedus aequum with Rome (Livy 8.26.6; Staatsverträge 410). An alliance with the Samnites in C4 is attested by Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 15.5.2. A navy is attested for C4 (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 15.6.3).

Reception of envoys is attested in Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 15.5.1, 2 (rC4). The presbeis sent by Taras to Neapolis in C4 were proxenoi of Neapolis according to Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 15.5.2.

Neapolis received refugees from Kyme when that city fell to the Samnites in 421, according to Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 15.6.4; it is not clear from the text whether the Kymeans were granted citizenship, and the coins struck by the Neapolitan mint in the name of Kyme (Rutter (1979) 96) may indicate that Kymeans identity remained alive at Neapolis (cf. Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 15.6.4, reporting the existence of a group of Kymeans at Neapolis c.327; cf. Lomas (2000) 178). At an unknown date (C4?), Neapolis, after a stasis, received some Kampanians as synoikoi; obviously these were granted citizenship, since they were entitled to hold the office of demarchos (Strabo 5.4.7; cf. Livy 8.21ff; Lomas (2000) 177–78).

Neapolis experienced a stasis, presumably in C4 (Strabo 5.4.7). The office of demarchos, at first given only to Greeks, but later to non-Greeks absorbed into the citizenry as well (Strabo 5.4.7; cf. Lomas (2000) 177–78), may indicate a democratic constitution. A boule, an ekklisia and the procedure of probouleis are attested for C4 by Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 15.6.1–3 (cf. Ghinatti (1996) 103–6).

Neapolis was founded on a sloping coastal plateau, where bradyseism has caused changes to the coastline and hindered an identification of the ancient harbour site. The plateau was fortified by a circuit wall c.3.8 km long and enclosing an area of c.75 ha; it is a C4 double curtain-wall in ashlar with internal fill, but stretches built in another type of tufa rock and in a different technique go back to the period of foundation c.470 (Napoli (1959) 31–40; Fratta (2002) 68–69). One isolated stretch may testify to a diateichisma wall rather than a C4 enlargement of the urban area. The location of the gates of the Greek city is based upon the main territorial routes, the mediaeval gates of Naples and upon the location of the cemeteries (E. Greco (1985a) 191–99).

The layout of the ancient city is clearly mirrored in the city plan of the mediaeval city, one of the most spectacular examples of the survival of an ancient street plan, with three east–west plateiai and about twenty north–south stenopoi clearly revealing the orthogonal urban layout (Castagnoli (1956) 36–37). The use of long narrow insulae is very similar to the town plans of C5 Himera (no. 24) and Naxos (no. 41) and therefore possibly contemporary with the foundation, or slightly later. To judge from the evidence provided by the street plan as preserved in the mediaeval city, most of the area inside the circuit wall was urbanised; there are, however, no structural remains of habitation, but on the basis of better-known sites, E. Greco (1985a) 199–216 estimates two rows of ten houses per insula, with seven or eight inhabitants per house, and hence an urban population of 1,000–8,000 inhabitants. The elevated north-western part of the city formed an acropolis-like area which fell outside the regular urban layout and was very likely destined for sanctuaries, as indicated by votive deposits (E. Greco (1985a)).

The remains of monumental Roman structures in the upper part of the city adjoining the “acropolis” provide strong evidence for the location of an upper, probably political agora, and a lower, probably mercantile agora (E. Greco (1985a) 208, (1985b)); the Roman theatre of the lower agora (forum) probably had a Greek predecessor, but there is no archaeological evidence (Johannowsky (1985)). There is evidence of ephebeia and gymnasia in the Hellenistic period (Strabo 5.4.7).

Rich votive deposits from the area of S. Aniello, mainly C5–C4 in date and of a type ascribed to Demeter and the chthonic divinities, indicate a major sanctuary with a history going back to a pre-foundation phase situated in the north-western “acropolis” area of the city (Borriello and De Simone (1985)). A number of literary sources, albeit late, attest the importance of the Demeter cult at Neapolis (Stat. Silv. 3.5.79, 4.8.45–47; Cic. Balb. 55). A cult of the Siren Parthenope, the eponymous nymph of Parthenope (on which see the Introduction, supra), is attested in late sources only, but a cult of her father, Acheloos, is indirectly attested by representation of the river-god on C5 coins (Rutter (1979) 44–45 for sources). According to Timaios (FGrHist 566) fr. 98, the Athenian nauarchos Diotimos played an important role as instigator of a torch race in honour of the Siren Parthenope at Neapolis (Frederiksen (1984) 104–6; Raviola (1991) 24–27; for an overall survey of sources, see Valenza Mele (1993) 168, 171).

The four known cemeteries were situated along the cardinal east, north, west and south/south-west radial roads, with inhumation, cist-slab tombs and tile tombs dating to
C5–C4, replaced in C4l by cremation tombs (Borriello et al. (1985) 228–31). The evidence from the cemetery of Castel Capuano confirms the foundation date, with burials from c.470 (ibid. 232–74).

The coinage of Neapolis has been exhaustively treated by K. Rutter, who divides it into four main periods between 450 and 385 (Rutter (1979) 42–59). Minting began c.450 (ibid. 46) or c.470 at the time of foundation (Cantilena (1985); Valenza Mele (1993) 172). The earliest coinage is represented by a single specimen of a dirachm on the Euboian standard: obv. head of Parthenope in profile; rev. forepart of bearded man-faced bull, Acheloos, father of Parthenope; legend: ΝΕΗΠΟΛΙΣ (Rutter (1979) 46; Rutter, HN3 545). There are stylistic affinities with the coins of Gela (the obv. type) and Syracuse (the obv. type). C.450 commenced a more regular issue of dirachms, obols and minor fractions on the Phokaian standard (Rutter (1979) 46). The head of Parthenope, normally shown in profile, at times in three-quarter view (Rutter (1979) 52; Rutter, HN3 546, 552, 563; SNG Cop. Italy 385), continues as the most frequent obv. type until the city ceased to coin c.385. The rev. has a river-god, either the local stream Sebethis or Sebethos (named on an obol (Rutter, HN3 558)), or perhaps rather Acheloos attested in local myths (Rutter (1979) 43–45), here represented as a walking bull, at first as in nature, later with a human face or head, at times accompanied by a female figure, probably Nike, flying above and crowning the bull with a garland (an allusion to games held in honour of Parthenope?: Rutter (1979) 45). The rev. has legend ΝΕΗΠΟΛΙΤΗΣ, ΝΕΗΠΟΛΙΤΕΣ or variations, for which see the onomastic section above (SNG Cop. Italy 386–94). One issue carries the ketic ΝΕΟΠΟΛΙΤΙΚΟΝ on the obv. (cf. Guarducci, EG ii. 623; Rutter (1979) 47; Rutter, HN3 546). From c.420 some issues have on the obv. a helmet-headed head of Athena of Corinthian inspiration (Rutter, HN3 554; SNG Cop. Italy 382–83), not easily explained in C5s Neapolis, but according to K. Rutter possibly reflecting Diotimos’ visit there mentioned by Timaios (FGrHist (356) fr. 98; cf. Rutter (1979) 45, 95; Frederiksen (1984) 104–5; for Athenian settlers at Neapolis, see supra). Most obols have obv. head of Athena, at times wearing Attic helmet; rev. mussel shell, on early issues, later forepart of man-faced bull, legend ΝΕΟΠΟΛΙΤΙΕΩΝ and abbreviations thereof (Rutter (1979) 50–51, 58; Rutter, HN3 548, 555; SNG Cop. Italy 384). Neapolitan minted coins for the Kampanian Samnite communities: Kyme c.420–380, Capua c.415–400, Hyria 405–385, Nola 400–380, Allifae 400–395, and for the Fistelians 405–400 and the Fenserni 400–390 (Rutter (1979)).

64. Pandosia (Pandosinos) Map 46. Unlocated (see further Ciaceri (1928) ii. 158–60; Storti (1994) 331–32; probably near Cosentia in the upper Krathis valley, by the river Acheron (Strabo 6.1.5; coins, infra); not to be confused with Pandosia in the territory of Herakleia (no. 52). Size of territory: ?. Type: [A]. The toponym is ΠΑΝΔΟΣΙΑ, η (Ps.-Skylax 12; Strabo 6.1.5) or ΠΑΝΔΟΣΙΑ (Dodonian oracle apud Steph. Byz. 499.19). The city-ethnic is ΠΑΝΔΟΣΙΝΟΣ (Classical coins, infra; IG vii 2225.B.54 (C2f)).

Pandosia is one of ten toponyms listed at Ps.-Skylax 12 after the heading πόλεις εἰσίν Ἑλληνίδες αἵδε, where polis is used in the urban sense. The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found (as ΠΑΝΔΟΣΙΝ) on Classical coins (infra). The external individual use is found in IG vii 2225.B.54 (C2f).

Ps.-Skymnos 326–29 describes Pandosia (with Kroton (no. 56), Thourioi (no. 74) and Metapontion (no. 61)) as an Achaian foundation. Numismatic evidence (infra) suggests that the city was a dependency of Sybaris (no. 70) and later of Kroton (cf. Mazzarino (1963) 69; Storti (1994) 332 with refs.). According to Eusebios (Helm 181; Schöne 78), the foundation of Pandosia was contemporary with that of Metapontion: Ol. 1.4 = 773; it is not, however, clear whether the reference is to this Pandosia or the one near Herakleia (RE xviii. 551; Storti (1994) 332). In any case, the Eusebian date for Metapontion is unreliable. According to Strabo 6.1.5, tradition held that Pandosia was once the royal seat of the Oinotrians.

By c.500 Pandosia with Kroton struck stater on the Achaian standard and with the incuse technique: obv. tripod, legend ΧΩΡ, rev. bull of Sybarite type within incuse square, legend: ΠΑΝΔΟΣΙΟ (Gorini (1975) 27; Parise (1982) 105–6, 114; Stazio (1983b) 967–69; Rutter, HN3 2097). The legends and the obv. type suggest dependency upon Kroton, but the rev. type depicting the Sybarite bull suggests earlier dependence upon Sybaris (RE xviii. 552: Giangiuolo (1989) 233 n. 67). By C5s Pandosia was striking stater of its own in double relief: obv. head of nymph Pandosia, legend: ΠΑΝΔΟΣΙΑ, rev. naked youth offering libation, personification of river Krathis, legend: ΚΡΑΘΙΣΙΟΣ (Rutter, HN3 2449). C.440, staters and thirds depict obv. head of Hera Lakinia; rev. seated, naked Pan with dog, in front herd with kerykeion affixed, legend: ΠΑΝΔΟΣΙ, ΠΑΝΔΟΣΙΝ, in field mint-mark Φ, similar to mint-marks known from Hyele, Neapolis, Thourioi and other mints (Rutter, HN3 2450–52).

65. Pithekoussai (Pithekoussaios) Map 44. Lat. 40.45, long. 13.55. Size of territory: 1. Type: A. The toponym is
\(\Pi\theta\epsilon\kappa\sigma(\sigma)\alpha, \eta\) (Phercydes (FGHist 3) fr. 54; Ps.-Skylax 10; Ptol. Geog. 3.1.69); \(\Pi\theta\epsilon\kappa\sigma(\sigma)\alpha, \alpha'\) (Mir. ausc. 833a; Strabo 5.4.9). For the change between singular (denoting the main island) and plural (denoting the archipelago), see Coretti and Soverini (1990) 327. The city-ethnic is \(\Pi\theta\epsilon\kappa\sigma\sigma\sigma\alpha\sigma\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha\sigma\sigma\) (Strabo 5.4.7 (rC57)).

Pithekoussai is called a \textit{polis} in the urban sense at Ps.-Skylax 10, and the external collective use of the city-ethnic is found in Strabo 5.4.7 (rC57). However, Pithekoussai has often been denied the status of a \textit{polis} and described as an \textit{emporion}, i.e. trading station (see Hansen 4 (1997b) 99 n. 91; most recent discussion: Boffa (1998)). Bartoloni and Cordano (1978) denied \textit{polis} status to Pithekoussai because: (a) the site is not described as an \textit{apoklia} and no oecist is named; (b) there is no evidence for a political organisation of the community; (c) there is no evidence of social stratification; (d) though predominantly Greek, the population was of mixed ethnicity. While some of these points, such as the mixed ethnic identity of the population, are irrefutable (Buchner (1978); Ridgway (1992) 111–18, (1998b), (2000) 185–85), others are to a large degree based on absence of evidence, and recent archaeological investigations suggest that the community may not have been exclusively a trading station; for a recent review of the status of Pithekoussai, see Ridgway (2000) 185–86. The following should be noted:

1. Some kind of political organisation and social stratification is in fact suggested by Strabo’s report (5.4.9) of a \textit{stasis}.

2. As Ridgway (1992) 50–51 and d’Agostino (1999b) 213–17 point out, the mortuary evidence does actually indicate some social stratification.

3. A territory seems \textit{not} to be absent: there is sporadic evidence of C8–C7 Greek presence over much of the island, which suggests that Pithekoussai had a \textit{chora} and that the settlement aimed at some agricultural self-sufficiency. The extent of arable land has been estimated at c.10–20 km² (De Caro (1994)). At Punta Chiarito on a promontory on the south coast, c.12 km from the acropolis of Pithekoussai, two LGI–LGII farmsteads, abandoned c.680, were succeeded in C7s by a Greek settlement proper, probably destroyed in C6f by a natural catastrophe (Gialanella (1994)). So even if Pithekoussai may have been primarily a commercial settlement, that cannot be considered to be its only role (see also d’Agostino (1999b) 218–20).

4. The urban characteristics of Pithekoussai are no different from other C8 western Greek settlements (for an overall topographical plan, see Buchner and Ridgway (1993) Carta topografica): Pithekoussai was situated on the island of the same name (Ps.-Skylax 10) in the Gulf of Naples facing Kyme and Cape Misenum. The settlement was founded on the promontory of Monte di Vico on the north-west coast of the island, a site defended by natural steep slopes on all sides, and with bays forming natural harbours on both sides. The plateau, relatively flat, formed a habitation area of about 6 ha. Although no habitation structures are extant, sherds found over most of the surface of the plateau testify to extensive C8 habitation (Buchner (1975) 63–64). There is some evidence of pre-colonial trading contacts (Ridgway (1992) 107–8; cf. d’Agostino (1999a) 56–58), but the archaeological data from the “Gosetti-Akropolis dump” and from the Mazzola excavation date the foundation to C.750 (Neef (1994) 150 n. 9 (“c.740”); Coldstream (1995); d’Agostino (1999a) 56–58). Surface finds on the Monte di Vico plateau also give evidence of habitation from C6 to C4, and C6–C4 architectural terracottas are, with the foundation structures of a temple, testimony of sanctuaries (Coretti and Soverini (1990) 336–37; Ridgway (1992) 37–39, 86–87).

The finds from the plateau and from the “Gosetta dump”, and from the workshop quarter of Mazzola (\textit{infra}), seem to indicate some interruption, or at least regression, in the habitation of the site c.700–600, seen by some as evidence of Kyaian domination in this period (d’Agostino and Soteriou (1998) 368).

The principal habitation site was on the Monte di Vico, but during the early history of the settlement, habitation also extended along the ridge of Mezzavia and Mazzola, where noteworthy workshops have been excavated (Buchner (1975); Ridgway (1992) 91–101). The whole area of Pithekoussai, including the Valle di S. Montano with cemeteries, and from the workshop quarter of Mazzola (\textit{infra}), seems to indicate some interruption, or at least regression, in the habitation of the site c.700–600, seen by some as evidence of Kyaian domination in this period (d’Agostino and Soteriou (1998) 368).

The finds from the plateau and from the “Gosetta dump”, and from the workshop quarter of Mazzola (\textit{infra}), seem to indicate some interruption, or at least regression, in the habitation of the site c.700–600, seen by some as evidence of Kyaian domination in this period (d’Agostino and Soteriou (1998) 368).
In the lower city, a sanctuary, possibly a Heraion, is likewise attested by C7e architectural terracottas from Pastola, between the Mazzola ridge and the sea, west of the acropolis (d’Agostino (1994–95) 86–91). A rich C7e votive deposit from the same area has been taken as evidence of a heroon on the assumption that a tomb found there was part of the same complex as the deposit (d’Agostino (1994–95)).

At the very least, this evidence suggests that the political status of Pithekoussai must remain an open question.

Little is known of the history of Pithekoussai. According to Strabo 5.4.9, Pithekoussai was founded by Eretrians (no. 370) and Chalkidians (no. 365); Livy 8.22.6 (cf. Mele (1979) 32) names only Chalkidians. Apart from this, no account of the foundation survives. The settlers found the site unoccupied (Buchner (1975) 64), but mixed marriages—evidenced by, e.g., fibula typology—may have occurred in a later phase, c. C6 (Buchner (1975) 77–80; Coldstream (1993)). According to Livy (loc. cit.), the Chalkidians moved on to Kyme (no. 57); however, in the account of the foundation of Kyme by Dionysios of Halikarnassos, Pithekoussai does not appear as a first stage or halting place for the Chalkidian and Eretrian founders of Kyme (Ant. Rom. 7.3.1). According to Strabo 5.4.7, Pithekoussaians participated, with Athenians and Chalkidians, in a resettling of Neapolis at an unspecified date. Hieron of Syracuse constructed a teichos on the island, but the personnel had to abandon it because of seismic activity (Strabo 5.4.9). The island was then taken over by Neapolis, who lost it in an unspecified war (ibid.).

66. Poseidonia (Poseidoniatisa) Map 45. Lat. 40.25, long. 15.00. Size of territory: 4. Type: A. The toponym is Ποσειδωνία, η (ML 10.6–7 (550–525)); Ποσειδανία (Ps.-Skylax 12; Strabo 6.4.13); or Ποσειδωνίας, η (Ps.-Skynnos 248). The city-ethnic is Ποσειδωνιάτας (C5f coins, infra); Ποσειδωνιάτης (Aristox. fr. 124, Wehrli), or Ποσειδωνιώτης (Hdt. 1.167.4).

Poseidonia is one of ten toponyms listed at Ps.-Skylax 12 after the heading πόλεις εἰσίν Ἑλληνίδες αἰῶνες, where polis is used in the urban sense, and it is called a polis in the political sense in ML 10.7 (550–525). The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C5f coins (infra); the external collective use is found in Aristox. fr. 124, Wehrli, and Strabo 6.1.3 (rC5l–C4e); the external individual use is found in Iambl. VP 239 and 267 (rC6l–C5m), Diod. 11.65.1 and Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 9.56.1 (1468).

Poseidonia was founded by Sybaris (no. 70.1) (Ps.-Skynnos 249; cf. Strabo 6.1.1). According to Solin. 2.10, the city was founded by unspecified Dorians; if historical, these Dorians may have been Troizenians (no. 357), since, according to Arist. Pol. 1303b30, Troizenians had participated in the foundation of Sybaris itself (cf. Steph. Byz. 639.9, where Steph. associates the toponym Troizen with Italy and cites Charax = FGrHist 103, fr. 61). The literary tradition offers only a terminus ante quem for the foundation, viz. c. 530, provided by Herodotos, who at 1.167.4 refers to the city as in existence when Hyle (no. 54) was founded (c. 540–535). Archaeological evidence suggests a foundation date of c. 600 (E. Greco (1981a); Poseidonia ii. 73 n. 7). At Strabo 6.1.1 an initial Sybarite settlement distinct from the later city is mentioned and described as a teichos; the location and status of this teichos is still unresolved (Greco (1979); Tréziny (1992); Junker (1993) 2–3).

Suburban sanctuaries of Demeter(? 3–4 km to the east of Poseidonia and of Artemis(? (cf. Diod. 4.22.3) reflect the C6e expansion of the city’s influence (E. Greco (1992) 480–81). The C6–C5 chora of Poseidonia was delimited to the north by the river Sele and the important sanctuary of Hera (infra), to the east by the foothills bordering the coastal plain, and to the south by the sanctuary of Poseidonia(?) at Agropoli (Fiammenghi (1985a)). Other important extrurban sanctuaries of Demeter and Hera are known at S. Nicola di Albanella (Cipriani (1989); Cipriani and Ar dovino (1990–91); Hinz (1998) 176–80) and at Fonte, 14 km from Poseidonia (E. Greco (1979) 19). Greek and indigenous graves respectively mark the boundary of Poseidonian territory c. 14 km to the east of the city. There is evidence of an Archaic Greek rural settlement near the Heraion at the Foce del Sele and of harbour installations on the estuary of the river Sele. The C6–C5 territory of Poseidonia comprised about 200 km² (E. Greco (1979); Greco, Stazio and Vallet (1987)).

The most important of the extra-urban sanctuaries was the Heraion located on the left bank of the river Sele (ancient Silaris) close to the estuary, on the northern border of Poseidonian territory (Strabo 6.1.1; Solin. 2.7). The evidence suggests that the foundation of the Heraion was contemporary with the foundation of Poseidonia (Tocco Sciarelli et al. (1989) 67–90). On the sanctuary, see Zancani Montuoro and Zanotti-Bianco (1951–54); Parise Badoni (1989); de La Genière (1997b). The cult of Demeter is attested at several sanctuaries in the chora (Cipriani and Ar dovino (1989–90)).

In ML 10.7, a treaty of symmachia between Sybaris (no. 70.1) with allies and the Serdaioi, Poseidonia is listed as proxenos of the agreement; Poseidonia itself here appears to be outside the Sybarite alliance, and its function as proxenos is
not easy to interpret (ML ad loc.); however, the inscription attests the ability of Poseidonia to conduct foreign policy and to enter into interstate relations. According to Strabo 6.1.3, Poseidonia had a number of symmachoi in C5l–C4e when the city was defeated by the Leukaniens. A war of uncertain date with Hyle (no. 54) is attested in Strabo 6.1.1.

Poseidonia was conquered by the Leukaniens in C5l–C4e, probably after the fall of Kyme (E. Greco (1992b) 249). During C4s the Greek identity of the community was effaced, and the Greek language was no longer spoken (Aristox. fr. 124, Wehrli), but though the Poseidonitai are described as “wholly barbarianized” (Aristox. fr. 124, Wehrli), the persistence of at least one ancient Greek religious festival is reported (ibid.; cf. Ampolo – 1980); in Ps.-Skylax 12 Poseidonia is listed as a polis Hellenis and Greek-style coinage persisted (infra), and Lomas (2000) 178 questions whether Poseidonia was in fact barbarianized “to the extent that Aristoxenus would have us believe”.

The only evidence for the internal political life at Poseidonia is the C5m ekklesiasterion (infra) with its implication of an assembly. A C6l–480 bronze olpe from a tomb in the area of the city (Arena (1996) no. 32) is inscribed with four Greek names, each of which is preceded by two letters (πα, βο, δυβίς); “the letters preceding the names are sigla identifying the bearers as members of some civic subdivision, whether a phyle, demos or otherwise” (SEG 43 855 comm.).

Poseidonia was founded on an irregular limestone plateau, later bounded by a circuit wall, running for 4,750 m and mainly of C4l Leukanian and Roman date (Sclläger (1962); Blum (1987)). There are, however, remains of a Greek circuit wall inside the later walls, east of the south gate (Sclläger (1966) 22), and the Greek city probably did have a circuit wall, at least contemporary with the building of the large temples, as indicated by the fact that the north and south gates were laid out in accordance with the orientation of the temples. The extent of the C6–C5 habitation area, estimated at c.125 ha, is indicated by several large cemeteries (E. Greco (1979) 12–13; Pontrandolfo (1987)) and sanctuaries situated along the edge of the urban area (Greco, Stazio and Vallet (1987); Pedley et al. (1993)).

Although the orthogonal urban layout with narrow insulae and the use of plateiai and stenopoi is of Roman date, it was probably Greek in origin, as suggested by the very similar evidence from Metapontion (no. 61), also an Achaian colony (Castagnoli (1956) 39–44; Sclläger (1965) 188–97; E. Greco and Theodorescu (1990) 87). The main divisions of the city were formed by a broad central, civic belt: the agora and the two large temene, dividing the habitation area into two main zones. The public space constituted about 25 per cent of the area inside the walls (E. Greco and Theodorescu (1994) 236). There is no certain evidence of the extent of the C6 habitation, but it probably comprised c.70 ha of the urban area. The political function of the agora is revealed by an ekklesiasterion and a heroon. The C5m–C4 circular ekklesiasterion had a seating capacity of 1,000–1,700 (E. Greco and Theodorescu (1983) 34–49, 79–81; Hansen and Fischer-Hansen (1994) 69–72). A heroon, or cenotaph, has been recognised in the sunken limestone chamber containing rich grave goods and in C4 surrounded by a peribolos wall (Sestieri (1955a); E. Greco and Theodorescu (1983) 25–33, 74–79). The location of the structure suggests a political cult, possibly that of the oikistes. The small ante-temple located west of the ekklesiasterion possibly housed a poliad cult; the altar in the ekklesiasterion lies on the axis of this temple, thus suggesting some overall planning (E. Greco and Theodorescu (1981) 65 fig. 8 “T”).

The major divinity of the southern temenos was Hera. The main temple was the C6m “Basilica” (Heraion I), a Heraion according to the epigraphic evidence (Guarducci (1952); LSAG 252, 260 no. 3; SEG 29 982; Arena (1996) no. 19). Apart from her warrior aspect, she was also kourotophos (Ardovino (1986) 107,113). There were other cults (survey of cults: Ardovino (1986)): Hera Hippia: G. Greco (1992) 254–55; Hera and Zeus: Stern (1980); but Hera, the patron deity, enthroned and holding a phiale is the commonest type of votive. The second major temple was the “Temple of Poseidon” (Heraion II) (c.460–450), normally identified as a Heraion, though Torelli (1987) 60–62 suggests Apollo Hiatros (Cipriani (1997) 221–22 suggests Zeus). There were several other structures in the sanctuary already from the Archaic period, e.g. a C6l temple located on the northern edge of the temenos (Bertarelli Sestieri (1987–88) 107–8 pl. 2). Votive finds indicate cults of Athena, Aphrodite and Artemis in addition to that of Hera and kourotophoi, and a number of anatomical votives and the type of “infant in swaddling clothes” suggest a healing divinity or a Meter (Bertarelli Sestieri (1989)). The stele (a horos?) of Chiron (C6e) suggests a “precinct of Chiron” (LSAG 252, 259 no. 2; Arena (1996) no. 50.25). A precinct of Zeus Xenios is inferred from a (lost) inscription (Cipriani (1997) 223; Arena (1996) no. 23), and several smaller temples, as well as various altars and votive deposits add to the furnishings of the sanctuary (Sestieri (1955b), (1956); Bertarelli Sestieri (1987–88); Cipriani (1997) 215–16; cf. also Mertens (1993) 93 n. 868: architectural remains from at least eight different Archaic roofs). The row
of altars, various votive deposits, and horoi east of the two large temples indicate the eastern limit of the sanctuary (Bertarelli Sestieri (1987–88) 94–95,114). There is C6 evidence of a Demeter sanctuary on the southern confines of the Heraion (Cipriani and Ardovino (1989–90) 346 with refs.), and the Demeter cult is attested in various locations of Poseidonia (Cipriani (1997) 222–23; Hinz (1998) 171–76). Finally there are epigraphic attestations of various cults: of Poseidon, as an epiclesis of Hera (?), of Athena, Zeus Xenios, Chiron (if not a personal name), and of the nymphs (Ardovino (1980); Arena (1996) no. 51). A cult of Poseidon must have played an important role in the city, as we can infer from the city’s name and from the coin type depicting a striding Poseidon. There is evidence of a Herakles cult in the Leukanian period, but for the Greek period the evidence is uncertain, though there are many references to Herakles myths in the architectural sculptures of the Heraion del Sele (see Cipriani (1997) 223–24, stressing the polis aspect of Herakles cults). In the northern sanctuary there is one major temple, a C6–C5e “Temple of Demeter” (Krauss (1999)), and a cult of Athena is inferred from votive material (Sestieri (1955b) 40). A C6 sacellum located to the south of the major temple is the earliest identified temple at Poseidonia, known only from its architectural terracottas (Mertens (1993) 93, 127). An Aphrodite shrine was probably situated to the north of the Athena temple (Sestieri (1955b) 40), and a C6e naïskos lay between the Athenaion and the agora (Poseidonia ii. 64). The cult of Poseidon must have been important in the first settlement (at Agropolis?; cf. schol. Lycoph. Alex. 724) but is not attested in the major settlement except on the coins (infra). Important Greek cemeteries occupied extensive areas to the north, south-east and south of the city (Mello and Libero Mangieri (1996) 332–33, 335–37).

Parmenides of Poseidonia won both the stadion and the diaulos at Olympia in 468 (Olympionikai 235–36).

Poseidonia began minting silver coins C5b–525 with issues in the Achaian incuse fabric, although the weight system used was the “Phocaean–Phoenician” standard, as at Hyele (see Taliercio Mensitieri (1987)). Drachms, obols and hemiobols were struck in addition to staters (Rutter, HN3 1107ff). The type depicts a striding Poseidon, a trident in his raised right hand; legends: ΠΟΣΕΙΔΟΝΙΑΤΑΝ (Gorini (1975) 30–32; Rutter, HN3 1107; SNG Cop. Italy 1271–76, 1294–96). Some coins carry the additional legend ΦΣΣΣΣ, the meaning of which is disputed (Rutter, HN3 ad 1108). The suggestion that it refers to Is, oecist of Sybaris, has won some acceptance (Guarducci, EG ii. 661), though it cannot be excluded that the legend refers to an unknown locality implying some sort of league membership (Gorini (1975) 208). The minting of incuse staters stopped C510–500, perhaps as a result of the destruction of Sybaris, and until C470 the city struck only minor denominations (Rutter (1997) 57). C470 Poseidonia introduced a double-relief coinage employing the Achaian weight standard, possibly influenced by refugees from Sybaris (no. 70.11) (Kraay (1967) 133; Rutter (1997) 42). Types depict obv. Poseidon striding; rev. bull standing; legend: ΠΟΣΕΙΔΟΝΙΑΤΑΝ. The additional legend ΣΕΙΛΑ on one issue may refer to the river Seilaros/Silaris (?) or, perhaps more plausibly, may read ΜΕΓΥΛ, a name and a possible reference to an otherwise undocumented oikistes (Guarducci, EG ii. 698–99; Rutter, HN3 1114). Bronze coinage with types of the double-relief silver coinage and continued use of the city-ethnic for the legend starts c.420 (Grunauer (1973) 38; Rutter, HN3 1115ff; SNG Cop. Italy 1309–23). To the later C5 belongs a gold triobol inscribed ΠΟΣΕΙ (Rutter, HN3 1115). The Leukanian conquest may not mean the end of the coinage (Rutter (1997) 76–77).

67. Pyxous  Map 46. Lat. 40.05, long. 15.30. Size of territory: ? Type: B. The toponym is Πυξούς, -οῦντος (Diod. 11.59.4 (r. 4.71); Strabo 6.1.13; Steph. Byz. 540.11: there described as a polis Sikelas, but mistaken Sicilian locations are not uncommon in Stephanos, cf. Bencivenga Trillmich (1988) 725 n. 60. C6s coins inscribed ΠΥΣΟΕΣ (Libero Mangieri (1981); Rutter, HN3 p. 143) may belong to this city, and the legend may be the uncontracted toponym (so Head, HN2 83–84; but see further Rutter, HN3 p. 143). Πυξούς in Steph. Byz. 540.8, possibly derived from Hekataios, may refer to Pyxous or, more likely, to another site (it is described as εν μεσοσαγαί τῶν Θων οὐντῶν). A city-ethnic is not attested apart from the entries in Steph. Byz. (540.8, 10).

No Archaic or Classical source calls Pyxous a polis, but it is included as a type B here on account of the following evidence: (a) Diod. 11.59.4, where it is reported that it was founded as a polis in 471/0 by Mikhthos, the tyrant of Rhegion (no. 68) and Zankle/Messana (no. 51); it may have been founded as a military outpost (Johannowsky (1992)), but the classification suggested by Diodorus may well be correct; (b) the C6s incuse coins (staters and a single specimen of a third-stater) on the Achaian standard depicting the
Sybarite bull and inscribed obv. ΣΙΠΕΛ, ΣΙΠΙΝΟΣ, rev. ΠΥΣΩΟΕΣ (Gorini (1975) 9; Rutter, HN3 1722, 1727; SNG Cap. Italy 1387; SNG Cap. Suppl. 53). These coins may have been struck by Pyxous under the aegis of Sybaris (cf. Parise (1972) 102–4) and another community, presumably Siris (no. 69) or a community, Sirinos(?), in the vicinity of Pyxous (no. 67). The issue has been subdivided into either four series (Libero Mangieri (1981)) or two series (Sternberg (1980); cf. also Moscati Castellnuovo (1989) 94–100; Rutter, HN3 p. 143). If the coins were so minted, it follows that Pyxous existed prior to Mikhys’ foundation of the site, and that the community was able to enter into close relations with Siris(?) and Sybaris (no. 70), of which latter it may have been a dependency. What is less clear, however, is whether Pyxous can be considered a Hellenic community prior to Mikhys’ foundation.

If Pyxous as founded by Mikhys was indeed a polis, it may have been a failure, for Strabo 6.1.1 reports that it was left by the settlers μηλιν διάης though he does not specify a date for the depopulation; Pyxous does not appear in Ps.-Skylax, pointing to Cαμ as a terminus ante quem. The C5m indigenous settlement at Roccalgoriosa 7 km from Pyxous (Gualtieri (1993)) has been interpreted as a Leukanian replacement of Pyxous. According to Cordiano (1995a), a new reading of the Olympia inscription SEG 24 103, previously thought to refer to a conflict between Rhegion and Gela, should rather be taken as evidence of conflicts between Hyel and Rhegion, perhaps brought about by Rhegian expansion and the foundation of Pyxous by Mikhys. The extent of Pyxous’ territory is uncertain; prior to the defeat of Sybaris by Kroton, Pyxous would hardly have been autonomous, but rather part of the dominion of Sybaris; as founded by Mikhys, it may have been a dependency of Rhegion.

The site of ancient Pyxous is almost certainly to be identified with Roman Buxentum, mediaeval and present-day Policastro, located on a knoll on the left bank of the river Policastro on the Gulf of Laos (Ταλαος Κόλπος) (Bencivenga Trillmich (1988) fig. 1). Recent excavations have revealed two phases of the circuit wall of the Greek settlement incorporated in the mediaeval walls: a C5f phase constructed in ashlar with upper structures in sun-dried brick and a C4f phase in a polygonal technique. The walls enclosed an area of about 11 ha, of which perhaps only about 6 ha was used for habitation. There are no other structural remains from the Greek phase; there is evidence of cult activity in the form of fragments of C5–C4 votive figurines. The C5f phase corresponds well with the tradition of the foundation of Pyxous by Mikhys. However, if Bencivenga Trillmich (1988) is right in maintaining that there is no material of an earlier period, the site did not have an earlier indigenous or Greek history and cannot therefore have issued the C6l coins discussed above (for a different view, see Johannowsky (1992)).

68. Rhegion (Rheginos) Map 46. Lat. 38.05, long. 15.40. Size of territory: 5. Type: A. The toponym is ‘Ρέγινος (C5 coins, infra); ‘Ρήγιον, τό (Hdt. 1167.3; Thuc. 4.1.3; IG i3 1178.4 (433/2)). The city-ethnic is ‘Ρηγίνως (SEG 48 1252 (c.550–500); C6l coins, infra; ML 63 (433/2)); ‘Ρηγίνως (Hdt. 7.170.3; Thuc. 6.46.2).

Rhegion is called a polis both in the political sense (Thuc. 3.86.2, 6.44.2–3; Arist. Pol. 1316e38) and in the urban sense (Thuc. 6.44.3, Ps.-Skylax 12; Heracl. Lemb. 55). The Aristotelian collection of 158 politeiai included a ‘Ρηγίνως πολιτεία (Heracl. Lemb. 55; Arist. fr. 585, Gigon); αστός is found at Hdt. 7.170.3; πάτρα (= patris) is found in IG i3 1178.2 (433/2; cf. CEG 112; ML 63).

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on coins from C6l (infra). The external collective use is attested in SEG 11 1205 (c.500), SEG 24 303–5 (C6–C5), ML 63.12 (433/2), Hdt. 7.170.3 and Thuc. 6.44.3; the external individual use is found in SEG 48 1252 (c.550–500), CEG 1 388 (c.450–425), Arist. Pol. 1274/23 and Timaios (FGrHist 566) fr. 43.

Rhegion was a colony of Chalkis (no. 365) (Thuc. 6.44.3; Ps.-Sklynos 311–12; Diod. 14.40.1; Strabo 6.1.6), and Euboian involvement in the foundation is supported by calendrical evidence (Trümpy, Monat. 43–44); Peloponnesian Messenians also participated in the foundation according to Antiuchos (FGrHist 555) fr. 9 and Heracl. Lemb. 55. According to Antiuchos (FGrHist 555) fr. 9, the Zankaiains (no. 51) sent for the colonists and appointed the oikistes Antimnestos. The participation of Messenian refugees from the First Messenian War dates the foundation to C8s (CAH iii.3.323–24). According to Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 19.2, the city was founded by Artimedes of Chalkis. By the Classical period there existed a well-developed foundation myth (Antiuchos (FGrHist 555) fr. 9; Heracl. Lemb. 55).

On the Ionian coast along the river Halex (cf. Cordiano (1995b)) Rhegion was bounded by the territory of Lokroi (no. 59), and on the Tyrrenian coast by the river Petrace and the territory of Metauros (no. 62) (Costamagna (1986) 479–84 fig. 1). The territory is termed γη at Thuc. 4.24.2; its name was η ‘Ρηγίνως (Thuc. 7.35.2). The site of Rhegion is perhaps the only site with agricultural resources on the southern Aspromonte, and these were exploited from C7;
the walled site of Serro di Tavola is interpreted as a C6s phrourion in control of inland routes and the Tyrrenhian coast (Costamagna 1986: 495–502; Cordiano (1995b) 83–88, 104–7). An extra-urban cult of Herakles is attested by a C5f inscription from Castelllaco, south of Metauros (IGDGG no. 41; Givigliano (1987) 95; Cordiano (1995b) 103–4); evidence of a Demeter cult at Grufo Saline Ioniche is offered by a C5s inscription (IGDGG no. 42; for Demeter in R hegian territory, see Hinz (1998) 169–70). An estimate of the size of the territory is still largely based upon the evidence presented by Vallet (1958) 133–37, who estimated it at c.1,000–1,300 km\(^2\) (cf. Cordiano (1995b)). The influence of R hegion extended over a much larger area, as shown by the foundation of Pyxous (no. 67) c.476–465 (Diod. 11.59.4; Strabo 6.11.1) and the pressure on Lokrian territorial aspirations (cf. Cordiano (1995b) esp. 92–94).

R hegion was presumably a member of the Italiote League (Staatsverträge 230). The city was allied to Lokroi (no. 59) at the battle of Sagra in C6 (Strabo 6.11.10), but war between it and Lokroi is attested during the reign of Anaxilas (schol. Pind. Pyth. 1.99a, 2.36c, Drachmann). An alliance with Taras (no. 71) in 473 is implied by Hdt. 7.170.3, who reports that 3,000 R hegians fell in a battle fought by the R hegians and the Tarantines against Iapygians (cf. Diod. 11.52.3–4, who calls the R hegians symmachoi of Taras). IGDGG no. 38 (c.450) is a kerykeion inscribed PEIION; ML 63 (= Staatsverträge 162) is a 433/2 renewal of an alliance with Athens (no. 361) originally concluded in the 440s; in 415, however, the city refrained from supporting the Athenian effort against Syracuse (Thuc. 6.4.3, 46.2; Diod. 13.3.5), though it did make a payment to Athens (IG13 391.17.19 (c.415)). A symmachia with Leontinoi (no. 33) in 427 is attested by Thuc. 3.86.3. A peace treaty with Dionysios I of Syracuse was concluded in 399 (Diod. 14.40.7; cf. 14.90.7) and in 389 (Diod. 14.107.4) when the city had to surrender its navy, pay 300 tal., and turn over 100 hostages to Dionysios. R hegion was taken and destroyed by Dionysios I of Syracuse in 387 (Diod. 14.111–12), who sold off as slaves those inhabitants who were not able to raise a ransom of one silver mina. The city was refounded by his son Dionysios II, and a part of the city was for a short period called by the name of Phoibia (Strabo 6.1.6). The independence of R hegion was restored by Leptines and Kallipos of Syracuse in 351 (Diod. 16.45.9).

In C5s, R hegion experienced a period of stasis (Thuc. 4.1.3), and there were R hegian phygades at Lokroi urging that city to invade R hegian territory (Thuc. 4.1.3). According to Hdt. 7.170.3, R hegion lost 3,000 men in battle against the Iapygians in 473 (cf. Diod. 11.52.3–4). An army of 6,000 foot, 600 horse and fifty triremes was deployed in 399 (Diod. 14.40.3). In 427 and 425, R hegian naval forces assisted the Athenian operations in the west (Diod. 12.54.4; Thuc. 4.25.2). In C4f, R hegion possessed a navy comprising seventy triremes (Diod. 14.107.4; cf. 14.8.2; 14.40.3), but the city was stripped of its navy by Dionysios I in 389 (Diod. 14.106.3). Appointment of strategoi is mentioned at Diod. 14.40.3 (r399) (cf. 14.87.1 (r394)), and 14.108.4 (r388) indicates that such appointments were made by election.

Sending of envoys is attested by Thuc. 3.86.3 (cf. ML 63.1) and by Diod. 14.40.7 (r399), 106.2 (r389). Reception of envoys is attested in Diod. 14.8.2 (r404) and 44.4–6 (r398). Diplomatic activity is further attested by the C5m kerykeion (supra). Two or more citizens are listed as proxenoi of Tenos (no. 525) in IG11 Suppl. 313.7 (C3m). According to Arist. Pol. 1274b23, Androdamas of R hegion at an unknown date (Zahrnt (1971) 16 n. 27) served the Thraceward Chaldikians as nomothetes. A citizen of R hegion served as theorodokos of Epidauros (no. 348) in 356/5 (IG14 1.4 95.47).

The constitution preceding the tyranny of Anaxilas is described as an oligarchy at Arist. Pol. 1316b35ff. It is presumably this constitution that is referred to in Heracle. Lemb. 55: it is described as an aristocracy employing the laws of Charondas and administered by 1,000 men αἱρέτοι ἀνὴρ τιμηµάτων. According to Antiochos (FGrHist 555 fr. 9, the R hegian ἰγκεµὼνες (= the 1,000) were all of Messenian genos in this period. In 494 the constitution changed “from oligarchy to the tyranny of Anaxilas” (Arist. Pol. 1316b37). Anaxilas conquered Zankle (no. 51) and changed its name to Messana (Hdt. 6.23.2; Thuc. 6.4.6); he was then tyrant of both R hegion and Zankle/Messana (Diod. 11.48.2; Berve 1967 156): R hegion was governed by his son Leophron while he himself ruled Zankle/Messana (schol. Pind. Pyth. 2.38). After the battle of Himera in 480 he concluded a treaty with Gelon and was left in possession of Messana (schol. Pind. Pyth. 1.112). At the death of Anaxilas in 476 Mitythos succeeded to the tyranny (Diod. 11.48.2) both at R hegion and Zankle/Messana (Diod. 11.59.4). In 465 the sons of Anaxilas took over power from Mitythos, but they were soon expelled and R hegion was “liberated” (Diod. 11.76.5 (1461)). C5s R hegion went through a period of stasis culminating in 425 (Thuc. 4.1.3; Berger (1992) 29–30). Four nomothetai are mentioned in lambil. VP 172 (cf. 130 referring to them as composers of a politeia (τρικύρα (C5m): Minar (1942) 48, 85). A meeting of the ekklesia is attested for 398 by Diod. 14.44.5 (cf. Arist. Oec. 1349b18; Ael. VH 5.20) and again for 345/4 (Diod. 16.68.3); for a survey of strategoi and assemblies in C4f, see Costabile (1978).
Rhegion was founded on a narrow sloping plateau near the sea between the river Calopinace (ancient Apsiias) and the river Annunciata. It was one of the early Chalkidian foundations, probably founded shortly after Naaxos and Zankle (730–720) as corroborated by C8i and C7 ceramic finds, structural evidence being absent (Sabbione (1981b) 275–81; cf. also Spadea (1987)).

The harbour was located on the estuary of the ancient Apsiias, outside the urban area (Vallet (1958) 130–31; Martorano (1985) 234–36). Spadea suggests a harbour location on the estuary of the Fumara dell’Annunciata, below the city and near the recent urban investigations at the Lido (Spadea (1986) 461–62).

The urban layout is largely unknown, apart from the remains of a few public buildings, the location of sanctuaries, and the circuit wall. The course of the early fortification remains uncertain, though part of a C6–C5(?l) dried brick wall is preserved (Guzzo (1982b) fig. at p. 129). Significant stretches of a C4 double curtain-wall are preserved along the coast and inland along the Aspromonte hills (refs.: Guzzo (1982b) fig. at p. 130; Tréziny (1986) 192 n. 64). It is uncertain whether the wall is earlier or later than the alleged destruction of the city by Dionysios I in 387 (cf. Diod. 14.111–12); fortifications are attested by Diodorus before (14.90.5 (r393)) and after (16.45.9 (r350)) the destruction. The area within the C4 circuit wall comprised about 70 ha, obviously less during the Archaic period if part of the Aspromonte hills were outside the fortified area.

Evidence of public architecture is mostly late. In connection with the ekklēsia held by the Rhégians in 344, on the occasion of Timoleon’s visit, a bema is mentioned (Diod. 16.68.4–5; Plut. Tim. 10.1–4; Costabile (1978) 45–49). Part of a C4 koilon situated on the upper slopes of the city belong to a theatre or an ekklēsiasterion; the diameter of the structure, c.50 m, gives a seating capacity of about 1,500–1,600. Martorano (1985) interprets the structure as an ekklēsiasterion on the basis of size and features perhaps not compatible with a theatre proper, and P. Orsi (1922) has interpreted the remains as an odeion, but these interpretations are uncertain (Todisco (1990) 137–41; Hansen and Fischer-Hansen (1994) 72–74).

Little is known of Rhegion’s major sanctuaries. The importance of Apollo at Rhegion is reflected in the foundation myth of the city (Lacroix (1965); Costabile (1979)) and in the name “Phoibia” given to a quarter in the city (supra). The oldest explicit evidence of a temple of Apollo, however, is a C1l honorary decree (ILS 5471). The location is unknown, but it was possibly in the lower part of the city (Vallet (1958) 123–24, 250–51; cf. Sabbione (1981b) 278). A sanctuary, possibly for the chthonic divinities, was located close to the theatre and proves the public character of the whole area (Vallet (1958) 121–23). A C5 graffito refers to Zeus Keraunos (Mosino (1995)). According to Thuc. 6.44.3, Artemis had a sanctuary outside the city by the coast (see further Vallet (1958) 79, 130–31). There are remains of yet another suburban temple, “de la Marina” (Vallet (1958) 124 pl. II.3 (number left out but temple indicated to the south-west of Hellenistic cemetery no. 10)). So far no Archaic tombs have been located, all tomb evidence being C4–Hellenistic (Spadea (1986)).

Communal oracle consultation is reported by Aristox. fr. 117, Wehrli. Anaxilas was victorious in the mule race in 480 at Olympia (Olympionikai 208) and the cithara-player Ariston participated in the Pythian Games (Timaeus (FGrHist 566) fr. 43). Rhegion possibly made a communal dedication at Delphi shortly after the abolition of tyranny in 461 (IGDGG no. 37; cf. also 38: a kerykeion possibly also connected with the abolition of tyranny). At Olympia dedications of weapons commemorate C6–C5 victories over Lokroi (no. 59) and Gela (no. 17) (Yalouris (1980) 102 pl. 48.1; pls. 36, 38; SEG 24.304–5; IGDGG nos. 33–34).

Rhegion commenced its coinage c.510 with a small issue of drachms on the Euboic standard and in the incuse technique; the type depicts a man-faced bull (probably the river-god of the river Apsiias), above a locust; the diameter of the structure, c.43 mm, gives a seating capacity of about 500–600. Lower denominations have the same obv. type, rev. PETINON (retr.) is in the Chalkidian script (C. Boehringer (1984–85) 111–12; Rutter, HN3 2468). The next issue, struck c.494 at the beginning of the reign of Anaxilas, consists of stater and drachms on the Euboic standard, in double relief, similar to Messanian issues and like them inspired by Samian types: obv. lion mask facing; rev. calf’s head and legend PETINON (retr.) (Caccamo Caltabiano (1993) 17–18, 25–26; Rutter, HN3 2469; SNG Cop. Italy 1923). Lower denominations have the same obv. type, rev. PET in dotted circle (Caccamo Caltabiano (1993) 26–27). A small issue of tetradrachms on the Attic standard, with types as above, were struck c.485–480 (Caccamo Caltabiano (1993) 28). C.480, still during the reign of Anaxilas, Rhegion and Messana simultaneously struck tetradrachms and fractions on the Attic standard: obv. mule biga; rev. running hare and, on Rhégian coins, the legend PETINON (retr.); lower denominations have obv. running hare, rev. legend PET in dotted circle (Caccamo Caltabiano (1993) 53–56; Rutter, HN3 2472ff; SNG Cop. Italy 1924–27). The abolition of tyrannical rule at Rhegion in 461 led to a new coinage from c.C5m: tetradrachms and drachms with obv. lion mask as above; rev.
seated male figure surrounded by a wreath, probably the eocist Iokastos, legendary founder of the city; legend: \textit{ΠΕΓΙΝΩΝ}, on later issues \textit{ΠΗΓΙΝΟΣ} (Lacroix (1965) 44–45; Stazio (1978) 195–96; Rutter, \textit{HN}³ 2477ff; 2488ff; \textsc{SNG Cop. Italy} 1928–30, 1932 (obol)). The revival of coinage at Rhegion has been connected with the appearance of over-stuck Athenian tetradrachms in this city and at Messana, reflecting Athenian influence in South Italy and the foundation of Thourioi in \textit{444} (Kray (1976) 219). The rev. type was changed \textit{c.420} to a head of Apollo, legends \textit{ΠΗΓΙΝΟΣ}, \textit{ΠΗΓΙΝΩΝ}, \textit{ΡΗΓΙΝΟΣ} (Rutter, \textit{HN}³ 2494; \textsc{SNG Cop. Italy} 1933–34). A later issue with obv. head of Apollo; rev. lion mask (Rutter, \textit{HN}³ 2501; \textsc{SNG Cop. Italy} 1945–52) is attributed to 356–351 and the refoundation of Rhegion by Dionysios II, see \textit{supra} (Kray (1976) 22). Bronze coinage, with types similar to the silver, was introduced in \textit{C55} (Caccamo Caltabiano (1979); Rutter, \textit{HN}³ 2513ff; \textsc{SNG Cop. Italy} 1939–40).

Rhegion was the \textit{metropolis} of Pyxouos, founded in \textit{476–465} by Mikythos (Diod. 11.59; Strabo 6.1.1; see further the entry for Pyxouos).

\textbf{69. Siris} (Sirites) \textit{Map 46. Lat. 40.15, long. 16.40.} The location indicated by Barr. (lat. 40.10, long. 16.40) is not followed here. Barr. locates Siris \textit{c.5} km south of Herakleia Leukania in accordance with one literary tradition which suggests separate locations for the two sites (\textit{infra}). However, in our entries for Siris and Herakleia Leukania we locate both communities on the plateau of modern Policoro, a location suggested by the archaeological evidence and at present widely accepted. Size of territory: ?

Type: A. The toponym is \textit{Σιρῖνος}, \textit{ἡ} (\textit{SEG} 19 618 (\textit{C6–C5}); Hdt. 8.62.2); on the name \textit{Πολειεύον} (\textit{Mir. ausc.} 106; Strabo 6.1.14; Steph. Byz. 531.12), see \textit{infra}. \textit{Σ(ε)ρίσις}, which properly denotes the territory, is sometimes used almost as a toponym (Antiuchos (\textit{FGrHist} 555) fr. 12; Strabo 6.1.14).

The city-ethnic is \textit{Σιρίται} (Hdt. 6.127.1); \textit{Σιρίνος} of the \textit{C6} coin legends may also be the city-ethnic (\textit{infra}); Steph. Byz. 572.12 lists this as a form of the ethnic.

Antiuchos (\textit{FGrHist} 555) fr. 12 should probably be emended to read \textit{δυντίν \ οὐσίων \ πόλεων, τοῖν \ Μεταποιοῖν ... <τίς δὲ \ Σιρίτιδας}>; if accepted, the text calls Siris a \textit{polis} in, primarily, the territorial sense, with the urban sense as a connotation. The external collective use of the city-ethnic is found in Timaios (\textit{FGrHist} 566) fr. 51 (\textit{rC7}) \textit{apud} Ath. 12.232C; the external individual use is found in Hdt. 6.127.1 (\textit{rC6f}). Siris is implicitly described as \textit{patre} (= \textit{patris}) in Hdt. 6.127.1–4.

The literary tradition presents a number of traditions on the origin, foundation and early history of Siris; the evidence is quite confusing and difficult to correlate with the archaeological evidence (see e.g. Lombardo (1986); Sacchi (1990); Osborne (1998) 265–67). A synthesis yields the following picture.

According to Strabo \textit{6.1.14}, Ionians fleeing from Lydian rule conquered a non-Greek (Chonian) \textit{polis} and changed the name from Siris to Polieion (cf. \textit{Mir. ausc.} 106; Steph. Byz. 531.11, 572.10; \textit{Etym. Magn.} 680.11), a name that is, however, not often found in the sources relating to the Greek city. Strabo does not specify who these Ionians were or the date of their capture of Siris; but Ath. 12.523C (= Arist. fr. 601) and Timaens (= \textit{FGrHist} 566, fr. 51) identifies them as from Kolophon (no. 8.48), and since Gyges (c.680–645) is known to have conquered Kolophon (Hdt. 1.14.4), a synchronisation of the capture of Kolophon and the foundation of Polieion would produce a foundation date of c.660 (Ronconi (1980); Lombardo (1986) 63–64). The historicity of this tradition of a Kolophonian foundation was rejected by Beloch (1894) 606–7, but is accepted by Demand (1990) 31–33; a C6–m loom weight inscribed in the Ionian alphabet may possibly support an Ionian presence at Siris (\textit{LSAG} 286). The foundation date of c.660 implied by the synchronisation with Gyges’ capture of Kolophon does not square well with the archaeological evidence, which points to a foundation date of C81–C76. Strabo’s report (6.1.14) that Siris was a Rhodian foundation is unique.

According to Antiuchos (\textit{FGrHist} 555) fr. 12, Sybaris (no. 70.1) invited Achaian colonists to settle in Italy to create a buffer against Taras (no. 71); two sites were at the disposal of the settlers, Metapontion and Siris, and the Sybarites advised settling Metapontion since the new community would then \textit{also} control Siris. This seems to imply that Siris lay empty or was controlled by Sybaris; Just. \textit{Epit.} 20.2.4 reports that an alliance of Metapontion (no. 61), Sybaris (70.1) and Kroton (no. 56) conquered Siris, and this would seem the probable occasion after which Sybaris could control Siris; this conquest is usually dated to C6f (Giangiulio (1989) 249–50; Sacchi (1990) 151) and archaeological evidence confirms a C6f/m destruction of Siris (Adamasteanu (1975b) 527). But Metapontion seems to have been founded c.630 (see the entry for Metapontion), and in any case the city can hardly have participated in the war that provided the preconditions for its own foundation. This combination of the evidence, then, runs into difficulties. Furthermore, Siris seems to have existed and minted coins in C6f (\textit{infra}),
and with legends in Achaian script. According to Just. Epit.
20.2.10, Siris was allied to Lokroi (no. 59) during the conflict
with Metapontion, Sybaris and Kroton.

Though Hdt. 8.62.1 may imply that Siris was unoccupied
in C5e, it does seem to have been occupied when Taras (no.
71) and Thurioi (no. 74) fought for control of the site short-
ly after the foundation of Thurioi; the war was ended by a
mutual agreement between the two cities to found a joint
colony (Antiochos (FGrHist 555) fr. 11; Staatsverträge 158).
Diod. 12.36.4 dates the foundation of this colony to 433/2,
and he reports that it was founded at the site of Siris,
whose inhabitants were deported. According to Antiochos
(FGrHist 555) fr. 11, “Heraklea” was not the original name of
the colony: the city was thus named only after having
changed its initial location. A combination of Diodorus and
Antiochos would suggest that the city was originally found-
ed as Siris on the site of Siris, but later relocated and then
named Heraklea; such a reconstruction is not, however,
supported by the archaeological evidence, which clearly
shows Heraklea to have occupied the site identified with
Siris (see further the entry for Heraklea). According to
Strabo 6.1.14, Siris served as the epieion of Heraklea, but
the reference here is not to the historical Greek Siris, but to
a legendary Siris, a polis Troike, of which there are no archaeo-
logical remains. So, by the 430s Siris had been replaced by
Heraklea (no. 52).

The territory is called Σ(*)ερίτις (Antiochos (FGrHist
555) fr. 3; Arist. Pol. 1329b21). The sources refer to a founda-
tion near the river Siris, but there is no archaeological evidence
for such a site, and Siris is therefore normally identified
with the settlement on the hill of Policoro (infra). The
archaeological evidence indicates Greek settlers on the
plateau of Policoro from C8l, and the Kolophonian settlers
(supra) therefore had Greek predecessors. Greek presence in
the Siris area from the C8s has been documented at other sites
also, most importantly at Incoronata c.18 km to the north of
Siris. Incoronata had a cultural appearance very similar to
that of Siris, and the site is therefore interpreted as an empo-
rior of this city, located on the northern border of Sirite
territory (Orlandini (1986a), (1986b)); it was destroyed by
Metapontion (no. 61) at the time of the foundation of that
Ionian influence was curtailed by the foundation of
Metapontion and so confined within the valley of the river
Cavone from C7s. The northern border of Siris’ territory
centred upon the Hellenised indigenous settlement at
Termitito (Osanna (1992) 94). The chora of Siris extended
along the coast and somewhat inland along the Sini and
Agri river valleys, as attested by the border sites of S. Maria
d’Anglona and Piano Sollazzo, which are Hellenised from
C7s, but the influence of Siris undoubtedly reached the
Tyrrenhian coast (Osanna (1992) 92–96, 109–10). To the
south the territory was bounded by the Siris valley and
beyond that by Sybarite territory. There is no evidence of
sanctuaries in the territory of Siris prior to the foundation of

The C8l–C7e settlement founded on the narrow, coastal
east–west oriented plateau (c.1,700 × 100/150 m), modern
Policoro, is here identified with Siris. The easternmost part
of the plateau was fortified on its west side by a ditch and
forms an acropolis (Hänsel (1973) 401–4 fig. 1, 429–41,
443–46, 461–63). Remains of C7–C6 mudbrick circuit walls
along the edge of the Policoro plateau (Hänsel (1973)
429–43, 492; Adamesteau (1980b) 82–85) show that habita-
tion, although concentrated in separate areas, covered most
of the plateau. The sporadic structural remains on the
plateau (Adamesteau and Dilthey (1978) 521–25 fig. 12) and
ashlar foundations of two large structures (temples?) on the
acropolis date from c.700 (Adamesteau (1980b) 76–78).
There are traces of habitation and workshops also outside
and south of the plateau; the location of several cemeteries
seems to indicate separate nuclei of habitation areas
(Tagliente (1986a), (1986b)). The archaeological evidence
confirms a destruction c.660 (= the Achaian conquest of
Just. Epit. 20.3.4?), but there are also some signs of continu-
sing settlement (Adamesteau (1975b) 527). The vast C5 public
area, an agora(?), on the southern slope above the
sanctuary of the “Archaic Temple”, may have had an Archaic
origin. Sanctuaries were located at springs rising on the
southern slope of the plateau. The sanctuary of Demeter
identified by C5–C4 epigraphic evidence (Neutsch (1967)
134–36, (1980)) originated in C8l–C7e (Adamesteau
(1980b) 78 n. 24, 86–87 with refs.; (1982) 301, 303 fig. 2; for
The divinity of the C6e “Archaic Temple” to the west of the
Demeter sanctuary is unknown; cult was practised from
C7m (Adamesteau (1974) 97, (1980b) 87–88; Mertens-Horn
and Viola (1990) 249–50). Further west, yet another sanctu-
ary with remains of two or three C6l naiskoi and votive
material testify to the overall public character of the south-
ern slope of the plateau. The cult is uncertain, though a
votive pinax found on the site with a representation of
Apollo and Herakles may point to these divinities (Neutsch
terracottas found above in the western area of the plateau
have been taken as evidence of one or more naiskoi
The major urban cult was that of Athena Ilias, presumably the patron divinity (Mir. ausc. 106; Strabo 6.1.14). Other evidence of cult includes a Cēl–Cēse bronze plaque listing objects, in Achaian script, belonging to the sanctuary, epi Siri and epi dromo, of a female divinity which is with some uncertainty identified as Hera, Athena or Demeter (Guarducci (1958) 52, 57–58: Cēs; LSAG 287: c.475; Guarducci, EG i. 117–18). Circumstantial evidence suggests a cult of Artemis Bendis (Hänsel (1973) 457). The Achaian cemeteries are found on the outermost western part of the plateau, with evidence of burials inside the circuit wall (Adamesteanu (1975b) 526–27, (1980a)), but mainly in an extensive area to the west of the plateau (Contrade Cerchiarito, Schirone and Madonelle) (Adamesteanu (1974) 111–16). Such separate well-defined cemeteries point to separate nuclei of settlement. The funerary road, later the continuation of the plateia of Herakleia, was originally an important artery of the territory, also leading to the chorai of Dionyso known from C4 but possibly of more ancient origin (see the entry for Herakleia Leukania).

An architectural fragment from Olympia has been taken as evidence of a treasury of Siris (Mertens-Horn and Viola (1990) 242).

Siris may have minted coins. An issue of Cēs incuse staters on the Achaian standard carry the Sybarite type of a bull looking back and double legends in the Achaian alphabet: ΣΙΡΙΝΟΣ (retr.), rev. ΠΥΞΟΕΣ or ΠΥΞΕ (Gorini (1975) 9, 95–98; Sternberg (1980); Rutter, HN3 1722; SNG Cop. Italy 1387; SNG Cop. Suppl. 53). A single third-stater with obv. legend ΣΙΠΙ is attested (Sternberg (1980) 127, 139; Moscati Castelnuovo (1989) 94 n. 7; Rutter, HN3 1727). The interpretation of these coins is uncertain. The legend ΣΙΡΙΝΟΣ is either a city-ethnic of Siris or a toponym (Sirinos; see Pyxous (no. 67)). If it is the city-ethnic of Siris, the coinage may be a joint issue of Siris and Pyxous, though it is a problem that the two sites are situated far apart, or of Siris and some otherwise unknown locality near Siris (cf. Gallo (1996) 97–100). The initial issue is normally dated c.550–540 (Moscati Castelnuovo (1989) 94–100; Sternberg (1980) unconvincingly interprets the early Siris coinage as a prototype for Sybaris’ coinage and dates it 560–550). The Sybarite bull type dates the issue to after the destruction of Siris by Sybaris et al. (supra), and the coinage therefore represents a Siris within Sybaris’ dominion, rather than an issue of an independent city (cf. Parise (1972) 102–4; Guzzo (1989) 41, 46). The coinage has been divided into four series (Libero Mangieri (1981) or into two series (Sternberg (1980)) terminating c.510 contemporary with the fall of Sybaris.

70. Sybaris (Sybaritas) Map 46. Lat. 39.45, long. 16.30. Size of territory: 5. Type: A. The toponym is Σύβαρης, โห (Hdt. 5.44.1; Ar. Vesp. 1435). The city-ethnic is Σύβαριτας (ML 10 (550–525); Cēl coin, infra), in the Ionic dialect Σύβαριτης (Hdt. 6.127.1).

Sybaris I. Sybaris is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 5.45.1 and Theophr. Hist. pl. 1.9.5, and in the political sense at Hdt. 6.21.1 and at Arist. Pol. 1303*26, 29, where Sybaris is the first of eight examples listed under the heading polis. The Aristotelian collection of politeiai seems to have included a Σύβαριτων πολιτεία (132, Gigon = fr. 583, Rose). It is called an ἀποικία at Ps.-Skymnos 340. The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is attested on coins from Cēl, once in nom. sing. (infra). The external collective use is found in ML 10 (550–525); Hdt. 5.44.2; Antiochos (FGrHist 555) fr. 12; and Arist. Pol. 1303*31. The external individual use is found at Hdt. 5.47.1 (rCēs) and 6.127.1 (rCēf) and IG ii2 2326.4 = SEG 32 217 (C3, 1616). Sybaris is implicitly described as patres (= patris) in Hdt. 6.127.1–4.

Sybaris was founded in the last quarter of C8 (721/20; Ps.-Skymnos 360; or 709/8: Euseb. Chron. 91b Helm), a date confirmed by archaeological evidence (Guzzo (1982a)). It was commonly regarded as an Achaean foundation (Antiochos (FGrHist 555) fr. 12; Ps.-Skymnos 340), but Arist. Pol. 1303*29 describes it as a joint foundation of Troizenians (no. 367) and Achaeans. Solin. 2.10 describes it as founded by Troizenians and Sagaris, the son of the Lokrian Aias; Ant. Lib. Met. 8.7 describes it as a Lokrian foundation, but this Lokrian tradition is presumably simple aetiology, entirely without historical value (Paphathomopoulos ad Ant. Lib. 8.7). The oecist is reported to have been Is of Helike (Strabo 6.1.12; Pugliese Carratelli (1972–73) 17; Morgan and Hall (1996) 204; Bugno (1999)).

Greek finds show that the chorai of Sybaris extended as far as the valleys of the rivers Krathis and Sybaris (modern Coscile). Northwards the settlement of Amendolara (= Lagaria according to de La Genière (1991b)) delimits the Sybarite and Sirite areas of influence, southwards the border between Sybarite and Krotonian areas of influence is unclear (Guzzo (1982a)). There is archaeological evidence, as early as C8, of Sybarite influence far inland along the routes offering shortcuts to the Tyrrenian coast (survey in de La Genière (1978) 344–54), and the defeat of Sybaris by Kroton (no. 56) in 510 is reflected in the abandonment of
sites on the Tyrrenian coast, e.g. at Petrosa di Scalea (cf. E. Greco (1990) 47, 51–52). An important Athena sanctuary (cf. *CEG* 394; C5$^b$ graffito: Arena (1996) no. 28.9) with C7 temples was located in the hinterland of Sybaris on the plateau of Timpone della Motta (Francavilla Marittima; de La Genière (1989)); R. Russo (1996); Maaskant Kleibrink (2000); Ridgway (2002) 135–36, the site of an earlier indigenous settlement identified by some as Lagaria (cf. Strabo 6.1.14). There is evidence of a rural sanctuary of Hera further inland en route for Laos, mentioned on the inscribed axe found at S. Sosti (Arena (1996) no. 36.15; cf. Steph. Byz. 589.14 with discussion by Lucca (1994)).

The heyday of Sybaris was the Archaic period down to 510, the date of its crushing defeat at the hands of the Krotoniates. In the C6$^b$ war against Siris (no. 69), Sybaris was allied with Kroton (no. 56) and Metapontion (no. 61) (Just. *Epit.* 20.2.3–4). By C6$^b$ at the latest Sybaris had come to control a vast dominion (comprising, according to the inflated report by Strabo 6.1.13, four neighbouring *ethne* and twenty-five *poleis hypekooi*; cf. Ampolo (1992) 246 with refs.); in extent, the dominion of Sybaris may have been as large as c.3,000 km² (Ampolo (1992) 247). At least one of the mechanisms employed by Sybaris to control its dependencies was a hegemonic *symmachia*: ML 10 (550–525) shows the city as the leader of an alliance including the Serdaioi and other unspecified *symmachoi*. Apparently some of the cities and communities in the dominion of Sybaris issued coins, while others did not; this may perhaps be a reflection of differences in degree of dependency. Numismatic evidence suggests that Laos (no. 58), Temesa (no. 72) and the unidentified settlements or communities of Ami[-] and the So[-] were also subordinate to Sybaris (Parise (1984) 253, (1988) 307–9; cf. also Rutter (1997) 22–27 and the list of pre-Hellenistic settlements *supra*). According to Diod. 12.9.2 (rC6$^b$), Sybaris granted citizenship to many foreigners, and this may possibly be connected with the control of the dominion (Rutter (1970) 171). The city was also active as coloniser, founding Laos (no. 58) prior to 510 and Poseidonia (no. 66) c.600; see also Skidros in the list of non-polis sites *supra*.

The large figures reported for the number of citizens (100,000 *astoί*: Ps.-Skymnos 341; 300,000 *politaί*: Diod. 10.23, 12.9.2) or armed forces (300,000 men: Diod. 10.23 and Strabo 6.1.13; 50,000 horse: Ath. 519C = Timaeus (*FGrHist* 566) fr. 50), although obviously legendary, may all the same indicate a very populous city; the size of the urban area (c.500 ha, *infra*) confirms that Sybaris was indeed a large city.

The city was founded on a row of coastal dunes parallel to the coast between the rivers Krathis and Sybaris. It had a perimeter of 50 stades (c.9–10 km) according to Strabo 6.1.13, possibly implying a circuit wall though there is no archaeological evidence of such a wall. However, recent investigations indicate that the extent of the city was about 500 ha. Most of the urban remains lie under 4 m-deep alluvial deposits, not, however, unequivocally to be connected with Kroton’s destruction of Sybaris (Strabo 6.1.13). However, the destruction of 510 is archaeologically attested and revealed by destroyed and flooded strata (Guzzo (1976) 51, (1997) 379). Only about 5 ha (1 per cent of the presumed urban area) has been investigated by excavations. The earliest Greek material confirms a foundation in C8$^b$ (Guzzo (1982a)) but the structural remains are later, and it is uncertain whether the first phase comprised one large settlement or a plurality of smaller nucleated settlements (Guzzo (1982a) 241, 243). The C7–C6 remains came to light in two zones, “Parco di Cavallo” and “Stombi”, c.1,800 m apart, and revealed some consistent orientation though the overall urban layout of the city is uncertain (Carando (1999)). An industrial quarter is evidenced by kilns (Various authors (1972), (1973), (1988–89)). Architectural fragments from “Parco di Cavallo” testify to a major C6$^b$ temple (a Heraion?), and there is further evidence of a monumental rectangular C6 building, probably with a public purpose (Zancani Montuoro (1972–73a); Various authors (1988–89) 27–28).

There is little evidence for cults: Zeus and Apollo are listed as *proxenoi* (“guarantors”) of the *symmachia* treaty ML 10 (550–525). Dorieus, who had supported Kroton against Sybaris (Hdt. 5.44–45), founded a sanctuary with a temple for Athena Krathia (Hdt. 5.45) after the defeat of Sybaris by Kroton, and votive material from “Stombi” possibly refers to Athena (Zancani Montuoro (1972–73a) 67); further evidence for Athena in *CEG* 394 (600–550). A number of sources refer to the cult of Hera at Sybaris (Ael. VH 3.43; Ath. 518C; cf. also Torelli (1988) 594), and C6$^b$ structural remains have been attributed to a Heraion (*supra*). Whether the later Thurian cults of Zeus, Athena, Aphrodite, Dionysos and Herakles (see entry for Thurioi) were in vogue in Sybaris is unknown (cf. Zancani Montuoro (1972–73a) 57). A festival with large monetary prizes is hinted at by Ath. 532D.

Two citizens of Sybaris achieved Olympic victories: Philytas in 516 (*Olympionikai* 71 (boys’ boxing)) and Kleomrotos in C6$^b$ (*CEG* 394 (event unknown)), and it seems that already by C6$^b$ Sybaris rewarded its victors handsomely (Mann (2001) 69–70, discussing *CEG* 394 (6f)). The Sybarites seem to have had treasuries at Olympia (Paus.
6.19.9; Mertens-Horn and Viola (1990) 240–46) and at Delphi (Strabo 9.3.8) with rich dedications (Ath. 605A–B). For attempts to identify a C6m treasury of the Sybarites in the architectural remains at Delphi, see Partida (2000) 261–63. In C6m, the city published a public document at Olympia (ML 10). Communal consultation of the Delphic oracle is reported by Ael. VH 3.43 (rC6s).

For the possible existence of a system of civic subdivisions, see Jones, POAG 164–65. Little is known of the constitution prior to 510; an early stasis is attested in Arist. Pol. 1303a25–31; it seems to have been rooted in ethnic differences and ended with the expulsion of the Troizenians by the Achaians. In general, the information relating to the king/tyrant Telys and his rise to power suggests that prior to his reign Sybaris was an oligarchy, and the importance of the aristocracy is attested by the participation of Smindyrides of Sybaris in the competition for the hand of the daughter of the tyrant Kleisthenes of Sikyon (Hdt. 6.127; Diod. 8.19). Telys is described as basileus at Hdt. 5.44.1, as tyrannos at Hdt. 5.44.2; cf. Carlier (1984) 470, and his rule as a tyrannis at Heraclid. Pont. fr. 49, Wehrli. Diod. 12.9.2 describes him as having risen to power as a demagogos, e.g. by having persuaded the Sybarites to exile 500 of the euripotatoi citizens and confiscate their property. The exiles found refuge at Kroton (no. 56), and Telys sent an embassy demanding the extradition of the exiles on threat of war (Diod. 12.9.3). The Krotoniates opted for war, and in the ensuing battle in 510 they won a decisive victory (Diod. 12.9.5–6), killed off the larger part of the Sybarite army and went on to sack the city (Hdt. 6.23; Diod. 12.10.1). Thus Sybarite power was eliminated and the phase of Sybarite history often referred to as “Sybaris I” came to an end.

Sybaris II. However, the defeat did not mean the annihilation of Sybaris. Some citizens escaped to the Sybarite colonies of Laos (no. 58) and Skidros (Hdt. 6.21.1), but other survivors must have remained, as appears from several pieces of evidence: (1) incuse coins inscribed with the abbreviated ethnics of both Kroton and Sybaris (ΣΠΟΣΥ) indicate that Sybaris passed into dependency on Kroton (see §2a in the numismatic section infra and the entry for Kroton); and this is confirmed by (2), the report that the Krotoniates appointed a governor at Sybaris (Iambl. VP 74; Minar 1942) 74; Rutter (1970) 169); (3) when besieged by the Krotoniates in 467, the Sybarites called on Hieron of Syracuse for help (Diod. 11.48.4). This implies a (fortified) settlement at the site of Sybaris (Rutter (1970) 174), the ability to conduct foreign policy, and an (unsuccessful) attempt to obtain some independence from Krotoniate hegemony. There is, thus, no doubt that a polis of Sybaris continued to exist, but it was now a dependent polis of Kroton (cf. Kahrstedt (1918) 181–82). To this “Sybaris II” have been attributed the coins described in §2b of the numismatic section infra.

The size or status of Sybarite territory in this period is unknown. The earlier dominion of Sybaris was dissolved, and cities like Temesa (no. 72) and Laos (no. 58) were now probably dependencies of Kroton (no. 56) as revealed by the second issue of Sybaris, Kroton and Laos mentioned in §2a of the numismatic section infra. Iambl. VP 255 (rC6l) seems to indicate that at least some Sybarite land was appropriated by Kroton (Rutter (1970) 169).

Dorieus founded a sanctuary of Athena Krathia after the defeat of Sybaris by Kroton (Hdt. 5.45) and the cult probably continued during C5. The importance of the Athena sanctuary on the plateau of Timone della Motta (Francavilla Marittima) remained undiminished during the C5 (de La Genière (1989) 494–95).

For “Sybaris II”, as well as for the following phases of the city, the archaeological evidence is limited. The destruction of “Sybaris I” is documented (supra), but there is continuity of life throughout C5, although the finds from and structures attributable to C5e are few. Attribution of single strata or structural remains to the different phases outlined above and below is not possible as the finds most often have a longer lifespan than that allowed for the individual phases of Sybarite history (Guzzo (1976) 51–52).

Sybaris III. According to Diod. 11.90.3–4 and 12.10.2, fifty-eight years after the 510 catastrophe (i.e. in 453) a Thessalian or a man named Thessalos (11.90.3) or, more unlikely, Thessalians, refounded (12.10.3) the city (ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὠκισαν Σύβαριν: 11.90.3; συνήκοσαν: 12.10.2). However, after a while (five years?) the Sybarites were driven out by the Krotoniates (12.10.2, cf. 11.90.4), and sent presbeis to Sparta (no. 345) and Athens (no. 361) requesting assistance and reinforcements in their attempt to return (Diod. 12.10.3–4). This phase, “Sybaris III”, from c.453 to the initial stages of the foundation of Thurioi (no. 74), is probably reflected in a new series of double-relief coins (cf. §3 in the numismatic section infra).

Sybaris IV. During the first phase of the process which eventually led to the foundation of Thurioi in 446/5, Sybaris was reinforced by Athenians and Peloponnesians (Diod. 12.10.4) and seems indeed still to have been called, and located at, Sybaris (coins; cf. RE iv.1. 1008; Rutter (1973) 163). The community was strongly dominated by Sybarites,
and a period of serious stasis was caused by the claims of the original Sybarites to privileges in the political, cultic and economic spheres of life; the Sybarites, however, were put to death almost to the last man or expelled, thus paving the way for the foundation of Thurioi proper (Diod. 12.11.1–4; cf. Arist. Pol. 1303a31–33 and Strabo 6.1.13). To this initial “Sybarite” phase of Thurioi = “Sybaris IV” have been attributed the coins described in §4 of the numismatic section infra.

V. Sybaris on the Traeis. The Sybarites expelled from Thurioi (no. 74) in 446/5 (cf. “Sybaris IV”, supra), settled by the river Traeis according to Diod. 12.22.1 (this settlement remains unlocated). According to Strabo 6.1.14, one tradition (τινὲς ταύτα) said that Sybaris on the Traeithys (emended to Traeis by Meineke) was founded by Rhodians. This tradition may reflect a Rhodian settlement, otherwise unknown, in the region where the Sybarites later settled, or, more likely, the tradition is mistaken (Walbank (2000) 24). To Sybaris on the Traeis are ascribed the coins described in §5 of the numismatic section infra. According to Polyb. 2.39.6, Sybaris combined with Kroton (no. 56) and Kaulonia (no. 55) to form an Achaian confederation in imitation of the homeland Achaions. The date of this confederation, and thus of the Sybaris participating in it, is uncertain, but the date is probably C55, and the reference would then be to Sybaris on the Traeis (Walbank, HCP ad loc. and (2000) 24; Mele (1983a) 86 n. 546; Giangiulio (1989) 177 n. 52, 197). If the alliance dates to 430–420, this is the best evidence for polis status of Sybaris on the Traeis, apart from its coins. In any case, the city was soon (after χρόνων πτώχης; Diod. 12.22.1) destroyed by the Brettians and thus Sybaris came to a final end (ibid.).

Sybaris seems to have struck coins in all its different phases and manifestations.

§1. Coins of Sybaris I. Coins on the Achaian standard were struck from c. 540, possibly as the earliest of the Achaian incuse coinages of South Italy. At first only staters were minted, but gradually lower denominations with the same type were also struck (drachms, triobols and obols). The type shows a bull facing left with head turned back, normally interpreted as a river divinity. Legends: ΣΥ, ΣΥΒ, ΣΥΒΑ, ΣΥΒΑΠΙΤΑΣ (Guarducci, EG i. 112, ii. 618; Gorini (1975) 10–11; Rutter, HN3 1729–39; SNG Cap. Italy 1388–93). Sybaris I struck coins in some quantity, coins which circulated from the Ionian to the Tyrrhenian coast. Alongside this coinage are found other series in the same incuse fabric, on the Achaian standard and with the same type (bull looking back), but with legends referring to cities other than Sybaris itself: Siris (no. 69) or Sirinos/Pyxous (no. 67), and two unknown sites named Ami- and So- (Euboic standard). An issue of incuse staters and drachms on the Achaian standard, though with the type of a boar and the retrograde legends ΠΑΛ (rev.) and ΜΟΑ (rev.), thought to have been made at some settlement of Palinouros and/or Molpa, has also been placed within the Sybarite sphere of influence (Parise (1972) esp. 102–11; Gorini (1975) 9, 12–13). These issues are interpreted as having been struck under a C6S hegemony or dominion of Sybaris, rather than as an alliance coinage (see the entries for these sites in Inventory and in list of non-polis sites supra).

§2. Coins of Sybaris II. (a) Incuse coins (staters and triobols) with obv. Krotonian tripod, legend: ΞΠΟΩ; rev. Sybarite bull, legend: ΣΥΠΑ, as well as staters and triobols with obv. Krotonian tripod with ΣΥΠΑ r. and octopus l.; rev. Sybarite bull, legend: ΛΑΙ (for Laos proper) in exergue (Gorini (1975) 26.1; Rutter, HN3 p. 145) can be ascribed to an early phase of Sybaris II (C61) when the city was subordinate to Kroton (no. 50). (b) To this Sybaris may also belong incuse staters similar to, but stylistically more advanced than, those of §1, as well as triobols with obv. standing bull, legend: ΣΥΠΑ; rev. amphora incuse; and obols with obv. bull; rev. acorn incuse (Kraay (1958) 15–16; Gorini (1975) 12.10–11, dated to 530–510; Rutter, HN3 1740–43; SNG Cap. Italy 1394–95 (triobols)).

§3. Coins of Sybaris III. This phase, “Sybaris III”, from c. 453 to the foundation of Thurioi (no. 74), is probably reflected in a new series of double-relief coins issued under Poseidonian influence. Staters: obv. striding Poseidon; rev. bull facing right, legend: ΣΥΠΑΘ; rev. bird (Rutter, HN3 1743). Triobols and obols: obv. striding Poseidon; rev. bird (Rutter, HN3 1744–45; SNG Cap. Italy 1397). In this period Sybaris also issued coins jointly with Poseidonia (no. 66) and Laos (no. 58). Poseidonia and Sybaris III: triobols with obv. Poseidon, legend: ΣΥΠΑ, rev. bull facing right, legend: ΠΟΣ (Rutter, HN3 1746–49; SNG Cap. Italy 1399–1401). Laos and Sybaris III: diobols with obv. bull, legend: ΣΥΠΑΘ or ΣΩ and Λ, for Laos (Rutter, HN3 2284). Some triobols of Laos: obv. bull; rev. acorn (cf. §2b), legend: ΣΥΠΑΘ on the obv. (Rutter, HN3 2282; SNG Cap. Italy 1398).

§4. Coins of Sybaris IV. To the initial phase of the Sybarite–Athenian settlement of Thurioi = Sybaris IV have been ascribed two issues with the ethnic ΣΥΠΠΑΠΑ and ΣΥΠΑ in the Ionic alphabet, and types obv. helmeted head of Athena (a reference to the Athenian involvement in the
foundation?; rev. (first series) bull looking back in the style of Sybaris I (Rutter, *HN* 3 1750; SNG Cap. Italy 1402–4); rev. (second series) bull with lowered head butting, in the exergue a fish—a symbol not found on earlier Sybarite coinage (Rutter, *HN* 3 1753; Rutter 1989: 251; Bugno 1997).

§5. Coins of Sybaris on the Traeis. A late coinage in the incuse technique: staters with the bull type and the obv. legends: in exergue ΣΥ retrograde and in field BAP (Kraay 1958: 29–32; Gorini 1975: 12.12, 105), is assigned to Sybaris on the Traeis, as is a triobol of c.400: obv. horseman; rev. standing bull, legend: ΣΥΒΑΠΙΤΩΝ (Rutter, *HN* 3 1754–56).

71. Taras (Tarantinos) Map 45. Lat. 40.30, long. 17.15. Size of territory: 4 (C5). Type: A. The toponym is Τάρας (C6–C4 coins, *infra*; Hdt. 1.24.1; IG IV2.1 95.43 (356/5)), Θάρας (Thuc. 6.104.2) or η (Strabo 6.3.3). The city-ethnic is Ταραντίνων (C5–C4 coins, *infra*; Hdt. 7.130.3; Antiocoshochos (*FGrHist* 555) fr. 11).

Taras is called a polis in the urban sense by Antiocoshochos (*FGrHist* 555) fr. 13, and implicitly at Ps.-Skylax 14 where Taras is the third toponym listed after the heading πόλεις ἐστιν αἶδε; in the political sense it is called a *polis* in Thuc. 6.44.2; Pl. Leg. 657B; Theopomp. fr. 233; and SGDI 1567/4620 (C4l–C3e). A *Ταραντίνων πολείεα* (Herac. Lemb. 57; Arist. fr. 607, Gigon) was included among the 158 Aristotelian politieai; politeuesthai is found at Pol. 1320b14. *Demos (ho Tarantinon)* is found in Arist. Pol. 1320b13 and Theopomp. fr. 100, and *demosioi* in Theopomp. fr. 233. It is called πάτρην (= *patris*) in AG7.715.1 and *patris* in CEG 11 833 (C5l–C4e).

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is attested on C5l coins (*infra*); the external collective use is found in Lazzarini (1976) nos. 971–72 (500–475); *IvO* 254–56 (c.440); Hdt. 3.136.2; Antiocoshochos (*FGrHist* 555) fr. 12; and Theopomp. fr. 233. The external individual use is found in IG x11.9 187A (= ML 82 (c.411)) and IG x11.9 187B (C4e).

Taras was a colony of Sparta (no. 345; Antiocoshochos (*FGrHist* 555) fr. 13; Ephor. fr. 216; Pl. Leg. 657B; Arist. Pol. 1306b31; cf. Cartledge (1979) 123–24 and Malkin (1994) 128 with n. 68) founded in C8l (706 according to Euseb. *Chron.* 91, Helm; cf. Van Compernolle 1992: 774). By the late Archaic (Nafissi 1999: 246, 255) and Classical periods there existed a first legendary account of the foundation (*locc. cilt.): Taras was founded by the so-called Partheniai (*locc. cilt.*), a group of Spartan citizens (*ἔκ τῶν ὀρμών, Arist.*) who had become atimoi (Antiocoshochos) and attempted revolution (Arist.). The *oikistes* was Phalanthos (Antiocoshochos). The city owed its name to the hero Taras, eponym also of the river Taras (Antiocoshochos); see Lo Porto (1964) 178–84; Moscati Castelnuevo (1991); Malkin (1994) 115–42; Nafissi (1999) 251–58. The foundation of Taras is connected with that of Satyrion, mentioned in the oracle to Phalanthos (Diod. 8.21.3) and probably earlier than Taras. Satyrion is identified with settlement remains at Saturo on the coast c.12 km to the south-east of Taras, where Lakonians occupied the Iapygian site a few years before settling at Taras (Lo Porto 1964). Satyrion probably continued as a trading station serving Taras.

The name of the territory was ἡ Ταραντίνη (Antiocoshochos (*FGrHist* 555) fr. 3 *apud* Strabo 6.1.4); it bordered on the territory of Brentesos (no. 78) (Strabo 6.3.6). It was soon occupied by sanctuaries, which seem to have delimited the *chora*, and by several small Greek (?) settlements, at times fortified, and cemeteries situated in the hills surrounding the plain of Taras (Corchiaro 1981; E. Greco 1995b 87); however, none of these settlements is with certainty identified as Tarantine (Lamboley 1996 6), and in any case they were soon eclipsed by Taras itself (E. Greco 1981b; Nenci 1987 198 (Cavallino)). From C7 to C4m the *chora* gradually expanded towards the north-east and south-east, and grew from c.350 km² to c.1,000 km² (Alessio and Guzzo 1989–90; Osanna 1992: 11–16). Early warfare against Metapontion (no. 61) for control or expansion of the territory seems implied by Strabo 6.1.15. In the Classical period Taras fought several wars against both Greek and non-Greek communities, presumably for territorial control: in 473, the city was severely defeated by the Iapygians (Diod. 11.52.3–4; cf. Hdt. 7.170.3–4); C5f victories over the Messapioi and the Peuketioi were commemorated at Delphi (Lazzarini 1976) no. 971; cf. Paus. 10.10.6; Messapioi; Lazzarini (1976) no. 972; cf. Paus. 10.13.10: Peuketioi). Dedications of spoils taken from Thourioi (no. 74) were made at Olympia c.440 (*IvO* 254–56 = ML 57); Antiocoshochos (*FGrHist* 555) fr. 11 explicitly states that the latter war was fought for control of the Siritis. The war was ended by an agreement to found a joint colony which developed into Herakleia (no. 52) (*Staatsverträge* 158). In C4, the city under Archytas had close ties with Dionysios II of Syracuse, securing Syracusan influence in the Adriatic (Pl. *Ep.* 7.339D; Dem. 61.46; Brauer 1986: 43–59). Also in C4, Taras fought the Messapioi (*Iaml. VP* 197), and the Leukanians (Diod. 16.61.4 ([1568]; cf. Diod. 16.62.4, 88.3). Such wars induced the city to seek help from Sparta (no. 345) in 340 (Sparta sent Archidamos: Theopomp. fr. 232; Diod. 16.62.4, 63.1) and from Alexander I of Epeiros in 334–330 (Strabo 6.3.4: Just.
Epit. 12.2.1, 23.1.15). Conflicts with the local population may have been a feature of Tarantine life right from the beginning, for the city itself presumably took over the site of a pre-existing non-Greek community (Lo Porto (1970) 356).

During the period of democratic rule in C₄ Taras was very powerful, and its military forces comprised the largest fleet of Magna Graecia (naval forces are attested already by Thuc. 8.91.2). Allegedly, Taras could muster 30,000 infantry, 3,000 cavalry and 1,000 hipparchoi (Strabo 6.3.4) in the age of Archytas. Diodorus has 20,000 infantry and 2,000 cavalry (20.104.2 (1303)) as the citizen troops mobilised by Kleonymos in 303. And Taras was known as the most populous of the cities of Magna Graecia (Ps.-Skymnos 330). If the army figures are of the right order of magnitude, Taras, at its peak in C₄, must have had a citizen population of over 100,000 plus an unknown number of foreigners and slaves (on the basis of these army figures, Wulleumier (1939) 173–74 calculates a C₄m citizen population of 240,000 and a C₄l one of 155,000; Beloch (1886) 302 suggests 60,000 for C₃l). The large extent of the C₅–C₄ city, c.530 ha, may support a high population figure, though the intramural area included the cemetery (Polyb. 8.28.7).

In C₅l–C₄e, Taras was presumably a member of the Italiote League (Staatsverträge 230). A treaty of symmachia with Rhegion (no. 68) is attested for 473 by Diod. 11.52.3 (cf. Hdt. 7.170.3). Some kind of treaty (συμβήραι) between Taras and Thourioi (no. 74) concerning a joint colony is implied by Antiochos (FGHist 555) fr. 12 = Staatsverträge 158, and Taras seems to have been the senior partner in this collaboration (τὴν ἀποικίαν κριθῆναι Ταραντίνων). Thuc. 8.91.2 refers to Tarantine naval forces supporting Sparta against Athens, thus implying a treaty with Sparta. The arrangement with Sparta which led to the expedition of Archidamos in 344 is described as a symmachia by Theopomp. fr. 232 and Diod. 16.62.4, 63.1.

A board of strategoi is attested down to C₃e (Zonar. 8.2); their number is unknown (Urso (1998) 1–10). Diog. Laert. 8.79 (rC₄m) refers to a law stipulating that the office of strategos could not be held in two consecutive years. However, Archytas exceptionally served continuously (from 367 or from 356) for six (Ael. VH7.14) or seven years (Aristox. fr. 48, Wehrli; cf. Strabo 6.3.4; only Suda, s.v. Ἀρχύτας, describes him as στρατηγὸς αὐτοκράτωρ, but it is uncertain whether this refers to an office of the Italiote League or an extraordinary office of the city as attested for C₃e (Zonar. 8.2: 281)). Plut. Quaest. Graec. 42 (= Theophr. fr. 133, Wimmer) describes a meeting of the assembly at which a strategos refused to recognise the outcome of a vote taken by show of hands, but it is unclear whether he was relying on the constitutional powers of the office to do so. Strategoi were appointed by election (Ael. VH7.14).

An exile is mentioned at Hdt. 3.138.1. Reception of envoys in C₄m is attested in Aristox. fr. 50, Wehrli, and implied by Hdt. 3.138.2 (rC₆l); sending of envoys is attested in Theopomp. fr. 232 and Diod. 16.62.4 (r346/5). Citizens of Taras were appointed proxenoi by Eretria (no. 370) c.411 (IG xi1.9 187A = ML 82) and C₄e (IG xi1.9 187B), by Athens (no. 361) in C₄m (IG 11² 248), and by Delphi (no. 177) in C₄l (EDelphes III.1.135). Two citizens served as theorodokoi of Epidaurus (no. 348) in 356/5 (IG IV.2.1 95.44).

A C₄l–C₃e inscription may suggest the existence of some system of civic subdivisions (Jones, POAG 161). At 3.126.2 Herodotos refers to a τῶν Ταραντίνων βασιλεῶν; if by basileus Herodotos means tyrannoĩ (the two terms are sometimes interchangeable, cf. 5.44.1 and 4.42; Luraghi (1994) 76–77), Taras may have experienced a tyranny in C₆l. However, since Taras was a Spartan colony, the existence of some kind of formal monarchy is not impossible (Malkin (1994) 132 with n. 87; add: Phot. s.v. ὰγιστός; Naffissi (1999) 251). Democracy was introduced shortly after the Persian Wars (Arist. Pol. 1303’s5); prior to that the constitution was a politieia, presumably favouring the gnorinoi, since Aristotle reports that the change of constitution was occasioned by heavy losses among the gnorinoi in a war against the Iapygians. At Pol. 1291b23, too, Aristotle presumably classifies Taras as a democracy, and at Pol. 1320a11–14 Taras is again classified as a democracy combining democratic sortition and oligarchic election in the selection of magistrates: all archai were dittai, and on each board some positions were filled by lot and others by election; or, alternatively, some magistracies were filled by election, others by sortition. Strabo 6.3.4 refers to C₄ Taras as a democracy. No stasis proper is on record (Berger (1992) 53), but the foundation legend included a stasis immediately after the foundation (Just. Epit. 3.4.11) in which, among others, the oecist was exiled (Malkin (1994) 129–30).

Arist. Pol. 1320a11ff refers to a plurality of boards of magistrates. The existence of ephoroi at the metropolis Sparta as well as the C₅s Tarantine colony Herakleia (IG XIV 645.1.1 (C₄l); SEG 30 1162–70 (C₄l–C₃e)) may suggest the existence of this office at Archaic and Classical Taras as well, but it is attested only from C₃e (SEG 40 901), when the office was eponymous. The ῥήτροφθαλκεῖς (Etym. Magn. s.v. ῥήτρα) were probably charged with the custody of the laws. The interpretation of the numerous monograms found on C₄
coins is disputed: they may be names of *ephoroi* (Brunetti (1960) 48–50), monetary magistrates or artists, or of chief civic magistrates (Rutter, *HN* III pp. 95–96). A *pyrtanis* and an *ēpιστατήν* [-] are attested by C4–C2 epigraphic evidence (Viola (1894) 61.3). The assembly was named ἀλίατα (i.e. ἀλία: Hesychius s.v.).

The almost triangular Tarentine peninsula terminates in the isthmus, the *akropolis* according to Strabo 6.3.1. The lagoon, Mare Piccolo, with the inner harbour was reached by the natural waterway to the west of the isthmus, the *stoma tou limenos* of Strabo 6.3.1 (the artificial canal between the acropolis-isthmus and the eastern hinterland was cut in C6 AD, and the modern island status of the isthmus is not ancient). The acropolis, a low plateau measuring c.16 ha (Lo Porto (1970) 362) surrounded by steep slopes, may have been strengthened with an ashlar circuit wall in C6 (ibid. 359; Strabo 6.3.1 seems to imply that the whole city, including the acropolis, was fortified). The isthmus was the site of the earliest Greek settlement and the early sanctuaries; the *akropolis*, was fortified. The isthmus was the site of the civic magistrates (Rutter, *HN* III 429; Boschung (1994) 177). No structural remains of the early habitation phases are extant, but the evidence from Ortygia (Syracuse) suggests a C6 origin for the east–west *plateia* with orthogonally joined *stenopoi* in accordance with a *per strigas* urban system (Lo Porto (1970) 361–62).

The early settlement had extended as far as the nearest part of the adjoining eastern plateau at least by C5, and Strabo 6.3.1 locates the agora immediately to the east below the acropolis in the narrow space delimited to the west by the Archaic cemetery. From C5 the urban area measured c.530 ha (E. Greco (1981b) 150–51); a c.10 km-long circuit wall built in 450–430 incorporated the new urban extension and the Archaic cemeteries, with two long straight walls constructed as a double ashlar wall, joining the Mare Piccolo and the Mare Grande (Lo Porto (1970) 362–64). Sporadic evidence makes it possible to reconstruct a Hippodamian urban plan, probably contemporary with that of Thouroi (444/3; E. Greco (1981b) 157); new cemeteries and public spaces were laid out inside the C5 circuit (for the Archaic and later cemeteries: Moreschini (1988); Lippolis (1994b)).

The eastern and western ends of the acropolis were laid out as sanctuaries from the early history of the colony: the east was the location of the C6 "Temple of Poseidon", the earliest known monumental stone temple in Magna Graecia (Filippi (1976)). The divinity to whom the temple was dedicated is, however, uncertain: Stazio (1967) 306–7 suggests Persephone, but Lippolis (1982) 90 Hera. To the west an ashlar foundation has been taken to be part of the stereobate of a temple of monumental size (Lo Porto (1970) 376; but see Lippolis (1982) 84–86). Sanctuaries were laid out outside the acropolis on the eastern plateau, along the Mare Piccolo where there is some evidence of C6 cult (Lippolis (1982) 117ff). The whole coastal zone seems to have been laid out as a vast sanctuary with several *heroi* between the harbour and the cemeteries which have produced C6 evidence of funeral and foundation cults (Jacobone (1988)).

The inner harbour, the Mare Piccolo, was famous in antiquity (Strabo 6.3.1; Polyb. 10.1.1); it was the only natural harbour in the Gulf of Taranto and the basis for Taras’ economy and wealth. Ashlar walls of uncertain date are interpreted as piers (Lippolis (1982) 98). A harbour (*limen*) called *Hydrus* is mentioned by Ps.-Skylax 14. Fishermen were, according to Arist. *Pol*. 1291b23, very numerous at Taras. Significant socio-economic differentiations are implied by Arist. *Pol*. 1320b10, where it is reported that the *aporoi* were allowed the use of private property in order to win their favour for the constitution.

There is only sparse evidence of public buildings: a stepped structure near the agora has been interpreted as a *bouleuterion* or as a theatre (Todisco (1990) 149). A theatre near the agora was used for a C3 louterion of Roman ambassadors (Dion. Hal. 19.5.8; Polyb. 8.30.7 (223); cf. Todisco (1990) 146–49). A *pyrτανείον* is attested c.360 (Ath. 700D; Miller (1978) no. 434).

A cult of, among others, the Atreidai is attested at Arist. *Mir. ausc.* 8406–7 (Malkin (1994) 57–60; for a survey of Tarantine cults: Pugliese Carratelli (1970a); Hinz (1998) 182–87). A tomb of (Apollo) Hyakinthos is mentioned at Polyb. 8.28.2, and Hyakinthos may be depicted on coins (*infra*). A cult of Dionysos may be inferred from C5e numismatic evidence (*infra*); cf. Pl. *Leg.* 637B. A cult of the Dioskouroi may be inferred from numismatic evidence (*infra*; Wuilleumier (1939) 519–22). A cult of Zeus Eleutherios is referred to in Hesych. s.v. *Ελευθέριος Ζεύς*. *Anth. Pal.* 6.129 (Leonidas of Taras) concerns a dedication to Athena Koryphasia (?), of spoils taken from the Leukadians. However, the occasion is uncertain (C3e?), and it is not certain that Athena Koryphasia was worshipped in Taras (Gow-Page, *HE* 2 (xxxxiv) 344–45). The evidence for other cults is uncertain: Aphrodite Basilis (Osanna (1990)); Persephone (extra-urban sanctuary: Wuilleumier (1939) 396); Apollo Alais (C4 inscription on marble *louterion*: Buononato (1960)); hero cults of Phalanthos and Taras (Lacroix (1965) 89–100; Leschhorn (1984) 31–43). Public sacrifices accompanied by *demosiā histiæis* are mentioned
by Theopomp. fr. 233. A festival of Dionysos is attested by Pl. Leg. 637B.

Communal consultation of the oracle at Dodona is attested in SGDI 1567/4620 (C4–C3e). Syll. 3 295 (C4) attests a grant of promanteia by Delphi (no. 177) to the Tarantines (Roux (1990)). From 520 to 336, Tarantine athletes won several Olympic victories (Olympionikai 130–31, 212, 230, 238, 307, 397, 436, 457). In 500–475, a monument commemorating a victory over the Messapii was dedicated at Delphi (Lazarri (1976) no. 971; cf. Paus. 10.10.6; Beschi (1982) 232), and in the same period one commemorating a victory over the Peuketioi was dedicated, also at Delphi (Lazarri (1976) no. 972; cf. Paus. 10.13.10; Beschi (1982) 236). Dedications of spoils taken from Thourioi (no. 1976) From Olympionikai several Olympic victories (1976 (232)), and in the same period one commemorating a victory over the Messapii was dedicated at Delphi (Lazarri (1976) no. 971; cf. Paus. 10.10.6; Beschi (1982) 232), and in the same period one commemorating a victory over the Peuketioi was dedicated, also at Delphi (Lazarri (1976) no. 972; cf. Paus. 10.13.10; Beschi (1982) 236). Dedications of spoils taken from Thourioi (no. 74) were made at Olympia c.440 (IvO 254–56 = ML 57). At Delphi architectural terracottas have be taken as evidence of a Tarantine treasury (Le Roy (1967) 70–87).

Taras initiated silver coinage about 520–510 (Cahn (1968)) or slightly later (Westermarck (1979) 291; Rutter, HN3 p. 92) in the incuse technique on the Achaeans style with nomoi divided into thirds as at Metapontion (for surveys of Tarantine coinage with refs., see Stazio (1970); Fischer-Bossert (1999); Rutter, HN3 pp. 92–93). The earliest obv. type shows a kneeling youth holding lyre and flower, presumably Hyakinthos or Eros; legend: TAPAΣ (Rutter, HN3 824; SNG Cap. Italy 766). The subsequent main obv. type of the nomoi depicts a dolphin rider (Taras or Phalanthos); legend: TAPAΣ (Rutter, HN3 826; SNG Cap. Italy 765). Double-relief coins were minted from C5e: obv. dolphin rider; rev. various types (e.g. hippocamp, four-spoked wheel, or female head); legends: TAPAΣ, TAP (Westermarck (1979); Rutter, HN3 827, 833, 838; SNG Cap. Italy 767–78). These were accompanied by fractions of the nomos third-, sixth-, tenth- (= litra), twentieth- (= hemilitra), and sixtillitra with a variety of types and rev. types (dolphin, shell, wheel or hippocamp; Rutter, HN3 828ff; SNG Cap. Italy 783–86). A unique stater in Naples has rev. seated male figure holding a kantharos and distaff, probably the hero Taras, normally referred to as the “oecist” type but here revealing a connection with the cult of Dionysos (Cahn (1968) 77–72; Rutter, HN3 843), legend: TAPAΣ; rev. dolphin rider, legend: TAPAΣ. From C5m the types of the nomoi are obv. dolphin rider, legend: TAPAΣ/TAPANTINΩN; rev. seated male figure, the “oecist” (Rutter, HN3 844; SNG Cap. Italy 779–82); half-nomoi (drachms) have obv. hippocamp; rev. female head (Rutter, HN3 839; SNG Cap. Italy 787–88). From C5a a horseman becomes the normal obv. type; rev. dolphin rider, legend: TAPANTINΩN. These are the main types throughout C4 with some variants (Rutter, HN3 847ff, 868ff; SNG Cap. Italy 797–829); obv. types have two riders, the Dioskouroi (Rutter, HN3 898; SNG Cap. Italy 830); new fractions appeared in C4 (Rutter, HN3 907ff). In C4S the city struck in gold on the Attic standard on more than one occasion, usually with obv. type: head of Hera; rev. young Taras appealing to seated Poseidon (stater), dolphin rider (half-stater), infant Taras with wool and distaff (sixth-stater), kantharos (twelfth-stater; Rutter, HN3 901–4); time of Alexander the Molossian: stater with usual obv., rev. horseman, in field sometimes thunderbolt; twentieth-stater with obv. Helios; rev. thunderbolt (Rutter, HN3 905–6; SNG Cap. Italy 831–34). Bronze coins were minted only in C3 (Rutter, HN3 p. 106).

Taras was the founder of Herakleia (no. 52), which was originally a joint colony of Taras and Thourioi (no. 74) (Antiochos (FGrHist 555) fr. 12). The foundation of Herakleia involved the displacement of the previous inhabitants of Siris (no. 69; Diod. 12.36.4 (1433)).

72. Temesa (Temesaios) Map 46. Lat. 39.05, long. 16.10. Size of territory: ?. Type: Bβ. The toponym is ΤΕΜΕΣΕΙΑ, η (Polyb. 13.10.3); ΤΕΜΕΙΑ, η (Strabo 6.1.5; Steph. Byz. 615.1); ΤΕΜΕΙΟΣ(ή)a, η (Lycoph. Alex. 1067; Paus. 6.6.7); attractive, but still uncertain, is the identification with Homeric ΤΕΜΕΙΑ (Hom. Od. 1.184; Biraschi (1982)). Steph. Byz. 615.2 gives the city-ethnic as ΤΕΜΕΙΣΑΙΟΣ and this form is found in Callim. Aet. fr. 85.10, Pfeiffer, and may be abbreviated as TE and TEM on C6–C5 coins (infra) unless the legends abbreviate the toponym. For the location of Temesa, still not resolved, at Casalina di S. Sosti or further southwards at Fiumefreddo Bruzio, see Massaro (1982) 22 with refs. Recently sporadic archaeological evidence has been investigated on the fertile plain of Campora S. Giovanni near the coast in the Savuto valley, but the evidence is inconclusive, though the cultural assemblage is indeed C6–C5f Greek (De Sensi Sestito and Valentini (1990) esp. 137–42). Spada (followed by Barr.) argues for a location at the Piano della Tirena, where the urban remains include parts of a circuit wall and habitation. However, these are mainly C4 and therefore belong primarily to the Oskan-Brettian-Hellenistic period (Spada (1990a), leaving the location of the Archaic city still unresolved (E. Greco (1986) 129–30, with reference also to the analogous case of Laos).

Temesa is called polis only by late sources (Strabo 6.1.5; Steph. Byz. 615.1; Paus. 6.6.11); however, its C6–C5 coinage (infra) suggests that it was a polis in the Archaic and Classical
periods, albeit probably mostly a dependency of larger poleis (infra).

According to Strabo 6.1.5, Temesa was a foundation of the Ausonians, and the settlement accordingly was originally not Greek but indigenous. A later Greek or Hellenising phase is, however, suggested by the tradition of heroic colonisation by Aitolians led by Thoas, who in their turn were later ousted by Brettians (Strabo 6.1.5). This tradition may be connected with the activities of Alexander the Molossian in South Italy (Biraschi (1982) 36–37). Other Greek traditions are that of Polites, a companion of Odysseus, who had a heroön near Temesa (Strabo 6.1.5; cf. Mele (1985b)), and that of the Olympic victor Euthymos of Lokroi who fought this Polites when the Lokrians had captured the city (Strabo 6.1.5; cf. Paus. 6.6.4–11 for a variant of the myth, referring also to a painting depicting personifications of the young Sybaris and of the polis of Temesa). Greek identity is suggested also by the Greek-style coinage (infra). All these elements suggest that Temesa was an Oinotrian city (schol. Hom. Od. 1.184), strongly Hellenised, prior to 510 within the dominion of Sybaris (no. 70.1) and after 510 in the dominion of Kroton (no. 56), and from c.480, some time after the Medmean, Hipponian and Lokrian defeat of Kroton, in the dominion of Lokroi (no. 59).

The territories of Temesa and Terina (at S. Eufemia Vetere(?); cf. Terina (no. 73)) were adjacent (Strabo 6.1.5); Temesa is often located in the area of the estuary of the river Savuto, ancient Sabutus (supra). Sybaris controlled the valleys of the rivers Krathis and Sabutus and the access to the Tyrrenhenian Sea, and so Temesa may have been within Sybaris’ dominion. After Kroton’s victory over Sybaris, Temesa seems to have become a part of Kroton’s dominion, as indicated by its coinage (infra). It was later held by Lokroi, as suggested by the traditions associated with Euthymos (supra); numismatic evidence dates Lokrian control to C5m (infra), whereas dates based upon written evidence point rather to c.480, in which case it was followed by a new period of Krotoniate influence (see De Sensi Sestito (1982a) for a full discussion).

Temesa with Kroton struck silver coins on the Achaian standard. Initially, i.e. C6, it was an incuse coinage with the tripod of Kroton and legends in the Achaian script: TE (sometimes retrograde) and ΨPO, one issue with the rev. type: flying eagle, contemporary with the “dominion-coinage” of Kroton (see the entry for Kroton, infra; Stazio (1982) 96–99; Parise (1982) 107–10, (1990a); Rutter, HN3 p. 167); dumpy flan incuse issues (similar type and legend) of c.480 are also known (Stazio (1982) 98). From C5m Temesa struck double-relief staters: obv. tripod of Kroton; rev. Corinthian helmet, the emblem of Temesa, legend: TE or TEM on obv. and rev. (Stazio (1982) 94–95, 99; Rutter, HN3 2566; SNG Cop. Italy 1828). A Krotoniate C5s issue of double-relief staters has obv. tripod, legend ΨPO, rev. Corinthian helmet, legend TE; lower denominations are without TE, but the rev. type ensures their attribution to this group (Stazio (1982) 96; Rutter, HN3 2122–24). The affiliation of Temesa to Kroton is clear and the evidence suggests that Temesa was part of the Krotoniate dominion from C6l, though from C5m less dependent upon Kroton, as possibly reflected in the tradition of Lokrian influence (supra; Prontera (1982) 42, 47; De Sensi Sestito and Valentini (1990)).

73. Terina (Terinaios) Map 46. Lat. 38.55, Long. 16.15. Still unlocated (Spadea (1979); cf. Spadea (1990a)) though most often located at S. Eufemia Lamezia (thus Barr. with query). Size of territory: ? Type: [A]. The toponym is Τέρεινα (IG iv2 1.95.45 (356/5); Ps.-Skylax 12), or Τέρεινα (Lycoph. Alex. 726; Ps.-Skymnos 306). The city-ethnic is Τερηναιόι (C5l coins, infra; IG ii2 10438 (C4m)) or Τερεναιοί ([Plut.] X orat. 845C (rC45)).

Terina is one of ten toponyms listed at Ps.-Skylax 12 after the heading πόλεις εἰσίν ἕλληνις ἢ λιονεῖς αἰδε, where polis is used in the urban sense (cf. Polyaen. 2.10.1 (rC53); Diod. 16.15.2 (1356/5)). The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C5 coins (infra); the external collective use is found in Polyaen. 2.10.1 (rC53); the external individual use is found in IG ii2 10438 (C4m) and [Plut.] X orat. 845C (rC45).

Terina was founded by Kroton (no. 56) (Ps.-Skymnos 306–7; Phlegron (FGrHist 257) fr. 31); the date of foundation is unknown, and the terminus ante quem is c.460, the date at which the city began issuing coins (Rutter (1997) 61). Terina may have been founded after the Krotoniate defeat of Sybaris c.510 (De Sensi Sestito (1985) 199–200); if the foundation was earlier, it probably antedated the C7–C6f Lokrian foundations of Hipponion (no. 53) and Medma (no. 60) (Spadea (1979); Giangiulio (1989) 233–38). After c.510, Sybaritan influence in the area was replaced by Krotoniate influence, as demonstrated by coin hoards (De Sensi Sestito (1985)).

A war with Thourioi (no. 74) is attested a few years after 444/3 (Polyaen. 2.10.1). Terina was besieged and taken by the Brettians in 356 (Diod. 16.15.2), and the city became a Brettian community, surviving the conquest of Alexander the Molossian c.325 (Livy 8.24.4).
A citizen of Terina served as theorodokos of Epidauros (no. 348) in 356/5 (IG I2 4.1 95.45). An inscribed bronze plaque (of C4 or later) found near S. Eufemia Lamezia has been tentatively attributed to Terina (IGSII no. 21); in l. 10 it mentions a πριτάνας, an office known also from Kroton (Ath. 522C (rC5e)). The same inscription possibly attests the existence of a system of civic subdivisions of a territorial disposition (Jones, POAG 167–68). Terina was presumably fortified in 356/5 when it was besieged by the Brettians (ἐκπολιορκεῖν: Diod. 16.15.2).

C5–C4 (infra) coins attest to cults of the eponymous nymph and Nike, who seem to have become assimilated (Lacroix (1965) 126; Rutter (1997) 61–62). A cult of the local nymph Pandina may be indicated by C4 bronze issues, perhaps reflecting the influence of Hipponion (Giannelli (1963) 171–74).

In all probability, a citizen of Terina was victorious at Olympia in 392: the victor’s full name has been corrupted, but Africanus gives Τεριναίος as his first name, and the victor was thus probably from Terina (see Olympionikai 376).

Terina commenced minting c.460; c.460–440 there are three main issues of staters and fractions on the Achaian standard: (a) staters: obv. head of river-nymph Terina, legend: TEPINA; rev. standing wingless Nike holding branch, legend: NIKA, within an olive wreath (Holloway and Jenkins (1983) no. 1; Rutter, HN3 2567); (b) staters: obv. as above, but later style; rev. standing winged Nike with branch and wreath (Holloway and Jenkins (1983) nos. 2–3; Rutter, HN3 2568); (c) staters: similar types, but Nike on rev. has raised arms (Holloway and Jenkins (1983) no. 4; Rutter, HN3 2569; SNG Cop. Italy 1994). Smaller denominations are drachms: obv. as above, legend TEPEI; rev. winged Nike standing facing; diobols have legend TEPE cruciﬁum on rev. (Holloway and Jenkins (1983) nos. 6–8; Rutter, HN3 2571–73). By C3 and C4f types are obv. head of Terina; rev. winged Nike seated on amphora, cippus or four-legged seat in various attitudes and holding various attributes (ball, bird, kerykeion), on some issues a phiale with which she pours a libation or draws water from a fountain—a merging of the river-nymph Terina and Nike. From c.440, legend TEPINAION; on C4f issues legend TEPINAION, and, on some issues, rev. TEPINA (Holloway and Jenkins (1983) 10–93; Rutter, HN3 2574ff, 2627ff; SNG Cop. Italy 1995–2013; SNG Cop. Suppl. 58). Smaller fractions are drachms, triobols, diobols and obols, with similar types and legends: TE, TEPE, TEPI (Holloway and Jenkins (1983) 25–29, 70; Rutter, HN3 2631–32, 2634–42; SNG Cop. Italy 2014–27). Bronze coinage was introduced C4f (Holloway and Jenkins (1983) nos. 119–28; Rutter, HN3 2644ff), with similar types (SNG Cop. Italy 2032–34), or with rev. crab, or hare, or hippocamp (SNG Cop. Italy 2035–41); other types: obv. lion mask; rev. head of Apollo (SNG Cop. Suppl. 59); one issue has obv. head of goddess Pandina, legend: ΠΑΝΑΙΝΑ, shared with coins of Hipponion; rev. winged seated Nike (Holloway and Jenkins (1983) no. 125; Rutter, HN3 2650).

74. Thourioi (Thourios) Map 46. Lat. 39.45, long. 16.30. Size of territory: 3/4. Type: A. The toponym is Θούριος, oi (Thuc. 6.61.6; Pl. Euthydemos 271C; IG I2 4.1 95.43 (356/5)); Thuc. 6.104.2 may use Θουηρία as the name of the city (in contradistinction to the territory for which it is the usual Thucydidean name) and so may Ps.-Skylax (1953) for a full discussion of the toponym); Diod. 12.10.6 (1446) has Θούηροι besides his usual Θούριοι, which he uses in nine passages (e.g. 12.9.1; cf. Mir. ausc. 846ff.33). The city-ethnic is Θούριος (Thuc. 6.104.3; C5 coins, infra; IG I2 8895 (C4m); cf. Tod (1953) 202).

Thourioi is called a polis in the urban sense at Ps.-Skylax 13, and at Arist. Pol. 1303b26,CI Thourioi is the second of eight examples listed under the heading polis. Politeia is found in the sense of “citizenship” at Thuc. 6.104.2, and in the sense of “constitution” at Arist. Pol. 1307b30 and 1307b7; politeuein is found at Xen. Hell. 1.5.19. A C5 bronze kerykeion found at Brindisi is inscribed δαμάσων Θουηρίου, δαμάσων Βρεδισίων (IG XIV 672). It is called πάτρη (= patris) in the epitaph of Herodotos transmitted in Steph. Byz. 315.16–316.2.

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on coins from the 440s onwards (infra); the external collective use is found in IoV 254–56 (= ML 57 (c.440): Tarantine dedications of spoils taken from Thourioi; cf. Antiochos (FGrHist 555) fr. 11); Thuc. 7.33.6; Pl. Leg. 636B; and Arist. Pol. 1307b6; and the external individual use is found in Xen. An. 5.1.2, IG II2 8895 (C4m), CID II 23.8 (341/0) and ILindos 2.C.38 (C1rC5).

The foundation of Thourioi was the outcome of a process which began with an appeal in 446 by refugee Sybarites (Diod. 11.90.3–4) to Sparta (no. 345) and Athens (no. 361) for assistance and reinforcement in their attempt to re-create their city and community in the face of Krotoniate opposition (Diod. 12.10.3; for the sources of Diodorus, see Rutter (1973) and De Sensi Sestito (1976); see also Sybaris (no. 70.IV)). This request was granted by the Athenians, who sent ten ships, partly manned by Peloponnesians (Diod. 12.10.4; Ehrenberg (1965) 301). This expedition may have
been led by the Athenians Lampon and Xenokrates (Diod. 12.10.4), but most scholars (cf. infra) refer their participation to the 444/3 foundation of Thourioi proper (infra). In this initial phase of the foundation of Thourioi, Sybaris was reinforced by Athenians and Peloponnesians (Diod. 12.10.4), and seems indeed still to have been called, and located at, Sybaris (coins; cf. RE iv. 1008; Rutter (1973) 163). The community was strongly dominated by Sybarites. However, their claims to privileges in political, cultic and economic spheres of life resulted in a serious stasis, and they were put to death almost to the last man or expelled, thus paving the way for the foundation of Thourioi proper (Diod. 12.11.1–4; cf. Arist. Pol. 1303b31–33). These events probably occurred in 445/4 (Diod. 12.22.1). The foundation proper of Thourioi followed in 444/3 (in the archonship of Praxiteles: Ps.-Plut. X orat. 835D; cf. Dion. Hal. Lys. 1.2). According to Diod. 12.11.3, the victors of the stasis themselves sent to Hellas for new settlers; Ps.-Plut. X orat. 835D seems to think that Athens was in charge of the foundation, whereas Dion. Hal. Lys. 1.2 says that the colonists were sent by Ἀθηναίων τε καὶ Ἑλλάς. Diodorus’ description of the initial system of phylai (infra) confirms that settlers had a wide variety of origins (12.11.3; cf. 12.35.1: ἐκ πολλῶν πολέων; on Athens’ role in the foundation, see Rutter (1973) 164–67, arguing that it has been exaggerated). It was, presumably, this second group of colonists from the mainland that was led by Lampon and Xenokrates (cf. Kagan (1969) 158; De Sensi Sestito (1984a) 81), though Diod. 12.10.4 is then guilty of confusion unless these men led both expeditions. Lampon is named as the oikistes by Plut. Mor. 812D, though other sources describe him as a mantis or exegetes (see refs. in Kagan (1969) 168 n. 36) performing only a temporary task (see Graham (1964) 36–37; Leschhorn (1984) 132–33; and Malkin (1987) 254–57). The identity of the oecist was, in fact, a matter of dispute which in 434 led to a stasis that was solved by reference to the Delphic oracle, which declared that Apollo himself should be recognised as the oecist (Diod. 12.35.3).

The name of the territory was Θουρία (Thuc. 6.61.7) or Θουρώας γῆ (Thuc. 7.35.1); it is termed χώρα at Arist. Pol. 1307b29ff. Almost immediately after its foundation the city engaged in extensive warfare, presumably to secure control of a sizeable territory. The Spartan exile Kleandridas became a citizen of Thourioi (Thuc. 6.104.2) and led campaigns against Terina (no. 73) (Polyaen. 2.10.1), and this may attest to territorial ambitions on the Tyrrhenian coast. Kleandridas also led Thourian forces against the Leukanians (Polyaen. 2.10.2) and was likewise the commander in a war against Taras (no. 71) (Diod. 12.23.2 (r444)) in which both cities struggled for influence in the Siritis (Antiochos (FGrHist 555) fr. 11). Deductions by Taras at Olympia c.440 of spoils taken from Thourioi (IvO 254–56 = ML 57) attest to some Tarantine success, and the territorial conflict was finally ended c.434 by an agreement to found a joint colony, though in the name of Taras (Antiochos, loc. cit.;) the colony developed into the city of Herakleia (no. 52). Lambl. VP 264 attests to C5s hostilities between Thourioi and Kroton (cf. Guzzo (1986) 201), but according to Diod. 12.11.3 Thourioi established philia with Kroton, presumably not long after the foundation.

Smaller agricultural settlements, some in the form of single villas, are above all known from the C4–C3 territory (Osanna (1992) 148–49; Guzzo (1997) 379). The border between Thourian and Leukanian/Brettian territory is not very clear; the southern Brettian site at Castiglione di Paludi is interpreted as a Brettian military installation (Osanna (1992) 146–49; De Sensi Sestito (1992) 350–53). The border was marked by a row of Thourian phouria, such as the one at Torre Mordillo, where a lead seal carrying the inscription ΘΥΩΥΙΣ- is found (Colburn (1977) 478, 521), and the one at Sierra Castello (Guzzo (1986) 203). One phourion is known by name: Lagaria, located somewhere inland μετὰ Θουρίων (Strabo 14.6.14), as yet not identified with certainty but sometimes identified with the settlement at Amendolara (cf. de La Genière (1991b)). Phourioi, presumably the personnel manning these installations, are referred to by Arist. Pol. 1307b9. Nothing is known of the size of the population, the only available figures being army numbers (infra).

Thourioi was a member of the Italiote League (Diod. 14.9.11 (r393) and 101.1 (r390); Staatsverträge 230). Some kind of treaty with Kroton (no. 56) soon after the foundation is implied by Diod. 12.11.3. The C5s bronze kerykeion inscribed δαµόσιον Θουρίων, δαµόσιον Βρενδεσίων and found at Brindisi (IG xiv 672) may also testify to some formalised collaboration between the two communities, possibly during the conflict between Taras and Thourioi in the period prior to the foundation of Herakleia in 434 (Antiochos (FGrHist 555) fr. 11; De Simone (1956)). This conflict itself was also ended by a treaty (Antiochos (FGrHist 555) fr. 11 = Staatsverträge 158). According to Thuc. 7.33.6, Athens (no. 361) in 413 negotiated for a full alliance with Thourioi; whether a treaty was concluded is unclear, but Thourioi did assist the Athenian effort against Syracuse (no. 47) (Thuc. 7.35.1, 57.11; cf. Diod. 13.11.1 (r413)). However, after the Athenian defeat at Syracuse, Thourioi is found assisting Sparta (no. 345) with naval forces.
(Thuc. 8.35.1, 61.2; Xen. Hell. 1.5.9), which implies a treaty. In 389 the city suffered a severe defeat by the Leukadians but managed to conclude peace via the mediation of Leptines of Syracuse (Diod. 14.101.1–102.3). A little after 379, Dionysios I sent a navy against Thourioi without success (Ael. VH 12.61 with Jacquemin (1979)). Collaboration with Corinthian forces sent out to reinforce Timoleon is attested at Plut. Tim. 16.2. In 356 the city was subdued by the Brettians (Diod. 16.15.2; cf. Plut. Tim. 16.2).

In 413, Thourioi assisted the Athenian attack on Syracuse with 700 hoplites and 300 akontistai (Thuc. 7.35.1). Naval forces (ten ships) are attested at Thuc. 8.35.1, commanded by Dorieus tritos autos (cf. Thuc. 8.61.2 and Xen. Hell. 1.5.19). A contingent of 14,000 pezoi and c.1,000 horse is recorded by Diod. 14.101.2 (1390). A board of strategoi was elected by the assembly (τὸν δήμον . . . χειροτονώντα); a law stipulated a five-year period between strategiai; but the law was repealed, and this started off a process by which the constitution developed into a dynasteia of the young reformers (Arist. Pol. 1307b6–19). Plato may allude to this event at Leg. 636B, where he describes gymnasia and sysitia as breeding grounds of young citizens inclined to revolution. The Spartan exile Kleanididas became a citizen of Thourioi (Thuc. 6.104.2; Plut. Per. 22.3) and served as strategos in wars against Taras (Strabo 6.1.14), Terina and the Leukadians (Polyaen. 2.10.1–2).

Reception of envoys is recorded by Thuc. 6.104.2 and sending of envoys by Diod. 14.101.2 (1390). F.Delphes iii.11.4 388 (325–300) may possibly be a grant by Delphi (no. 177) of proxeny, etc. to a man of Thourioi. A man of Thourioi was granted hereditary citizenship and other honours by Zelea (no. 764) in the Propontis c.330–300 (AM 9 (1884) 58–60 no. 3 = Michel 531). Theorokotai of Epidauros (no. 348) at Thourioi are attested by IG iv.1 95.11.43, 52 (C4m).

A system of phylai was established soon after the foundation, in which the citizens were enrolled on the basis of their origin; the ten phylai were named: Arkas, Achaïs, Eleia, Boiotia, Amphiktyonias, Doris, Ias, Aethnai, Euboïs and Nesiotis (Diod. 12.11.3; see Jones, POAG 165–67).

According to Diod. 12.11.3–4, Thourioi was founded as a democracy, and the city’s law code was drawn up by Charondas of Thourioi (apparently a namesake of the famous lawmaker of the Archaic period, pace Mühl, Klio 22 (1929) 439), but Heraclid. Pont. tells us that it was Protagoras of Abdera who wrote the laws (fr. 150, Wehrli = Diog. Laert. 9.8.50). It has been suggested that he based his laws on those of Charondas and Zaleukos (De Sensi Sestito (1984a) 82).

Several staseis are recorded (Berger (1992) 33–34); one involved the identity of the oecist (Diod. 12.35.3 (1434)) and in another anti-Athenians were defeated and exiled (Thuc. 7.33.5–6; Berger (1992) 33). In 413, however, after the Athenian defeat at Syracuse, 300 pro-Athenians were exiled, one of them Lysias (Dion. Hal. Lys. 1; Plut. Mor. 835E). Aristotle refers to two further staseis, both perhaps posterior to 413: the first (Pol. 1307b27–33) is given as an example of change from oligarchy in the direction of democracy: the passage testifies to the existence of a property qualification for office holding (archai); the qualification was lowered and the number of magistrates (archeia) increased after pressure from the demos the chronological reference is uncertain (De Sensi Sestito (1992) 344ff: 440s; Berger (1992) 33–34: c.413). The city seems to have attempted control of land ownership, even among its own citizens; but large landholdings were acquired unconstitutionally by the gororimoi and had to be given up by the owners after a stasis (Arist. Pol. 1307b29–33; Jacquemin (1979)).

The second passage (Pol. 1307b6–19) describes a process by which the constitution developed (from a democracy?) into a dynasteia of young military leaders (supra); the chronological reference is again uncertain. The passage testifies to the existence of symboloi; they seem to have been entrusted with general supervision of the constitution; the passage also refers to archontes in general.

Thourioi was situated on part of the site of Archaic Sybaris (no. 70.1), and the assertion by Diod. 12.10.3 (cf. Strabo 6.1.13) that the city was moved to another site is not convincing in view of the archaeological evidence. According to Diod. 12.10.6 (CfS), the city had a circuit wall, not archaeologically attested so far. The city was laid out with four plateiai and three stenopoi, named respectively Herakleia, Aphrodisia, Olympias, Dionysias, and Heroa, Thuria, Thurina (Diod. 12.10.7; Castagnoli (1971); for the textual problems, see Vallet (1976) 1030–32; Lapini (1997)). Hippodamos is called Thourian in some traditions, and the town plan of Thourioi has been attributed to him, though the tradition is ambiguous (see e.g. E. Greco (1997)). Whether the streets named by Diodorus correspond to twelve city quarters distributed to the tribes, also listed by Diodorus (supra), is doubtful (Vallet (1976) 1027–28), but the overall orthogonal urban layout as described by Diodorus has found confirmation in the archaeological evidence: the C3l–C4f city plan was orthogonal, and the sporadic remains of habitation are oriented according to the urban layout (infra; cf. E. Greco (1997) 457–58; recent investigation of Hippodamian layout: E. Greco and Luppino (1999)). The technique of construction of the sparse habitation remains is rather similar to that of Archaic Sybaris (Guzzo (1988–89) 20–23, 87,178, 240–48, 290–304, 365). There
are overall traces of a levelling of the remains of the Sybarite phase in preparation for the foundation of Thourioi (ibid. 23). An east–west-oriented plateia, going back to the time of foundation (ibid. 20), terminated near the coast in C4(? harbour structures of uncertain use (Zancani Montuoro (1972–73))). Remains of public architecture are meagre, and the extant structures are mainly ascribable to Roman Copia. The agora is mentioned at Theophr. fr. 97, but the tradition that Herodotos was buried there is rejected outright by Jacoby (RE suppl. ii. 214), although there can be no doubt that Herodotos was a citizen of Thourioi (Arist. Rh. 1409*28) and probably moved to Thourioi in 444/3 (Plut. Mor. 604F).

A cult of Athena may be inferred from coin types (infra). A cult of Boreas was instituted by decree in C4f (Ael. VH 12.61) after this divinity had wrecked a navy of Dionysios I on its way to Thourioi; Boreas was voted citizenship, and an annual festival instituted (Jacquemin (1979)). The cults of Sybaris and Thourioi are not always easily separated (cf. Giannelli (1961) 101–16). The cult of Hera is documented for Sybaris (see Sybaris (no. 70.1)) and may have continued in Thourioi, though the coin type of Hera Lakinia (infra) probably has no connection with the Sybarite cult of Hera (cf. Giannelli (1963) 103). C3 numismatic evidence may suggest at least C3 cults of Apollo, Demeter and Artemis (SNG Cop. Italy 1507–10, 1513–18). A cult of Apollo is also suggested by the tradition of Apollo as the oikistes (supra; and cf. Giannelli (1963) 105). The division of Thourioi into quarters by streets named after Herakles, Aphrodite, the Olympian Zeus and Dionysos (Diod. 12.10.7) may indicate cults of these deities. A cult of Diomedes at Thourioi is attested at Polemon, FGH III 122 no. 23.

Communal consultation of the Delphic oracle is recorded in Diod. 12.35.3 (r.434). Syll.3 295 (C4) is a Delphic decree confirming an earlier grant of promanteia to Thourioi (Roux (1990); Gauthier, BE (1991) 486–87 no. 306). A grant by an individual Thourian towards the rebuilding of the Delphic temple is recorded in CID 11 23.8 (341/40).

Damon of Thourioi was victorious at Olympia in 376 (Olympionikai 403: stadion race) and in 372 (Olympionikai 407: stadion). The Rhodian exile Dorieus won several Panhellenic victories also at Nemea, Isthmia and Delphi (Syll.3 82; Olympia 332); he was a Thourian citizen (Xen. Hell. 1.5.19) and participated at Olympia, etc. as a Thourian (Paus. 6.7.4), as did his relative Peisidoros (ibid.; Olympia 356); cf. Pugliese Carratelli (1972–73) 29.

Thourioi struck coins in silver from c.440 on the Achaean standard; denominations: distaters, staters and triobols (Rutter (1979) 44–45; Rutter, HN3 p. 146). Thourioi took over the types of Sybaris (no. 70.IV) with some changes: obv. head of Athena wearing Attic helmet, reflecting Athenian influence; rev. bull, derived from Sybaris but with butting head, or, later, charging, and with fish in exergue. Legend on rev. ΘΟΥΡΙΩΝ; some issues have initials or symbols of magistrates or names of die-engravers (Rutter, HN3 1770ff; SNG Cop. Italy 1405–30, 1432–63 (distaters, staters); 1470–88 (triobols)). The exceptionally abundant issues of distaters and staters suggests that Thourioi had ample stocks of silver, perhaps in the form of bullion brought from Athens (Kraay (1976) 184–85). One specimen has obv. head of Hera Lakinia, a Kampanian type and a unique example of die sharing by a Kampanian mint and a Thourian mint (Rutter (1979) 60–61; Rutter, HN3 1796; SNG Cop. Italy 1431). Bronzes were issued early and nearly contemporary with the silver coinage, employing the same types (Rutter, HN3 1903ff; SNG Cop. Italy 1494–1506).
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I. The Region

The long arm of the Adriatic Sea extends for c.800 km northwards with an average breadth of 175 km. In the south at its narrowest point the Straits of Otranto are 75 km wide, while further north the screen of islands along the east (Dalmatian) shore reduces the width of open space to c.150 km. The east coast is rocky with long sections of steep cliffs, but it has many inlets and bays, while on the west the Italian shore is low and generally devoid of safe anchorages. In the north the delta of the river Po, whose silting has advanced the coast several miles since antiquity (cf. already Strabo 5.1.7), is flanked by marshy lagoons. The peninsula of Istria (Dalmatian) shore reduces the width of open space to c.50 km. In the south, the delta of the river Adria and the city Adria (for further analyses, see Braccesi (1977) 64–66; Vattuone (2000) esp. 14, 36–37).

There were close and reciprocal cultural contacts across the Adriatic between the neighbouring regions of Apulia and southern Illyria from the prehistoric and through the historic periods. The tradition of Cretan settlers in the lower Adriatic seems to reflect contacts between Iapygia and Illyria (Strabo 6.3.2; Hellan. fr. 79; cf. analysis by Nenci (1978) 50–58 with sources), and even a common origin of Iapygian and Illyrian tribes is widely acknowledged (ibid. 51). Daunian pottery is found northwards along the western Adriatic coast in Picenum and as far north as the Po delta, in Istria and along the eastern Adriatic coast of modern Slovenia, Bosnia and Croatia. Bronzes and other objects from the various Balkan cultures are widely represented in finds from the Salento peninsula and at Otranto, and a C8–C6 “cultural koiné” has been suggested for the eastern and western Adriatic (cf. also Colonna (1974) 16 n. 60; D’Andria (1982) 110–14; Landolfi (1987)); even the Illyrian and Messapian languages are to some extent similar (Wilkes (1992) 68–69).

According to Hdt. 4.49, Illyria extended from Epeiros to Venetia, whereas Illyris occupied a more restricted region according to Ps.-Skylax 22. (For the political geography of the eastern Adriatic as it was known to the C4 Greek world, with an analysis of the relevant passages in Ps.-Skymnos and Ps.-Skylax, see Wilkes (1992) 91–104.) Greek pottery from indigenous tombs and the type of architecture employed in the settlement fortifications show the penetration of Greek influence into the Illyrian hinterland. A survey of early contacts with the Greek world, from before the C7 colonisation and later through the C6 and C5, with an account of the settlement pattern and urban development of the single Illyrian sites is found in Ceka (1983) and Wilkes (1992). The Greek colonisers at Apollonia and Epidamnos...
found developed proto-urban societies in the territory chosen for their foundations, and the colonies in the Adriatic were for this reason few in number and in any case limited to the coastal zones (Wilkes (1992)).

The first Greek records of the area and its indigenous peoples appear to have been compiled in C6 (names of local peoples survive from the works of Hekataios of Miletos (fr. 86–97)), and one poet of C7 (Alcm. fr. 172) already knew of the Adriatic (V)eneti. None of the early writers specifies a historical Greek presence north of Epidamnos (no. 79) before the end of C6, but there seems little doubt there was such a presence, whether of established traders or colonisers. The contemporary historical record commences with Herodotos, while Thucydides furnishes much detail about the affairs of Epidamnos, including the role of the Illyrian Taulantii in their internal conflicts.

In the south-western Adriatic, Iapygia (comprising the Salentine peninsula and, in some sources, the Gargano) was traditionally subdivided into the territory of the Daunians and, in some sources, the Gargano) was traditionally subdivided into the territory of the Daunians and, in some sources, the Gargano) was traditionally subdivided into the territory of the Daunians and, in some sources, the Gargano) was traditionally subdivided into the territory of the Daunians and, in some sources, the Gargano) was traditionally subdivided into the territory of the Daunians, Taulantii in their internal conflicts.

the affairs of Epidamnos, including the role of the Illyrian Taulantii in their internal conflicts.

According to Hdt. 4.99, Iapygia comprised the Salentine peninsula from Leuca in the south to a line between Brentesion (no. 78) and Taras (no. 71) in the north. According to Thuc. 7.370, the Messapians were an Iapygian tribe. Messapian culture, as revealed by the diffusion of the Messapian language, is also represented further north in Peuketia and Daunia. For Ps.-Skylax 14, Iapygia comprised also the Greek cities of Herakleia (no. 52), Metapontion (no. 61) and Taras (no. 71); analysis of the ancient sources: Nenci (1978) 43–50; Lamboley (1996) 304–6.

Iapygia was wide open to Greek influence from across the Ionian Sea, but its urbanised settlements formed a bulwark against Greek foundations, of which there are only few examples, see infra. Daunians participated on the side of the Etruscans in the 524/3 conflict with Kyme (no. 57) (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.3–4), and the strength of the Cype Messapian settlements is attested by their defeat of Taras in 473 and the subsequent Iapygian expedition as far as Rhegion (no. 68). Though the outcome of this—the conquest of Rhegion, according to Diod. 11.52—may have been exaggerated in the sources, it does at least reflect the military strength of some Messapian cities.

According to Strabo 6.3.5, the Peuketians and Daunians had the same origin as the Iapygians, though epigraphy has shown a strong Oaskan element in Daunian culture. The region of Daunia and Peuketia is also without Greek colonies—apart from the uncertain example of Hyria in the Peuketia and Daunia. For Ps.-Skylax 14, Iapygia comprised also the Greek cities of Herakleia (no. 52), Metapontion (no. 61) and Taras (no. 71); analysis of the ancient sources: Nenci (1978) 43–50; Lamboley (1996) 304–6.

Iapygia was wide open to Greek influence from across the Ionian Sea, but its urbanised settlements formed a bulwark against Greek foundations, of which there are only few examples, see infra. Daunians participated on the side of the Etruscans in the 524/3 conflict with Kyme (no. 57) (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.3–4), and the strength of the Cype Messapian settlements is attested by their defeat of Taras in 473 and the subsequent Iapygian expedition as far as Rhegion (no. 68). Though the outcome of this—the conquest of Rhegion, according to Diod. 11.52—may have been exaggerated in the sources, it does at least reflect the military strength of some Messapian cities.

According to Strabo 6.3.5, the Peuketians and Daunians had the same origin as the Iapygians, though epigraphy has shown a strong Oaskan element in Daunian culture. The region of Daunia and Peuketia is also without Greek colonies—apart from the uncertain example of Hyria in the

Gargano. However, Greek influence is documented by the cult of Diomedes at Argyrippa and at other sites. But even so, the Peuketians are seen as quite different from the Oinotrians, who were more in contact with the Greek colonies of Siris (no. 69) and Metapontion (no. 61) (cf. Hecat. fr. 89 and later sources; Lamboley (1996) 305–6). The mid-Adriatic region of the Pikenoi (Picenum) and the Ombricians (Umbria) has in recent years seen a spate of research revealing the extent of Greek contacts. The earliest evidence of Attic imports at Numana and at other sites in the Picene region dates to c.520–510, and is therefore somewhat later than that known at the Padanian sites of Spina (no. 85) and Adria (no. 75). The region functioned as a commercial intermediary between Greece and Etruria, and the Celtic regions in the north (Landolfi (1987), (2000)).

The Adriatic coast of Italy from Apulia to Picenum and Umbria is with few exceptions not so well provided with natural harbours as the coast of Illyria and Epeiros (cf. Strabo 7.5.10). Apart from the good harbours of Ankon and Numana, there is evidence of other ports of call along the mid-Adriatic coast at Santa Marina di Focara, at Pisauro and at Ariminum, where finds of Greek pottery confirm visits and coastal trade, probably to be seen in the perspective of the Greek trade with Spina and Adria (Luni (1982) esp. 68–75, (1995)). The sites of Spina and Adria in Etruria Padana are discussed in the site entries.

Etruscan thalassocracy in the Adriatic, undoubtedly weakened by Hieron's victory at Kyme in 474 (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.2). The Adriatic became wide open to Greek trade from C6s, perhaps no less intense than that of the Tyrrhenian coast, as shown by pottery and other Greek products from the indigenous settlements in the hinterland, see supra. Whether to define the status of these settlements, and above all that of Spina and Adria, which provide the most evidence, as trading stations—emporia rather than as fully-fledged foundations, apoikiai or poleis—may in the future be answered only by a close analysis of the political and social organisation (cf. entries).

There are no grounds for the notion, advanced from time to time, that Greeks of Archaic and Classical times were repelled from penetrating the Adriatic by the climate or by the hostility of the inhabitants. From the time when Phokaian navigators first explored it (Hdt. 1.163), the Adriatic was as much open to Greek seafarers as it was in a later age to the Venetians, who, relying on ships of basically
similar design, controlled it for centuries. Nor does it seem that organised piracy was a significant deterrent before C₄. The Illyrian power of Agron and Teuta, which arose in C₃, was reputedly the first organised threat to Adriatic shipping to come from that quarter (Polyb. 2.2.4). Native hostility to the Greek settlement on Pharos (no. 84) in C₄ (Diod. 15.14.2) appears to have been a local quarrel, and not a symptom of general hostility to the Greek presence in the area (later the two groups were to unite against Roman and Italian settlers). Etruscan expansion towards the Po in C₆ might have proved as hostile to Greek activity on the eastern shore of Italy as it had on the west, but the volume of commerce which appears to have passed through Spina seems to negate this, while the other local groups (Piceni, Umbri and Veneti) offered the prospect of stable relationships.

Several hero cults connected with the aftermath of the Trojan War recall early voyages of exploration. That of Diomedes is centred on his burial on the Tremitic islands (Insulae Diomedeae) north of Monte Gargano, which over the ages has been the landfall for many approaching Italy from the south-east. His cult is found also at many places in central and southern Italy but was concentrated among the Peuketioi in northern Apulia; it also appears on the east coast at Melaina Korkyra (no. 83), and in central Dalmatia the promontory between Split and Šibenik (Cape Ploča¹) bore his name. He was also worshipped among the Umbrians at Spina and Adria, and further north among the (V)eneti near the source of the river Timavus deep in the Gulf of Trieste.

The tale of the exploits of Diomedes, playing the role of oecist at various sites in Daunia (Fantasia (1972) 115–19) and at Adria and Spina, and his conflict with the Achaeans along the eastern and western Adriatic coast (Strabo 5.1.8–9, 6.3.9), with a temple in his honour at Ankon (no. 76), has been attributed to the influence of Syracuse (no. 47). The C₄ foundations of Dionysios I corresponded in large measure to those of Diomedes, reflecting a wish to legitimise the Adriatic ambitions of the Syracusan dynast (Braccesi (1977); Briendel (1987); Coppola (1988)). But the cult of Diomede is the Adriatic has a history going back to the late C₆. The dedicatory graffiti to Diomedes and, probably, to Athena on C₆–C₅ Attic sherds from the island of Palagruža in the Adriatic between the Gargano and the coast of Croatia have recently revealed a sanctuary of Diomedes; this has with near certainty identified the islands as the nesoi Diomedeiai, where the hero had his tomb (Strabo 6.3.9; Plin. HN 3.151).

The graffiti are valuable evidence for a Greek trade route along the lower Illyrian coast, across the middle Adriatic and along the western Adriatic to Spina (no. 85) and Adria (no. 75); Kirk and Cane (1998); Colonna (1998)).

A healing cult associated with Podosilvs at Monte S. Angelo at the southern end of Gargano (Strabo’s Drion) was already known in C₄. Its oracular or divinatory role may have passed to a shrine of a local Daunian hero later identified with the seer Kalchas on the same hill.

On the east shore the legend of Kadmos the Phoenician, who with his queen Harmonia migrated from Thebes to rule the Illyrian Enchelei around Lake Ohrid, was at least as old as C₅. He was credited with founding Lychnidos (Ohrid) and Bouthoe (Budva) on the coast of Montenegro. He was also linked with northern Epeiros, and further north with a local serpent cult at a place named Epidaurum (Cavt near Dubrovnik). The tale of Phaethon, son of Helios, whose misadventure with the horses of the solar chariot caused Zeus to destroy him with a thunderbolt, ended with his fall into the river Eridanos, where his grieving sisters were transformed into amber-dropping trees. An identification with the river Po had already been made in C₆, while the name of Hesiod’s Elektrides (Amber Islands) which lay at its mouth was later attached to islands in the Quarnero (modern Cres and Lošinj). The story that the elderly and wise Trojan Antenor brought the leaderless Enets from Paphlagonia to a home at the head of the Adriatic (he was later identified as founder of Patavium) was current in C₅e. Though he appears also at Melaina Korkyra (no. 83), the whole notion is likely to be a fiction based on a coincidence between the names of the Enets of Asia Minor and the Adriatic Veneti.²

By C₄ some islands in the Quarnero had been named Apsyrtides after Apsyrtos, the ill-fated brother of Jason of the Argonauts. The fantastic tale of their return voyage by a branch of the Danube (Danuvius) which flowed into the head of the Adriatic, described by Apollonios Rhodios, can only be explained by the coincidence of the names Istria and Ister, the Greek name for the lower Danube, though the notion of a Danube–Adriatic passage appears to have been current in C₅. Similar coincidences can explain the alleged Colchian foundation of Ulcinjon (Ulcinj) on the coast of Montenegro and their settlement further south at Orikos in the Bay of Vlora. Colchians are also credited with the foundation of Pola near the southern tip of Istra. There is no reason to doubt the assumption that all Greek contact with

¹ For remains of a sanctuary here, see Dujmušić (2002).
² For the tradition of Aineias at Melaina Korkyra, see Vanetti (2002).
the Adriatic was by sea from the south. Tales of overland contacts, though often repeated, have a consistently fantastic quality. One might explain the tale, repeated by Strabo 7.5.9, that pottery from Thasos (no. 526) and Chios (no. 840) could be found in the bed of the river Neretva as one of the miracles of rivers in the limestone karst of Dalmatia, which suddenly disappear underground and resurface on the other side of a mountain range. In the same category must be placed a story that ships sailing in the Black Sea were visible from a mountain near the Adriatic at a gap in which there was a market where the goods of Lesbos, Thasos and Chios coming from the direction of the Black Sea could be exchanged for the amphorae of Korkyra coming from the Adriatic (Arist. Mir. aunc. 104). Like the fantasy of a passage into the Adriatic from the Danube, the stories were perhaps based on the strange behaviour of rivers, coincidences of names, and the equations of Greek and local myths. More intriguing is Herodotos’ story of the offerings to Delian Apollo by the Hyperboreans (4.33). Wrapped in wheat-straw these were passed into Skythia and then through a succession of different peoples, which seems an authentic echo of the mechanics of prehistoric trade. Their journey continued westward as far as the Adriatic, where they first came into Greek hands at Dodona in Epeiros. One interpretation is that the offerings were pieces of amber which had travelled the well-established route between the Baltic and the head of the Adriatic, but the embellishment of the tale arose from a wish to demonstrate that the fame of Delos had spread even beyond the limits of the known world.

Tales of Kadmos the Phoenician in the Adriatic have from time to time encouraged notions of a Phoenician presence, but evidence to support this has proved hard to find, and the first historical record of a Greek is the tradition of Cretans in Iapygia preserved by Herodotos, while Hydrous (Ortranto), described as ἄλμεθν ... ἐπὶ τῷ τοῦ Αὔρειου ἵ τῷ τοῦ Ἰονίου κόλπου στόματι in C4 by Ps.-Skylax 14, also had a Cretan foundation legend, though no similar traditions are attached to Barion (Bari) (Andreassi and Cataldi (1984)) or nearby Neapolis (Menchelli et al. (1996)), both of which later struck coins with Greek legends. The first fully documented Greek presence is that of the Eretrians of Euboia, who had preceded the Corinthians on Melaina Korkyra, where they had enjoyed better relations with the local inhabitants, and also established a settlement on the island of Orikos in the Gulf of Vlora (= Vlora above?), which controlled several routes to the interior.

The mineral wealth of the region is often taken as the economic reason behind the Syracusan C₄ expansion into the upper Adriatic, but the evidence is not unequivocal. The passage in Strabo 7.7.8 referring to the silver mines of Damastion is often used as evidence of mineral riches, but these may not be so relevant for Illyria. The coinage of Damastion (May (1939)), bullion rather than commercial according to Schwabacher (1943), reveals kinship with the coinage of the cities of Chalkidike, e.g. Olynthos (no. 588), rather than with that of Corinth (no. 227) and Illyria (most recently Ceka (1994b)). Bitumen, timber (Meiggs (1982) 355–56) and slaves were probably the merchandise traded.

In spite of their earlier hostility, Corinthians along with other Dorians collaborated with Korkyra (no. 123) in the foundation of Epidamnos (no. 79) in 627, a city known later as Dyrrhachion, where the main incentive may have been a closer access to the sources of Illyrian silver. The vigorous contests between factions linked with local peoples suggest a community that comprised a significant element of wealth based on commerce with the hinterland, which was partly under the control of a civic official. The settlement later known as Apollonia (no. 77) was founded by Corinthians around the end of C₇ and, like Epidamnos, was a point of departure for several routes inland and was also to receive additional settlers from Mainland Greece (historical surveys: Salmon (1984) 270–80; De Fidio (1994)). Famed for its rich pastures, the territorial expansion of Apollonia is implied in the dedication at Olympia of spoils from the destruction of the Euboian-Lokrian settlement at Thronion. During C₆ Corinthian products begin to appear around the northern Adriatic but not in the quantity of Attic products in the following century. In C₇ the Rhodians, already active in the colonisation of Sicily, joined with Kos in a settlement of Elpiai on the coast of northern Apulia, but there is no indication that it ever flourished or contributed significantly to any links with the local Daunians, who were evidently less receptive than their Messapian neighbours to the south. A late tradition attributes its foundation to Diomedes, along with Kanouision and Arpi, for which it served as a port, and a similar tradition existed for Sipous or Sipontion near Manfredonia, whose name was said to derive from the Greek word for cuttlefish (sepia). Hyria in Calabria was reputedly settled by Cretans returning from Sicily, while Hyrion (Uria) on the coast north of Gargano struck coins with a Greek legend, though only in C₃. The harbour of

³ Evidence of shipwrecks from C₅ is reviewed by Petrić (2002).

⁴ For Damastion, the sources of silver and the significance of the C₅ hoard from Hollm in Albania, see Cabanes (2002).
Brentesion (Brindisi (no. 78)) was never exploited before Roman times. Though doubtless known to Greek sailors (one tradition makes it a Cretan foundation, another attributes it to Aitolians under Diomedes) and also serving as occasional refuge to Tarentine exiles, the settlement at Brentesion, although remaining mainly in the hands of the Messapians, became somewhat assimilated to a Greek polis (see no. 78).

In C8 Corinth, under the leadership of the Bakchiadai, initiated trading contacts in the lower Adriatic region attested by finds from Brentesion and Hydrous. There is testimony of Euboian and Corinthian imports from C8 and C7f in the settlements of the central Salentine—at Cavallino, Vaste, but above all at Hydrous; for a survey of Greek finds from the Salentine peninsula: D’Andria (1982), esp. 115–16 for C8 Corinthian material, (1984); Various authors (1994).

The first Greek settlement in Dalmatia apparently took place on Melaina Korkyra early in C6 when, in alliance against Periander of Corinth, Knidos (no. 903) with the support of Korkyra (no. 123) sent a colony to the island which they named in honour of their ally.

Greek imports to Etruscan settlements north of the Apennines, notably Felsina, began in C6 and probably reached there by way of Numana, perhaps at the same time that Sicilian exiles occupied the harbour at Ankon on the north side of Mt. Cornero in C4e. Further north lay the Veneti, with their distinctive culture, while to the south of the Etruscans in the Po valley dwelt the Umbrians and Piceni, whose principal settlements lay inland. They appear to have made little use of the harbour at Ankon, while their other settlements at Numana, Ariminum, Pisaurum and Ravenna never amounted to much. Strabo 5.1.7 records a settlement of Thessalians at Ravenna, perhaps attracted by the horses and rich soil of the region, but in spite of assistance from the Umbrians, the venture failed, perhaps because of hostility from the Etruscans.

A large volume of Greek goods reached the port of Spina (no. 85) and the Po valley, probably to the exclusion of any other area. A dedication of spoils in its treasury at Delphi may derive from a successful elimination of a local competitor in open warfare. Sailing from the Po was a constant threat to the city, but more damaging was the collapse of Etruscan power north of the Apennines in the face of the advancing Gauls.

According to Strabo 8.6.16, Aiginetans founded a colony en ombrikois, probably archaeologically attested in Adria (no. 75). Adria was a slightly later foundation and was never to match Spina in the volume of its commerce; yet it was to enjoy a longer history probably because of its superior location for longer distance trading in tin and similar products with northern and western Europe.

In Dalmatia the Knidian venture on Melaina Korkyra may have failed, but by C4e two colonies had become established in the islands of Pharos (Hyphar (no. 84)) and Issa (Vis, (no. 81)), both of which survived until the Roman conquest. In 385 Dionysios of Syracuse assisted the Parians to establish a settlement on Pharos, having already sent a colony to the Adriatic and founded “a city called Lissos” (no. 82) (Diod. 15.13.4). In the following year, after the native Illyrians had summoned help from the mainland against the Parians, the commander of Lissos came with a force of triremes and inflicted heavy losses on the Illyrians in their lighter ships. The place from which Dionysios’ fleet came could be the later Illyrian fortress of Lissos (Lezhe) at the mouth of the river Drin in northern Albania, which has an impressive circuit of late Hellenistic masonry fortifications, but is more likely to be in fact the other Greek colony in the area, Issa (Vis) on the island of the same name and known from other evidence to be a Syracuse foundation. Issa was the more successful of the two, later establishing settlements on Melaina Korkyra at Lumbarda, perhaps in C3, and on the mainland among the Illyrians at Epetion (Stobreč) and Tragourion (Trogir) which still existed in C2.

Dionysios I further secured his Syracusean Adriatic empire with new foundations in the eastern Adriatic at Ankon (no. 76), Spina (no. 85) and Adria (no. 75); the somewhat ambiguous term “Dionysios’ Adriatic empire” is widely employed in modern scholarship.

Pharos (no. 84) later fell under Illyrian control, while Issa (no. 81) maintained an independence which ended only when, according to one tradition, it persuaded the Romans to cross the Adriatic and crush the Illyrian power of Agron and Teuta. The first surviving Greek account of the Adriatic is the Periplus of c.330, attributed to Skylax of Karyanda, which contains some material of much earlier date (15–27). In addition to the names of native peoples and places, including several “cities” of the Liburnians in the north-east Adriatic and those of the main Greek settlements, the text records the Greek names for several of the lesser islands (Elektrides, Apsiytai, Mentorides, Proterius, Krateia, Olunta, Melite and Elaphites).

For archaeological evidence for Greek settlement, including walls and votives, see Kovačić (2002) and Babić (2002).

5 Greek imports in Istria and Kvarner are surveyed by Mihovilić (2002).
1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis

Bouthoe (Βουθόη, Βουθοή) Ps.-Skylax 24–25 (ἐπι-πάροικοι?); Euty. Magn. 207.13 (πόλεις τῆς Ἡλλανδίας); Steph. Byz. 219.39 (πόλεις Ἡλλανδίας). The few Greek remains are primarily from the Hellenistic-Roman cemetery (Papović and Popović Ljubiša (1996)). Barr. 49, C.


Hydrous ('Ηδροῦς, Ἰδρώεις) Ps.-Skylax 14 (Ἀμήνων), 27 (πόλεις ἐν τῇ Ἱπτυγία); Steph. Byz. 62.3 (Ἱπτυγίας πόλεις), 646.13 (πόλεις Ἰλαλίας); Strabo 6.3.5 (πολίξιν); Paus. 6.19.9. Allegedly founded by Cretans guided by Biennos (Steph. Byz. 169.3–4). Though Hellenised to some extent, it was principally an indigenous site, and almost all remains are Roman (D’Andria and Moreschini (1994); Lamboley (1996) 207–33). Barr. 45, AC.

Hyria (Ὑρία, Ἰρίη) Hdt. 7.170.2 (πόλεις); a lapygian-Messapian polis allegedly founded by the Cretans under Minos (Hdt. 7.170.2; cf. D’Andria (1993); Lamboley (1996) 120–35). Barr. 45, AC.

Kallipolis (Καλλιπόλες) Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 19.3 (ἐπώνευαν). Allegedly an apoikia of Leukippoos, but no Greek remains have been found (Lamboley (1996) 243–45). Barr. 45, AC.

Pellion (Πέλλιον; Pelion) Arr. Anab. 1.5.5 (πόλεις); Livy 31.40.4 (urbs). Pelion was a city in the Dassaretis (Hammond and Walbank (1988) 41 n. 1; Ceka (1990) fig. 1.20; Wilkes (1992) 123–24). Bosworth (1980) 68–70 argues that Arrian’s Pellion is Pella. Barr. 49, H, but C must be added, if the identity between Πέλλιον and Pelion is accepted.

Rhodai (Ῥωδαίας) Strabo 6.3.5 (πόλεις Ἐλληνικάς); Ptol. 3.1.67. A Messapian city partly Hellenised by C4 (Ciongoli (1990); Lamboley (1996) 171–81). Barr. 45, AC.

Thronion (Θρόνων) CEG 390 (C5m) = I.Apoll. 303; Paus. 5.22.3 (πόλισμα τυρκσμί). Unlocated but situated somewhere in the Abantis region, south-south-east of Apollonia, probably near Amantia (Hammond (1967) 384–85, 493–95, 523; Ceka (1990) 217); Cabanes (1995) 32. Barr. 49, C.

Planned but unlocated Athenian colony An Athenian decree of 325/4 lists ships and equipment for a colony (apoikia) in the Adriatic (IG II2 1629.165–271 = Tod 200). The location of the planned colony is unknown and a matter of conjecture—somewhere in the vicinity of Adria (no. 75) and Spina (no. 85), where Athens had strong C5 trade contacts, or on the coast of Apulia in the southern Adriatic. Possibly the settlement was never realised, though the use of the term epoikoi (224–25) may indicate that a foundation was indeed carried out (Braccesi (1977) 296–300); the term has even been taken to indicate a strengthening of an already existing emporion (Fantasia (1972) 337). The site-classification used in the decree is “naval station” (220: ναῦσταθµον).

The oecist was Miltiades of Lakiadai, probably a descendant of the younger Miltiades. The foundation was planned as a protection (φυλακή) against Tyrrenian pirates—by Tyrrenoi are probably meant Etruscans, though other meanings cannot be excluded (Braccesi (1977) 287–96). For the historical significance of the decree, see Vallet (1950); Fantasia (1972) 136–39; Braccesi (1977) 300–6; Leschhorn (1984) 186–88.

Two foundations by Dionysios the Younger Two colonies in Apulia founded by Dionysios II in 359/8 are mentioned by Diod. 16.5.3, but without any information about their names and locations. The purpose was protection against Illyrian pirates, and the foundations were most likely on the coast. The sites are unknown, but conjectures have been put forward, such as Hydrous, Istros, Neapolis and others (survey in Uggeri (2002) 312–13).

II. The Poleis

75. Adria Map. 40. Lat. 45.05, long. 12.05. Size of territory: ? Type: C/B. The toponym is Ἄδρια, ἦ (Hecat. fr. 90; Strabo 5.1.8, MSS) or Ἀδριά (Strabo 5.1.8; Steph. Byz. 143.16). The only source for a city-ethnic is Steph. Byz. 29.3–4. Hsch. s.v. Ἀδριανοῦ refers to the Celtic tribes living along the coastline of the Adriatic. Adria is called a polis in the urban sense by Strabo, once illustrous, but in his own times a polismation (5.1.8 (rC5–C4)); in Hecat. fr. 90 we have no guarantee that the classification of Adria as a polis stems from Hekataios.

Adria was possibly a Cél foundation of Aigina (no. 358), as indicated by some of the C5 dedicatory graffiti in the Aiginetan alphabet from the site, combined with Strabo 8.6.16: ἀποικοὺς δ’ ἔστηλαν Ἀγίνητας εἰς . . . Ὀμβρικοῦς (Colonna (1974); Dubois, IGDGG pp. 181–87);
however, a graffito in the Ionic alphabet is also known from the site (Johnston (1979)). The foundation myths are linked with the local dynast Adrios, son of Ionios (Theopomp. fr. 128) or with Diomedes (Steph. Byz. 143.16, see supra 000). In C4f Adria was, apparently, refounded by Dionysios I (Theopomp. fr. 128; Tzetzes ad Lyocophr. 631; Etym. Magn. 18.54–57). According to Just. Epit. 20.1.9, Adria was a Greek foundation (Graeca urbs); whereas the city was founded by the Etruscans according to Plutarch and other Roman sources (Plut. Cam. 16; Livy 5.33.7; Plin. HN 3.120).

Adria rose alongside an ancient branch of the river Po (between the Adige and the Po), in the territory of the Hetenikians (Venetians) (implicitly Strabo 5.1.7), today about 25 km from the coast of the Adriatic Sea, which took its name from the city (Strabo 5.1.8; cf. also 7.5.9), if not from the river Adria (Steph. Byz. 28.14–15). If the conjecture of an Aiginetan foundation (supra) is valid, Adria lay in the territory of the Ombriakians (Umbrians). However, the border-line between Venetian and Umbrian territory is rather fluid (cf. Colonna (1974) 11–12) and, according to Steph. Byz. 143.16, Adria was situated in Tyrrenia.

There are no extant urban Greek remains, though there are vestiges of housing structures in wood, as known from Venetian palafittic habitation structures. Attic sherds from the settlement area attest contact with the Greek world already from C6f, culminating in C5–C4, but decreasing in the course of C4 (Colonna (1974) 5; Giangiulio (1984) 44), and there is no archaeological evidence of a C385 foundation by Dionysios I. By C4m Adria fell victim to invasions by the Gauls (Ps.-Skylax 18.2, see Colonna (1974) 11–12; Peretti (1979) 201–2).

Dedicatory graffiti to Apollo (IGDGG no. 70) and Eris (?) (IGDGG no. 72) have revealed a Greek sanctuary, no other language being represented among the finds (Colonna (1974) 8–10). The archaeological evidence, including the nomenclature of the graffiti, suggests that C4 Syracusan settlers at Adria were anticipated by settlers from Aigina.

Evidence of public works is scarce; the philistina fossa of Plin. HN 3.16.120–23 has tentatively been interpreted as a canal or drainage system built by Philistos the Syracusan sent into exile by Dionysios I, with his residence at Adria(?). The evidence is tenuous, and Philistos may have been exiled in the Adriatic generally speaking or at Epeiros (Wikén (1937) 144–45; cf. Fogolari and Scarfi (1970) 36 n. 25). Extensive cemeteries east, south and south-west of the settlement are mainly C4 and Roman. Tombs from the Archaic period are so far rarely attested (Giangiulio (1984) 43).

As for the Late Classical period, it should be noted that the tradition found in Just. Epit 20.1.9: Adria . . . Graeca urbs, reflects the undoubted presence of Greeks at Adria, and the Greek foundation myth according to which Adria was founded by Diomedes (supra) may reflect a C4 attempt to legitimise Syracuse's Adriatic empire (Briquel (1987) 257–59).

Most likely we have to do with a Greek trading station in Etruscan-Venetian territory—the pre-Roman finds have revealed very strong ties with Etruscan culture; from C4s the site was occupied by the Gauls.

76. Ankon (Ankonites) Map 42. Lat. 43.35, long. 13.30. Size of territory: ? Type: Aββ, see infra. The toponym is Αιγκών, δ (Ps.-Skylax 16; Strabo 6.3.10). The city-ethnic is Αιγκώνειτης (L.Dyrh. 20 (C2–C1)) or Αγκώνειτης (SGDI 2612.3; Steph. Byz. 18.17–18, quoting Artemidoros). Ankon is called a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 16 and described retrospectively as a πόλις Ἑλληνικής by Strabo 5.4.2 (r387). The internal and collective use of the city-ethnic is probably attested in abbreviated form on some C3–C2 bronze coins (ΑΓΚΩΝ, ΣΝΓ Cop. Italy 82–83). The external and individual use is found in a Delphic proxeny decree of 167 (SGDI 2612.3).

According to Strabo 5.4.2, Ankon was colonised c387 by Syracusan refugees who had fled from Dionysios I, but the city may have been part of Dionysios' Adriatic empire, and he may have been responsible for the settlement (Woodhead (1970) 511–12; Braccesi (1977) 220–22). According to Plin. HN 3.111, Ankon was, with Numana, a foundation of the Sikelois, and according to Catullus (36.13) and Juvenal (4.40), the city was a Doric foundation. Strabo 5.4.2 locates Ankon in Pikenian territory, Ps.-Skylax 16 among the Umbrians. Braccesi and others seem to hold that Ankon was a Greek trading post, possibly strengthened during the reign of Dionysios I and his expansion into the Adriatic, but not a colonial foundation with a well-defined urban layout (Braccesi (1977) 220–23, 246); cf. Spina (no. 85) and Adria (no. 75).

The C7 indigenous settlement rose on a coastal, bow-shaped promontory which enclosed a harbour (Strabo 5.4.2; settlement history: Luni (1995) 193–96 fig. 4). The settlement consisted of an acropolis with a sanctuary and, below, a town comprising both a public area and a habitation area—at least in Roman times. There are remains of a C4 circuit wall fortifying the acropolis (Sebastiani (1983)). The urban remains are mainly Roman, but there are sporadic finds of Greek sherds, mainly Attic of C6–C5. The remains of a Greek temple on the acropolis have been dated to the period
of Dionysios I, c.380–370, or to the period of Agathokles, 316–289 (Bacchielli (1985); D’Andria (2002) 120–22). The sources suggest a temple dedicated to Aphrodite, perhaps Euploia. But by analogy with various Dorian/Corinthian Aphrodite sanctuaries, Cordano (1993) prefers Aphrodite Akraia; cf. Juvenal (4.40) and Catullus (36.16.13) and the obverse type of the C₃₅–C₉ coins (SNG Cop. Italy 82–83). It has recently been suggested that the Syracusan (Dionsyan) settlement was located on the neighbouring hill of Montagnolo (EAA sec. suppl. 1971–941 (1994) 224).

77. Apollonia (Apolloniates) Map 49. Lat. 40.45, long. 19.30. Size of territory: probably 5. Type: Α. The toponym is Ἀπολλώνια, ἦ (Hdt. 9.92–93; I.Apoll. 303 = CEG 390 (C5m)). The city-ethnic is Ἀπολλωνιάτης (Hdt. 9.92.2; CID ii 4.1.18 (360)). Apollonia is called a polis both in the urban sense (Hdt. 9.93.1, 94.2; Ps.-Skylax 26) and in the political sense (Arist. Pol. 1290n11–12). In the accounts of the Delphic ναοποιοί, Apollonia is listed under the heading πόλεις καὶ ἔδραται (CID ii 4.1.14, 11.1–22 (360)). The citizens are described as astoi in Hdt. 9.93–94. The collective use of the ethnic is attested externally in the dedication on a victory memorial set up by the Apolloniates at Olympia (CEG 390 = I.Apoll. 303), also cited by Paus. 5.22.3 (cf. infra), and in CEG 809 = I.Apoll. 307 (C4m). The individual use of the ethnic is attested externally in literary sources (Hdt. 9.92.2) and in inscriptions (F.Delphes iii.1.4.3 = I.Apoll. 304 (C4f); IG ii² 350.10 = SEG 35.77 (C4f)).

According to Thuc. 1.26.2, Apollonia was founded by Corinthians (no. 227) only (cf. Braccesi (1977) 92 n. 4), and according to Plut. Mor. 552E the contingent was led by Periander, which suggests a date of c.600 for the foundation. According to a variant tradition, a contingent of 200 Corinthians was led by one Gylax, after whom the city was named Gylakeia (Steph. Byz. 105.22, 214.9–10; cf. Γυάλεῖον πεδίον in a second century ad inscription from Apollonia, I.Apoll. 213). Alternatively, Ps.-Skynnos 439–40 and Strabo 7.5.8 claim that Apollonia was founded by colonists from Corinth and Korkyra (no. 123) (I.Dyrrh. 29). In Pol. 1305a25–28, 36–38, Aristotle adduces Apollonia as an (undated) example of στάσις caused by the arrival of new colonists. The foundation myth told by the Apolloniates was that their city had been founded by Apollo (CEG 390 = I.Apoll. 303 = Paus. 5.22.3; cf. coins of the Roman period (Head, HN iii 314)).

The tradition mentioning Periander indicates that the foundation took place during his reign, although his personal involvement remains uncertain (cf. Berve (1967) 21; Salmon (1984) 211; foundation chronology c.600: Van Compernolle (1953); Ducat (1962) 174–78). The foundation of Apollonia and Epidamnos (no. 79) probably reflects Corinthian expansion in the Adriatic after the subjugation of Korkyra (Salmon (1984) 222–24) and Corinthian trade attracted by the mineral wealth of the region (Braccesi (1977) 98–103).

The lack of Protocorinthian pottery confirms a foundation date of c.600 (Mano (1983) 232–34; Apollonia d’Illyrie iv. 855). The population was Hellenic, and the colonists from Corinth and Korkyra were reinforced by most of the inhabitants of Dysponent (no. 250) near Olympia, who are said to have fled to Epidamnos and Apollonia after the destruction of their city c.570 (Strabo 8.3.32; Ducat (1962) 175–76).

The growth and territorial aspirations of Apollonia may have led to conflict with neighbouring settlements, such as the C5m war with Thronion in the Abantis attested in the inscription from Olympia (also cited by Paus. 5.22.3) which commemorates spoils taken from Thronion by the Apolloniates (I.Apoll. 303 (C5m); cf. Hammond (1967) 493–95). Paus. 5.22.4 records that spoils were also given to the Corinthians. For Apollonia’s dominance over Thronion and Byllis (no. 92), see Hammond (1967) 523. In the conflict between Corinth and Korkyra in 435 Apollonia sided with Corinth (Thuc. 1.26.2; see Salmon (1984) 274–80). In C4m the Apolloniates are listed in the Corinthian inscription commemorating Timoleon’s victory over Carthage at the river Krimissos in 344 (CEG 809 = I.Apoll. 307; see Talbert (1974) 76–77).

The constitution was organised democratically, but offices of state were restricted to the descendants of the original colonists, who constituted a minority of the citizens (Arist. Pol. 1290b11–14). This peculiar form of democracy may have been preceded by an oligarchy which was overthrown because the ruling oligarchs embezzled public money (Arist. Pol. 1305b39–40 with 1306a6–9). However, the chronology is uncertain, and the sequence of constitutions may have been the opposite (cf. Aubonnet in the Budé edn., p. 161 n. 5). The polis was famous for its good laws (εὔνομωτάτη, Strabo 7.5.8), and is reputed to have practised expulsion of foreigners (xenelasia) on the Spartan model (Ael. VH 13.15). There is a C4s Delphic proxyne decree for a citizen of Apollonia (I.Apoll. 310), and an Apolloniates is granted isopoliteia in the Molossian kingdom by a federal decree of c.343–331 (I.Apoll. 308). Apollonia figures in the C4s Argive list of theorodokoi as one of the most northerly cities of the itinerary (SEG 23 189.1.14 = I.Apoll. 309). Communal oracle consultations at Dodona and Delphi are reported in an anecdote told at Hdt. 9.93–95; cf. Fontenrose
(1978) Q161. Meneptolemos of Apollonia was victorious in the boys’ race c.504–500 (Paus. 6.14.13; Olympionikai 162).

The colony was founded near the coast, πόλις θρήσκου κόλπου (Hdt. 9.92.2), in the land of the Taulantii (Ps.-Skylax 26), and now lies between the estuaries of the river Seman (ancient Apos) and the river Vjošë (ancient Aous) at modern Pojani in southern Albania (morphology and site plan: Apollonia d’Illyrie i. 523–26 fig. 3). The name of the territory was ἡ Ἀπολλωνία χώρα (Hdt. 9.93.1, 94.2). Coin finds show that C4 Apollonia had contacts over a wide territory, perhaps as extensive as modern Albania (Mano 1976) fig. 3). There are traces of indigenous settlements and ancient routes in the territory (Praschniker 1922–24) fig. 2), remains of a C4 Doric temple of unknown cult at Stylassi c.800 m south of the city, no longer extant (Praschniker 1922–24) 40–42 fig. 14; I.Dyrh. 14), and some indications of a river harbour on the Aous (Praschniker 1922–24) 55–57.

Most of the urban remains are Hellenistic or Roman, and are dispersed along the crest and on the slopes of the range surrounding the city. A C6? ashlar circuit wall fortified the acropolis and upper settlement area (c.20 ha). The lower city (c.110 ha) was protected by an extensive C4–C3 ashlar and brick circuit wall, furnished with a number of gates (Koch 1989) 218–20; Apollonia d’Illyrie ii. 765–78; Apollonia d’Illyrie iii. 977–85; Apollonia d’Illyrie iv. 857–60); the city withstood sieges in C4l (Diod. 19.70.7 (r314); 81.1 (r312)). A C6s Doric hexastyle temple was raised on the southern peak of the acropolis; fragments of a C6 sculptural frieze reveal Ionic traits. The cult was that of Apollo (I.Apol. 315.51) and possibly Artemis (Apollonia d’Illyrie i. 529). Public buildings below the acropolis consist of a C4s urban temple (Apollonia d’Illyrie iii. 976), a C3m theatre seating c.8,000 (Isler, TGR i. 227), C4–C3 stoas and a C3 nymphaeum (Strabo 9.3.16; see Koch 1989) 222–25), and various structures probably from the time of Dionysios I (Lamboley 2002). There are vestiges of an urban layout dating to 450–380, with a street grid of 61 m × 61 m and streets 5.95–6.30 m wide (Koch 1989) 218–19).

The cemeteries were laid out in the Kryegyata valley east of the city: C7l–C5 tumuli and sarcophagi, C4–C3 chamber tombs, C3–C1 cremation tombs (Ceka 1994a); Apollonia d’Illyrie iv. 854–56). Tomb gifts and rites were similar to those at Epidamnos and Korkyra (Mano 1983) 232).

The major cult was probably that of Apollo, as indicated by the foundation myth (supra) as well as the name of the city. Also, the Apolloniatsans dedicated summer crops fashioned in gold to the Delphic Apollo (Plut. Mor. 402A). Other communal cults are Helios (Hdt. 9.93) and Artemis, also frequently invoked (I.Apol. 1.33). C3l inscriptions with dedications to Artemis Limnatis and Artemis Proscopta show the importance of her cult (cf. Cabanes 1986) 152–55, and coin evidence).

The calendar month Haliotropios (I.Apol. 315.2) and Psydreo (I.Apol. 387 (C4l)) are known also from Ambrakia, Bouthrothos, Dodona, Epidamnos and Korkyra, and suggest a Corinthian origin for the calendar (Hadjis 1994; Trümpy, Monat. 155–59).


78. Brentesion (Brendesinos) Map. 45. Lat. 40.40, long. 18.00. Size of territory: ? Type: C3β. The toponym is Βρέντεσιος, τό (Hdt. 4.99.5) or Βρέντησιον (Etym. Magn. 212.23). The city-ethnic is Βρέντεσιος (IG xiv 672 (C5m)) or Βρέντεσιον (Heracl. Lemb. 56) or Βρέντεσιον (Polyb. 10.1.8–9; Strabo 6.3.6). Brentesion is called a polis in late sources only, in Polyb. 10.1.9 referring to the Roman colony of C3m and retrospectively in Strabo 6.3.6 referring to the mythical period. Strabo describes Brentesion as a barbarian city in territory opposed to that of the Tarantines and with a Messapian name. However, its status as a Greek or at least partly Hellenised polis of the Classical period is indicated by a C5m kerykeion inscribed δαµόσιον Θουρίων. δαµόσιον Βρέντεσιας (IG xiv 672 = Jeffery, LSAG 284 no. 13, pl. 54), perhaps a testimony of an alliance between Brentesion and Thourioi (De Simone 1956; Greco 1993) 302). Though not explicitly mentioned in the sources, Brentesion must have played a leading role in the lapygian wars with Taras (no. 71) and Rhigion (no. 68) (Hdt. 7.170.3; Diod. 11.52 (1473)). The importance of its use as a port is attested in Hdt. 4.99.5, where we find the term limen. πόλις βασιλευοµένη at Strabo 6.3.6 concerns the mythical period but may refer to the Messapian kingships (C5). A boule of the Brendisioi is known from a late source (Roman), but it is of some importance because it refers to a Greek philosopher (IG xiv 674; Ghinatti 1996) 120). The foundation story of Brentesion has Cretan elements (Strabo 6.3.6), as has the origin of the lapygians (Hdt. 7.170.2; Antiochos (ForHist 555) fr. 6), perhaps an indication of early Hellenisation. According to Strabo 6.3.6, Phalanthos of Taras settled in Brentesion when
he had been exiled from Taras, a tradition perhaps reflecting early contacts between the Greek colony and Iapygia (Fantasia (1972) 119–20).

The epigraphic evidence is mainly Messapian, the Greek inscriptions being primarily from the Roman period. Archaeological remains are mainly Hellenistic (Cataldi (1985); Lamboley (1996) 58–79).

79. Epidamnios (Epidamnion)/Dyrrhachion (Dyrrachinos)

Map 49. Lat. 41.20, long. 19.25. Size of territory: ? Type: A:a. The toponym is ‘Επίδαµνος, ή (Thuc. 1.2.1; SEG 43 335 (C6s)). The city-ethnic is ‘Επιδάµνιος (Hdt. 6.127.2; IG 11.2 350.9 (331/0), 3052.2 (328/7)). The later toponym, Δυράχιον (Strabo 7.5.8), is first attested in the C3 τεταθήκη of theοροδοκοί (BCH 45 (1921) iv.57), whereas the corresponding city-ethnic, Δυρ(ρ)άχιον, is attested on coins as early as C5m (infra). Epidamnios is called a polis in the urban sense (Thuc. 1.24.1; Ps.-Skyt. 26), in the territorial sense (Thuc. 1.24.4–6), and in the political sense (Thuc. 1.25.1). In Arist. Pol. 1304α13–14, Epidamnios is one of six communities subject to the heading polis (1303σ32). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins (infra) and externally in Thuc. 1.24.1. For the individual and external use, see Αμψίμηνιτασ τον ‘Επιστρόφον του ‘Επιδάµνιος, one of the suitors of Agariste of Sikyon (Hdt. 6.127.2 (c 580)), and the Attic citizenship decree for a named Epidamnian (IG 11.2 350 = SEG 35 77 (C4s)). It is implicitly described as patre (= patris) in Hdt. 6.127.1–4.

Epidamnios was founded in either 627 or 625 (Hieron. Chron. 97b, Helm) by Korkyrians (no. 123) (Thuc. 1.24.1; Ps.-Skynnos 435–36) assisted by some Corinthians (no. 227) and other Dorians (Thuc. 1.24.2). The oecist was Φιλαμίδα του Ερατοκλέδου Κορίνθου, a descendant of Herakles, and he was summoned from Korkyria’s metropolis in accordance with ancestral traditions (Thuc. 1.24.2). Epidamnios and Apollonia (no. 77) were the only true C7 colonies in the Adriatic, the outcome of Corinthian expansion and trade attracted to the wealth of the region (Braccesi (1977) 98–103). In c.570 inhabitants from the destroyed Eleian city of Dysspondion (no. 250) migrated to Epidamnios and Apollonia (Strabo 8.3.32; for the chronology: Ducat (1962) 175–76). The city was strong and populous (Thuc. 1.24.3), but civil strife over many years (στασιάδαισωτεσ) and wars with the neighbouring indigenous towns left it weak. Internal strife led ultimately to the conflicts between Epidamnios, Korkyra and Corinth. C.437 the demos expelled the aristocratic faction (οἱ δυνατοί), which then concluded an alliance with the neighbouring peoples and with Korkyra. In 435 Epidamnios sent envoys (presbeis) to Korkyra pleading mediation, but this was rejected (Thuc. 1.24.5–7). Following the advice of Delphi, the Epidamnians gave up their colony to Corinth, a garrison of Corinthians was sent to the aid of Epidamnios, and the Epidamnians were reinforced by new colonists of Corinthians, Leukadians (no. 126) and Ambrikiots (no. 113) (Thuc. 1.25), who obtained equal rights with the other citizens (Thuc. 1.27.1). The result was a siege of the city by the Korkyrians and the exiled Epidamnians (Thuc. 1.26.5). The war between Corinth and Korkyra led to the defeat of the Corinthian fleet, the conquest of Epidamnios in 434, and the reintroduction of an “aristocratic” constitution (for the “Kerkyrakia” (Thuc. 1.24–55), see Hornblower (1991) 66–97; Salmon (1984) 282–85; for the stasis, see Gehrke, Stasis 60–62).

There are few sources for the later history of Epidamnios and Apollonia (no. 77), but in the C4s Illyrian kings came to play a major part. Epidamnios was given over to Glaucias, king of the Illyrians, by the Korkyrians in 313 (Diod. 19.78.1), and Illyrian dynasts may have been in power before this if coin legends naming Monoun, basileos, are C4s and refer to the father of Glaucias, as argued by Ceka (1972) 25–27.

The constitution was originally a narrow oligarchy which was changed piecemeal into a more moderate form of oligarchy (Arist. Pol. 1301b4–15): the phylarchs were replaced by a council (boule); among the full citizens (politeuma) the magistrates were under obligation to attend the assembly (heliaia); and the single archon was another oligarchic element of the constitution (Arist. Pol. 1301b21–25). After a stasis probably in 437, the oligarchic constitution was changed into a democracy: the people ( demos) exiled the members of the ruling class (hoi dynatoi, Thuc. 1.24.5), and citizens hitherto excluded from the politeia were apparently enfranchised (Arist. Pol. 1304b13–17). But in 433 the Epidamnian democrats had to surrender the city to the besieging Korkyrians on the following terms: the new colonists were sold into slavery, the Corinthian garrison was imprisoned (Thuc. 1.29.5), and the exiles were restored to Epidamnios (Diod. 12.30.5). As a result, the constitution was changed once again: one supreme official (arche) was in charge of the (financial) administration (Arist. Pol. 1287b4–8), and another official, called poletes, was in charge of all trade between Epidamnios and its barbarian neighbours (Plut. Mor. 297F). Artisans employed on public works were public slaves (Arist. Pol. 1267b16–19).

Epidamnios was situated in Illyris, in the territory of the Taulantioi, an Illyrian tribe (ethnos, Thuc. 1.24.1), on the coast at modern Durrës in central Albania.
The town was founded on an isthmus (Thuc. 1.26), according to some later sources the name of the peninsula
was Dyrrhachion (Eratosthenes apud Steph. Byz. 244.10–11; cf. Strabo 7.5.8), whereas according to App. B Civ. 2.39
Dyrrachion was the name of the harbour, Epidamnos the name of the upper city. According to Paus. 6.10.8, there was
a short distance between the two cities. However, there is no archaeological evidence for separate settlements. The few
Greek remains lie beneath the Roman, mediaeval and modern city, but they confirm a foundation date of c.625 (Hidri
(1987)); see also D’Andria (1990) 285 for noteworthy early Archaic finds and also now Davis, et al. (2003). There are
architectural remains of two C6 styles sanctuaries situated on the outskirts of the modern city, but the location in relation
to the ancient city is unknown (Korkuti (1994) 403). A fortification wall is implicitly attested for the 430s by Thuc. 1.26.5.

A cult of Herakles is deduced from a C6C3 relief of Herakles with votive inscription (I.Dyrhh. 1); a C4–C3
inscription mentions Asklepios (I.Dyrhh. 2); and a C4–C3 inscription the theoi megaloai (I.Dyrhh. 3 (restored)). Coins
offer evidence of cults of Herakles and Zeus (infra). According to Paus. 6.19.8, the Epidamnians dedicated a
basilica at Olympia, now identified in foundation III of the Treasury Terrace. C6s roof fragments have been assigned
to the building (Mallwitz (1972) 165–71; Mertens-Horn and Viola (1990) 239–40). Kleosthenes, son of Pontis, from
Epidamnos, was victor in the chariot race at Olympia in 516 (Paus. 6.10.6; Olympiónikai 141).

The names of the months Haliotropios (I.Magnesia 463 = Rigby no. 96), Apellaioi, Machaneus and Panamos

Dyrrhachion struck coins (1) c.450–350, staters with Korikyaean types: obv. cow suckling calf; rev. stellate
squares; legend: ∆YP, or ∆ (SNG Cop. Illyricum 421–28); (2) c.350–229, staters on the Corinthian standard and with
Corinthian types: obv. Pegasos; rev. Athena, behind club; legend: ∆YPAXIONΩ, ∆YP, ∆ (SNG Cop. Illyricum 429–32); (3) c.300–200, drachms with Corinthian types: obv.
head of Herakles; rev. Pegasos; legend as supra (SNG Cop. Illyricum 433–42) (Ceka (1972) 22, 57–66). An otherwise unknown C4S
Illyrian dynast, Monoun, struck triadrachmas of Korikyaean type with the legend ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩ ΜΟΝΟΥΝΙΟΥ ∆YP
(Ceka (1972) 23–27; SNG Cop. Illyricum 528). (4) Bronze coins were struck from C4: obv. head of Dodonian Zeus;
rev. tripod; legend: ∆YP, and magistrates’ names (SNG Cop. Illyricum 501–23; Ceka (1972) dates to C4). Three silver
staters (obv. head of Athena, rev. Pegasos, legend: E or E and ʔ) struck in C5 and probably prior to the Peloponnesian
War may represent the earliest coins of the city (using the name Epidamnos) presumably struck in collaboration with

80. Herakleia (Herakleiotai) Map 20. Unlocated. Type Aα. The toponym is Ηρακλεία, η (Ps.-Skylax 22). The
city-ethnic is attested in the collective and internal sense on C4 coins: ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΟΤΑΝ (infra). Herakleia is called a
polis Hellēnis in the urban sense at Ps.-Skylax 22. Its status as a polis in the political sense is indicated by the C4 mint
(infra).

Herakleia had a harbour (limen, Ps.-Skylax 22), but its location has not been established satisfactorily. Its origin is
unknown, though most scholars take it to be one of the Adriatic foundations of Dionysios I (see coin evidence
below). Herakleia is usually located on the island of Pharos, where most of the coins have been found (Brunšmid (1898)
54; Dukat and Mirk (1976) 181–82. For a recent survey of coin distribution, see Kirigin (1990) 294–95. Attempts to
identify Herakleia with various sites in the eastern Adriatic, such as the Knidian foundation on Korkyra Melaina, are
unconvincing (Braccesi (1977) 106–8).

Herakleia struck bronze coins in C4 on the Syracusan standard. Types: (1) obv. Herakles; rev. bow and club; legend:
ΗΡΑ or ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΟΤΑΝ (Brunšmid (1898) 1–15; SNG Cop. Illyricum 535–37), and in one case ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΟΤΑΝ (Dukat and Mirk (1976) 181). (2)
C4(?), obv. female head; rev. dolphin; legend: ΗΡΑ (Brunšmid (1898) 16).

81. Issa (Issaios) Map 20, island. Lat. 43.05, long. 16.05; city not indicated on map. Size of territory: 3. Type: Aα. The
toponym Ἰσσα, η is used about both the island and the city (Ps.-Skylax 23). At Diod. 15.13.4, contra e.g. Stylianou (1998)
193–95, one should reject Ἰσσαν as a plausible emendation of ΜΣ Ἀισσών or Λίσσων. For the emendation of 15.14.2, see
infra. The city-ethnic is Ισσαιοις (Syll. 3 141.2 (C4–C3)). Issa is called a πόλις ‘Ελληνικής in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax
23. That Issa was a polis in the political sense too is indicated by its mint (infra) and the colonisation decree of c.300
(infra). The collective and internal use of the city-ethnic is attested in the colonisation decree (Syll. 3 141.2) and on C3
bronze coins (infra).

According to Ps.-Skymnos 413–14, Issa was a Syracusan foundation (apoikía), and this tradition is confirmed by some
of the names of the c.250 Issai colonists sent to Melaina Korkyra (no. 83) (SEG 40 511, 43 348). Issa is normally believed to
have been founded by Dionysios I in connection with his
establishment of colonies in the Adriatic (Diod. 15.13.1–5 (r385); see esp. Braccesi (1977) 230–32; Stylianou (1998) 196), although there is no unequivocal literary or archaeological evidence for this (cf. Beaumont (1936) 202; and see infra), and archaeological evidence indicates a settlement of Greeks prior to Dionysios’ interference (Sanader (2002)), just as sporadic finds of Archaic Greek pottery from Issa and Pharos attest earlier contacts with the Greek world; also, the hero Ionios, though first attested on C4 coins from Issa (infra), may have had an earlier cult on the island of Issa (Braccesi (1977) 75–76, 229 n. 106).

Issa served as a naval station when Dionysios’ governor (eparchos) of Issa in 384 engaged in a naval battle against the Illyrians in support of the Knidian colony of Pharos (Diod. 15.14.2, where 'Iσσας is a plausible conjecture for MSS Λίσσας or Λίσσας (Vial (Budé), followed by Fraser (1993) 169 and Stylianou (1998) 197; the emendation is rejected by Woodhead (1970) 508 n. 1 and Braccesi (1977) 227–32; however, the distance makes it unlikely that Dionysios’ ships came from Lissos). The presence of a Syracusan eparchos at Issa indicates that the colony was a dependent polis.

The main source for the political organisation of Issa is a colonisation decree of c.300–250 (Syll.3 141 = Staatsverträge 451), passed by the demos (l. 3: ἐδεξε Τώ ἡμῖν). The eponymous official is a hieronmoman (l. 1), and the Issaians sent as colonists to Melaina Korkyra are divided into the three Doric tribes: Dymanes, Hylleis and Pamphylloi (18ff). The decree was passed in the month of Machaneus (1), also attested in the Korkyran calendar (‘Trumpy, Monat. 161). The decree was previously connected with Dionysios’ activities in the northern Adriatic and dated c.385 (Syll.3 141), but has later been down-dated to c.300 (Fraser (1993) 170ff; C4–C3 in LPN 3) or C3f (Rendić-Miočević (1965); Woodhead (1970) 508–10; cf. SEG 43 348).

Issa is situated at modern Vis on the north side of the island off the coast of ancient Dalmatia, on a slope on the west side of a large bay, one of the largest natural ports of Dalmatia. The immediate hinterland covers about 1,000 ha, but Issa probably controlled the entire island, a territory of about 1,400 km². Possible evidence for Greek land division is identified by Zaninović (2002). Greek finds go back to the Archaic period, though the nature of the finds is uncertain (Kirgin (1990) 303, 310). There are few urban remains of the C4 Greek city. The C4 circuit wall, built in ashlar technique, may have had an Archaic predecessor (ibid. (1990) 303). The C4 wall enclosed an area of c.9.8 ha. There are traces of a street grid and habitation structures (Zaninović (1976a); Kirgin (1990); Cambi (2002) 49–55). The known cemetery is Hellenistic (Kirgin (1990) 303). The present archaeological record indicates that there was no Greek settlement before c.330 (Kirgin (1990) 310; cf. Visona (1995) 56–57), but “Only approximately 10% of the city of Issa is said to have been explored thus far” (Visona (1995) 57 n. 10), and the archaeological record is not necessarily incompatible with a foundation date in the reign of Dionysios I.

Issa struck bronze coins from C4f (Gorini (1993)) or C4s (Visona (1995); Mandinić and Visona (2002)): (1) according to Gorini (1993), overstrikes on Dionysios issues; according to Visona (1995), rather c.330–320 transitional issues to Issa’s civic issues. Types: obv. head of Ionios; rev. dolphin; legend: ΙΟΝΙΟ(Σ) (SNG Cop. Illyricum 538–39); (2) C3, various types. Legend: ΙΣ, on some ΙΣΑ (SNG Cop. Illyricum 540–44; Dukat and Mirnik (1976) 183–84).

82. Lissos (Lissates) Map 49. Lat. 41.45, long. 19.35. Size of territory: ? Type: C/β. The toponym is Λίσσας, ἦ (Diod. 15.13.4; on 14.2, see supra; App. II. 21) or ἦ (Polyb. 2.12.3). The collective and internal form of the city-ethnic is attested on C3 coins (SNG Cop. Illyricum 524: ΛΙΣΣΑΣΑΤΑΝ). Lissos is called a polis in the urban sense by Diod. 15.13.4 (rC4e).

Lissos was founded shortly before 385 by Dionysios I (Diod. 15.13.4; following Vial (Budé), Stylianou (1998) 194 defends the MS reading Λίσσας against the emendation Ισσας, preferred by e.g. Beloch (1922) 118 n. 2).

Lissos was founded on the steep slope of a hill, modern Lezha, on the south bank of the river Drin, near its estuary (anc. Drilo) (May (1946) 54–56, a site already occupied by Illyrian settlers (Prendi and Zheku (1972))). The site of Akrolissos, listed by Strabo 7.5.8 as a polis apart, is normally identified as the fortress lying above Lissos on the height of Mali Selbumit, an interpretation indicated by Polyb. 8.13.1, who describes this as a fortress separated from the city itself (for the topography of Lissos and Akrolissos, see Praschniker and Schober (1919)).

Extensive circuit walls are from different phases: a C4 phase comprised only an upper acropolis of c.2.3 ha. Walls in ashlar blocks, strengthened with square towers, were raised down the slope of the hill to the river Drin in C3–C2; with a perimeter of 2,150 m they enclosed a lower settlement area of c.22 ha (Prendi and Zheku (1972); Fraser (1993) 169 n. 17). Diateichisma walls divided the city into zones, perhaps based upon different functions. The city had a harbour on the river bank (Koch (1989) 140–43; Ceka (1990) 222–23 fig. 11). The urban features are rather similar to those of local Illyrian sites, but the south-west gateway is very sophisticated and
shows characteristics of Syracusan (Dionysian) C4 military architecture. Although the archaeological remains, including the circuit wall, are now dated mainly to the Hellenistic period, it cannot be precluded that Lissos was a Dionysian foundation on a smaller scale (Stylianou (1998) 194).

83. Melaina Korkyra (Korkyraios) Map 20. Lat. 43.00, long. 17.00. Size of territory: 4 (c.300 km²). Type: Α:α. The toponym Μέλαινα Κόρκυρα, ἕ (Ps.-Skymnos 428; Strabo 7.5.5.) is used for both the island and the city (Strabo 7.5.5). The city-ethnic Κόρκυραιος is attested on C3 coins (infra). The colony is referred to as a polis in the urban sense in the colonisation decree passed by the Issaians and found in modern Lumbarda (probably = ancient Melaina Korkyra) lays down regulations for an ab novo colonisation by Issaians (Syll.3 141.4, 9, 17 and in some late sources (Strabo 7.5.5; Plin. HN 3.152: oppidum). That it was a polis in the political sense too is indicated by the C3 coins (infra).

According to Ps.-Skymnos 428, Strabo 7.5.5 and Plin. HN 3.152, Melaina Korkyra was a Knidian colony. But a C4–C3 decree passed by the Issaians and found in modern Lumbarda (probably = ancient Melaina Korkyra) lays down regulations for an ab novo colonisation by Issaians (Syll.3 141). Some historians assume that there were two colonies on the island, the first one founded by Knidians in perhaps C6 (Beaumont (1936) 174)—unlocated, but perhaps situated at Vela Luka on the west coast—and the other founded by Issaians—situated at modern Lumbarda on the east coast—see (Braccesi (1977) 104–6; Kirigin (1990) 293). A preferable reconstruction seems to be that the original Knidian settlement had died out before the new Issaian foundation, and that the Issaians were resettling a place already occupied in the past by the Greeks (Grahame (1964) 43). Note, however, that Melaina Korkyra was still referred to as a Knidian colony in the Roman period.

The foundation by Issaians is attested in the inscription found on Korčula (Korkyra Melaina) near modern Lumbarda (Syll.3 141; SEG 17 312, 19 435, 40 511, 43 348 = Lombardo (1993) passim with rich bibliography; Lombardo (2002)) now dated to C3f (Woodhead (1970) 508–9 following Rendić-Miocević (1983) 192) or C4–C3 (Fraser (1993) 170ff and LGPN 3), see also Braccesi (1977) 311–12. The decree may have been a treaty between Issa and the otherwise unknown Illyrian dynasts Pyllos and Dazos, allowing the foundation of a colony on their territory (Staatsverträge 451). Or Pyllos and Dazos, being either Issaians or Illyrians, were the oecists of the colony (Braccesi (1977) 310). The Issaian foundation may have been located at Lumbarda, where the inscription was found, in eastern Korčula; for archaeological remains and discussion of the colony’s location, see Radić and Bass (2002). There are a few urban remains and a C3 cemetery in the vicinity (Braccesi (1977) 309–16; Kirigin (1990) 311). On the walls (Syll.3 141.4–5, 17), see Maier (1959–61) 204–6. The settlers were Dorians, and the three Dorian tribes Hylleis, Dymanes and Pamphylloi are named in the inscription (I.18). Onomastic studies indicate that the Issaian colonisers came originally from Syracuse (no. 47) (Fraser (1993)), but there was an Illyrian element too (Woodhead (1970) 510). The inscription throws valuable light on the distribution of land in the city and in the chora of the colony (Asheri (1971)). For possible traces of land division, see Zaminović (2002).

A rare series of C4 bronze coins were struck by the Korkyraians of Melaina Korkyra, whether the Knidian foundation or the Issaian is not clear. Types: obv. Apollo; rev. ear of corn; legend: ΚΟΡΚΥΡΑΙΩΝ (Brunšmid (1898) 69 listing specimens, one with legend KOPKY (Dukat and Mirnik (1976) 182)). For the uncertain evidence of a C4 bronze coinage with obv. male head; rev. “Knidian lion”, no legend and no attested provenance from Korčula—but attested from the island of Issa (Kirigin (1990) 293).

84. Pharos (Pharios) Map 20. Lat. 43.15, long. 16.35. Size of territory: 1. Type: Α:α. The toponym Φάρος, ἕ is used for both the island and the polis (Ps.-Skylax 23). Φάρος, ὁ is attested only once (Polyb. 5.108.7). According to Strabo 7.5.5, the toponym was originally Πάρος. The city-ethnic is Φάριος (C4 coins, infra). Pharos is called a πόλις Ἐλληνίς in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 23. The political sense is attested in a funerary epigram of C4–C3 (SEG 31 604.1 = CEG 662). The collective and internal use of the city-ethnic is attested on the C4 coins (infra). For the individual and external use, see Δημήτριος ὁ Φάριος (Polyb. 2.65.5 (222)).

Pharos was a colony (apoikia) founded by Paros (no. 509) in 385 with the assistance of Dionysios I of Syracuse according to Diod. 15.13.4, 14.1–2, whereas only Paros is mentioned as the founder by Ephor. fr. 89, by Ps.-Skymnos 426–27, and by Strabo 7.5.5. Two decrees of C3, one passed by the polis of Pharos, the other by the polis of Paros, refer to Pharos as a colony of Paros (SEG 23 489a1–16, 29–30; for the date: SEG 43 349). Archaeological evidence suggests the possibility that the colony of 385 was preceded by “pre-colonial” Greek settlement (Gaffney et al. (2002)).

Pharos, modern Stari Grad, lies innermost in a narrow bay on the north side of the island of Paros (modern Hvar). The fertile hinterland (plain of Jelsa), c.20 km², is cut off from the rest of the island by a mountain range; the
easternmost part of the plain was retained under Illyrian control (Kirigin (1990) 296 fig. 3, 301–2). The *chora* shows traces of a land division, with 1,000 × 200 m lots, which may go back to the Greek period (cf. Hellenistic (?) *horos* stone: Brunšmid (1898) 20.5; Cambi (2002) 56–57; Slapšak (2002)). The Greek settlers found the site occupied by Illyrians (pre-Greek defences: Kirigin (1990) 299; cf. Diod. 15.14.1), and an armed conflict between the Illyrians and the colonists was won by the colonists only because the Syracuse commander in, probably, Issa (no. 81) sent a squadron (Diod. 15.14.1–2; see, Stylianou (1998) 193–97, and *supra* 332).

There are few urban remains; the size of the Greek city is estimated to comprise between 1.5 ha and 6 ha (Kirigin (1990) 299; Cambi (2002) 56–57). According to Diodorus, the Parian settlers fortified their city (Diod. 15.14.1), and there are traces of circuit walls in “Cyclopean” and in masonry technique (Zaninović (1976b); Cambi (2002) 56, 70); for remains of walls and for local pottery, see Jeličić-Radonić (2002) and Kirigin et al. (2002).

Pharos struck a rich series of coins from C4 (Head, *HN* 318; Dukat and Mirknić (1976) 182–83). Silver types: obv. Zeus; rev. goat or serpent; legend: ΦΑΠ or ΦΑΠΙ (Brunšmid (1898) 41–46). Bronze, in four denominations: (1) Types as above. Legend: ΦΑ or ΦΑΠΙΩΝ (SNG Cop. Illyricum 545–46). (2) Types: obv. Persephone; rev. goat; legend: ΦΑ (SNG Cop. Illyricum 547–48). (3) Types: obv. Dionysos; rev. kantharos; legend: ΦΑ (SNG Cop. Illyricum 549–50). Coin finds reveal a wide commercial network from Makedonia to Sicily (Kirigin (1990) 301). A series of overstrikes carrying the legend ΔΙ or ΔΙΜ have been attributed to an otherwise unknown *polis* of Dimos, but the type was most likely issued by a Pharian magistrate or ruler (Dukat and Mirknić (1976) 182; Rendić-Miočvić (1983) 193).

85. **Spina** (Spinites) Map. 40. Lat. 44.40, long. 12.05. Size of territory: ? Type: A:β. The toponym is *Σπίνα, ἶ* (Eudoxus fr. 358, Lasserre; Strabo 5.1.7). No matter whether one accepts Müller’s insertion of the toponym <Σπίνα> in Ps.-Skylax 17, there can be little doubt that Spina must be the *πόλις Ἑλληνικής* referred to in the passage. The text is probably corrupt, but Spina is the only *polis* both topographically and historically fits the text as transmitted (Peretti (1979) 202–16). Apart from a reconstructed form at Steph. Byz. 584.13, the only attestation of the city-ethnic is Σπίνατον at Strabo 5.1.7. According to Strabo 5.1.7, Spina had dwindled to a small village but was once a famous Hellenic *polis* Ἰ Σπίνα, νόν μὲν κομίοι, πάλαι δὲ Ἑλληνικής πόλις ἐνδοξός. The archaeological record indicates that the period referred to is C6–C4 (infra), and, combining the archaeological record with the almost universally accepted interpretation of Ps.-Skylax, Spina is therefore included in this Inventory as a *polis*.

According to one tradition, Spina was a Greek colony (Strabo 5.1.7; Just. *Epit.* 20.11.1; Plin. *HN* 3.120: founded by Diomedes), but Hellan. fr. 4 (= Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.18.4, 28.3) describes the town as a Pelasgian foundation. It was founded in Umbrian territory (Just. *Epit.* 20.11.1) or what was originally Umbrian territory before the C6 Etruscan expansion (cf. Pareti (1961) 411–12). By C4 the city fell victim to Celtic invasions (Peretti (1979) 201–2).

The settlement, c.6 km west of present-day Comacchio (prov. Ferrara), was originally situated on the coast (Strabo 5.1.7, though it lay further inland in his time) on the estuary of one of the tributaries of the river Po, viz. the river Spinus (Steph. Byz. 584.14).

Aerial photographs have revealed an irregular perimeter and ramparts, a north-west/south-east street grid, with housing plots separated by channels and dykes, and excavations have laid bare the remains of timber houses. The habitation area extended over c.6 ha and was linked to the sea by a 15 m-wide canal, probably built by Etruscan engineers (Uggeri and Uggeri Patitucci (1974); for the urbanisation in an Etruscan setting, see Guilletta (1994) 256 n. 43). The city is Etruscan, but it is profoundly Hellenised with its Greek “merchant-houses”, etc., involved in the dispersal of Greek goods. Greek presence is attested by the finds of Greek graffiti from the site (Colonna (1974)); cf. the vast quantity of Attic C6–C4 vases from the Valle Trebbia cemetery (see *infra*). The evidence indicates a substantial Greek presence at Spina.

Two sectors of the cemetery have been laid bare, one with c.1,413 tombs, another with c.2,650 tombs. The grave goods, primarily vases destined for use in banquets, reflect wide commercial C6–C3 contacts with Greece—mainly Athens (no. 361), with rich finds of Attic red-figure vases covering the period 480–375 (Alfieri (1979), (1994); Berti and Guzzo (1993)). The contacts with the Greek world were sealed by a treasury at Delphi (see *infra*).

A cult of Apollo at Spina can be deduced from the Spinetan treasury at Delphi, and graffiti attest cults of Dionysos and Hermes at S. Maria della Tomba, and votive busts a cult of Demeter (*IGDGG* no. 77 b, c; Guilletta (1994) 258; Mambella (1984)).

According to Strabo 5.1.7, the city had a treasury at Delphi, not archaeologically identified (for attempts, cf. Alfieri (1979) xlvi n. 28). The description of the contents of the treasury indicates some wealth (Polemon *apud* Ath. 13.606A).
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THE ADRIATIC 337
I. The Region

The basic meaning of Ἡπειρῶτης is “the mainland”, by contrast with the ocean or an island (Hom. Il. 3.90; Hdt. 8.66.1; Ar. Ach. 534; Xen. Hell. 6.1.4; Pl. Phil. 111A). In the course of the Archaic and Classical periods, however, the word became common as a toponym designating a specific part of north-western Greece (Franke (1955) 3–30). Whereas in Homer the Akarnanian mainland opposite Ithaka is called Ἡπειρῶτης (Il. 2.635), both Hekataioi (fr. 26, 106) and later Hellanikos (fr. 83) place the mainland called Ἡπειρῶτης further north. The first precise delimitation of the region is found in Pindar (Nem. 451–53), who says that Ἀπειρωτᾶς stretches “from Dodone to the Ionian Sea”. Pindar’s statement stands isolated, and neither Ἡπειρῶτης nor Ἡπειρώτας is used as a toponym in C4 prose and drama, although Thucydides demonstrates that he has a detailed knowledge of the ethnic and political organisation of the region (2.80.5–6).

It is only in C4 that Ἡπειρῶτης (Ἀπειρωτᾶς) becomes a well-defined toponym designating the region stretching from the Keraunian mountains in the north to the Ambrakian Gulf in the south (Xen. Hell. 6.1.7; Ephor. fr. 129b; Lycurg. 1.26; IGIV 1.95.23, 73, 122.60). The exact delimitation of the region of Epeiros was in dispute throughout Antiquity. Amphilocheia was part of Epeiros according to Strabo 7.7.1 and 8; but did not belong to Epeiros according to Strabo 9.5.1. There was no clearly defined boundary to the north between Epeiros and Illyria and to the east between Epeiros and the peoples living east of the Pindos Range. Thus, Apollonia (no. 77) belongs to Epeiros according to Strabo 2.5.40 and 16.2.43, but to Illyria according to Steph. Byz. 105.20 and 214.9. The population of these regions was culturally mixed and under shifting domination. Accordingly, this chapter of the Inventory includes some settlements in southern Illyria near the lower reach of the river Aoos. The coastal cities in southern Illyria, on the other hand, as well as Amphilocheia are treated in the chapter about the Adriatic (321–37).

In C4 the toponyms Ἡπειρῶτης (Ἀπειρωτᾶς) and Ἡπειρῶτας were purely geographical (Theopomp. fr. 382; Lycurg. 1.26); the inhabitants of the region invariably described themselves as members of either a polis (SGDI 1351.5 (C48) Ἀνδρόκκας Δωδωναῖος) or an ethnos (SGDI 1351.11: Φίλων Ὠνόπεροις (cf. Hammond (1967) 526, 538–39; cf. Ps.-Sklax 28, 30–32). The ethnic Ἀπειρωτᾶς (Ἀπειρωτᾶς, Ἡπειρωτῆς) takes on a political connotation only in C4 when, under Molossian leadership, all the previously independent Epeirite tribes were united and called σύμμαχοι τῶν Ἀπειρωτῶν (SGDI 1336 (C48); see Cabanes (1976) 155–85). Thereafter the collective use of the regional ethnic is attested both externally (I.Magnesia 32.5–6 (C2e); see also SEG 23 189.11 (c.330)) and internally on C3 coins (Franke (1961) 121, 125–33; SNG Cop. Epirus 104, 106) and in the official designation of the federation and its magistrates (SGDI 1350 (C2e); SEG 16 385 (C3l); I.Magnesia 32.42 (C2e)).

In the Epeirite federation, the affiliation of a citizen with his city and/or tribal unit is recorded by an ethnic added to his name, either a city-ethnic (e.g. Ἑρέχελαος Δωδωναῖος: Cabanes (1976) 586 no. 70.6 (C4)) or an ethnic denoting a subdivision of one of the three major tribes: the Molossians, the Thesprotians and the Chaonians (e.g. Αμφικόρος Ἀρκτάν: SEG 15 384.9 (370–368)). Sometimes both the tribal ethnic and the city-ethnic are recorded (Ἀνδρόκαθης Ἀρκτάν Ἐρυμιναῖος (SEG 15 384.10–11)). In lists of names in which such subdivisional ethnics are recorded, the names of the three major tribes are sometimes added as headings (Μολοσσῶν Ἀνδρόκκας Δωδωναῖοι ... Θεσπρωτῶν οἴκοι Δόκιµος Λαρισαῖος ... (SGDI 1351 (C48)). Before the creation of the federation, names recorded in external contexts are specified by an ethnic indicating membership of one of the three major tribes (Νικαρέτα Θεσπρωτής (IG II² 8840 (C4m); Αντάνωρ Εὐθυµίδου Χαονίς (F.Delphes 111.4 409.8 (C4h/C3e)). In the federation, the usual naming custom is to use either the regional ethnic (Αἴσωπος Ηπειρώτης (IG II² 8855 (C4s)) or the regional and tribal ethnics combined (Σύμακος Φαλακρίωνος Ἡπειρωτῆς ἀπὸ Θεσπρωτῶν (IG IV 3 98.19–20 (C3f)). The recording
of the tribal affiliation by ἀπὸ plus an ethnic in the genitive is attested only for the three major tribes and testifies to their status as political sub-units of the federation.

The many different ways of recording the ethnikon testify to the variety and development of the ethnic and political structure of Epeiros. The tremendously complex organisation of the Epeirote tribes is difficult to analyse due to lack of sources (cf. Franke (1955); Hammond (1967); Larsen (1968); Cabanes (1976); Hammond (1994)). A high number of ethnics is attested; but they do not form an unambiguous pattern, due to the often multi-levelled hierarchical organisation of the Epeirote tribes. Accordingly, it is impossible to draw a clear line between “tribal ethnics” indicating membership of the overriding tribal structure and “city-ethnics” in the proper sense.

The Epeirote tribes were settled κοιμητῶν at least to the end of C5. The political transformation of the region began in C5 (Thuc. 2.80.5–6) and went hand in hand with a gradual urbanisation, just as in the other parts of north-western and central Greece. Ps.-Skylax 30–32 claims that Epeiros was still settled κατὰ κόμιας in C4, but archaeological research in the region has demonstrated that by C4 urban centres had emerged in many places (Dakaris (1987); Ceka (1990); Corvisier (1991)). In C3–C2 Epeiros became dotted with urban centres, which were almost all destroyed by the Romans when, in 168, Aemilius Paulus had seventy Epeirote cities razed to the ground (Strabo 7.7.3, quoting Polyb. for the information; Livy 45.34.1–6; Plut. Aem. 29.1–5).

This inventory of Epeirote poleis is restricted to communities whose status as polis is securely attested before 300. Consequently we have excluded poleis founded in the Hellenistic or Roman period on sites with no older remains of urban settlement. Furthermore, we have omitted many epigraphically attested ethnikon, already listed in Cabanes (1976) 134–41. Another community excluded from the inventory is one attested in a question put to the oracle in Dodona in C4 by the πόλις ά τῶν Χαώνων (SEG 15 397). Since no toponym is added to the mention of the Chaonians, it is impossible to decide whether the reference is to Phoinike (no. 107)—the polis which was the centre of the tribe of the Chaonians—or whether the term polis is here used as a designation of the entire tribal organisation (Larsen (1968) 280 n. 3; Cabanes (1976) 156, 174; Hansen (1998) 130). In the latter case polis is used in the political sense, without having the urban sense, as a connotation.

The written sources, on the one hand, contain only a few, scattered pieces of information about Epeiros in the Classical period and provide us with an inadequate picture of the settlement pattern of the region before c.300. There is, on the other hand, archaeological evidence of numerous settlements of C5–C4. Many of them have significant remains of urban structures: defence circuits and fortifications, habitation quarters, etc. (1) Some of these archaeological sites have been identified with ancient toponyms and are recorded in an alphabetically ordered list below. A number of settlements which are classified as polis, limen or oppidum by post-Classical authors are still unlocated. Since it cannot be excluded that they existed in the pre-Hellenistic period, they are also recorded in the list. (2) Others have not so far been linked to a toponym attested in the written sources; these settlements are named after the modern toponym and are likewise recorded below in an alphabetically ordered list.

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis

**Baiake** (Βαϊάκη)  Steph. Byz. 156.16: πόλις τῆς Χαώνας, Ἐκαία. Stephanos quotes Hecat. fr. 104 for the toponym but not necessarily for the site-classification (Hansen (1997) 17–18). One MS (P) has Βαλάκη, but the alphabetical arrangement of Stephanos’ texts shows that Βαϊάκη is the preferable reading. Hammond (1967) 471–72, however, prefers Βαλάκη, which he takes to be identical with Βαλλιακή. According to Strabo 7.5.8, Baiake was located between Apollonia (no. 77) and Orikos (no. 103). Next, following most editors of Strabo in believing that Βαλλιακή must be related to or identical with Βόλυλος (infra no. 92), he accepts Βαλλιακή as a plausible emendation of both Βαλλιακή in Strabo and Βαϊάκη in Stephanos. Finally, he identifies this Byllake (for which there is no ancient authority whatsoever) with modern Plaka. As soon as the unwarranted emendation of Strabo and Stephanos is discarded, we are left with the unlocated settlement Βαϊάκη, mentioned by Hekataios as quoted by Stephanos. Whether Strabo’s Baiake is identical with Hekataios’ Baiake is a moot point. Not in Barr., but Hecat. fr. 104 indicates Α.

**Bounimaa** (Βοώνειμα)  Steph. Byz. 182.9 (πόλις Πηείρου); in Steph. Byz. 631.3 the reading is Βοώιμων. Hammond (1967) 660 identifies Bounima with Moni Voutsia. In Barr. 54 unlocated, A? C?

**Charadros** (Χάραδρος)  Polyb. 21.26.7, or Χαράδρα (Polyb. 4.63.4). Identified with Palaia-Philippias. Polis status in the Hellenistic period is attested by a Cam treaty with Ambrakia (no. 113) concerning the frontiers (SEG 35 665), but there is no indication of polis status before C3 apart from a C4?
defensive wall (Dakaris (1971)b Fig. 30); cf. Cabanes and Andreou (1985); Charneux and Treheux (1988)). **Barr. 54, C.**

Chimeron (Χειμέριον) Thuc. 1.46.4 (λιμήν); Strabo 7.7.5; Steph. Byz. 690.9 (Αιγίς). Dakaris identifies Chimeron with the ancient remains of modern Stigkia about 4–5 km west of Ephyras. An acropolis of it was fortified probably already in the Archaic period (Dakaris (1972) 80, 96, 134 fig. 22). **Barr. 54, C** but A may attested as well (supra).

Chimera (Chimera) Plin. **HN 4.1.4 (castellum).** Identified with Himare, walls of C45 (Corvisier (1991) 219, 287). In **Barr. 49** only RL but see *loc. cit.*

Elaias Limen (‘Ελαιας λιμήν) Ps.-Sky lax 30; Ptol. Geog. 1.14.5, situated near Kerenta. It was probably the harbour of Elea (no. 95; Dakaris (1972) 134). See also Chimeron (s.v. Ephyras (no. 96)). **Barr. 54, C.**

Elina (‘Ελινα) **SGDI 1561 (C1).** Elina is identified with Dymokastro (Dakaris (1972) 102), fortified in C4 (ibid. fig. 31). **Barr. 54, C.**


Helikranon (‘Ηλίκρανον) Polyb. 2.6.3. Hammond (1967) 660 identifies Helikranon with Chysorrach, where some remains from C5 have been found (Corvisier (1991) 202). In **Barr. 54** only H.

Ilion (Ilium) Town on the Peutinger Table; cf. also Verg. Aen. 3.336. Hammond (1967) 660 identifies Ilion with Dhespotikon; C4? walls (Corvisier (1991) 284). In **Barr. 54** only R.

Kas(s)iope (Κασ(ς)ιόπη) Strabo 7.7.5; Ptol. Geog. 3.14.2 (λιμήν). Probably Kastrosyokia, walled in C4 (Dakaris (1971)b 51). In **Barr.** Kastrosyokia is identified with Berenike and Kassiope with Kassiopi. Only HRL, but C seems to be attest- ed too.

Nerikos (Νέρικος) Hsch. 5.18.1 (πόλις Ἡπείρου); probably a confusion with Nerikos in Arcarnania: Steph. Byz. 473.20 (πόλις Ἀκραννίας); see also Thuc. 3.7.4. **Barr. 54, C.**

Onchesmos (Ὀνχησμός) Ptol. Geog. 3.14.2; Strabo 7.7.5 (λιμήν). Dion. Hal. **Ant. Rom.** 1.52.2; Cic. **Att.** 7.2.1. Located north of Saranda (Hammond (1976b)); probably the seaport of Phoinike (no. 107). **Barr. 54, C.**


Photike (Φωτική) Hierocl. **Syncoc.** 652.5 (πόλις); Procop. **Aed.** 4.1.37 (πολίχνιον). Hammond (1967) 659 identifies it with Paramythia, where Dakaris (1972) 99, 115 fig. 31 shows a fortified C4 acropolis. Samsari (1994) 18 identifies Photike with the ancient remains at the sites of Limpini and Lambobithra near Paramythia. In **Barr. 54** only RL.

Sybota (Σύβοτα λιμήν) Thuc. 1.50.3 (τῆς Θεσπρωτίδος λιμήν ἐρήμος), 3.76.1 (λιμήν); Ptol. Geog. 3.14.5 (λιμήν). **Barr. 54, C.**

Thesprotia (Θεσπρωτία) Steph. Byz. 310.16–17 (πόλις καὶ χώρα ξέω τοῦ Λιμβρακίκων κόλπων); Strabo 7.7.8. Unlocated. Θεσπρωτία is possibly connected with the C3–c1e city-ethnic Θεσπρώτος (IG x2.1 31A.47; EDelphes 111.2.83; SEG 27 203.13–14,16–17; SEG13 248.9) and could have been the urban centre of the Thesprotians after C4l. **Barr. 54, C.**

Tramya (Τραμύα) Steph. Byz. 631.3 (πόλις τῆς Ἡπείρου πλησίον Βουνίμων); cf. Lycoph. **Alex.** 800 (mythological tradition). Hammond (1967) 660 identifies it with Voutonosi. In **Barr. 54** recorded s.v. Tramya, A? C? H.

2. **Unidentified Classical Settlements**

Ano Parakalamo C5e (Corvisier (1991) 202). Not in **Barr.**

Arachovitsa C5 (Corvisier (1991) 202). Not in **Barr.**

Belishove C3l (Corvisier (1991) 288). Not in **Barr.**

Elimi C4 defensive wall (Dakaris (1972) 100–2, fig. 31). Hammond (1967) 79–80 describes the remains of the walls but gives no precise dating. **Barr. 54, C.**

Grammenos/Vourta Walls dated C5–C4 (Corvisier (1991) 214, 282). Not in **Barr.**

Kalivo C5 km east of Bouthroton (no. 91). C5–C4 fortification wall (Corvisier (1991) 287). **Barr. 54, AC.**

Karos Walls dated C5–C4 (Corvisier (1991) 287). Not in **Barr.**
**Kastriza**  Fortified in C4 (Dakaris (1972) 100, 115 fig. 31). Only H recorded in Barr. 54, C.

**Kastroxhita**  Fortified in C4; probably a seaport of Kassopa (no. 100; Dakaris (1971b) 51 fig. 30); cf. Kassopa (no. 100). Not in Barr.

**Khoika**  C4? defensive wall (Dakaris (1972) 97, 115 fig. 31). Barr. 54, C.

**Kleisoura**  With a C4? outer wall (Dakaris (1971b) 53 fig. 30). Barr. 54, C?

**Klimatia**  Walls dated C5 (Corvisier (1991) 202). Barr. 54, C?

**Koutsia**  C4 (Dakaris (1972) 100–2, 115 fig. 31). Not in Barr.

**Lukovi**  C4s (Corvisier (1991) 219). Not in Barr.

**Matohasanaj**  Fortified in C3l (Corvisier (1991) 288). Not in Barr.

**Mouzaikia**  Probably fortified in C4 (Dakaris (1971b) 52–53 fig. 30). Barr. 54, C.


**Phaskomelia**  Possibly fortified in C4 (Dakaris (1972) 102, 115 fig. 31). Barr. 54, C.

**Psina**  Hammond (1967) 190–91 describes the remains of the walls but gives no precise dating; Dakaris (1972) fig. 31 suggests C4 Barr. 54, C.

**Pyrgos**  Walls dated C5 (Dakaris (1972) 104 fig. 52), probably part of the peraia of Korkyra (no. 123) which is mentioned in Thuc. 3.85.2. *Barr. 54, A? C*.


**Riziani**  Dakaris (1972) 112, fig. 31 supposes that a settlement existed in C5 but that it was not fortified. Hammond (1967) 88 reports ancient buildings but gives no precise dating. *Barr. 54, C?*

**Selo**  C5 settlement (Corvisier (1991) 218). Only H recorded in Barr.

**Tatzat**  With reference to Philipppson (1956) 65 n. 4, where he reports an ancient fortification. *Barr. 54, C?*

**Zuka d’ Ajtoj**  Settlement of C5–C4 (Corvisier (1991) 287). *Barr. 54, AC (Çukê e Ajtojt).*

---

1 The following sites are recorded in Barr, Map 54, as C but have not yielded any sign of urban settlement: (1) Ag. Georgios—Dakaris (1971b) fig. 30 classifies Ag. Georgios as an open settlement in C4; (2) Ag. Panagia—Hammond (1967) 177–78 describes fortifications but gives no precise dating; (3) Aidonia—Hammond (1967) 55, 62 refers only to remains of house foundations, which may be ancient; (4) Dakaris (1972) fig. 30 classifies Aidonia as an open settlement in C4; (5) Alpokhori—Dakaris (1971b) fig. 30 classifies Alpokhori as an open settlement in C4; (5) Anthousa—Dakaris (1972) 100–36 describes Anthousa as an open village in C4–C2; (6) Bestia—Dakaris (1971b) 32 describes Bestia as an unalled settlement in C4–C2; (7) Chalkis—even Hammond (1967) 255, 703 has doubts that Chalkis is an ancient settlement; (8) Dhoorian—Hammond (1967) 120 describes the remains of the walls but gives no precise dating; (9) Doliana—Hammond (1967) 86–87 refers just to a wall near Doliana but gives no dating; (10) Dvora—Hammond (1967) 251 mentions no signs of fortifications; (11) Epitaphion—Hammond (1967) 152 without dating; (12) Grauliot—Hammond (1967) 181 describes the remains of the walls but gives no precise dating; (13) Han Emini Aga—Hammond (1967) 157–58 describes the remains of the walls without precise dating; (14) Kalarritai—Hammond (1967) 178–79 describes the remains of the walls without precise dating; (15) Kalogeritsa—Hammond (1967) 158–59 describes the remains of the walls but gives no precise dating; (16) Kalokhori—Hammond (1967) 189–90 describes the remains of the walls but gives no precise dating; (17) Kastrid—Hammond (1967) 163–64 describes the remains of the walls but gives no precise dating; (18) Kastrion—Hammond (1967) 67 describes the remains of the walls but gives no precise dating; (19) Kastritoura—Hammond (1967) 149–50 describes the remains of the walls but gives no precise dating; (20) Kastriot—Dakaris (1971a) fig. 30 classifies Kastriot as an open settlement in C4; (21) Kato Zalongon—Hammond (1967) 188 describes the remains of the walls but gives no precise dating; (22) Kerassen—Dakaris (1971b) fig. 30 classifies Kerassen as an open settlement in C4; (23) Kheinado—Dakaris (1971b) fig. 30 classifies Kheinados as an open settlement in C4; (24) Maltan—Hammond (1967) 97 describes the remains of the walls but gives no precise dating; (25) Maskititis—Dakaris (1972) figs. 28, 31 record only graves in C5–C4; (26) Mesokhora—Hammond (1967) 251 mentions no fortifications; (27) Meri Solimou—Hammond (1967) 196 describes the remains of the walls but gives no precise dating; (28) Polaiokastro—Hammond (1967) 212 describes only a Byzantine fortification; (29) Polaiochori—Hammond (1967) 164–65 mentions a walled ancient site, Dakaris (1971b) fig. 30 classifies Polaiokhori as an open settlement in C4; (30) Polaiokhori (Vaitelioi)—Hammond (1967) 251 describes a wall without precise dating; (31) Poliouri—Drakoumi—Hammond (1967) 192–93 describes a wall without precise dating; (32) Phileates—Hammond (1967) 86 reports only remains of a tower but gives no precise dating; (33) Phyllorida—Heuzey (1866) 307 describes the site as an enceinte with towers and dwellings inside and outside the walls but gives no precise dating; (34) Polyastaphyon—Hammond (1967) 57 mentions only that there was probably a village site in ancient times; (35) Romanos—Dakaris (1971b) 52 describes an unalled settlement in C6–C4; (36) Sinou—Hammond (1967) 90 mentions walls but gives no precise dating; (37) Skamnelli—Hammond (1967) 265–64 describes walls but gives no precise dating; (38) Solomos—Hammond (1967) 242 describes the remains of the walls but gives no precise dating; (39) Strongil—Dakaris (1971b) fig. 30 classifies Strongilh as an open settlement in C4; Hammond (1967) 6: “Although I have not visited the place it is safe to assume that it was occupied in classical Greek times, as well as in Roman times, and was a dependency of Rogous”; (40) Vogolat—Hammond (1967) 66 describes the remains of the walls but gives no precise dating; (41) Vitsa—Vokotopoulos (1986) pavis calls Vitsa a village; (42) Vomos—Hammond (1967) 151 describes the remains of the walls but gives no precise dating; (43) Voutonos—Hammond (1967) 265 describes the remains of the walls but gives no precise dating; (44) Vriona—Hammond (1967) 187 describes the remains of the walls but gives no precise dating.
II. The Poleis

86. Amantia (Amantieus) Map 49. Lat. 40.25, long. 19.45. Size of territory: ? Type: B. The toponym is Ἀμαντία, ἦ (Ps.-Skylax 26; Lycoph. Alex. 1043) or Ἀμαντία (C3i/Cze Delphic list of theodorokoi: Plassart (1921) col. iv 56). The city-ethnic is Ἀμαντίες (Ps.-Skylax 27).

Amantia was a dependency of Kassopa (no. 77). Batiai was a dependency of Kassopa (no. 77) and Orikos (no. 103) (Ps.-Skylax 26, where Ἀμαντία seems to denote the territory rather than the urban centre of the polis; cf. Steph. Byz. 82.23: Ἀμαντία Ἡλλωρίων μοῖρα). Apart from the collective and external use of the city-ethnic found in Ps.-Skylax, the only attestation in Greek sources of the city-ethnic is in Steph. Byz. 83.1.

Cults of Aphrodite (Ceka (1990) 218) and Athena (Tzouvara-Souli (1979) fig. 1) are attested; they are probably of Hellenistic date.

Amantia is identified with the ancient remains near Plocë (Corvisier (1991) 288); it was fortified in C5; the walls were about 2,100 m long and enclosed an area of roughly 20 ha. A temple and a stadium have been found south of the walls (Ceka (1990) 217–18). Ceka (1990) 217 suggests that Amantia replaced Thronion (cf. 328), which was destroyed by Apollonia (no. 77) in C3m.

87. Artichia Map 54. Unlocated, not in Barr. Type: C. The toponym is Ἀρτιχία, ἦ. The only thing we know about Artichia is that in, probably, 355 a theodorokos was appointed to host theoroi from Epidaurus: Ἀρτιχία. Σχιδᾶς (IG iv² 1991, 278). Cabanes (1997a) suggests locating Artichia in the Parauaia in the Permet basin.

88. Boucheta (Bouchetios) Map 54. Lat. 39.15, long. 20.50. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is Βούχετος, ή (Theopomp. fr. 206) or Βούχετος, αί (Theopomp. fr. 382 apud Strabo 7.7.5).

The earliest evidence of Boucheta as a polis is Theopomp. fr. 206, where Batiai is mentioned together with Elateia (no. 94), Pandosia (no.104) and Boucheta (no. 90) as πόλεις τῶν Κασσωσπαίων. Since these three sites are mentioned by Dem. 7.32 as being colonies of Elis (no. 251), it seems reasonable to suppose that Batiai too was an Elean colony. Batiai was a polis belonging to the Kassopians (Theopomp. fr. 206), who in turn formed a section of the Thesprotians (Strabo 7.7.5). In C4s Boucheta was a dependency of Kassopa (no. 100).

Boucheta is classified as a polis in the urban sense by Dem. 7.32 and by Theopomp. fr. 206. It is also regarded as a colony of Elis (no. 251) (Dem. 7.32). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in a C3 sepulchral inscription found in Palairos (no. 131) (IG x 1971, 152). Boucheta was a polis belonging to the Kassopians (Theopomp. fr. 206), who in turn formed a section of the Thesprotians (Strabo 7.7.5). In C4s Boucheta was a dependency of Kassopa (no. 100).

According to tradition, Boucheta was situated in the Kassopai at the river Louros at a short distance from the sea. Dakaris (1971b) 177 fig. 9 and Hammond (1976a) locate it on a secluded hill, where ruins of the Byzantine castle of Rogoi are visible, on the right bank of the river Louros. This
was an advantageous position near the Ambrakian Gulf, to
which Boucheta was connected by the navigable Louros.
Dakaris (1971b) 178 suggests that Boucheta was the port of
Elateia (no. 94) and Batiai (no. 88).

The site was settled from prehistoric times. Corvisier
(1991) 201 suggests that, already in the Archaic period, 0.75
ha was fortified. By C51 an isodomic wall with eight towers
had been built and enclosed an area of 1.5 ha. The only gate
was in the north-west corner (Dakaris (1971b) 181 fig. 47).
When in C44 the settlement extended westward, the wall
with interval towers was increased and now enclosed up to
3.5 ha, with a population of about 1,000. The gateway was
situated on the western side (ibid.).

The visible remains of the urban structure have been
destroyed by building activity in mediaeval and modern
times; the only traces are of a large ancient building on the
southern foothill which can be followed for about
80 m; it might be a stoa-shaped structure which probably served as
a wharf or shipyard of the navigable river (ibid. 182–83 fig. 47).

91. Bouthroton (Bouthrotios) Map 54. Lat. 39.45, long.
20.00. Size of territory: ? Type: A. The toponym is
Βουθρωτός (Hecat. fr. 106 = Steph. Byz. 709.16–18) or
Βουθρωτόν (Strabo 7.7.5). The individual use of the
city-ethnic Βουθρώτιος is attested internally in a C3m dedi-
cation (SEG 36 567).

Bouthroton is attested as a polis in the urban sense at
Hecat. fr. 106; it is unlikely that there was a polis in Epeiros as
early as 500, unless it was a Greek colony (Hansen (1997) 20).
There is no tradition of a Greek colony, but excavations have
yielded Protocorinthian, Corinthian and Attic pottery of C7
to C5. It is perfectly possible that there was a Greek colony
unattested but for the quote from Hekataios (Hammond

Bouthroton was situated about 6 km from modern
Saranda. Ptol. Geog. 3.14.4 lists Bouthroton as part of
Thespatria. Bouthroton was the urban centre of the
Prasaiboi, as is demonstrated by several Hellenistic proxeny
decrees and manumission inscriptions found in Bouthroton

The acropolis was protected by three circuit walls. The
oldest wall was constructed between C6 and C5. Further for-
tified extensions are dated from C5–C4 and C3 (Bergemann
287). A C4 stoa and a C4l theatre on the south slopes of the
acropolis have been excavated (Bergemann (1998) 50).

92. Byllis (Byllion) Map 49. Lat. 40.35, long. 19.45. Size of
territory: ? Type: B. The toponym is Βύλλις, ἦ (SEG 38 542
(C3–C2); Plut. Brut. 26.4) or Βουλλίς (Ptol. Geog. 3.13.4).
The city-ethnic is Βυλλίων (SEG 43 334 (oracular lead tablet
of C4m); SEG 24 449.1 (C3s); Hellenistic coins (Head, ΗΝ
314–15)) or Βουλλίων (Ps.-Skylax 27).

The only attestation of Byllis as a polis is in Steph. Byz.
190.12 (πόλις Ἱλλίρωδος). The collective use of the city-
ethnic is attested externally in a C4m oracle inquiry (SEG 43
334) and internally by C3–C2 coins (Head, ἩΝ 314–15).

The territory of the Bylliones is quite well identified by
Ceka (1987) 135–36. He describes a trapezoidal territory on
the right side of the rivers Luftinje and Aaos, extending in
the west to the Malakastra mountains, in the south-west to
Kalinac, and in the south-east to Rabie. This territory corre-
sponds quite well with the tradition (Strabo 7.5.8; Ptol. Geog.
3.13.4).

Byllis was part of the Atintania (Ceka (1987) 141, map).
Ptol. Geog. 3.13.4 mentions Byllis under the heading
Ἐλαμβυρώτων. Byllis was the urban centre of the κοινὰς
Βυλλίων which is attested in C3s (SEG 24 449). Ceka
(1987) 137 traces the origin of the κοινὸν back to C4m. The
Bylliones acted for the first time as a political unit in C4m,
when they posed an oracle inquiry to Dodone (Dakaris et al.

The town of Byllis was situated at the right side of the
Aaos, at modern Gradish. It was fortified in C4m (Ceka
(1990) 221). The wall enclosed an area of 28 ha (Corvisier
(1991) 288). The archaeological remains confirm that Byllis
was a political and cultural centre of the region in the
Hellenistic period. Excavations have brought to light an
agora, two stoa (C3s), a C3m theatre for 7,500 spectators,
a stadium (C3s), a cistern and a peristylistic temple of C3s

93. Dodone (Dodonaios) Map 54. Lat. 39.30, long. 20.45.
Size of territory: ? Type: B. The toponym is Δωδώη, ἦ
(Aesch. PV 658; Hdt. 1.46.2). The city-ethnic is Δωδωναῖος,
and the external use is attested both collectively (Hdt. 2.57.1)
and individually (SGDI 1351 (C4s), 1355 (undated)).

Usually Dodone is mentioned as an oracle (Hdt. 2.52) or a
sanctuary (Eur. Phoen. 983). Dodone was the religious,
political and cultural centre of the Molossian League and
later of the Epirote League. Copies of the decrees (proxeny
and citizenship decrees, manumission records) of the
Molossian and Epirote League were set up in Dodone (the
oldest decrees: Cabanes (1976) 534–40 no. 1 (370–368), no. 2
(shortly before 330), no. 3 (before 330)). From these inscrip-
tions we know of the main institutions and the most
important magistrates of the Molossian and Epeirose
League; but we have no information about the institutions of the city itself. For the Molossian League are attested basileus, prostates, grammateus, damiorgoi, synarchontes, hieromnemones (Cabanes (1976) 534–40 nos. 1–3) and an eklesia (sic) (ibid. no. 5).

Attested cults include Zeus Dodonaios or Naious (Hom. Il. 16.233; Cabanes (1976) 550 no. 24 (C5); Dem. 18.253); Dione (Cabanes (1976) 550 no. 24 (C5)); Themis (ibid. 560 no. 22 (C4)); Apollo (ibid. 560 no. 22 (C4)); Aphrodite and Herakles (Dakaris (1993a) 19–20).

Dodone is situated 22 km south-west of modern Ioannina at the foot of Mt. Tomaros (Dakaris (1993a) 6). The acropolis was surrounded by a C4 polygonal wall which enclosed an area of 3.4 ha (Dakaris (1971a) 72–73). It had ten towers, two main gates (in the north-east and south-west) and a small gate in the south (Dakaris (1993a) 34–35). On the acropolis some foundations of buildings and a rectangular cistern hewn out of the rock are noticeable, but not yet completely excavated (Dakaris (1971a) 75).

The main sanctuary was situated below the acropolis. The central cult site was the prophetic oak. In C3l the first temple was built, simple in construction with pronaoi and cella (Evelagidis and Dakaris (1959) 27; Dakaris (1960) 6; Dieterle (1999) ch. iii.1).

The Molossian and Epeirotes federal coins had among other types the head of Zeus Dodonaios and Dione, eagle, thunderbolt or oak leaves, all referring to the oracle at Dodone. Legend: ΜΟΛΟΣΣΩΝ or ΑΠΕΙΡΩΤΑΝ (Franke (1961) 93–97, 150–56; SNG Cop. Epirus 105–34).

94. Elateia Map 54. Lat. 39.10, long. 20.40. Size of territory: ? Type: A. The toponym is *Ελάτεια, ἦ (BCH 80 (1956) 300 (C4–C3m)) or *Ελέα (Franke (1961) 300–7, arguing that MS *Ελεδ in Ps.-Skylax 30 should be emended *Ελέα or *Ελέα instead of *Ελαία, as the coins carry the legend ΕΛΕΑΤΑΝ or ΕΛΕΑΙ(ΩΝ); according to Franke (1961) 300, the toponym *Ελαία—derived from Thuc. 1.46.4 (ἐν τῇ *Ελαιάτιδι) and Ptol. Geog. 3.14.5 (*Ελαιάς λυγήν)—is erroneous, and the passages should be emended *Ελαιάτιδι and *Ελέας respectively. The city-ethnic is *Ελαιοις (SGDI 1351 (C4s); coinage: Franke (1961) 43) and later *Ελεάτας (coinage: Franke (1961) 44–45).

According to Ps.-Skylax 30, Elea was just a harbour (λιμήν), but the archaeological, numismatic and epigraphical record reveals that in C4s Elea must have been a polis. Franke (1961) 30ı–2 suggests that Elea was a colony of Corinth (no. 227). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on C4s coins (infra). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in a C4s manumission inscription from Dodona (no. 93) which records the name of a witness from Elea (SGDI 1351).

Elaia was situated in the region of Elaiatis which, in turn, was part of the region of Thesprotia (Thuc. 1.46.4; Ps.-Skylax 30). This is confirmed by a C4s manumission inscription from Dodona recording an *Ελαιόις among the Thesprotian witnesses (SGDI 1351).

Dakaris (1972) 97 identifies Elea with Charauge (near modern Veliani) on the slopes of the Korila and describes it as a fortified settlement of 10 ha (Dakaris (1987) 75). Gates are visible in the south-western and eastern part (Dakaris (1972) figs. 42 and 43). The city was grid-planned and had an agora (Dakaris (1971b) 184), a Hellenistic theatre comparable in size to the small theatre of Kassopa (no. 100), and two stoas to the west and east of the theatre (Dakaris
Eurymenai is identified with the ancient remains of modern Kastritsa, which is situated on the south side of the lake of Ioannina (Hammond (1997) 31); the site, however, is identified with Tekmon (no. 109) by Cabanes (1997b) 116. The site was settled from the prehistoric period (Dakaris (1951), (1952)). In C4 the settlement on the hill was fortified. The area enclosed by the circuit measures c.34.4 ha (Corvisier (1991) 214; Vokotopoulou (1970)).

Livy 42.38.1 calls Gitana a meeting place of the Epeirote League (concilio Epirotarum). A C4 m manumission inscription naming the eponymous prostates of the Thesprotians testifies to the importance of this town already in the Classical period and shows that Gitana belonged to the Thesprotian tribal community (SEG 26 717).

According to the C4 m manumission inscription, Themis was worshipped in Gitana (SEG 26 717); Tzouvara-Souli (1979) appendix fig. 1 mentions a cult of Aphrodite but does not suggest any date.

Gitana is situated near Philiales on the north-west side of the limestone mountain Brysella at the confluence of the Kalpakiotikos and Kalamas, which was navigable up to this point (Dakaris (1972) 35). According to Polyb. 27.16.4–6, Gitana was situated c.16 km from the sea.

In C4 an area of 28 ha was enclosed with a circuit wall running for 3,000 m (Dakaris (1972) 115), and the town was grid-planned. The agora has been identified in the western part, and a small theatre has been discovered outside the wall (undated, but presumably C3–C2). The main gate was in the northern side, and further gates were situated to the north-west, west and between the lower town and the acropolis (Dakaris (1987) 75 and (1972) figs. 53–54).

99. Horraon (Horraitai) Map 54. Lat. 39.15, long. 20.55. Size of territory: ? Type: B/C. The toponym is *Ορραον, τό (SEG 35 665 A.18 (Czm)). The city-ethnic is *Ορραίαται (Cabanes (1976) 586 no. 70.5) or *Ορραιείται (SEG 35 665 (Czm)) or Ορραονείται (GGM 1 239.45 = Dikaiairos(?)); cf. BCh 109 (1985) 522–23). The rough breathing is attested in the Latin form Horreum (Livy 45.26.4).
Horraon is not explicitly classified as a *polis* in any source; but in a decree of c.330, a citizen of Horraon is recorded among the *hieronomine* of the Molossian *koinon* (Cabanes (1976) 539–40 no. 3; cf. BCH 109 (1985) 532). It follows that Horraon was a member of the *koinon* and probably a *polis* in the political sense. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in a C4m treaty (SEG 35 665A.24). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in a C4 manumission document (Cabanes (1976) 586 no. 70). Horraon has been identified by Cabanes and Andreou (1985) 520 with the ancient remains near Ammotopos. Excavations show that Horraon was fortified before C4m (AR (1976–77) 43). The enclosed area measures c.7.2 ha (Corvisier (1991) 284). The city was grid-planned, and some houses of C4m–s have been excavated (Dakaris (1989) 42–44; Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994) 147–50).

100. **Kassopa** (Kassopaios) Map 54. Lat. 39.10, long. 20.40. Size of territory: 5 (c.900 km²; Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994) 120). Type: A. The toponym is Ἐλειαια (IG iv².1 95.25 (355); BCH 45 (1921) 17.51 (C31)), in *koine Κασσωπιᾶ* ( SEG 36 555 (C2s); Steph. Byz. 365.21) or Κασσωπία (Diod. 19.88.3 (rC4l)). The city-ethnic is Κασσωπιαῖος (C4 coins (infra); I.Magnesia 32.51 (C2e); IG vi 188.11 (C2e)) or Κασσωπίας (Herodoros (FGrHist 31) fr. 35; Ps.-Skylax 31).

The earliest source classifying Kassopa explicitly as a *polis* in the political sense is a C4l/C3e dedication on a statue base (SEG 34 589). The evidence for Kassopa as a *polis* in the urban sense is literary and retrospective (Diod. 19.88.3: Κασσωπιαῖοι πόλεις (rC4l)). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in IG vi 188.11 (= Ager (1996) no. 85) and internally on the C4 coins (Franke (1961) 69–70) and on weights stamped with the inscription Κασσωπιαῖοι (SEG 35 673). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in IG ix².1 243.4 (C3)).

Kassopa was situated in a region called Κασσωπία (Dem. 7.32; Theopomp fr. 206–7; Ps.-Skylax 31–32) or Κασσωπία (Plut. Mor. 297B) or Κασσωπία (Ptol. Geog. 3.14.8), which was part of Thesprotia (Strabo 7.7.5). In most cases it is impossible to determine whether the evidence concerns the *polis* Kassopa or the region Kassopia. The territory was delimited by the river Acheron, the Ionian Sea and the Gulf of Ambrakia, and must have been c.900 km² in size (Thuc. 1.46.4; Ps.-Skylax 31; Ps.-Smyrnios 447, 453, and Strabo 7.7.1, 5). To Kassopaia belonged in C4 four smaller towns of 5 to 8 ha (Batiai (no. 88), Berenike (no. 89), Boucheta (no. 90), and Kastroyka (probably = Κασσωπιᾶ λεμύρ, mentioned in Ptol. Geog. 3.14.2; Strabo 7.7.4)), one medium-sized town (Elateia (no. 94)) and two large towns (Pandosia (no. 104) and Kassopa (Corvisier (1991) 87; see also the map in Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994) 116)).

According to Strabo 7.7.5, the Kassopaians were Thesprotians, and c.330–325 they became members of the Epeirote Federation (Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994) 116). From C4m Kassopa was the political centre of the region and is recorded in the C4m list of *theorodokoi* from Epidauros (IG iv².1 95.25). The attested political institutions are all of the Hellenistic period (SEG 15 383 (C2a)). A C3–C2 honorific decree passed by the πόλις Κασσωπιαίων (SEG 35 671) suggests that there was a popular assembly. The archaeological evidence (infra) indicates that these institutions existed already in C4 (Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994) 119).

Kassopa is identified with the remains of an ancient settlement near modern Kamarina. Situated on the slopes of Mt. Zalongo, Kassopa had a dominating position with a superb view of the Gulf of Ambrakia. The C4m defence circuit enclosed an area of 30 ha (Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994) 123). The agora is situated south of the main road, in the westernmost part of the town. The place was probably chosen because of its magnificent view. The town was grid-planned, and the west side of the agora was probably from the beginning reserved for public buildings. The open ekkleistērion of C3 (Hansen and Fischer-Hansen (1994) 62–83) most likely had a predecessor in the form of a natural theatre. A temple of Aphrodite was built about C4m (Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994) 120–45 figs. 94 and 95). The main deity of the town seems to have been Aphrodite (coins (infra), temple, SEG 15 383 (C2a)). A C4–C3 theatre is located in the western part of the city (TGR ii. 231).

The Kassopaians struck silver and bronze coins in the period 342–330/25: obv. head of Aphrodite wearing stephanos or boucraion; rev. serpent or dove; legend (sometimes on obv.): ΚΑΣΣΩΠΙΑΙΟΝ (Franke (1961) 69–75; SNG Cap. Epirus 43–45).


Nikaia is called *polis* only by Steph. Byz. 474.20 (πόλις ἐν Ἰλλυρίδα). It has been included in this inventory because of the remains of a fortified C5–C4 settlement which is too large to be a *kome* (infra), combined with the site-classification in Steph. Byz. Nikaia was a member of the *koinon* of the Bylliones, as is apparent from a C4l inscription which mentions a Σώστρατος ... Βούλλων ἀπὸ Νικαιας (Leonardou (1925–26) 25 no. 140.11; Robert (1928) 433–34). A Hellenistic
manumission inscription found at Nikaia records the strategos eponymos of the koinon of the Bylliones (SEG 35 696). The ancient remains near Klos have been identified with Nikaia. The site was fortified in C5. The area enclosed by the wall measures c.18 ha (Corvisier 1991 288). The city plan of Nikaia is similar to that of Amantia (Ceka (1990) 218–19).

102. Olympia (Olympanstas)  Not in Barr. Lat. 40.25, long. 19.35. Size of territory: ? Type: C. The toponym is Ὄλυμπα, ὥ (terracotta stamp (infra)), in koinē Ὅλυμπη, ὦ (Steph. Byz. 491.3). The city-ethnic is probably Ὀλυμπαστάς (C3–C2 coins (infra)). Olympia is called a polis only by Steph. Byz. 491.3 (πόλις Ἑλληνίς). The reason for including Olympia in this inventory is the evidence for polis status in the Hellenistic period, combined with the remains of a fortified C5–C4 settlement which is too large to be a kome (infra). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on the C3s–C2f coins (infra). A C3 dedication to Zeus Megistos mentions a politarches, the synarchontes and a grammateus (SEG 35 697). Bronze coins of C3s–C2f with the legend ΟΛΥΜΠΙΑΣΤΑΝ and a terracotta stamped with ΟΛΥΜΠΑ (terracotta stamp (infra)), in koinē Ὅλυμπη, ὦ (Steph. Byz. 491.3). The city-ethnic is probably Ὀλυμπαστάς (C3–C2 coins (infra)).

103. Orikos (Orikios)  Map 49. Lat. 40.20, long. 19.30. Size of territory: ? Type: A. The toponym is Ὀρικός, ὥ (Hdt. 9.93.1; Polyb. 7.14.d) or Ὀρίκος (SEG 43 359 (C5m); Ps.-Skytla 26), ὥ (Polyb. 7.14.d) or Ὀρίκον, ὥ (Cass. Dio 41.45.1; Strabo 7.5.8 (conj.)). The city-ethnic is Ὀρίκοσ (IG 1x i2 4. 1203(C3) ). Orikos is classified as a limen by Hecat. fr. 106 and Hdt. 9.93.1. But it is called a polis in the urban sense at Ps.-Skytla 26 and in Hellenistic sources (Apollodoros fr. 300; Ps.-Skymnos 441, describing Orikos as a „Ἐλληνίς πόλις“). In the Classical period Orikos was probably part of the peraia of Korkyra mentioned by Thuc. 3.85.2. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in a Korkyraian decree of C3 (I.Magnesia 44.46 = IG 1x.1.4 1196) and internally in a C3 oracle inquiry (IG 1x i2 4. 1203) and on C3–C2 coins (Head, HN 314–15; Hammond (1967) 639).

According to the ancient sources, Orikos was situated on the Ionian coast near the Acroceraunian mountains at a distance of 80 miles from Salentinum (Plin. HN 3.145); the site has been identified with the ancient remains found on an island in the southern part of the Gulf of Valona, which already in Antiquity became connected with the mainland (Plin. HN 2.204), i.e. modern Pascha Liman (Hammond (1976c)). Orikos is situated on a small promontory which is easily defensible on the landward side. The settlement covered an area of 5 ha (Corvisier (1991) 287). The archaeological remains are scarce. Hammond (1967) 127 reports a post-Classical circuit wall and towers.

104. Pandosia (Pan-)  Map 54. Lat. 39.15, long. 20.34. Size of territory: ? Type: A. The toponym is Πάνδοσια, ἡ (Dem. 7.32; Theopomp. fr. 206; Strabo 7.7.5). The only attestation of a city-ethnic is in Steph. Byz. 499.22. Hellenistic coins bear an abbreviated form of the city-ethnic: ΠΑΝΑΝ (Head HN² 321; Dakaris (1971b) 169). Pandosia is classified as a polis in the urban sense by Dem. 7.32 and by Theopomp. fr. 206. It is also regarded as being a colony of Elis (no. 251) (Dem. 7.32).

Pandosia was a polis belonging to the Kassopians (Theopomp. fr. 206), who in turn formed a section of the Thebostrians (Strabo 7.7.5, 6.1.5). In C4s Pandosia was a dependency of Kassopa (no. 100). Pandosia is recorded in the C4m list of theorodorokoi from Epidaurus (IG 1v² 1.95.24). An oracle from Dodona, misinterpreted by Alexander I, shows that Pandosia was built on three hills near the Acherusian lake and the river Acheron (Strabo 6.1.5) and was situated in the region of Kassopia (Dem. 7.32; Strabo 7.7.5). On the basis of the literary sources, Hammond (1967) 477–78, 674–75, with map) identified Pandosia with Gourana near modern Triastro (accepted by Barr.). Dakaris, on the other hand, combined the thesis of Leake (1835) 4.55, 73, 75 with that of Philippon (1956) 106 and identified Pandosia with the ancient remains of a site near Kastri: a rounded hill in the middle of the Acheron plain rising to a height of 107 m between Kanalikon and Ephyra. Contrary to the ancient description, the Acheron flows to the south of this hill. Dakaris counters this objection with the suggestion that the course of the Louros has changed and that in Antiquity the river-bed was on the southern side of the hill (Dakaris (1971b) 164).

Pandosia was connected with the sea by the Acherusian lake and the navigable river Acheron. Dakaris believes that a port existed on the south side of the lake at Dromos Skalomatos, where oak keels of ancient vessels have been found. Another port may have existed on the north side of the lake near the south wall of Pandosia, because ancient metal rings were formerly affixed to the rocks for tying up
small ships. The bridge mentioned by Plin. HN 4.1.4 probably linked the main settlement on Kastri hill with the two northern hillocks (Dakaris (1971b) 170).

The site was settled from the prehistoric period (Corvisier (1991) 201). The way Philip besieged and pillaged the land of the colonists (Dem. 7.32) was one normally adopted against walled cities. Therefore the conquest of Pandosia by Philip II (343/2) constitutes the terminus ante quem of the older walls. This date is in accordance with the style of the walls and the political role Pandosia played at this time. Dakaris suggests that Pandosia was fortified between C5l and 343/2; the polygonal enclosure encompassed an area of 13.1 ha (Dakaris (1971b) 167). The settlement is divided into two parts by an inner wall (ibid. 167 with fig. 42; cf. AR (2000–1) 67). The wall was reinforced with twenty-two towers and had two gates on the eastern side, the southern one leading to the Acherousian lake with twenty-two towers and had two gates on the eastern side, the southern one leading to the Acherousian lake (Dakaris (1971b) 167 with fig. 42). From the very few remains of buildings it is impossible to reconstruct the city plan (ibid. 168). The nature of the terrain makes it most unlikely that the city was grid-planned (ibid. 167). On the hill-top two large cisterns are preserved (ibid. 169–70).

105. Passaron Map 54. Lat. 39.40, long. 20.45. Size of territory: ? Type: C. The toponym is Πασσαρών, -ών (Plut. Pyrrh. 5.5) and Passaron (Livy 45.26.4). Passaron is not called a polis in any ancient source. It is described as an oppidum by Livy 45.26.4 and as a χωρίον τῆς Μολλοτίδος by Plut. Pyrrh. 5.5.

Passaron is located near Gardiki on the hill above Radotovi in the north-west of modern Ioannina (Dakaris (1987) 72). Decrees found at this site (SEG 26 719 mentioning the prostates of the Molossii (after 264); Cabanes (1976) 545–46 no. 13) as well as the literary tradition (Plut. Pyrrh. 5.5) indicate that Passaron with its temple was the political centre of the Molossians, where the Molossian kings and people exchanged oaths (Plut. Pyrrh. 5.5). The fortification of the acropolis covering an area of 3.65 ha dates from C5s (Dakaris (1987) 72); in C4l a new defence circuit enclosed an additional area of 10 ha (Corvisier (1991) 213–14). Three cisterns and three gates in the north, south-east and west have been identified. The cavea of a theatre, lying outside the fortification, has been excavated (Dakaris (1987) 72 fig. 1). A C4 temple (Evangelidis (1952) 306–8) at the foot of the hill is thought to have been the official sanctuary of the Molossii, where, probably, Zeus Areios was worshipped (Plut. Pyrrh. 5.5).

106. Phanote (Phanoteus) Map 54. Lat. 39.35, long. 20.20. Size of territory: ? Type: C. The toponym is Phanote (Livy 43.21.4, 45.26.3). The city-ethnic is Φανωτεύς (Polyb. 5.96.6, 27.16.4).

Phanote is called a polis at Polyb. 5.96.4 (ἐπὶ τῆς τῶν Φανωτήων πόλεως); Livy classifies it as urbs (45.26.3) and as castellum Epiri (43.21.4). The only reason to include Phanote as a possible polis in the Classical period is the combination of the Hellenistic site-classification with the remains of a fairly large C4l settlement (infra).

Phanote is no longer localised at Raveni (Hammond (1967) 660; Barr.) but at modern Doliane (Dakaris (1972) 40–41). The town was built on a hill on the right side of the Kalamas. An area of c.5.3 ha was fortified in C4l (ibid. 154). The main gate was on the northern side (ibid. fig. 56). The cemetery was discovered c.200 m further north (ibid. 155).

107. Phoinike Map 54. Lat. 39.50, long. 20.05. Size of territory: ? Type: B. The toponym is [Φοιν]ίκα, ἳ (SEG 23 189.1.12 (c.330)).

Phoinike is called a polis in the urban sense by Polyb. 2.5.5 and 2.8.4. Polis status in C4 is strongly indicated by the epigraphical and archaeological record: an oracle inquiry of C4l/C3e from Dodone (no. 90) filed by ἄ πολις ἄ τῶν Χαόνων is ascribed to Phoinike (Dakaris et al. (1993) 58 = SEG 15 397.4). Phoinike seems to have been the political centre of the Chaonians from C4m (Cabanès (1976) 15–16). Phoinike is recorded in the C4s list of the theorodokoi from Argos (SEG 23 189; Charneux (1966a) 156–239, (1966b)). The patron god was probably Athena Polias (SEG 15 397.4 (C4l/C3e)).

Phoinike has been identified with the ancient site on the hill above modern Finik in southern Albania, where a small walled acropolis of about 1.5 ha can be traced back to C5 (Corvisier (1991) 218; Budina (1986) 119: 6 ha). In the Hellenistic period the city grew to cover up to 57 ha.

108. Poionos Map 54. Unlocated, not in Barr. Type: C. The toponym is Ποιωνός. The only thing we know about Poionos is that in, probably, 355 a theorodokos was appointed to host theoroi from Epidaurus: Ποιωνός, Ἀδματος (IG 11v.1 95.27), if the reading Ποιωνός is correct. Cabanes (1997a) 97 has no doubt, and Perlman (2000) 182 rejects the conjecture Τόρωνος suggested by Baunack (1895) 56 and again by Dakaris (1972) 34. Hammond (1967) 519 suggests that Poionos might be a personal name. If so, the Thesprotians had four theorodokoi. Because of the geographical order in the list, Cabanes (ibid.) supposes that Poionos was a harbour between Thesprotia and Korkyra (no. 123).

or Tekmon (Liv. 45.26.4, 10). The only source for the city-
ethnic is Steph. Byz. 611.21.

Tekmon is called a polis by Steph. Byz. 611.21 (πόλις 
Θεσπρωτῶν) and an oppidum by Livy (45.26.4). The only
reason to include Tekmon in this inventory is the site-classi-
fication in Steph. Byz. combined with the remains of a fortified 
C4 settlement which is much too large to be a kome (infra).

Tekmon is identified with the ancient remains of modern 
Kastritsa, which is situated on the south side of the lake of
Ioannina (Cabanes (1997b) 116). Hammond, however,
((1997) 31) prefers to identify this site with Eurymenai (no.
97). The site was settled from the prehistoric period
(Dakaris (1951), (1952)). In C4, the settlement on the hill was
fortified and the walls enclosed an area of c.34.4 ha
(Corvisier (1991) 214; Vokotopoulou (1970))). Unlocated in
Barr. and only H.

110. Torone Map 54. Lat. 39.31, long. 20.10. Size of territory:
1 or 2. Type: C. The toponym is Τόρωνη (Ptol. Geog. 3.14.5).

Torone is mentioned by Ptol. Geog. 3.14.5 in a context
which indicates that it was either a polis or a harbour. If we
accept Dakaris’ emendation of Ποίωνας into Τάρωνας
(Dakaris 1972) 34), Torone may be recorded in the C4m list
of theodorodos from Epidauros (IG iv².1 95.27 as emended
already by Baunack (1895) 56, rejected by Perlman (2000)
182, see supra 108), which would indicate that the settlement
was a polis in C4m. Against this view, see Cabanes (1997a) 97.

In Ptolemy’s list Torone is recorded between the mouth of
the Thymis and Sybota. Accordingly, Dakaris (1972) 115
with fig. 49 locates Torone on a peninsula in the northern
part of Sybota Bay (= modern Lygia) and suggests that the
site belonged to the peraia of Korkyra (no. 123), referred to
by Thuc. 3.85.2. This place was settled from the Archaic peri-
od. Probably in C5 the open settlement was transformed
into a small fortified acropolis of 1.2 ha. It expanded to the
south and west; by 427 it had grown to 21.5 ha, and in C4 it
covered 58 ha (Corvisier (1991) 205–6; Dakaris (1972) 115 figs.
49–51). Three parts can be distinguished: part A, fortified
already before 427 with gates to the south, east and west
(ibid. fig. 51); part B, also fortified before 427 with a gate
probably in the east; and part C, fortified after 427 with a gate
in the west (ibid. fig. 50).

111. Zmaratha Map 54. Unlocated, not in Barr. Type: C.
The toponym is Ζμαράθα, ή The only thing we know
about Zmaratha is that in, probably, 340–338 a theodorodos
was appointed to host theoroi from Epidauros: Ζμαράθας,
Έπιν(ι)κος Νικάνδρου (IG iv².1 95.76); cf. also Perlman
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AKARNANIA AND ADJACENT AREAS

HANS-JOACHIM GEHRKE, ECKHARD WIRBELAUER

I. The Region

No ancient name for the region as a whole existed, but for the main part of the mainland, the name Ἀκαρνανία is attested (Hecat. fr. 110–11; Hdt. 2.10.3 (Ἀκαρνανίη); Thuc. 2.80.8; Xen. Hell. 6.2.37; IG ii² 237.35 (C4); IG ix².1 393.3 (C3)). The ethnic is Ἀκαρναῖος (Hdt. 1.6.2, 7.221; SEG 42 1041 (C4)), the feminine form Ἀκαρναίας (IG ix².1 585.2 (Pagasai, c.300)) or Ἀκαρνάνισσα (IG ii² 2332.97 (183/2)). The collective use of the ethnic is attested externally in Attic inscriptions of C4 (IG ii² 43.B.12 (= Staatsverträge 257 (377)); 96.8), internally in local inscriptions of the Hellenistic period (IG ix².1 3A; IG ix².1 583 (Olympia, 216)), and very often in literary sources (e.g. Thuc. 2.30.1; Xen. Hell. 4.6.4; Arist. fr. 477); for the individual and external use, cf. Ἀκαρνανεύς ξε Χιλιες (SEG 42 1041 (Ephesos, C4); cf. LGPN IIIA 367, s.v. Πόλις) and Ἀκαρνανθέρησις (SGDI 2658 (Delphi, 315–280)). The region itself is called χώρα (Thuc. 2.102.2, 6) and ἔθνος (Ps.-Skylax 34); this last term is also used to denote the community of the Akarnanians (IG ix².1 583.11–12, 56 (Olympia, 216)), for which we find τὸ πλῆθος τῶν Ἀκαρνανίων as well (ibid. 56). The normal term for the political unit, i.e. the Akarnanian federal state, is τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἀκαρνανίων (Xen. Hell. 4.6.4; IG ix².1 208.7, 9–10 (C2)). Owing to the nature of the region, there was a distinction between inland Akarnania (ἡ μεσόγεια τῆς Ἀκαρνανίας, Thuc. 2.102.1), part of which was τὸ Ἀκαρνανικὸν πεδίον near the river Acheloos (Thuc. 2.102.2), and the coastal region (ἡ ἄλλη Ἀκαρνανία ἡ περὶ θάλασσας, Thuc. 2.33.2; cf. οἱ ἀπὸ θαλάσσας Ἀκαρνάνεις, Thuc. 2.80.1, and οἱ ἐπὶ θαλάσσας ἄνω Ἀκαρνάνεις, Thuc. 2.83.1).

The frontiers of Akarnania were the Gulf of Arta to the north, between Argos Amphilochikon (no. 115) and Actium (cf. no. 114; Strabo 7.7.56, 10.2.1, 7), the Ionian Sea to the west, from Actium to Oiniaïda (no. 130) (Thuc. 2.102.2; Strabo 10.2.1), and the river Acheloos to the east (IG ix².1 3A; Strabo 8.2.3, 10.2.1; for the inconsistencies in Strabo, cf. Gehlke (1994) 108–9), thus bordering on Argos Amphilochikon and on the Agraians to the north-east, on Aitolia to the east.

The common designation of the islands opposite the west coast of Greece, and especially of Akarnania, is “the Ionian islands”. The name covers Korkyra (no. 123), Leukas (no. 126), Kephallenia, Ithaka (no. 122) and Zakynthos (no. 141), and has been used since the last years of the eighteenth century when the French called their new possessions in the Ionian Sea “les îles Ioniennes”. They adopted the ancient terms for the sea in this region (cf. Treidler (1929)): Ἰόνιος κόλπος (Hecat. frr. 91, 92; Skylax (FGHist 709) T 4; Hdt. 6.127; Thuc. 1.24.1); other terms: Ἰόνιος πότος (Hdt. 7.20; Eur. Phoen. 208) or simply Ἰόνιον (Arist. Pol. 1329b26) and, poetically, Ἰόνιον κύμα (Hes. fr. 372.8, MW), Ἰόνιος πόρος (Pind. Nem. 4.53; Aesch. fr. 32 B.327, Mette; Soph. fr. 337, Radt), named after Io (Aesch. PV 840) or a certain Illyrian Ionios (Theopomp. fr. 128a). The terms normally designated the southern part of the Adriatic Sea between Greece and Italy. Occasionally, some islands were seen to belong to the same regional unit as Akarnania (Thuc. 2.7.3: Korkyra (no. 123), Kephallenia, the Akarnanians and Zakynthos (no. 141); cf. Thuc. 2.30.2: the position of Kephallenia κατὰ Ἀκαρνανίαν καὶ Λευκάδα; and Strabo 8.2.2: Ἀκαρνανία καὶ οἱ προκείμενοι νῆσοι, Ζάκυνθος καὶ Κεφαλληνία καὶ Ιθάκη καὶ Ἐχθνάδες).

Unlike the other islands, Kephallenia was divided between four poleis (τετράπολες οὔσα, Πολιτίς, Κράνιος, Σαμαῖοι, Πρώννου: Thuc. 2.30.2). A number of sources testify to co-operation between the four poleis and a common identity of all Kephallenians: IG ii² 96 = Staatsverträge 262; cf. also Κεφαλληνίας ἐκ Κρανίων (IG ix.1 276.3 (Oious, C3–C2)) or Κεφαλληνής ἡς Πολέων (F.Delphes III.1 376.3–4 (suppl., 358/7); BCH 68–69 (1944–45) 121 no. 32.4 (Delphi, C3)) or Κεφαλλήν ἐκ Πρώννων (IG ix².1 8.2–3 (suppl., C3)). Dreher (1995b) 199 n. 116 and, implicitly, Bengtson (Staatsverträge 262) have assumed the existence of a Kephallenian federal state; but this seems unwarranted. Unlike the Akarnanians and other federal states, the

¹ Steinhart and Wirbelauer (2002) 50. For this reason, the island of Kythera was included among the Ionian islands. Since this island lies outside the Ionian Sea, we have excluded it from the present study. Cf. also Thiry (2001) 132ff.
Kephallenian poleis did not strike common coins, and each of them seems to have been an independent polity (Poleis (no. 132) in 435; Kranoi (no. 125) in 431/30(?); Pronnoi (no. 135) in 377; Same (no. 136) in 189/8). From outside, the islanders were often seen simply as Kephallenians (especially at Athens; cf. Thuc. 3.94.1–2; Dem. 32.9, and Aristotle’s Κεφαλήνων πολείες no. 79, Gigon). A Kephallenian Confederacy with common institutions is not explicitly attested, and what united the Kephallenians seems to have been a geographical and ethnic identity (cf. the eponymous common ancestor, Kephalos) rather than some kind of political organisation.

From C8, the whole region was one of the centres of Corinthian colonisation, especially Korkyra (no. 123), Ambrakia (no. 113), Anaktorion (no. 114), Leukas (no. 126); cf. Domingo-Forasté (1988); Jouan (1990). One of the Corinthian colonies on the mainland, Anaktorion, became a member of the Akarnanian Confederacy during the Peloponnesian War (Thuc. 4.449; see infra), while Ambrakia, on the northern side of the Gulf of Arta, remained independent. A special case is Amphilochian Argos (no. 115), east of the Gulf: not belonging to the Akarnanian Confederacy, it maintained special relations with the κοινόν (Gehrke 1994–95 43).

Akarnania was organised as a federal state already in Classical times (Gehrke 1994–95 42–43; Beck 1997 31–43). In C5s–C4, the mint of the Confederacy may have been at Stratos (no. 138) (silver drachms and fractions). Types: obv. head of Acheloos; rev. Ἐ in incuse square; cf. Kraay (1976) 129 and no. 443; SNG Cop. Acarnania 405–6. Like many poleis of the region, the Akarnanian coinstruck coins on the Corinthian standard too (pegasii, c.350–330; cf. BMC Corinth 113).2 The interpretation of these coins as federal has been questioned by Dany (1999) 280–81.

The members of the Confederacy were divided into πόλεις and ἔθνη (IG ix2.1 583.40 (Olympia, 216); Habicht (1957) 109–10), ἔθνος being the term designating a member state of the Confederacy without an urban centre. Thus, the Akarnanian communities are categorised as poleis only if there are other indications of polis status—for example, an urban centre. In the region as a whole, altogether thirty settlements seem to have been poleis (including possible poleis placed in category C). They are described in the inventory below. The letters . . . λε[?] at the end of the list in IG ix2.1 582.49 (from Magnesia, c.207) may indicate an Akarnanian polis we cannot identify. We have classified it as C at the end of the Inventory.

A number of communities are attested as poleis only by Steph. Byz.: Akra (62.6), Apollonia (106.3–4), Aspalatheia (134.5: πόλις Ταφίων), Athenai (35.1ff, from Demetrios of Skepsis, perhaps founded as a fortification by the Athenians c.450 (Kirsten 1937 2210)), Eryssiche (281.10ff, see infra), Psophis (704.20–21; this name is also attested in Zakynthos (no. 114), Taphos (609.3: πόλις Κεφαληνίας, νῖν ἐπ Ταφίωσα, attested as a polis also Eur. HF 60 (ἐπιστευμένη in 1080), but in a mythological context (destruction by Amphilochus)); the question whether the island of Taphos (Meganisi?) was a polis remains open. With Taphos was also connected the place-name Telebois (μούρα τῆς Ἀκαρνανίας, ἀπὸ Τηλεβόου, 620.14), but likewise in a mythological context. Melos is referred to by Steph. Byz. 450.14 only as κοίνη τῆς Ἀκαρνανίας. Whether these names (except for Athenai) represent historical toponyms remains dubious.3

The remaining names attested in the sources and the archaeological sites, especially those included in Barr., are the following.

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis

Ambrakos (Ἀμβρακος) Steph. Byz. 85.10 (πολίχνιον); Polyb. 4.61.4–63.4; Ps.-Skylax 33 speaks of an ἐπί θαλάττης πείχος, meaning obviously Ambrakos; for πείχος as “fort, fortress”, i.e. a fortification located in the territory of a polis, see Flensted-Jensen (1997) 120–21. Fortified settlement (Hammond (1967) 138). Barr. C.

Diorikitos (Διόρικτος) Polyb. 5.5.12; Dion. Hal. Ant. 1.50.4. In Barr. a settlement of C?, but no settlement is attested.

Ellomenon (Ἐλλομενόν) Thuc. 3.94.1 is our only source, and there is no authority for Barr.’s Hellomenon. On Leukas (no. 126), and probably a second-order settlement. Barr. C.


2 Coins of the Akarnanian Confederacy are listed by Imhoof-Blumer (1878) 13–46; BMC Thessaly 168–70; BMC Corinth 113; Head, HNP 333–34; Grose (1926) nos. 538–97; SNG Copenhagen 418–24; IGCH nos. 145, 147, 201, 236, 312, 1971, 2187; SNG Stockholm 1365–69; SNG Paris, Delepierre 1209; SNG Tübingen 1564–66; Taliertcio Mensitieri and Spagnoli (1993) pl. 3; CHVIII, 506.

3 The Epidaurian list of theorodosoi, IGIV 2.135–38, has, between Argos and Aitolian Preschion, the places Akripoi, Hyporeiai, Therminae and Phyleia. According to Robert (1940) 107–8, Hyporeiai was Akarnanian. So the other places, especially Akripoi, which is named between Argos and Hyporeiai, may have been part of Akarnania too. Nevertheless, we have excluded them from this Inventory because there is no additional evidence for their being Akarnanian. See Perlman (2000) 69.
Ithoria (Ἰθώρια) Polyb. 4.64.9 (χωρίον). Fortified hill-top settlement (Bommelje et al. (1987) 74, s.v. Agios Elias). Barr. C.


Nellos (Νῆλος or -νον) IG II² 43, B.37–38. Also called Arkadia (Diod. 15.45.3). Unlocated fortified settlement on Zakynthos (no. 141), where the exiled Zakynthian democrats in 375 had established a temporary splinter community (Dreher (1995b) 177–78). Barr. C.

Nerikos (Νηρίκος) Hom. Od. 24.377 (πολιεύθρων); Thuc. 3.7.4; Strabo 10.2.8; Eust. Od. 2.327.31. Fortified place perhaps in the peraia of Leukas (no. 126). Barr. C.

Nisos (Νήσος) Probably the harbour of Thyrrheion (no. 139). Not in Barr.

Olpai (Ολπαί) Thuc. 3.105.1 (τείχος). Fortified settlement in the territory of Argos Amphilochikon (no. 115), used by the Arkanians and (probably) the Argives as the seat of their common law court, situated 25 stages from Argos, usually located at modern Agrioloumi (see e.g. Pritchett (1992) 22–25 or Schoch (1997) 37–38), where remains of a peribolos wall (Hammond (1967) 204–5) and of a large temple (Rhomaios (1918) 116) have been found. Barr. C.

Ptychia (Πτυχία) Thuc. 4.46.3 (νῆσος); Steph. Byz. 538.10 (νῆσος παρὰ τῇ Κερκύρᾳ). The island of Ptychia mentioned by Thuc. 4.46.3 has been identified with the modern island of Vido (Bürchner (1922) 1411–12 no. 9; Donats (1965) 139–40 n. 3). Barr. C.

Sauria (Σαυρία) Diod. 19.67.4. Fortified place in central Akarnania, to be located at modern Rigani (Pritchett (1991) 8–9, 13–14). In 314 a place of refuge for the population of southern Akarnania, especially from Oiniadai (no. 130; Diod. 19.67.4); for a discussion of the historical circumstances, see Freitag (1994) 222–23. Barr. C.

2. Unidentified Classical Settlements

Ag. Mina Remains of a “town of no small importance” (Benton (1932) 233) on the island of Kalamos, probably of the Classical and/or Hellenistic periods. Barr. C?

Ag. Pandeleimonas Port and small fortress with finds from the Classical and/or Hellenistic periods, perhaps belonging to Astakos (no. 116) (Murray (1982) 57–61; Schoch (1997) 41–42). Barr. C.

Kalamos Benton (1932) 233–34 gives some information about ruins of various periods on the island of Kalamos: e.g. a round tower at Xylokastro. Not in Barr.

Kharakti (= Kastro tou Sordatou) See Pronnoi (no. 135).

Limena Vatheos (= Ormos Vathy) Remains of an ancient settlement with “a classical foundation” (Benton (1932) 232) on the island of Meganisi, which is usually identified with ancient Taphos. Barr. A? or C?

Lykono Fortified place south of Monastiraki (Akarnania), Pritchett (1992) 108–13: probably a fortress (or two), but the existence of a settlement is not to be excluded. Barr. C?

Patra Possibly a settlement of the Classical period.

Psara Near the place Psara (or Psari), south of the modern village of Konopina, remains of at least two ancient cemeteries, ruins of houses on two hills, one of them called Kastro (information from local inhabitants), and numerous sherds (many of them black-glazed) and tile fragments indicate a settlement of Classical/Hellenistic times. The site is a candidate for an Akarnanian urban centre, which, however, in the present state of research cannot be identified with any of the places attested in our written sources. Not in Barr.

Sterna Fortified sanctuary and settlement on Mount Sterne in the territory of Palairos (no. 131). Barr. A?C.
II. The Poleis

112. Alyzeia (Alyzaioi) Map 54. Lat. 38.45, long. 20.55. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is ΑΛΥζεια, ἴ (SEG 15 393 (Dodona, C5–C4]); SEG 42 1041 (Ephesus, C4)) and (in literary sources) ΑΛΥζεια (Thuc. 7.31.2), ΑΛΥζεια (Xen. Hell. 5.4,65–66), ΑΛΥζεια (Ps.-Skylax 34) or ΑΛΥζεια (Hecat. fr. 111). The city-ethnic is ΑΛΥζαιοι (on C45 coins, infra; IG vii 2418.18 (355–351)), with a variant in the same inscription: ΑΛΥζηοι (ibid. 5, cf. SEG 37 531.11)), or ΑΛΥζεος (IG ix².1 582.49 (Magnesia, c.207)), or—with reference to the Confederacy—Ἀκαρνάν ἕ ΑΛΥζεας (SEG 42 1041 (Ephesus, C4)); cf. IGPNI IIIA 367, s.v. Πόλλους).

Alyzeia is called a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 34. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in a decree from Thebes (no. 221) (IG vii 2418.5, 16, 18 (355–351)) and internally on coins (see infra) and on an undated tile stamp (IG ix².1 450); the individual use is attested externally in two inscriptions from Dodona (SEG 15 395 (C5–C4)) and Ephesos (SEG 42 1041 (C4)).

Whether Alyzeia was founded by Corinth (no. 227) is disputed (for a discussion, see Domingo-Forasté (1988) 23–25; Schoch (1997) 33). According to ancient tradition, the eponymous hero of the polis was Alyzeus, son of Penelope’s father Ikarios and brother of Leukadios (Alkmaionis fr. 5. Bernabé; Ephor. fr. 124; Strabo 10.2.9).

Alyzeia was a member of the Akarnanian Confederacy (SEG 42 1041; cf. IG ix².1 582.49 (c.207)), during the Third Sacred War allied with Thebes (no. 221) (IG vii 2418), and a member of the Hellenic League of 323 (Staatsverträge 41). In 413 slingers and javelin-throwers from Alyzeia were raised by the Athenians (Thuc. 7.31.2, 5). An Athenian honorific decree of C45 may have bestowed proxenia on a citizen of Alyzeia (SEG 21 340.7–8: κράτως ἈΛΥζειαν προξενιάν; cf. Diod. 18.11.1). Theodorokos to host theoroi from Argos (no. 347) and Epidauros (no. 348) are attested for C4 (SEG 23 189.1.6 (330–324); IG iv².1 95.19).

The urban centre lay at a distance of 15 stades from the sea, the important harbour and precinct of Herakles at modern Mytikas (Strabo 10.2.21; Murray (1982) 114–21).

Alyzeia must have been fortified before 391 (ibid. 112–13). There are remains of the circuit walls 2.3 km long (apart from the southern wall, which has almost completely disappeared), with twenty-four towers, mostly of polygonal construction (ibid. 106–13), and a fortified acropolis at the north-east extremity of the city (ibid. 110–11). The walls enclosed an area of 27 ha.

Alyzeia struck coins between 350 and 330 (BMC Corinth, lviii, with reference to Imhoof-Blumer (1878) 47; Head, HN² 329). Corinthian staters (c.340–290; types: obv. Pegasos; rev. Athena) with the legend ΑΛΥΖΑΙΩΝ or ΑΛΥ were found in Sicilian hoards (Balbert (1971) 61; IGCH nos. 88, 2144–45, 2151, 2180–81, 2187–88; Taliencio Mensitter and Spagnoli (1993) pl. 51); SNG Cop. Acrania 280–82. Contemporary bronze coins show types related to the cult of Herakles (Head, HN² 429).

113. Ambrakia (Ambrakiotes) Map 54. Lat. 39.10, long. 21.00. Size of territory: 4. Type: A. The toponym is ΑΜπρακία, ἴ (SEG 41 540Α.7 (C6); cf. Cassio (1994) 103 17; SEG 44 465) or ΑΜπρακία (Thuc. 4.42.3) or ΑΜβρακία (most common; see e.g. Xen. Hell. 6.2.3; Ps.-Skylax 33). The city-ethnic is ΑΜπρακιώτης, -της (Hdt. 8.45; Thuc. 1.46.1; Xen. An. 1.7.18; ML 27.11 (479); CID II 4.111.28 (363), and coin legends, see infra) or ΑΜβρακιώτης, -της (Hellen. fr. 83; IG i² 236.6.6 (338/7); and coin legends, see infra) or ΑΜβρακίων (Parke (1967) 267 no. 12; SGDI 3184: ΑΜβρακίων / Τας from Dodona (C3)) or ΑΜβρακίους (Philistos (FGHist 556) fr. 62).

Ambrakia is called a polis in the urban sense by Thuc. 3.105.4,110.1,112.1,8,113.2,4,5; Ps.-Skylax 33; and in the political sense by Thuc. 3.113.6 and 7.25.9; it is subsumed under the heading poleis at Thuc. 2.9.2, 3. A polites is attested in an inscription (SEG 41 540Α.9 (C6)), and among the Aristotelian politeiai there was one of Ambrakia (fr. 481.1). In an early inscription Ambrakia is referred to as patris (SEG 41 540Α.9 (C6)).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally on the Serpent Column from Delphi (ML 27.11) and in other inscriptions (IG i² 236.6.6; SEG 9 2.19, 56–57 = Tod 196 (330–325)), internally on coins (see infra; cf. the undated tile stamp SEG 34 588c). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested externally, especially in inscriptions at Delphi (CID II 4.111.28; SEG 31 535.2 (both C4)).

The name of the territory was ΑΜβρακία (Archestratos fr. 16.1, Olson and Sens = Suppl. Hell. 146.1; Ps.-Skylax 33; Etym. Mag. 81.3–4). It is briefly described by Polyb. 21.26.3–4. Ambrakia bordered on the Thesprotians (Hdt.
Ambrakia was founded by Corinthians (no. 227) (Thuc. 2.80.3; Dem. 3.34) at the time of Kypselos (Strabo 7.6.6, 10.2.8; Ant. Lib. Met. 4.4), i.e. between 657/6 and 627/6 (for the date of Kypselos, see Gehrke (1990) 34). The oecist was Gorgos, son of Kypselos (Ps.-Skymnos 455; Nic. Dam. (FGrHist 90) fr. 59.1; Strabo 10.2.8 (MS Gargasos); Ant. Lib. Met. 4.4 (MS Torgos); one coin attested: Kraay (1976) no. 428 with the name added).

After the expulsion of the tyrant Pyrander (Arist. Pol. 1304a31–33, 1311a40–b1; cf. Plut. Mor. 768F (rC6)), Ambrakia was organised as a moderate oligarchy with a low census, later as a democracy (Arist. Pol. 1303a20–25; Diod. 17.3.3; cf. Gehrke, Stasis 19; Schüttrumpf and Gehrke (1996) 455). After the battle of Chaironeia, an oligarchy was established, supported by a Macedonian garrison, but after the death of Philip II, Ambrakia became democratic again (Diod. 17.3.3, 4.3; cf. Gehrke, Stasis 19). The historical circumstances of the tyranny of a certain Phalaikos (or Phaylos) in Ambrakia (e.g. Ant. Lib. Met. 4.4–5) remain dubious, cf. Keyßner (1938) 1612.

Ambrakia was a member of the Hellenic League against Persia (Hdt. 8.45, 47, 9.28.5, 9.31.4; Staatsverträge 130). Before the Peloponnesian War, it sided with the Corinthians (no. 227) against Korkyra (no. 123) and acted, consistently, as a Spartan ally during the war (Thuc. 2.9.2, 2.80.5, 3.105.1, 6.104.1, 8.106.3), although in 426 it was forced to conclude a symmachia and a treaty with the Akarnanians and the Amphilochians (Thuc. 3.114.3; Staatsverträge 175). In 395, Ambrakia became a member of the alliance between Boiotia, Athens (no. 361), Corinth (no. 227) and Argos (no. 347) against Sparta (no. 345) (Diod. 14.82.3; Staatsverträge 225), but it sided with Sparta against Athens and Korkyra in 375 and 373/2 (Xen. Hell. 5.4.65–66, 6.2.3). Ambrakia is attested as a member of the Corinthian League of 338/7 (IG ii² 236.b.6; Staatsverträge 130) and of the Hellenic League of 323 (Staatsverträge 413). In 317/16, it was allied with Olympia (Diod. 19.35.7).

Ambrakia was engaged with contingents in the following battles: against Korkyra on the river Arachthus c. 600 (SEG 1 145; cf. Hammond (1967) 493; Andreou (1991) 436–38); against the Perrhaibians together with Corinth (no. 227) in C6 (SEG 41 540.A.7; cf. Cassio (1994) and SEG 44 463); at Salamis with seven ships (Hdt. 8.45); at Plataea with 500 hoplites (Hdt. 9.28.5, 31.4); at Epidamnos in 435 with eight ships (Thuc. 1.127.2); at Sybota in 433 with 27 (Thuc. 1.46.1); and against Korkyra together with Leukas (no. 126) in 427 with thirteen ships (Thuc. 3.69.1). In 425, Ambrakia went to war against Akarnania and Amphilochian Argos (no. 115) with at least 3,000 hoplites (Thuc. 3.105.1), and in 414, three Ambrakian ships joined the Corinthian fleet (Thuc. 6.104.1). In 405, the Ambrakian Euanthidas fought under Lysander’s command at Aigos potamoi (Paus. 10.9.10). In 375 and 373/2, Ambrakia supported the Peloponnesian navy with six ships (Xen. Hell. 5.4.65–66, 6.2.3).

The patron deities were Apollo Soter (or Agyieus) and Herakles; cf. the aitia reported by Ant. Lib. Met. 4 (cf. SEG 35 665.B.33–34, 45 (C2), with Cabanes and Andréou (1985) 513, 531, 533–34; Jacoby, comm. in Athanadas (FGrHist 303); Tzouvara-Souli (1992) 197–200). The Ambrakians used a Dorian calendar like Corinth (no. 227) and Korkyra (Bischoff (1919) 1592 no. 32; cf. Cabanes and Andréou (1985) 536–37). Sophron of Ambrakia is recorded as a winner in the Olympic Games of 432 (Olympionikai 321).


Ambrakian theodorokoi are attested for theoroi from Argos (no. 347; SEG 23 189.1.10 (330–324)), Delphi (no. 177) (SEG 31 555.2 (c.320)) and Epidaurus (no. 348) (IG iv² 1.95.32, 81–82 (356/5)). In the Delphic decree a grant of proxenia was added to the grant of theodorokia (SEG 31 553.3).

Public architecture is not attested before the Hellenistic period, nor are there ruins of older public buildings except
for the remains of a late Archaic temple (Tzouvara-Souli (1992) 43; Lang (1996) 296 with n. 529). The acropolis was situated on the hill called Perranthes (Livy 38.4.1, 4.6, 5.2; cf. Hammond (1967) 143). The walls mentioned by Livy (38.4.4) belong primarily to the time of Pyrrhos; they enclose an area of c.130 ha, but there are remains of the older walls of late Archaic or Classical times (Hammond (1967) 141–44, 481, 584–85, 659; Cabanes and Andréou (1985) 525–27 (sketch); Pritchett (1992) 120 with reference to Catling; Tzouvara-Souli (1992) 26–31; Andréou (1993) 93–94; Lang (1996) 296). The city buildings follow a plan with a rectangular road system (Tzouvara-Souli (1992) 31–33; Andréou (1993) 93–94; Lang (1996) 297–98) in both Archaic and Classical times. It has been suggested that one of the two theatres attested by archaeology goes back to C41 (TGR ii. 129) and is the one referred to at Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 1.50.4 (cf. Frederiksen (2002) 72).


114. Anaktorion (Anaktorion). Map 54. Lat. 38.55, long. 20.50. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Ἀνακτόριον (Thuc. 1.55.1; IG ix.2.1 95.22 (356/5)), originally Σανακτόριον (cf. the city-ethnic 𑁃ਆਵਾ ਨਾਕਤੋਰੀਏਸ). The city-ethnic is Ἀνακτόριος (coins with ἈΝΑΚΤΟΡΙΟΝ (infra); IG ix.2.1 3A.24 (263′)), originally 𑁃ਆਵਾ ਨਾਕਤੋਰੀਏਸ (ML 27.10 (Delphi, 479), and the earliest coin legend), or Ἀνακτόριος (Hdt. 9.28.5; Thuc. 1.46.1; coins with ἈΝΑΚΤΟΡΙΟΝ (infra)).

Anaktorion is called a polis in the urban and political senses simultaneously by Thuc. 4.49 (Hansen (1998) 32–33); in the urban sense implicitly by Ps.-Skyllax 34, and in the political sense Anaktorion is subsumed under the heading poleis at Thuc. 1.46.1–2 and 2.9.2–3.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally on the Serpent Column from Delphi (ML 27.10 (479)) and internally on coins (see infra). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested in the inscription concerning the cult of Artemis Leukophryene in Magnesia (IG ix.2.1 582.5 (c.207)).

The name of the territory was Ἀνακτορία γῆ (Thuc. 1.29.3) situated ἐπί τοὺς ἀνήρ βαρακικοῦ κόλπου (Thuc. 1.55.1, 4.49), 40 stades from Actium (Strabo 10.2.7). Anaktorion possessed a λιμήν (Ps.-Skyllax 34) inside the Gulf of Arta and another ἐκτός, at the sanctuary of Apollo Aktios (Strabo 10.2.7). Anaktorion was part of Akarnania according to the theedorokiō lists (IG iv.1 95.8 + 22; SEG 36 331.A.15 + 20 (both C45)) and Ps.-Skyllax 34.

Anaktorion was founded by Corinthians (no. 227; Paus. 5.23.3; Steph. Byz. 92.15–16; the participation of Korkyra (no. 123) is disputed; cf. Domingo-Forasté (1988) 6–42; De Fidio (1995) 125ff) at the time of Kypselos (657/6–627/6; for the date, see Gehrke (1990) 34; Strabo 10.2.8; Nic. Dam. (FGHist 90) fr. 57.7). For a discussion of Plut. Mor. 552E (colonisation of Anaktorion under Periander’s rule), see Domingo-Forasté (1988) 8–11. The oecist was Echiades (Nic. Dam. loc. cit.). Thucydides’ description of Anaktorion as Κοινωνίαπολείς (4.49) indicates that in C5 it was still, at least to some extent, controlled by its metropolis.

During the Great Persian War, Anaktorion belonged to the Hellenic League (Hdt. 9.28.5, 31.4; ML 27.10; Staatsverträge 130). It is attested as a symmachos of Sparta (no. 345) in 431 and 429 (Thuc. 2.9.2, 80.5) and entered into alliance with Thebes (no. 221) during the Third Sacred War (IG vii 2418). In the battle of Plateai, Anaktorion was present, together with Leukas (no. 126), with 800 hoplites (Hdt. 9.28.5). During the Korkyra campaign of 435, it joined the Corinthians (no. 227) with one ship under its own commander (Thuc. 1.46.1).

Being founded by Corinthians, Anaktorion was κοινὸν Κέρκυραίων καὶ ἑκείων (Thuc. 1.55.1). In 432 it was captured by the Corinthians and received new Corinthian settlers (ibid.; Losada (1972) 17). When it was captured by Athenians and Akarnanians in 425, the Akarnanians sent new colonists (Thuc. 4.49, probably reflected in Ps.-Skynnos 460–61). After that, Anaktorion must have been a member of the Akarananian Confederacy (Freitag (1996) 85–86, attested in IG ix.2.1 3A.24 (263′), 583.8 (216), 582.41 (c.207)).

Theodorokiōs were appointed to host theoroi from Argos (no. 347) (SEG 23 189.1,3 (330–324)), Epidaurus (no. 348) (IG ix.2.1 95.22, 76–77 (356/5) and Nemea (SEG 36 331.A.20–23 (331/30–313)). The public assembly of Anaktorion was called ἅλια, the eponymous magistrate was a ἑρπανία (IG ix.2.1 212.1, 3 (C4–C3)); cf. Sherbank (1990a) 257.

The famous sanctuary of Apollo Aktios was situated outside the city (Thuc. 1.29.3; cf. IG ix.2.1 583.14–15, 54 (Olympia, 216) and 582.40–41 (Magnaia, c.207)), with a temple of
Apollo (Strabo 7.7.6), a Helenaion, other unknown structures ἐν τ[ου ἀ]λοισι and parembalai, i.e. places for camping visitors (IG ix².1 583.38–41; cf. Habicht (1957) 98–102). There was a festival (ἡ Ἀκτιάς, IG ix².1 583.45; cf. BE (1956) 11) with agones. From C4 onward, some types of coins refer to this cult and festival.

The circuit of the city walls was described by Leake (1835) 493–94 (cf. Strauch (1996a) 377). Thucydides reports at 4.49 that Anaktorion in 425 was an indication that the town was fortified.

Anaktorion struck coins on the Corinthian standard and with Corinthian types (pegasi) in the 430s and in C4s (Imhoof-Blumer (1878) 53ff; Krael (1979) 53, 55; Domingo-Forasté (1988) 132–46 and (1993); Talbert (1971) 61; IGCH passim (cf. p. 395); Taliere Mensitieri and Spagnoli (1993) pl. 3; CH viii. 159, 167, 232; cf. in general Head, HN² 329). The coins bear the legends ἈΝΑΚΤΟΡΙΩΝ, ἈΝΑΚΤΟΡΙΩΝ and various abbreviations, the oldest coins use initial Ἕ.

115. Argos (Argeiioi) Map 54. Lat. 38.55, long. 21.10. Size of territory: 3. Type: A. The toponym is Ἀργος, τό (Thuc. 3.105.2; IG iv² 195.33 (356/5)) or Ἀργος τό Ἁμφιλοχικόν (Hecat. fr. 102c; Thuc. 268.1.3). The city-ethnic is Ἀργείος (Thuc. 3.105.1; Cabanes (1976) 586 no. 70.7 (Dodona, C4)) and Ἀργεύιος ὁ Ἁμφιλοχός (IG ix².1 186.16 (Magnesia, c.207)) or Ἁμφιλοχός ἐξ Ἀργείως (F.Delphes iii.4 407 (325–275)).

Argos is called a polis in the urban sense by Thuc. 268.9, 3.105.1, 106.3, and by Ps.-Skylax 34; the territorial sense is a connotation at Thuc. 268.4 and 6, as is the political sense at 268.4. At Hecat. fr. 102c = Strabo 6.2.4 we cannot be certain that the term polis stems from Hekataios.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally by Thucydides (see supra) and internally on C4s coins (see infra). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in an Athenian proxeny decree (IG ii² 374.11–12 (322/1)) and in Dodona (see supra).

The territory was called Ἀργεία (Thuc. 3.105.1, 106.3) or Ἁμφιλοχία (Thuc. 3.105.2). There existed at least three other settlements within the territory: Olpai (τεῖχος, Thuc. 3.105.1), Metropolis (Thuc. 3.107.1; Pritchett (1992) 25–27) and Krenai (χωρίον, Thuc. 3.105.2). In C5, Limnaia (no. 127) was part of the Argeiia too (Thuc. 280.8). The Argeia was situated between Epiros and Akarnania; cf. also IG iv².1 95.33.

The mythical founder of Argos was Amphilochos (Hecat. fr. 102c; Thuc. 268.3; Ps.-Skymnos 455–57, according to Ephor. fr. 123b together with his father and brother, sc. Akarnan), the son of Alkmion (Ephor. fr. 123b) or Amphiaros (Thuc. 268.3; Ps.-Skymnos 455–57). According to Thuc. 268.5, only the Argelians (together with the Ambrakian settlers expelled at about 440 BC, see infra), probably the population of the urban centre, were Hellenes while the other amphilochoi were barbarian (for a discussion of the problem cf. Hammond [1967] 419; Hornblower [1991] 353–3).

Whether Argos was a member of the Akarnanian Confederacy is disputed (Klaffenbach (1957) xviii against Beloch (1922) 291). In about 440 the Amphilochoi were expelled by Ambrakian settlers, but some two years later, with Athenian aid, they were resettled together with Akarnanians in Argos, while the Ambrakian settlers were exposed to andrapodismos (Thuc. 268.5–7; Gehrke, Stasis 34). At least there must have been a special relationship between Argos and the Akarnanian Confederacy (Gehrke 1994–95 43 with n. 6).

The Argelan/Akarnanian physician Euenor was honoured by the Athenians with proxeny (IG ii² 242 + 373 (337/6)), later citizenship (IG ii² 374 (322/1)). Argelian theodorokoi hosted theoroi from Argos (no. 347) (SEG 23 189.1.9 (330–324)) and Epidauros (no. 348) (IG iv².1 95.33).

The surviving walls at the site of Neochori are described by Pritchett (1992) 20–21 (with pls. 22–25), those of Palaioavli, Pritchett’s candidate for Argos, ibid. 17 (with pls. 9–21). Argos is commonly connected with the ruins near Ag Ioannis/Neochori (Heuzey (1887) 26–27; Strauch (1996c); Barr;); for a recent discussion, see Hammond (1967) 246 and Pritchett (1992) 13–21, who locate Argos at Palaioavli (cf. Schoch (1997) 38); but the remains at Neochori are much more impressive and thus a better candidate for a major polis site than the ruins at Palaioavli (probably ancient Krenai, see supra 353). Thucydides’ description of the unsuccessful Ambrakian attack on Argos in 430 indicates that the city was fortified (Thuc. 268.9).

Argos struck coins of silver and bronze on the Corinthian standard and with Corinthian types in C4s (Talbert (1971) 61; IGCH passim (cf. p. 396); Taliere Mensitieri and Spagnoli (1993) pls. 3, 5; CH viii. 159, 167, 232, 431; cf. in general Imhoof-Blumer (1878) 82–97). The coins bear the legends ἈΡΓΙΩΝ, ἈΡΓΙΩΝ.
116. Astakos (Astakenos)  Map 54. Lat. 38.35, long. 21.05. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Αστακός, ἦ (Thuc. 2.30.1, 33.1) or Ἀστακοῖ (only in inscriptions: IG ii² 266; SEG 36 331.A.52 (331/30–313)). The city-ethnic (not attested before the Hellenistic period) is Αστακός (IG ix² 1.443 (C3–C2); IG ix² 3.208.4, 33 (C2); cf. Klaffenbach (1957) 87) or Αστακηνός (SEG 43 35 (C3)). A C4 Attic inscription (IG ii² 266) has Ἀκαρνάνες ἐξ Ἡσακοῦ (vel Ἡσακῶν). There was another city named Astakos in Bithynia (no. 737). Well known, e.g. as a member of the Delian League, this polis (destroyed and refounded by the Bithynian king Zipoites near the former site) took the name Nikomedea in early C3. Therefore, all Astak(on)oi attested in Hellenistic inscriptions must be seen as citizens of the Akarnanian polis, e.g. the paroikoi Nikon Astakenos at Rhamnous (SEG 43 53 (C3 after 229)). Only the πατρις Αστακηνής (SEG 4 105 (Rome, first century AD)) may refer poetically to Nikomedea, e.g. cf. Nonnus, Dion. 14.327, 16.166 or Anth. Pal. 7.627-3.

Astakos is called a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 34, who also classifies Astakos as a limen. Thuc. 2.30.1 has χωρίων.

The collective use of the equivalent of the city-ethnic is attested externally in an Athenian inscription (IG ii² 266) and internally on a stamped tile (IG ix² 1.443 (C3–C2)). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in, e.g., SEG 43 53 (Rhamnous, C3), see n. 7. The bay near Astakos is named Αστακηνός κόλπος by Strabo 10.2.21.

Steph. Byz. 137.6 calls Astakos Κεφαλληνίας ἀποικόν, but, according to Kirsten (1940) 298, it may have been a colony of Corinth (no. 227), like Anaktorion (no. 114), Ambraakia (no. 113) and Leukas (no. 126; cf. Wacker (1996a) 99 with n. 6; Schoch (1997) 42; contra Klaffenbach (1957a) x).

According to the theorodokoi lists, Astakos was part of Akarnania (IG iv 1.95.8 + 14 (356/5)). After the expulsion of the tyrant Euarchos in 431 (Thuc. 2.30.1), repeated after his return in 429, Astakos became an Athenian ally and, probably, a member of the Akarnanian Confederacy (cf. Gomme ad Thuc. 2.102.1). The membership is attested only later (IG ix² 1.208, 209 (C2)). The theorodokoi to host theoroi are attested in Epidaurus (no. 348; IG iv² 1.95.14, 65 (356/5)) and in Nemea (SEG 36 331.A.52–53 (331/30–313)). Ruins of a sanctuary of Zeus Kara(i)os have been found 200 m west of the western gate; they can be identified by an inscription of C2 (IG ix² 1.434). The remains of the ancient walls, visible today as foundations of a mediaeval wall, are poorly preserved (Wacker (1996a) 101). The masonry suggests different phases (Murray (1982) 69–70), the first being probably C5 (Oberhummer (1887) 212; Philipson and Kirsten (1958) 395).

Astakos struck silver coins perhaps only in C4s, on the Corinthian standard and with Corinthian types: obv. Pegasos; rev. head of Athena with an astakos (i.e. a crayfish); legend: ΑΣ (Imhoof-Blumer (1878) 97–99; Head, HN 329; CH viii. 322).

117. Derion (Derieus)  Map 54. Lat. 38.40, long. 21.20. Size of territory: 1. Type: C. The toponym is Δήριον, τό (SEG 36 331.A.41 (331/30–313)). The city-ethnic is Δεριεύς (IAEpi 42.61, 65 (C3); Diod. 19.67.4 (313-4)) or Ηδριεύς (IG ix² 1.3A.23 (263/2)).

Derion is probably to be connected with the ruins at Skourtou in central Akarnania (Rhomaios (1918) 113–14; cf. the discussion by Pritchett (1992) 81–85); it is not attested as a polis in our sources. If the identification with the ruins of Skourtou is correct, Derion had an urban centre and may have been a polis already in C5–C4, not just one of the ἔθνη attested in IG ix² 1.583.40 (Olympia, 216).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally by Diod. 19.67.4 (313-4). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in an inscription from the Asklepieion at Epidaurus (IAEpi 42.61, 65 (C4–C3)) and in the treaty of 263(? ) between the Aitolians and Akarnanians (IG ix² 1.3A.23).

According to the Nemean theorodokoi list, Derion was part of Akarnania (SEG 36 331.A.15 + 41 (331/30–313)). At least in 314 it was a member of the Akarnanian Confederacy (Diod. 19.67.4; IG ix² 1.3A.23; cf. also the theorodokoi lists cited below). In C4–C3E Aristichadhas of Derion was appointed proxenos by Epidaurus (no. 348) for having hosted theoroi from there (IAEpi 42.61, 65). Other theorodokoi are attested in the Nemean List (SEG 36 331.A.41–43 (331/30–313)).

The remains of the site at Skourtou have recently been described by Pritchett (1992) 81–85, who refers to the acropolis, a possible temple site (citing Woodhouse) and the walls, and mentions "pieces of glazed pottery" of C5 (ibid. 85). However, there is a problem concerning the walls: Diodorus speaks of <ἀντεφέρων καὶ μικρῶν χωρίων καὶ τίτλων διαίρεσις καὶ πρίγγων καὶ οἰκήσεως περιοχήν καὶ ἀποκλίματος> in that context (19.67.3–5). But διαίρετος is a conjecture (by Reiske and Dindorf); the MSS have ὀχύρων, and Diodorus writes in general terms.
118. Echinos (Echinaioi) Map 54. Lat. 38.55, long. 20.55. Size of territory: 1. Type: B. The toponym is Ἐχίνων (SEG 36 331. A.24 (331/30–331)). The city-ethnic is Εχίνων (IG 11² 208.1, 7 (suppl.) = Staatsverträge 325 (349/8)). Perhaps more Akarnanian Echinaioi are mentioned in Greek inscriptions, but normally an Echinaioi will be identified with a citizen of the homonymous city in Malis, cf. e.g. SEG 25 642 (168/7).

Echinos is, in all probability, to be located at the ancient site of the Kastro of Prophitis Elias (Pritchett (1992) 93–101). Echinos is commonly located on the bay of Rouga (Heuze (1860) 375–76; Oberhummer (1887) 36; Philippson (1903); Klaßenbach (1957) 33). But Rouga is an obvious place for the harbour of Thyreion (no. 139). According to an inscription found during an excavation at Rouga by L. Kolonas (not yet published), its probable name was Neso.

Echinos is not attested as a polis. The Hellenistic poet Rhianos of Bene called it ἀστυ (Steph. Byz. 292.16–17: Ἐχίνων ἀστύ, Ἐχινος (?) ἀστον. Jacoby, FGrHist 265, fr. 34). As a member of the Akarnanian Confederacy which had an urban centre and presumably struck coins, Echinos was probably a polis, at least from C4 (infra).

The external use of the city-ethnic is attested in an Attic decree of 349/8 (IG 11² 208, the individual use in line 1, the collective in line 7 (suppl.)). For the individual use, see also Ακαρνανίαν ἄστυ 'Ἐχίνων, in a funerary epigram from Kos (IG 11² 357.9 (C3)).

According to the theorodokoi lists, Echinos was part of Akarnania (IG 11² 1, 95.8 + 17 (356/5); SEG 36 331. A.15 + 24 (331/30–331)). The mythical founder and eponym was Echinos (Rhianos (FGrHist 265) fr. 34 = Steph. Byz. 292.16–17). Membership of the Akarnanian Confederacy is well attested (IG 11² 208.1, 6ff = Staatsverträge 325 (349/8), cf. IG 11² 1, 579.6 (C3)).

Echinos sent envoys to Athens (no. 361) in 349/8 (IG 11² 208; cf. Wilhelm (1889) 127–30), and there were Echaean theorodokoi to host theoroi from Epidaurus (no. 348) and from Nemea (infra).

The remains of the site of Kastro to be identified with Echinos are described by Pritchett (1992) 93–97, who mentions Geometric, Classical and Hellenistic pottery. The walls have been compared with those of Rhamnous and Eleutherai by Heuze (1860) 381–82. A temenos of Apollo is attested in an epigram found at the Kastro (IG 11².1 238.5; cf. now Pritchett (1992) 95).

A Pegasos-type stater on the Corinthian standard (obv. head of Athena with fish-hook; legend: E) has tentatively been attributed to Echinos (Imhoof-Blumer (1878) 100; Head, HN 329). Since then, eight coins of this type have been found in Sicilian and South Italian hoards (Talbert (1971) 62; IGCH no. 218; Taliercio Mensitieri and Spagnoli (1993) especially pls. 1, 3; CH viii. 232); the coinage can be dated to C4: SNG Cap. Akarnania 324.

119. Euripos (Euripios) Map 54. Lat. 38.55, long. 21.00. Size of territory: 1. Type: B. The toponym is Εὐρίπος, ὥς (Ps.-Skylax 34 according to the MS; cf. Marcolle (1985) 254; IG 11².1 95.15 (356/5)). The city-ethnic is Εὐριπίτειος (ArchDelt 22 B.2 (1967) 321; BE (1970) 343 (C38); cf. Antonetti (1987) 100–1; Strauch (1996a) 282–83, 319; but the connection with the Akarnanian Euripos is not beyond doubt; there are also inscriptions relating to other euripoi Euripoi, e.g. SEG 3 415).

Euripos is presumably to be located west of the site Saradiniko on the west bank of the river Nissis near Loutraki (described by Pritchett (1994) 192–95). Pritchett (1992) 90–92 locates Euripos on the Bay of Rouga, but for the connection of that site with the harbour of Thyreion, see above Echinos (no. 118); cf. Kirsten (1941a) 108 n. 3; Schrander in AA (1991) 614. Euripos is not attested as a polis in the sources, but from the passage of Ps.-Skylax (infra) and, particularly, from the theorodokoi lists concerning Akarnania (see infra), we have to infer that it was a member of the Akarnanian Confederacy. Since remains of a Classical and Hellenistic urban settlement with a cemetery exist west of the above-mentioned Late Hellenistic/Roman site of Saradiniko (information from E.-L. Schrander), Euripos was probably a polis, at least from C4.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in a C3S building inscription at Makryada (ArchDelt 22 B.2 (1967), but see supra).

Euripian theorodokoi hosted theoroi from Epidaurus (no. 348) (IG 11² 1, 95.15 (356/5); SEG 35 306) and from Nemea (SEG 36 331. A.28–30 (331/30–313)). The Pegasos-type stater with an E assigned to Echinos (no. 118) may have been coins of Euripos as well.

120. Herakleia Map 54. Lat. 38.55, long. 20.55? The location of Herakleia is unknown, pace Barr. map 54. Pritchett suggests the area of Vonitsa ((1992) 2–3, 97–101; cf. SEG 42 379), but the question has to remain open. Thus, there are no identifiable ruins to show that Herakleia had an urban centre; nor is Herakleia mentioned in the theorodokoi lists. Type: C. The toponym is Ἡράκλεια (SEG 1 94; cf. LSAG 127–28, 131 no. 13 (C7–C6)) or Ἡράκλεια (Steph. Byz. 303.16, 304.2).

Herakleia is not mentioned as a polis in the ancient sources. Pliny records it under Acarnaniae . . . oppida (HN 4.5).
Because of the Corinthian interests in the region, the inscription on the golden phiale of C7–C6 found in Olympia (SEG 1940 158) is connected with Pliny’s Natural History by Pritchett (1992) 100–1, contra L. Antonelli; cf. SEG 45 404.

Coins of C5s with the legend ἩΡΑΚΛΕΩΤΩΝ or monograms attributed by Imhoof-Blumer (1878) 101–12 to the Akarnanian Herakleia may have been struck by another Herakleia (cf. Head, HN² 328–34; Rhomaios (1918) 115). SNG Cop. Acarnania 325.

121. Hyporeiai (Hyporetae)  Map 54. Unlocated, not in Barr. Type: C. The toponym is ‘Ὑπώρεια (IG iv² 1. 95.35 (356/5)). The ethnic is ‘Ὑπώρεα (τής) (IG ix² 1. 587.3 (C4); cf. SEG 39 281).

On the location, see Pritchett (1992) 79 n. 1: “L. Robert, Hellenica 1 (1940) 106–108, has shown . . . that it [sc. Hyporeiai] was an Akarnanian town and he suggests from its position that it was in eastern Akarnania on the Aitolian frontier ‘au pied des monts’.”

Hyporeiai is attested only twice: as a toponym in an Epidaurian theorodokoi list, and on an Athenian grave stele from the Piraeus (both cited above). Since the deceased of IG ix² 1. 587 is called Ἀκαρναν ‘Ὑπώρεα (τής) (Robert (1940) 106–8), Hyporeiai must have been a member of the Akarnanian Confederacy in C4. So it may have been a polis (cf. loc. cit.), although an ἐθνός (cf. Habicht (1957) 109–10) cannot be excluded.

A theorodokos to host theoroi from Epidaurus (no. 348) is attested for 356/5 (IG iv² 1. 95.35 (356/5)).

122. Ithaka (Ithakesios) Map 54. Lat. 38.25, long. 20.40. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Ἰθάκα, ἦ (I.Magnesia 35.37 = Riggsby (1996) 212–14 no. 85 (c.207)) or Ἰθάκη (Ps.-Skylax 34). The city-ethnic is Ἰθακήσιος (Bacchyl. fr. 29; Eur. Cyc. 277; Arist. Ithac. Pol. fr. 511) or Ἰθακός (I.Magnesia 36.4, 27; this form of the ethnic is also found on coins (infra) but is otherwise confined to poetry and to Odysseus, e.g. Eur. Cyc. 103).

Ithaka is attested as a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 34 and in the political sense by Eur. Cyc. 276 (but in a mythical context). The earliest epigraphical attestation of the political sense is in an Ithakan decree from Magnesia (I.Magnesia 36.4, 27 (c.207)). Polis status in C6 may be inferred from the cult of the goddess Athena Polias (IG ix² 1. 1614 (C6), contra Cole (1995) 301–4. Ithaka is included among the Aristotelian politeiai (Arist. fr. 509–14).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Aristotelian Ἰθακησίων πολιτεία (no. 68, Gigon) and internally on the coins (see infra).

The name of the island is Ἰθάκη (Hom. Il. 2. 632; Od. 1.18). It is identical with that of the city and the territory (Ps.-Skylax 34). The place Ἰθαλκομεναί called ἦ τῶν Ἰθακησίων πόλεις (Plut. Mor. 301D) or πόλεις ἐν Ἰθάκη πῆς νήσου (Steph. Byz. 75.14) is commonly identified with the site at the Aëtos mountain (Partsch (1890) 52–58; Strauch (1996b)), but it seems to be a mythological fiction (Wirbelauer (1998) 248–51). Other toponyms on Ithaka attested in ancient sources derive from the Odyssey. The island is situated near Kephallenia (Strabo 10.2.11–12; Steph. Byz. 328.12; cf. Strabo 8.2.2).

From the fact that Kephallenian cities were members of the Second Athenian Naval League, Dreher (1995b) 191, 199, infers Ithakan membership of the League too. The only psaphisma of Ithaka known to us is the inscription from Magnesia on the Maeander (I.Magnesia 36.29 (c.207)).

There was a sanctuary of Athena Polias and Hera Teleia (IG ix² 1. 1614 (C6); cf. I.Magnesia 36.30) and a cave sanctuary at the Polis bay (Benton (1934–35), (1938–39); Steinhart and Wirbelauer (2002) 354–5, Mycenaean to Roman times) with dedications, particularly to the Nymphs and to Herakles and Odysseus. The veneration of Athena and Odysseus is also attested on some coins (Head, HN² 428 (C4–C3)). A sanctuary and temple of Apollo were situated in the saddle east of the Aëtos mountain (Symeonoglou, Prakt (1986) 236–37, pl. 104a; cf. SEG 38 432 (C6–C3) and IG ix² 1.1685). The existence of a stadion is to be concluded from the mention of the games called Odyssea in I.Magnesia 36.16.

The settlement in the saddle east of Aëtos, presumably the urban centre of Ithaka, had a fortified acropolis on the summit of the mountain and polygonal city walls (C5–C4; sketch map: Heurtey and Lorimer (1932–33) pl. 1; renewed: Symeonoglou, Prakt (1985) 202; cf. especially Kilian (1975)) and several buildings (Symeonoglou, Prakt (1984ff); Ergon (1984ff); Steinhart and Wirbelauer (2002) 331; Randborg (2002) 1.109, 2.282–83). The city walls enclose an area of c.12 ha. A harbour (λιμήν) is recorded by Ps.-Skylax 34. There are other remains of polygonal walls scattered on various sites in the northern part of the island.

The eponym of Ithaka was Ithakos (Hom. Od. 17.207), brother of Neritos and son of Pterelaos (Akousilaos (FGHist 1) fr. 43), cf. Wirbelauer (1998) 280–83.

The patron deity of Ithaka was Athena Polias (IG ix² 1. 1614 (C6); cf. SEG 27 180; LSAG 231 no. 3). There was a festival called Odyssea at least in the Hellenistic period (I.Magnesia 36.16).
Ithaka struck bronze coins from C4 to C2. Types: obv. head of Athena or Odysseus; rev. fulmen in olive wreath, or Odysseus, or cock; legend: Ἡ Α, Ἡ ΑΚΩΝ (Postolakas (1868) 90; Head, ΗΝΠ 428; Grose (1926) nos. 6697–99; SNG Cop. Acarnania 478).

123. Korkyra (Korkyraioi) Map 54. Lat. 39.35, long. 19.55. Size of territory: 5. Type: A. The toponym is Κορκυραῖα (Corinna col. 11.36, Campbell), Κόρκυρα, η (IG i 1364.1, 7 = ML 61 (433/2); IGIV².1 95.28 (356/5)) or Κέρκυρα (IGII² 5224.2 = CEG 469 (Ca4)); Hdt. 7.145.2; Thuc. 3.70.3). The name of the island is the same as that of the polis (Ps.-Skylax 29). The city-ethnic is Ὀρθοκριταῖοι (F.Delphes ii¹ 454 = LSAG² 233 and 234 no. 15 (c.500–475); cf. SEG 31 546, 547), Κορκυρά(ιοι) (IG i 97 (375); on coins, cf. Head, ΗΝΠ 327 (C4)) or Κέρκυρα(ιοι) (Agora xvii 517 (C5–C4)), which is the only form attested in literary sources (Hdt. 7.15.3; Thuc. 3.70.1).*  

Korkyra is called a polis both in the urban sense (Thuc. 3.72.3, 74.2; Xen. Hell. 6.2.17, 24; Ps.-Skylax 29) and in the political sense (Thuc. 1.53.1, 3.70.1; Dem. 24.202). The territorial sense is a connotation at Thuc. 1.37.3. The citizen of Korkyra is called polites by Thuc. 3.70.2 and Xen. Hell. 6.2.22, and the polis was included among the Aristotelian politeiai (fr. 517.1). 

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in different inscriptions (e.g. IG ii¹ 97 (375)) and in Classical authors (e.g. Hdt. 7.154.3; Thuc. 1.32.2), and internally on coins (Head, ΗΝΠ 327 (C4)). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in Delphi (CID ii 11.5.1 (359/8)) and Athens (IG i 9010 (C45)). It is called patriς in IG i 9224, an inscription which is dated to c.375 on formal grounds; however, the grave associated with the stele seems to date to the third quarter of C5; the stele was presumably erected in 375 when Korkyra joined the Second Athenian Naval Confederacy (cf. IG ii 96); see Knigge (1972) and (1988) 99–100. 

The name of the territory is Κέρκυραία (Thuc. 1.30.1) or Κόρκυραία (Strabo 7.75). Κέρκυραία (Strabo 7 fr. 6) as the name of the peeria around Buthroton is supposed by Büchner (1922) 1401, 1417 (cf. Thuc. 3.85.2; Strauch (1997) 227). The island of Ptychia mentioned by Thuc. 4.46.3 has been identified with the modern island of Vido (Bürchner (1922) 1411–12 no. 9; Doutas (1965) 139–40 n. 3). The mountain Πρώτη had a τεῖχος/τείχημα held by the oligarchs in 427–425 with 600 men (Thuc. 3.85.4, 4.2.3, 46.2). On the north coast of the island lay a town named Kassiopi with a port and a temple of Zeus Kasioi (Adler (1919) 2267; Büchner (1919), (1922) 1413 no. 13; Schwabl (1972) 320–21, see also SEG 23 395).

The position of Korkyra was excellent for the traffic between Greece and Italy (Thuc. 1.36.2, 44.3; Xen. Hell. 6.2.9; cf. Partsch (1887) 57; Kiechle (1979); Thiry (2001) 139–40). 

For the foundation of Korkyra we have two different traditions. Strabo 6.2.4 says that it was founded in the same year as Syracuse (no. 47), i.e. traditionally in 733; Euseb. Chron. (translated by Jerome), however, gives the year 706, which better fits the archaeological evidence (cf. Coldstream (1977) 185; Kalligas (1984); De Fidio (1995) 90–94; Lang (1996) 301). The metropolis was Corinth (no. 227) (Hdt. 3.49.1; Thuc. 1.25.3, 38.1; cf. Corinth vii 111.3 23 = SEG 28 380 (C4)), but we hear also of Eretrians (no. 370) from Euboia as colonists before the Corinthians (Plut. Mor. 293AB; for a discussion, see Kalligas (1984); De Fidio (1995) 64–65; Parker (1997) 55–57). The oecist was the Bacchidai (Timaios (FGrHist 566) fr. 80; schol. Ap. Rhod. 4.1212–14, 1216) Chersikrates from Corinth (Strabo 6.2.4). Perhaps the inscription Χερσικράτης πατριωτάν (Klaßenbach (1940) 164–65 no. 3) is related to a cult for Chersikrates as heros kitistes. The mythical eponym is Korkyra, daughter of Asopus (Korinna, PMG 645 col. ii.1; schol. Pind. Ol. 6.144; Diod. 4.72.1; Paus. 5.22.6).

The foreign relations of Korkyra are amply attested. The Korkyraioi concluded an ἐπιμαχία with Athens (no. 361) in 433 (Thuc. 1.144.1–2; Staatsverträge 161) and an alliance in 427 (Thuc. 3.75.1; Staatsverträge 172). In 375, Korkyra became a member of the Second Athenian Naval League (IG ii² 96–97 = Staatsverträge 262–63; Dreher (1995) 13–14; contra: Cargill (1981) 68ff) and, in 340 or later, a member of the Hellenic League against Philip II (Dem. 18.237; Staatsverträge 343; cf. CEG ii 809). For C4 (C3; Parke), a sympleitía with the Orikioi (no. 103) is attested (Parke (1967) 261 no. 6 = SEG 23 474; for further information, see Strauch (1997) 227 n. 72).

The Korkyraioi were involved in the following wars and engagements. In C7 (664?), Korkyra and Corinth (no. 227) fought the first naval battle in Greek history, as far as Thucydides knew (1.13.4). About 600, the Arniad Charops (not Arniadas, cf. SEG 36 541) was killed in a naval campaign.
on the river Arachthus (CEG 1 145; Hammond (1967) 493; Andreou (1991) 436–38). Before the Persian wars, the Korkyraian fleet was among the best in Greece (Thuc. 1.14.2; Kiechle (1979) 175). Sixty ships were sent to Salamis, but remained in western waters (Hdt. 7.168.3). Before the Peloponnesian War, the Korkyraian navy was the second largest in Hellas, surpassed only by the Athenian (Thuc. 1.33.1). Korkyra could muster 110 ships against the Corinthians, of which about seventy were lost in the battle of Sybota (in 433, Thuc. 1.47.1, 54.2). In 373/2, the Spartans under Mnasippos besieged Korkyra without success (Xen. Hell. 6.2.3–26). In 345/4, two Korkyraian ships joined Timoleon (Plut. Tim. 8.5). Three strategoi (Mikiades, Asimides and Eurybatos) are attested as commanding the fleet in 433 (Thuc. 1.47.1, 48.3).

Korkyraian envoys were sent to Athens in 433 (Thuc. 1.31.2–44), in 427 (Thuc. 3.71.2) and in 375 (IG ii² 96). The envoys Thersandros and Simylos died in Athens (IG ii² 5224 = CEG 11469 (Caf. 1433/2)); cf. Knigge (1988) 99–100.

Before the Hellenistic period, Korkyra gave protonexia to Menkrates of Oiantheia (no. 166) (CEG 1 143 (625–600?); but cf. SEG 44 441 and Nomina i 34 (c.550)) and to some Corinthians (Thuc. 3.70.1), and Korkyraian were granted protonexia in Delphi (no. 177) (SEG 31 534 (C4); F.Delphes iii 4 406.2–4 (C4–C3); for protonoi of Delphi, cf. Empereur (1981) 418).

Theorodokoi were appointed in Korkyra to host theoroi from Argos (no. 347) (SEG 23 189.1.13 (330–324); cf. Cabanes (1969) 551; SEG 26 427 and 36 337), Delphi (no. 177) (F.Delphes iii 4 406.2–4 (C4–C3)), Epidauros (no. 348) (IG iv 2.1 95.28 (356/5)) and Nemea (SEG 36 331.B.6–7 (331/30–313)).

Several Korkyraian Olymphonikai are attested (111, 118, 155(?), 161, 168, 409? (C6–C4)). The famous bronze bull in Delphi was a communal dedication of the Korkyraian (Paus. 10.9.3–4; F.Delphes iii 1.2 (c.480); cf. LSAG ii 13 113 no. 13; F.Delphes iii 4 454 = LSAG ii 233 and 234 no. 15 (c.500–475); cf. Bommelaer (1991) 103–4 no. 104; Jacquemin (1999) 64–65, 320 no. 122). Another bronze bull was dedicated at Olympia (Paus. 5.27.9).

In C7–C6, Korkyra was under the rule of the Corinthian tyrant Periander (Hdt. 3.52.6). During the Archidamian War, there was a stasis between democrats and oligarchs (Thuc. 3.70–85; Diod. 12.57, 13.48; cf. Gehrke, Stasis 88–95). Thereafter, Korkyra was democratic (for 375, see IG ii² 96 = Staatsverträge 262; IG iii 97 = Staatsverträge 263), but suffered from civil strife several times: in 411/10 (Diod. 13.48.5ff), in 375/4 (Diod. 15.46.2, 47.1) and in 361, when the oligarchs came to power once again (Aen. Tact. 11.15).

The oldest public enactment (C7) is attested indirectly by protonexy given by the damos to Menkrates of Oiantheia (no. 166) (CEG 1143.3). Nomoi are mentioned by Xen. Hell. 5.4.64, 375. A law court can be inferred from Thuc. 3.70.3. The eponymous magistrate was a prytanis (IG ix² 1.786.1 (C4)), together with whom synarchoi are mentioned (Klaftenbach (1940) 163 no. 1 (C4)). A boule and bouleutai are attested by Thuc. 3.70.5–6. Explicitly, the term halia does not occur earlier than in Hellenistic inscriptions (e.g. IG ix² 1.786.5 (C4)). But since we know of decisions of the Korkyraian people before that date (CEG 1 143.3, 5–6; Thuc. 3.71.2), we have to conclude that the halia had existed since the Archaic period.

From inscribed lead tablets found at Palaiopolis (c.500) we are informed about the Korkyraian system of civic subdivisions (Kalligas (1971); cf. Jones, POAG 159–61; Hadzik (1993); Nomina ii 73), a combination of proper names given in gen. pl./sing. with a feminine ordinal adjective. A different kind of civic subdivision is attested in the form of a sub-ethnic on the back of one of the tablets: Εἴρυνυλλὸς Ἀμπινεύς (SEG 41 543). Two members of the Dorian phyle Hylleis are recorded in IG ix² 1.798.3, 5 (C2); cf. SEG 25 609; Kalligas (1971) 87).

The acropolis (Thuc. 3.72.3) was situated in the southern part of the city (Bürchner (1922) 1411). A teichós with πύργοι is mentioned by Xen. Hell. 6.2.15, 17, 20 (373/2). Whether the remains of a wall with gates and towers between the ports of Hylos and Alkinoos can be identified with Xenophon’s teichós is a matter of discussion; for: Schmidt (1890) 46 and pl. II; Spetsieris-Choremis (1997) 12 (C5–C4); against: Kaletsch in Lauffer (1989) 503, who dates this wall to the Hellenistic period. Archaeological evidence for the urban structure is reported by Lang (1996) 299–301.

The most important public buildings were the bouleuterion (Thuc. 3.70.6: ἐς τὴν βουλήν) and the prytaneion (I.Magnesia 44.40, 42 (c.207)). The agora, where in C5 most of the oligarchs lived (Thuc. 3.72.3), was situated in the northern part of the city near the northern harbour (Thuc. 3.72.3, 74.2).

A νεώριον is attested by Thuc. 3.74.2 (cf. ναώριον: SEG 13 384.10, 11 (C2)), who likewise mentions two Korkyraian ports (3.72.3), the ‘Ἦλικαι’ (‘Ἦλικος, Apoll. Rhod. 4.1125) or Ὡλοῦ (schol. Dionys. Per. 493 = GGM 11.450) λυμήν, and the λυμήν ὁ πρός αὐτή [sc. τῇ ἄγορᾳ] καὶ πρός τὴν ἤπειρον (commonly identified with the Ἀλκίνου λυμήν, schol. Dionys. Per. 493). Xen. Hell. 6.2.36 has only one λυμήν τῶν Κερκυραίων. According to Ps.-Skyllax 29,
Korkyra had three good harbours near the city, but the identification of the third remains doubtful.

The patron deity of Korkyra was Apollo Korkyraios (Kalligas [1968] 313 = LSAG 453 no. A (C5)). On his cult, see also Kalligas [1969a] 54–58; [1968] 304–13 (C6 and later). Sanctuaries for the following deities are attested: Artemis (Rodewaldt [1939]; Schleif et al. [1940]; Riemann [1943]) (C6); votive inscriptions: Klaffenbach [1940] 163–64 no. 1 (C4); no. 2 (C3); Apollo Pythios (Klaffenbach [1940] 165–66 no. 5 = LSAG 234 no. 17 (C5)); Hera Akr(a)ia (IG ix.1 698 = LSAG 234 no. 18 (C5), identified by Dontas [1965], [1976], and Kalligas [1969a] 51, 53, with one of the three temples known in the Mon Repos area; for the Heraion near the polis, see Thuc. 3.81.2); the Dioskouria (Thuc. 3.75.3; for a heros Διοσκούρων found near the Menekrates monument, see IG ix.1 1883.11 (C4)); Dionysos (Thuc. 3.81.5; for traces of a possible cult see, Cremer [1981]; Lang [1996] 299–300). There was a temenos of Zeus (Thuc. 3.70.4; for the cult of Zeus in Korkyra, see Schwabl [1972] 336 no. 9 (337); [1978] 1477) and one of the heros Alkinos (Thuc. 3.70.4). Outside the city, a temple of Zeus Kasios existed in Kassiope (see supra) and one of Artemis in the southern part of the Kanopi peninsula (Lang [1996] 299 no. 540).

The Korkyraians used the Dorian calendar of Corinth (no. 227) (Bischoff [1919] 1992 no. 31; Hadzis [1995]). The oracle of Dodona was consulted by the Korkyraians in C5 (Parke [1967] 260 nos. 2, 3), and in C4 (C3: Parke) together with the Orикиои (no. 103) (ibid. 261 no. 6 = SEG 23 474). In Delphi, Korkyra held the promanteia (E.Delphes 111.4 389 (C4); cf. Vatin [1981] 445; SEG 31 555).

In about 627, Epidamnos (no. 79) was founded by Korkyraians together with Corinthian and other Dorian settlers (Thuc. 1.24; Dios. 12.30.2; cf. Gomme [1945–81] i. 159; Gehrke, Stasis 60–61 n. 4). According to Strabo 7.5.8, Apollonia (no. 77) was a κτίσµα Κορινθίων καὶ Κερκυραίων, and Korkyra participated probably in the colonisation of Leukas (no. 126; together with Corinth (no. 227), Plut. Them. 24.1, from Theophrastos; Frost [1980] 201–2).

Anaktorion (no. 114) is recorded as a place common to Korkyraians and Corinthians before 432 (Thuc. 1.55.1), which may suggest that it was a shared foundation too (but see supra 356). Kiechle [1979] 179 supports the hypothesis that Korkyra was involved in the colonisation of the Dalmatian island of Melaina Korkyra (no. 83) carried out by the Knidians (no. 903).

During C6–C4, Korkyra struck coins (silver and bronze) following local tradition in both standard and design. Silver denominations: stater, drachm, triobol, diobol, obol. Types: obv. often cow (suckling calf) or amphora; rev. often stellate or floral pattern; legend: the Archaic coins are anepigraphic, but from about 450 onward, they are generally inscribed KOP. After 338, Korkyra began to strike stater similarities to those of Corinth but with the legends KOP, KORKYRAiΩN or K. A few have been found in hoards from Sicily and Magna Graecia (Talbert [1971] 61; Taliere Mensitieri and Spagnoli [1993] especially pls. 3, 5h). IG i3 383.91–93 (429/8) mentions Korkyraioi stateres (cf. Regling [1929] 2175). Head, HN 325–28; Kraay [1976] 123, 128–29; IGCH passim (cf. p. 398); Spetsieris-Choremis [1981] 38 viii. 41; cf. ibid. 52, 53, 160, 450; BMC Thessaly 115–67; BMC Corinth 112; SNG Cop. Acarnania 140–69.

124. Koronta (Korontaíōs) Map 54. Lat. 38.35, long. 21.10. Size of territory: 2. Type: B. The toponym is Κόροντα, τἀ (Thuc. 2.102.1) or Κόροντα, αἱ (IG iv.1 95.12 (356/5); SEG 36 331.A.49 (331/30–313)). The city–ethnic is Κορονταίων (IG ix.2.1 583.6 (216), 582.2 (c.207)).

Koronta is not explicitly attested as a polis but named together with Stratos (no. 138) καὶ ἄλλων χωρίων (sc. of Akarnania) by Thuc. 2.102.1. Since it was a member of the Akarnanian Confederacy, struck coins in C4–C3 and had a walled urban centre (with the highest degree of probability the site near modern Chrysovitsa: Pritchett [1992] 102–3; Schoch [1997] 43–44), it is to be classified as a polis of type B.

The collective use of the city–ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form (K (infra) or KO on coins (see s.v. Torybeia (no. 140)). The individual use of the city–ethnic is attested externally in Hellenistic inscriptions (see supra).

Koronta was part of Akarnania (IG iv.2.1 95.8 + (356/5); SEG 36 331.A.15 + 49 (331/30–313)), lying in the mesogeia (Thuc. 2.102.1). From the account of Thucydides (especially 2.102.1) we have to conclude that Koronta belonged to the Akarnanian Confederacy already in C5. It is explicitly attested as a member in C3 (IG ix.2.1 583, 582).

In 429, a group of citizens loyal to the Peloponnesians was exiled by the Athenians (Thuc. 2.102.1).

Theodorokoi are attested in Koronta to host theoroi from Epidaurus (no. 348; IG iv.2.1 95.12 (356/5)) and Nemea (SEG 36 331.A.49–51 (331/30–313)).

The walls of the presumed site of Koronta near Chrysovitsa were built of polygonal and horizontal masonry (Pritchett [1992] 103 with pls. 77–81). Kirsten dated them to the Hellenistic period (Philippsion and Kirsten [1958] 635 n. 15), but given the well-founded general observations by Pritchett ([1992] 115ff), an earlier date seems preferable.
A Pegasos-type stater of Corinthian standard has been attributed to Koronta. *Obv.* Pegasos; *rev.* head of Athena with Macedonian shield; legend: K (Imhoof-Blumer (1878) 114; Head, *HN*² 329). Since then, eight coins of this type have been found in Sicilian and South Italian hoards (Talbert (1971) 61; *IGCH* 88, 2030, 2180, 2185, 2187, 2198; Taliervico Mensiti and Spagnoli (1993) especially pls. 1, 3); this coinage can be dated to C.4. For other coins, see Torda (no. 1.40); *SNG Cop. Acarnania* 332.

**125. Kranioi (Kranios)** Map 54. Lat. 38.10, long. 20.30. Size of territory: 2 or 3. Type: A. The toponym is *Kránoi* (Thuc. 5.35.7; *IG* ix.1 276.3 (Opous, C–C–2?) or *Kránaia* (schol. Thuc. 1.27.2, Hude). The city-ethnic is *Kránosis* (Thuc. 2.30.2, 33.3; *Magnesia* 35.39 (c.207) or *Kráneos* (*Etym.* *Magn.* 507.31).

Kranioi is referred to as a *polis* in the urban sense by the term *περιπόλοις* at Thuc. 2.30.2, where the use of city-ethnics instead of toponyms indicates that the political sense is a connotation (Hansen (2000) 174 n. 3 and 208); cf. Xen. *Hell.* 6.2.33: τὰς ἐν τῇ Ἰφραλαβρια ἄνεμελεια.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in Hellenistic inscriptions ( *Magnesia* 35.39 (c.207); *IG* ix.1 276.3 (Opous, C–C–2?)) and by Thuc. 2.30.2, 33.2, and internally in various abbreviations, on C–C–4 coins (see infra). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in an honorific decree from Delphi ( *F.Delphes* 111.3 204.3 (162/1?)).

The name of the territory is given by Thuc. 2.33.3 as ἡ Ἰλλ. Κρανίων γη. It included the southern part of the island of Kephallenia without the peninsula to the west (cf. Paleis (no. 132)).

The eponym of the island was the hero Kephalos, son of Deion(eus) and father of Pronos, Samos, Pelus and Kranios, the eponyms of the four Kephallenian *poleis* (Gehrke (1994) 110–12; Wirbelauer (1998) 269–80).

In 431, an Athenian envoy was sent to Kephallenia to ascertain the Kephallenian views on the growing conflict (Thuc. 2.7.3; *Diod.* 12.4.5). The Corinthian aggression in the winter of 431/30 (Thuc. 2.33.3) indicates that Kraniou was pro-Athenian; its inhabitants may have been among the Kephalenians who supplied ships to the Athenians under Demosthenes during the campaign in 426 (Thuc. 3.94–98) and hoplites in 421 (Thuc. 7.31.2). In 421 the Athenians settled Messenians and other people from the Peloponnesos in Kraniou (Thuc. 5.35.7). They were expelled by the Spartans in 401 (Diod. 14.34.2–3). In 373/2 the Kraniou may have been among the Kephalenians who became members of the Second Athenian Naval League (*Staatsverträge* 262 and 267 = *Agora* xvi 46; Xen. *Hell.* 6.2.33; cf. Dreher (1995) 191, 199) and of the Corinthian League of 338/7 (*Staatsverträge* 403). The Argive theorodokoi list SEG 23 189.1.20 (330–324) mentions Kephallenia; so at least one of the four Kephallenian *poleis* appointed theorodokoi to host the *theoroi* from Argos (no. 347).

Archontes as judges in one city of Kephallenia (probably Kranioi or Paleis (no. 132); Wirbelauer (1998) 341–42) are attested by Dem. 32.9; cf. 14, 22–23.

A sanctuary of Demeter and Kore is mentioned in a late inscription (Kalligas (1978); SEG 30 517 (G1)). Whether the foundations with orthostats on the acropolis belong to this temple or to another one has to remain open (cf. Kalligas (1969b) 270–72). A rural sanctuary of C6 was discovered at Minies; its remains are now covered or destroyed by the modern airport (Kalligas (1973) 83–84; Randseberg (1995) 97).

The acropolis is situated on the top of the hill in the south-western part of the settlement (Kalligas (1969b) 270–72). Polygonal and ashlar walls exist on three sides of the town, and there are two other stretches connecting the main wall with the plain of Kutas, probably the ancient harbour of Kraniou (for Mycenaean remains and those of C–C–4, see Partsch (1890) 80–84 with pl. 2; Benton (1932) 224–25; Kalligas (1969b) 272, (1978) 173; Steinhardt and Wirbelauer (2002) 333; Randseberg (2002) i.106–8, ii.275–81, 299–307).

According to Kraay (1976) 96, the Kraniou were the first Kephalenians to strike coins: silver coins of C–C–4. Denominations: triobol, trihemidobol, obol. Types: *obv.* mostly ram’s head; *rev.* bow, often in incuse square; legend: *ΚΡΑ, ΚΡΑ, ΚΡΑΝ*. Bronze coins were issued from C5 onward. Types: *obv.* head of ram or of bull, male figure, identified by head with Kephalos, the mythical eponym; *rev.* head of Kephalos; legend: *ΚΡΑ, ΚΡΑ, ΚΡ ή H*, monograms (Babelon, *Traité* i.1 no. 1229: ΚΕΦΑ; see Postolakas (1868) 91–94; Babelon, *Traité* ii.1. 907–10; 2.791–96; Head, *HN*² 427, and for Kraay (1976) 96; *SNG Cop. Acarnania* 452–59.

**126. Leukas (Leukadios)** Map 54. Lat. 38.50, long. 20.45. Size of territory: 4. Type: A. The toponym is *Λευκά*, ἡ (Thuc. 3.94.2; Xen. *Hell.* 6.2.3; *IG* iv² 1.95 (356/5)). The city-ethnic is *Λευκάδιοι* (Hdt. 8.45; Thuc. 3.94.2; *ML* 27.10 (479); *IG* iv² 104 = *Staatsverträge* 278 (368)). According to Ps.-Skylax 34, the *polis* of Leukas was called Ἑπιλευκάδιοι in earlier times. This name of a πολίς μετὰ Λακανίαν is known also to Steph. *Byz.* 274.11 (from Hecat. fr. 110).
Leukas is called a *polis* in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 34 and in the political sense by Thuc. 1.30.3. At Thuc. 3.94.2 *polis* is used in the urban and political senses simultaneously. It was included among the Aristotelian *politeiai* (no. 101, Gigon); for the use of *politeia* in connection with Leukas, cf. Arist. *loc. cit.*). At Hecat. fr. 102c = Strabo 6.2.4 we cannot be certain that the term *polis* stems from Hekataios.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally on the Serpent Column from Delphi (ML 27.10) and in Hdt. 8.45 and Thuc. 3.94.2; internally it is found on C5–C4 coins (*ÆYKΔION* and various abbreviations). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in several inscriptions (e.g. *IAEpi* 14 (Epidaurus, C4–C5)) and by Hdt. 9.38.2.

The *polis* of Leukas (Ps.-Skylax 34) was situated on the island of the same name (Harp. s.v.), which was also, *qua* territory, called *Λευκάδια* (Thuc. 3.94.1). To the north and north-east, the Leukadians bordered on the Thesprotians (Hdt. 8.47). An isthmus with an artificial channel (*dioryktos*) connected the northern part of the island with the mainland (Strabo 10.2.8; cf. Partsch (1889) 2–7; (1907), Fiedler (1996) 159). A part of the mainland opposite was, as *peraia*, under Leukadian control (Thuc. 3.94.2). Part of this *peraia* may have been the fortified place Nerikos (Thuc. 3.7.4; Strabo 10.2.8), which can be identified tentatively with the ruins near Ag. Georgios (dominating the southern entrance into the Leukas channel), as suggested by Fiedler (1996) 159–60, 162) and others. Other place-names attested for Leukas island are Ellomenon (Thuc. 3.94.1) and Phara (Ps.-Skylax 34); in all probability, they were dependent settlements; they cannot be located with certainty (for the proposals, see Fiedler (1996) 159–60 and s.v. Palairos (no. 131)). There are various remains on the island (see in general Fiedler (1996) 161–68), among them a Doric temple at Agios Ioannis Rodakis (Dörpfeld (1927) 263–64).

Leukas was founded during the reign of the tyrant Kypselos (Strabo 10.2.8, for the date (657/6–627/6), see Gehrke (1990) 34; Oberhummer (1887) 76 proposed c.635) by Corinthians (no. 227) (e.g. Hdt. 8.45; Thuc. 1.30.2; Ps.-Skylax 34; Dem. 9.34.). New settlers arrived in the time of his successor Periander (Plut. *Mor.* 552E). The oecist was Pylaides (Nic. Dam. (*FGrHist* 90) fr. 57.7), and the colonists were sent out by Kypselos and his son Gorgos (Strabo 10.2.8).

According to the *Alkaianois* (fr. 5, Bernabé; Ephor. fr. 124 = Strabo 10.2.9), Leukadios, son of Ikarios, Penelope’s father, was the eponym of Leukas. Leukas was a member of the following leagues: Hellenic League of 481 (ML 27.10; Hdt. 8.45 *et passim*; *Staatsverträge* 130), Peloponnesian League (Thuc. 2.9.3; Diod. 12.42.4 (1431); Paus. 10.9.10 (1405)), Second Athenian Naval League (*IG* 11 ii 104 = *Staatsverträge* 278 (368); cf. Dreher (1995) 191 with n.122), Hellenic League against Philip II (Dem. 18.237; Aeschin. 3.95–98 (256); cf. *Staatsverträge* 343) and against Antipater in 323 (*Staatsverträge* 413). Leukas did not enter the Akarian Confederacy until the years 280/265 (cf. *IG* ix 2.1 3A.2.4 (263?); cf. Funke *et al.* (1993) 134; Schoch (1997) 74).

In 435, Leukas was allied with Corinth (no. 227) against Epidamnos (no. 79) (Thuc. 1.26.1, 27.2) and against Korkyra (no. 123) in 433 (Thuc. 1.46.1). During the Corinthian War, it was allied with Boiotia, Athens (no. 361), Corinth and Argos (no. 347) (Diod. 14.82.3; *Staatsverträge* 225). In 368, Leukas concluded a treaty(? with Athens (no. 361) (*IG* 11 ii 104 = *Staatsverträge* 278).

Leukas was engaged in the following campaigns and battles: in the battle of Salamis with three ships (Hdt. 8.45); at Plataiai together with Anaktorion (no. 114) with 800 hoplites (Hdt. 9.28.5); at Epidamnos and Sybota with ten ships (Thuc. 1.27.2, 46.1); in the campaign of 427 with thirteen ships (together with Ambrakia (no. 113); Thuc. 3.69.1, cf. Diod. 30.40.5); in 414 with two ships sent to Taras (no. 71; Thuc. 6.104); in the battle of Aigos potamoi (405) under Tełykrates in Lysander’s fleet (Paus. 10.9.10); against Korkyra, supporting the Lakedaimonian fleet, in 373/2 (Xen. *Hell.* 6.2,3, 26); following Timoleon to Sicily with one ship in 345/4 (Plut. *Tim.* 8.5). The Leukadian mercenary leader Euthymos first fought under Timoleon, later against him, and was executed by him c.339 (ibid. 30.6–9 and 32).

Leukadian envoys took the oaths on a treaty with Athens (*IG* 11 ii 104 = *Staatsverträge* 278). The Leukadians Nausigenes and Euandros were appointed *proxenos* by Epidaurus (no. 348) (*IAEpi* 14 (C4–C5)). *Theodorodoki* were appointed to host *theoroi* from Argos (no. 347) (*SEG* 23 189.1 (320–324)), Epidaurus (no. 348) (*IG* iv 2.1 95.20 (365/6); *IAEpi* 14) and Nemea (*SEG* 36 331.8–13 (331/30–313)). In the 320s, Leukas imported 15,000 *medimnoi* of grain from Kyrene (no. 1028) (*SEG* 9 2.20 = Tod 196).

In the Archaic or early Classical period the constitution changed from oligarchy to democracy. An Archaic law seems to have prescribed the preservation of the old *klaþ̄pou*. The abolition of this law led to a democratatisation of the Leukadian constitution, perhaps in C6–C5 (Arist. *Pol.* 1266b21–24; Gehrke, *Statis* 101). Magistrates are attested generally, as *år̄ɔχαί*, by Arist. *Pol.* 1266b24. Münsterberg (1973) 43 records more than sixty names of officials on Leukadian coins.
An agora is attested explicitly only for the Hellenistic period (forum, Livy 33.17.12 (197)); no remains of it have yet been found (Fiedler (1996) 162). From a votive inscription on a miniature bronze helmet crest we know of a dedication to Athena (IG ix.2.1 1237(C6)). A temple of Apollo was situated near the isthmus and the polis of Leukas (Thuc. 3.94.2; Strabo 10.2.9; Plut. Pomp. 24, but cf. Dörpfeld (1927) 271). There were temples of Hera (Heraeum, Livy 33.17.2, near the city) and of Aphrodite Aineas (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 1.50.4, on an island between the dioryktos and the polis, cf. the mention of a temple of Aphrodite in a Messenian inscription of C2: Themelis (1993) 35; Strauch (1997) 240 with n. 120); for the remains of a temple at Ag. Ioannis Rodakis, see supra.

The site of the λιµήν (Ps.-Sklayax 34) is unknown (Fiedler (1996) 162). Two moles have been found at the southern end of the Leukas channel (Murray (1982) 226ff; (1988) 101ff; Fiedler (1996) 162; Schoch (1997) 20). The acropolis (arcx, Livy 33.17.11 (197)) was presumably situated on the north-east hill of the city (Fiedler (1996) 162). There are only a few, undated remains of a city wall (cf. muri, moenia: Livy 33.17.4, 9–10, 13 (197)) and of other walls to the north and north-west of the ancient polis (Fiedler (1996) 161–63). The remains of houses dating to the Classical/Hellenistic period were laid out in accordance with a grid-plan street system (Fiedler (1996) 161–62).

The Leukadian mint is the oldest known in Akarnania, and its coins had the widest circulation. The silver coinage started in about 490 and was strongly influenced by Corinth (no. 227) (Carter (1993); cf. Anaktorion (no. 114)). Next to the Corinthian, the Leukadian pegasi are the coins most frequently found in Sicilian and South Italian hoards (Talbert (1997) 60, 62; IGCH passim (cf. p. 401); Taliércio Mensitieri and Spagnoli (1993) especially pls. 3, 5c (more than 500 pieces); CH viii. 53, 95, 159, 160, 167, 226, 232, 264, 506). Denominations: stater, drachm and smaller fractions. Types: obv. Pegasos; rev. head of Athena; legend: Α, sometimes ΛΕΥ or ΛΕΥΚΑΔΙΩΝ. Smaller C4 denominations struck in bronze with various types. More than sixty names of officials are attested on Leukadian coins (Münsterberg (1973) 43; for the coins, see generally Postolakas (1868) 54–89; Imhoof-Blumer (1878) 115–38; Head, HN² 329–31. SNG Cop. Acarnania 326–76, Suppl. 249–50).

127. Limnaia (Limnaios) Map 54. Lat. 38.50, long. 21.10. Size of territory: 2. Type: B. The toponym is Λιµναία, η (Thuc. 2.80.8, 3.106.2; IG iv².1 95.8 (356/5)). The city-ethnic is Λιµναίος (IG ix.2.1 588.9–10 (Sparta, C2)).

Limnaia is not attested as a polis in ancient sources. It is mentioned under the heading Ἀκαρνανία in an Epidaurian and a Nemean theorodokoi list (C4) and was, at least in Hellenistic times, a member of the Akarnanian Confederacy (see infra). Whether it was a polis or an ethnos in this Confederacy in the Classical period has to remain open. It is called a κόµη ἀτείχιστος by Thuc. 2.80.8. The walls at Karvassaras (modern Amphilocchia) to be identified with the site of Limnaia, however, suggest an urban centre. But they cannot be dated with certainty (cf. supra).

Thuc. 2.80.8 mentions Limnaia as a village in the Argeia, i.e. the territory of Argos Amphilochikon (no. 115) which was destroyed by a Spartan army under Knemion. Limnaia seems to have had a common frontier with Medion (no. 129) (to the south-west?) and with the Agraioi (Thuc. 3.106.2). According to Polyb. 5.5.14, the καλοµινή Λιµναία was a coastal site in the Gulf of Arta. Limnaia is attested as a part of Akarnania in an Epidaurian theorodokoi list (IG iv².1 95.8). It was a member of the Akarnanian Confederacy (IG ix.2.1 588.9–10 (Sparta, C2); cf. IG ix.2.1 3A). Theorodokoi were appointed to host theoroi from Epidaurus (no. 348; IG iv².1 95.8) and Nemea (SEG 36 331.A.31–33 (331/30–313)).

As the evidence stands, the most likely reconstruction is that, in C5s, Limnaia was a κόµη belonging to Argos (no. 115), but by 356/5 it had become a political unit and acquired the status of polis. The urban centre was fortified, and the community became a member of the Akarnanian Confederacy in its own right. See Medion (no. 129) and Phoitiai (no. 134).

The walls at Amphilocchia, with polygonal masonry, are described and discussed by Pritchett (1992) 2–6, 118–19; according to Winter (1971) 98, 111, they are not earlier than the last quarter of C4.

128. *Matropolis (Matropolites) Map 54. Lat. 38.35, long. 21.15. Size of territory: 2. Type: B. The toponym is *Ματρόπολις, η (see the ethnic), in koine Μητρόπολις (Polyb. 6.64.3–4). The city-ethnic is Ματροπολίτας (IG ix².3 B.4, 8 (C3); cf. Freitag (1994) 223–24 no. 11).³

³ Perhaps other Akarnanian Limnaiai are mentioned in Greek inscriptions, but normally a Limnaia will be identified with a citizen of the Thessalian city Limnaioi, see infra 69; see Stählin (1926); Daux (1995) 38; SEG 15 140 and 19. 379.

⁴ Perhaps other Akarnanian Matropolitai are mentioned in Greek inscriptions, but normally a Matropolites will be identified with a citizen of the homonym Thessalian city (no. 403) (cf. e.g. SEG 27 123; 11; Daux (1995) 37–38). The same problem concerns the coinage of Matropolis (Isler (1996) 170–71 n. 17). This Matropolis is not to be confused with the Μητρόπολες καλοµινή mentioned by Thuc. 3.107.1 in the territory of Argos Amphilochikon (Pritchett (1992) 25–27).
*Matropolis is not attested as a polis before C₃, when the term is found in the urban sense in Polyb. 4.64.4 (r219) and in the political sense in an inscription concerning a boundary dispute between Oiniadai (no. 130) and *Matropolis found in Aitolian Thermos (IG ix².1 3B.8 (C₃)). But the polis status of *Matropolis in the Classical period is strongly indicated by the toponym itself, the coinage of C₄ (see infra), the membership of both the Aitolian and the Akarnanian Confederacies (see infra), and the existence of an urban centre at the site of Palaioamna (identified convincingly with *Matropolis by Pritchett (1991) 8–15; cf. Freitag (1994) 224 and see infra).

In C₃ *Matropolis belonged to the Stratos district (Στρατικών τέλος) of the Aitolian Confederacy (IG ix².1 3B.2 (before 230); cf. Swoboda (1913) 332–33 n. 6; Klaffenbach (1957) xx; Guarducci, EG 11 554; Freitag (1994) 223–24). Later on, it is attested as a member of the Aitolian koinon (IG ix².1 209, 208 and 588.11 (C₂); cf. IG ix.2 61.5 (Lamia, 216–212)), part of which it must have been before the Aitolian conquest of about 250 (IG ix².1 3A; cf. Klaffenbach (1957) xx).

*Matropolis had an acropolis (άκρα) as a part distinct from the city (Polyb. 4.64.4). The site of Palaioamna fits very well the Polyanian report, which is decisive for the identification (Pritchett (1991) 11–12, with reference to Kirsten). The walls of the acropolis, in trapezoidal masonry, are flanked with towers, while the enceinte of the city is constructed of polygonal blocks (for a description, see Pritchett (1991) 9–12, who reports Geometric pottery and metal objects found on the site: ibid. 10).

A Pegaseos-type stater of Corinthian standard (obv. Pegaseos; rev. head of Athena with Makedonian shield and monogram MA) has been attributed to *Matropolis (Imhoof-Blumer (1878) 142–43; Head, HN² 331). Since then eighteen coins of this type have been found in Sicilian and South Italian hoards (Talbert (1971) 62; IGCH 2030, 2180, 2183, 2185, 2187; Taliercio Mensitieri and Spagnoli (1993) especially pls. 1.3; CH viii. 167). This coinage can be dated to C₄₈. SNG Cop. Acrarnnia 399.

129. Medion (Medionios) Map 54. Lat. 38.45, long. 21.10.
Size of territory: 3. Type A. The toponym is Μεδιώνως or Μεδιών (Thuc. 3.106.2) or Μεδιών (IG iv².1 95.13 (356/5); SEG 23 189.1.2 (suppl., Argos, 330–324); cf. Cabanes (1969) 550; SEG 36 331.4.4 (Nemea, 331/30–313); Steph. Byz. 440.1). The city-ethnic is Μεδιώνως (Mastrokostas (1965) 159 no. 17 = SEG 25 633 (stamped roof-tile of C₄–C₃)).

Medion is not attested as a polis before Polyb. 2.2.7, 11, 2.3.1 and 6 (r231), where the term is found in the urban sense. But in theorodokoi lists of C₄ it is recorded under the heading Akarnania, it is attested as a member of the Akarnanian Confederacy in C₃, it struck coins (see infra) and had a walled urban centre (near modern Katouna (Pritchett (1991) 83–88), where Medion is securely located by a tile stamp (SEG 25 633) found there). So it was probably a polis already in the Classical period.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in Hellenistic inscriptions (IG ix².1 388.1 (Megara, C₃), 582.46 (Magnesia, c.207)) and internally by a tile stamp (SEG 25 633 (C₄–C₃)) and in abbreviated form (ΜΕ) on C₄₅ coins (infra). The individual use of the city-ethnic is likewise attested externally in Hellenistic inscriptions (IG ix².1 583.21 (Olympia, 216), 582.4 (Magnesia, c.207)).

The name of the territory was Μεδεώνια (Polyb. 2.3.1). Medion is named among the other Akarnanian places in theorodokoi lists of C₄ (see infra). It was a member of the Akarnanian Confederacy (IG ix².1. 583, 582) and appointed theorodokoi to host theoroi from Argos (no. 347) (SEG 23 189.1.2 (330–324); cf. Cabanes (1969) 550), Epidauros (no. 348) (IG iv².1 95.13 (356/5)) and Nemea (SEG 36 333.4.44–46 (331/30–313)).

The walls of Medion, today poorly preserved, were of polygonal masonry (for a description, see Pritchett (1991) 85–88). Remains of a Doric temple (C₄₅) and a horos inscription of a cult place of Asklepios are reported by Schwandner, AA (1989) 651.

Some bronze coins of C₄₅ have been attributed to Medion by Imhoof-Blumer (1878) 139–41; Head, HN² 331; Hammond (1967) 729. Types: obv. head of Athena or Apollo; rev. tripod or owl between M and E. SNG Cop. Acrarnnia 397–98.

130. Oinidai (Oinidas) Map 54. Lat. 38.25, long. 21.10.
Size of territory: 3. Type A. The toponym is Οινίδα, οἱ (Thuc. 1.111.3; Soph. Tr. 510; Polyb. 4.65.4–5; IG iv².1 95.9 (356/5)); Οινίδα (Hippoc. Epid. 5.1.3–8). According to Steph. Byz. 281.10–11, the original toponym was Ἐρυσίχη, probably a construct by Hellenistic authors (Freitag (1994) 22). The city-ethnic is Οινίδας (Thuc. 2.82, 3.94.1; IG ix².1 3A.22, 24–25 (263/24)).

Oinidai is called a polis in the urban sense by Thuc. 2.102.2 and Ps.-Skyllax 34. The earliest attestation of the political sense is in a C₃ decree (IG ix².1 3B.7–8). The word παρπίς is used by Diod. 18.8.6 (τ c.329/4; see Jehne (1994) 241–43).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally by Thuc. 2.82 and 3.94.1 as well as in an inscription concerning a boundary dispute (IG ix².1 3B.3–4, 7–8 (C₃ before 230))
and internally on C3 coins (infra) and on a stamped tile (SEG 42 486 (C3–C2)).

The territory is called χώρα (IG ix2.1 3B, 3–4 (C3); Polyb. 21.32.14) or of περί Ὀινιάδαις τῶν (Thuc. 2.102.6) or ᾗ Ὀινίάς (schol. Thuc. 2.102). It was situated in south-western Akarnania, at a distance of about 70 stades from the mouth of the river Achelous (Strabo 10.2.2). It is attested as part of Akarnania in the theorodokoi lists (see infra). To the north, Oiniadai bordered on the territory of *Matropolis (no. 128) (IG ix2.1 3B).

The Argive hero Alkmaion passes for the founder of Oiniadai, while his son Akarnan gave his name to the whole region (Thuc. 2.102.5–6; Jouan 1990; Gehrke 1994–95 46–48).

Messenians from Naupaktos (no. 165) attacked Oiniadai in 456/5 and forced its population to leave their town, but in the next year the Oiniadai returned (Paus. 4.25.3). In 325/4 (Jehne 1994 241–43), the Oiniadai were driven out by the Aitolians (Diod. 18.8.6; Plut. Alex. 49.8). On Kassander’s advice the Oiniadai left their settlement in 314 and moved to Sauria (Diod. 19.67.4; cf. Freitag 1994 222–23). Strabo 10.2.2 mentions an old Oiniadai at a greater distance from the sea; the matter remains a mystery (for a discussion, see Freitag 1994 226–27).

According to Freitag 1994 236 with n. 97, Oiniadai did not become a member of the Akarnanian Confederacy until 424, when the polis was forced to join the Athenian League (Thuc. 4.77.2; Kagan 1974 281). In the years before, Oiniadai had supported the Lakedaimonians against the Akarnanians and Athenians (Thuc. 2.82). In 263(?), Oiniadai is attested as part of the Akarnanian koinon (IG ix2.1 3A, 22).

Oiniadai appointed theorodokoi to host theoroi from Epidaurus (no. 348; IG iv2.1 95.9 (356/5)) and Nemea (SEG 36 331 A.34–7 (331/30–313)).

An acropolis (ἄκρα) is attested by Polyb. 4.65.5–11 (1219). Remains of an edifice consisting of a complex of thirteen rooms on a hill-top near the acropolis may have been a dwelling house (cf. Powell 1904 214). The existence of a city wall in the 450s is indicated by Thucydides’ reference to a poliorkia by the Athenians (1.111.3; cf. Paus. 4.25.2) claiming that in 456/5 the Messenians of Naupaktos (no. 165) tried to take Oiniadai using scaling ladders and μηχανήματα; Plutarch mentions a wall of Oiniadai at the time of the Periklean expedition to Akarnania (Plut. Per. 19.3); in 219, Philip V fortified Oiniadai (again); Polyb. 4.65.5ff. There are substantial remains of a regular polygonal wall over 6 km in length (described by Powell 1904 146ff and Kirsten 1937 2215ff). It enclosed the acropolis and the lower city, an area of altogether 59 ha, and may date from C5–C4 (Winter 1971 236; Pritchett 1992 117–18, against Kirsten 1937 2224, who argued that only the acropolis had been enclosed by a wall until Philip V fortified Oiniadai in 219). Inside the circuit, few remains of streets and houses are discernible (cf. the plan by Kirsten 1937 2217–18). The results of recent archaeological investigations have been published by Kolonas, Serbetis and Schmidt (1992).

There are remains of a small temple on the western side of the harbour of Oiniadai, where a fragment of a foot from a statue has been found. Powell (1904) 205 suggests that it might have been Athena the Saviour, who was worshipped as the goddess of the sailors in the Piraeus.

The evidence for silver coins remains doubtful (Head, HN7 331). Bronze coins of C3 have the legend ΟΙΝΙΑΔΑΝ (Imhoof-Blumer 1878 15–17, 151; Grose 1926 5372–9; IGCH145, 311–12; SNG Cop. Acarnania 400–3).

131. Palairos (Palaeirus) Map 54. Lat. 38.50, long. 20.50. Size of territory: 2. Type: B. The toponym is Πάλαιρος (Epicharm. fr. 38, Kaibel (CGF); IG iv2.1 95.21 (356/5)). The city-ethnic is Παλαιρεύς (Thuc. 2.30.1; IG ix2.1 582.47 (Magnesia, c.207)) or Παλαιραῖος (SEG 9 2.35 = Tod 196 (Kyrene, 330–325)).

Palairos is not attested as a polis before the Hellenistic period unless one accepts a conjecture in the text of Ps.-Skylax 34: the MS has an otherwise unknown polis Φαρά listed between Leukas (no. 126) and Alyzeia and situated opposite Ithaka (and Kephallenia); instead of Φαρά, Wirbelauer (1998) 221–22 conjectures Πάλαιρος. Palairos was probably a polis already in C5; it was a member of the Akarnanian Confederacy, it had an urban centre, and it seems to have struck coins (see infra). Palairos is called a polis in two inscriptions of C2–C1 (SEG 27 156, 157).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in an inscription from Kyrene (SEG 9 2.35 = Tod 196 (330–326)) as well as by Thuc. 2.30.1 and internally in two mutilated honorific inscriptions (SEG 27 156, 157 (C2–C1)). The external and individual use is attested in the feminine form on a grave stele: Παλαιραία (IG ix2.1 379.2 (undated)).

Palairos was situated on the Plagia peninsula and bordered to the west on the Leukadian peraia (Wacker 1999). In 431 the Corinthian polisma peraia (Wacker 1999). In 431 the Corinthian polisma peraia Solion (no. 137) on the southern side of the peninsula (supra) was given to Palairos by the Athenians (Thuc. 2.30.1).

c.330–325, the polis received 10,000 medimnoi of grain from Kyrene (no. 1028) (SEG 9 2.35 = Tod 196).
Palairos was part of Akarnania according to the theorodokoi lists (see infra). The earliest explicit attestation of Palairos as a member of the Akarnanian Confederacy is C31 (IG 1x.1.5 828 (Magnesia, c.207); cf. IG 1x.2.3 Α3), but the addition of Ακαρνάνων to the city-ethnic found both in Thuc. 2.30.1 (Παλαιρεύς Ακαρνάνων) and in the Kyreanaia grain inscription (SEG 9 2.35 = Tod 196 (330–326): Ακαρνάνων Παλαιρεύς) is a very strong indication that Palairos was a member from C5 onwards.

Palairos appointed theorodokoi to host theoroi from Argos (no. 347) (SEG 23.189.15 (330–324)), Epidaurus (no. 348) (IG 1v.2.1 95.21 (356/5)) and Nemea (SEG 36 331.16–19 (331/30–313)).

The agora of Palairos with public buildings was possibly situated in the northern part of the upper city (Wacker (1996b) 94). Several cults of different deities are attested for Palairos but cannot be connected with existing remains. Outside the city, on the mountain Profitis Ilias, was a C4 extra-urban sanctuary (Faist and Kolonas (1990)). On the way to this site, about 100 m from the north-western corner of the city wall, a shrine of Artemis has been located (Camp (1977) 280–81; Wacker (1996b) 97–98). To the south-west of Profitis Ilias, on the summit of the mountain Sterna above the old village of Plagia, there are impressive remains of what must have been a fortified sanctuary controlled by Palairos (according to unpublished tile stamps: information from E.-L. Schwandner); other references concerning the site are given by Pritchett (1994) 205–7, who identifies it erroneously with Sollion (no. 137) (see supra).

There are virtually no traces left of walls or public architecture on the acropolis of Palairos, situated on the eastern summit of the upper city (Kirsten (1942) 2458). The acropolis and lower town were fortified. The existing circuit of walls of cyclopean, polygonal and horizontal masonry was not erected as late as C3, as suggested by Kirsten, but most likely in C5; see Murray (1982) 145; Pritchett (1992) 115–19. Wacker (1999) 81–90 gives a description of the different phases of the construction of the walls. In the whole area of the city, remains of houses are visible, in the western part of the upper city in an orthogonal structure (Wacker (1996b) 94; cf. Lang (1994) 243).

There is only slight evidence for Palaean coinage: a Pegasos with monogram read by Imhoof-Blumer (1878) 153 as ΠΑΛΑΙΡΟΣ; cf. Head, HN2 331.

132. Paleis (Paleus) Map 54. Lat. 38.15, long. 20.25. Size of territory: 2 or 3. Type: A. The toponym is Παλεύς (F.Delphes III.4 376.4 (suppl. 358/7)) or Πάλης, η (schol. Thuc. 1.27.2, Hude). The city-ethnic is Παλεύς (Hdt. 9.28.5; Thuc. 1.27.2, 2.30.2; I.Magnesia 35.39 (c.207); Paus. 6.15.7; Etym. Magn. 507.31) or Παλεύς (Polyb. 5.3.4, 5.2, 16.6, 17.5, 100.8).

Paleis is referred to as a polis in the urban sense by the term τετράπολης at Thuc. 2.30.2, where the use of city-ethnics instead of toponyms indicates that the political sense is a connotation (Hansen (2000) 174 n. 3, 208); cf. Xen. Hell. 6.2.33: τὰς ἐν τῇ Κεφαλληνίᾳ πόλεις.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally by Hdt. 9.28.5, 31.4; Thuc. 1.27.2, 2.30.2; and in a Hellenistic inscription from Magnesia (I.Magnesia 35.39) and internally, in abbreviation, on coins (see infra). The individual use is attested externally as Κεφαλλήν ή Παλεύων in a Delphic inscription (BCH 68/9 (1944–45) 121 no. 32.4 (C3)).

The territory of Paleis lies in the western part of the island of Kephallenia (cf. Thuc. 2.30.2; Paus. 6.15.7), today called Paliki.


In 435 the Paleis supported the Corinthian campaign against Korkyra (no. 123) with four ships (Thuc. 1.27.2). For membership in the Second Athenian Naval League and the Corinthian League, other alliances, military matters, envoys, theorodokoi, officials, taxation and founding myth, see the collective attestations of Kephallenians cited s.v. Kraniioi (no. 125).

A [...]στρατιδας was appointed prokôenos by Delphi (no. 177) in 358/7 (F.Delphes III.4 376.4 (suppl.)).

A sanctuary of Poseidon (?) was discovered in the southern part of the Paliki peninsula at Valsia (cf. Randsborg (1995) 97 and (2002) ii.59, 310). The acropolis of Paleis was situated on a hill at a distance of 1.5 km to the north of the modern town of Lixuri. Remains of the walls described by travellers up to the eighteenth century have disappeared because the stones were reused in buildings in Lixuri (Büchner (1921) 211; Steinhart and Wirbelauer (2002) 333–34; Randsborg (2002) ii. 281–82).

The silver coinage of Paleis started with a single type (BMC Peloponnesus 84 no. 1: obv. ram with legend Π; rev. pine-cone and sprays, all in incuse square), before 431. From 431 onward, Paleis struck silver coins. Denominations: tetrobols and smaller fractions. Types: Kephalos or Persephone (wearing barley wreath); legend: ΠΑ and/or ΚΕΦΑΛΟΣ or ΚΕΦΑ. Bronze coins date from C5–C2 (see in general Postolakas (1868) 94–96; Biedermann (1887) 67–68; Head, HN2 427–28; Babelon, Traité ii.2. 795–802;

133. Phara  Map 54. Lat. 38.40, long. 21.35. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. Our only source is Ps.-Skytaxus 34, where πόλις Φαράς is listed between Leukas (no. 126) and Ithaka (no. 122). Following Partsch (1889) 20, Barr places Phara on Leukas and identifies the settlement with modern Pyrgi. But in Ps.-Skytaxus, Phara is listed after Leukas, and if Phara had been a polis on Leukas, Ps.-Skytaxus would undoubtedly have classified Leukas as a dipolis island. Thus, Phara must either have been one of the small islands between Leukas and Ithaka or situated on the coast of Akanthia in the peraios of Leukas. If we accept Ps.-Skytaxus’s text as it stands, Phara must be classified as an unlocated polis in Akanthia. Alternatively, one may assume a corruption and conjecture Πάλαιρος (Wirbelauer (1998) 221–22; see supra 368).

134. Phoitiai (Phoitieus)  Map 54. Lat. 38.40, long. 21.10. Size of territory: 2. Type: [A]. The toponym is Φοιτιαί, οἱ (IG iv2.195.11 (365/5)) or Φοιτία, ἦ (Thuc. 3.106.2). The city-ethnic is Φοιτιαῖοις (CID II 1.1.16, 23 (362/1)) or Φοιτίας (IG ix².1 390.10 (C5)) or Φοίτους (Hellen. fr. 30 = Steph. Byz. 669.15).

The only attestation of Phoitiai as a polis (in the urban sense) is at Polyb. 4.63.7–9, but in the Delphic naopoi’s accounts of C4f the Phoitieus are recorded under the heading τὰίδε τῶν πόλεων (CID II 1.1.27 and 11.16). It was probably a polis already in C5: it was a member of the Akanthian Confederacy and it had an urban centre (see infra).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Delphic accounts (CID II 1.1.16 (362/1)). The individual use is attested externally in a proxeny decree of Stratos (IG ix².1 390.10 (C5)) and in CID II 1.1.23 (362/1).

The territory (ἡ Φοιτία, Thuc. 3.106.2) belonged to the Akanthian region, according to the theorodokoi lists (see infra). The eponym of Phoitiai was Phoitois, son of Alkmaion and grandson of Amphiaraois (Steph. Byz. 669.13–14).

The fact that a Phoitois is attested as bolarchoς of Stratos (no. 138) in a proxeny decree of C5l (IG ix².1 390.9–10) shows that Phoitiai was either a civic subdivision of Stratos or a dependent polis. In 362/1 Phoitiai and Stratos contributed jointly to the Delphic naopoi’s fund (CID II 1.1.16, 23), which indicates that Phoitiai was (now?) a polis side by side with Stratos and undoubtedly, like Stratos, a member of the Akanthian Confederacy. Membership is explicitly stated in the Aitolian–Akanthian treaty of c.263 (IG ix².1 3A.23). Phoitiai appointed theorodokoi to host theoroi from Epidaurus (no. 348) (IG iv².1 95.11 (356/5)) and from Nemea (SEG 30 331.A.47–48 (331/30–313)).

Ruins of a Doric temple are visible near Vlyziana (Kirsten (1941b) 440; Philipsson and Kirsten (1958) 397; Schoch (1997) 57). Phoitiai is commonly located at the site of the Porta hills, 2 km to the north of Bambini (Pritchett (1991) 4–7; Schoch (1997) 56–58). There one can find remains of two acropoleis, to the north and to the south (Kirsten (1941b) 438–39), and a circuit of walls about 2.8 km long, with eighteen (Noack) or eleven (Kirsten) towers, mostly of polygonal masonry (Noack (1916) 217ff; Kirsten (1941b) 438–42; Pritchett (1991) 6–9). The date proposed by Noack and Schoch (1997) 57–58, C5–C4, is preferable to that of Kirsten ((1941b) 440: C3, before 219).

The attribution to Phoitiai of some silver and bronze coins of C4m–C3m with the legend ΦΥ or Φ is not beyond doubt; cf. Imhoof-Blumer (1878) 152–55; Head, HN² 331; Kirsten (1941b) 437.

135. Pronnoi (Phronnos)  Map 54. Lat. 38.40, long. 20.45. Size of territory: 2 or 3. Type: A. The toponym is Πρόννοι, οἱ (Polyb. 5.3.3) or Πρόννοι, οἱ (IG ix².18.3–4 (suppl., C3); BCH 45 (1921) col. 11.142 (C3–C2)) or Πρόνναια (schol. Thuc. 1.27.2, Hude); cf. Προννησός in Strabo 10.2.13. The city-ethnic is Προνναιαῖος (Thuc. 2.30.2) or Πρόννοι (IG Π 43.B.12 = Staatsverträge 257 (377)) or Πρόννοις (Etym.Magn. 507.31).

Pronnoi is referred to as a polis in the urban sense by the term τετράπολις at Thuc. 2.30.2, where the use of city-ethnics instead of toponyms indicates that the political sense is a connotation (Hansen (2000) 174 n. 3, 208); cf. Xen. Hell. 6.2.33: τὰς ἐν τῇ Κεφαλληνίᾳ πόλεις.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in an Athenian psephisma (IG II² 43.12 (377)) and internally on the coins (see infra). The individual use is attested externally in Hellenistic inscriptions (see supra).

Pronnoi was situated in the south-eastern part of the island of Kephallenia (cf. Thuc. 2.30.2).

Pronnoi was a member of the Second Athenian Naval League (IG II² 43.12 = Staatsverträge 257 (377)); cf. Dreher (1995b) 190 and of the Corinthian League of 338/7 (IG II² 236.B.12 = Staatsverträge 403). For other alliances, military matters, envoy and theorodokoi, taxation and founding myth, see the collective attestations of Kephallennians cited s.v. Kranioi (no. 125).

Pronnoi is commonly identified with the site on the Pachni hill, where there are some remains of a Classical and Hellenistic settlement (C5–C3; Randsborg (2002) i. 30, 87; ii.
57, 261–64). This site matches Polybios’ description of Pronnoi as a πολισματίως δυσπολιούρητον almost to perfection (Polyb. 5.3.4). But we know about another acropolis in the Pronnoi territory, at Patiliakoastro with remains of Mycenaean and Byzantine walls, and a rock-cut altar with three steps within (Steinhart and Wirbelauer (2002) 157 pls. 63–64; Randsborg (2002) i. 15–20, 84–86; ii. 57, 258–62). For other finds, see now the catalogue in Randsborg (2002) i. 4–36; ii. 54–59. Near the chapel of Ag. Georgios, 3 km north of Skala, the foundations of a Doric temple (C6–C3) are visible (Kalligas (1969b) 273–76; Steinhart and Wirbelauer (2002) 156, 158, pls. 65–66, 335; Randsborg (2002) i. 12–13; ii. 58), perhaps a cult of Poseidon in reaction to earthquakes, cf. Wirbelauer (1998) 182–88.

Pronnoi struck silver (triobols and smaller fractions) and bronze coins in C4 and/or C3. Silver types: obv. head of Kephalos, or female head; rev. club; legend: ΠΡΩΝΝΩΝ or monogram with barley-corn. Bronze types: obv. head of Zeus; rev. monogram with pine-corn, which is interpreted as the symbol of Zeus Aine(s)ios (Postolakos (1868) 97–98; Biedermann (1887) 71; Head, ΗΝ 428; Babelon, Traité ii. 2. 807–8; Grose (1926) 6694; Kraay (1976) 96; SNG Cop. Acarnania 469–71).

136. Same (Sameas) Map 54. Lat. 38.15, long. 20.40. Size of territory: 2 or 3. Type: A. The toponym is Σάμαια, Ἡ (BCH 45 (1921) col. 11.136, 140; IG ix2.1 2.9, 27 (both C3–C2)) or Σάμως (Strabo 10.2.10; schol. Thuc. 2.30.2) or Σάμως, Ο (Strabo 10.2.10; schol. Thuc. 2.30.2; schol. Dionys. Per. 524 = GGM 11450; schol. Hom. Il. 2.634, Erbse) or Σάμαια (schol. Thuc. 1.27.2, Hude). The city-ethnic is Σαμαιας (Thuc. 2.30.2; Magnesia 35.15, 16, 18, 27, 29 (c.207); Ετυμ. Magn. 507.31; schol. Thuc. 2.30.2, Hude).9

Same is referred to as a polis in the urban sense by the term τετράπολις at Thuc. 2.30.2, where the use of city-ethnics instead of toponyms indicates that the political sense is a connotation (Hansen (2000) 174 n. 3, 208); cf. Xen. Hell. 6.2.33: τάς ἐν τῇ Κεφαλληνίᾳ πόλεις.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in a Samaian decree from Magnesia (I.Magnesia 35.15, 16, 18, 27, 29 (c.207)) and on coins (see infra).

Same was situated in the northern and north-eastern part of Kephallenia (cf. Thuc. 2.30.2). In the northern peninsula today called Erisos, in the Pylaros valley, there are some remains of settlements and fortified places, e.g. a small fortress of polygonal masonry at Pyrgos (C5–C3; Partsch (1890) 64–65; Steinhart and Wirbelauer (2002) 194 pl. 78; for a survey, see Randsborg (2002) i. 53–60; ii. 54–59). There are foundations of a temple outside the polis on the top of the hill Alpovuni (Partsch (1890) 72 and pl. 2; Randsborg (1995) 96 and (2002) ii. 58).

For league membership, alliances, military matters, envoys, theorodokoi, taxation and foundation myth, see the collective attestations of Kephallenians cited s.v. Kranioi (no. 125).

Two acropoleis are known to Livy (38.29.10), one called Cyneatis or Cyatis. Partsch (1890) 59–72 gives a description of their wall circuit and of the walls joining them. The remains are of polygonal and rectangular masonry (C4?, certainly C3; Randsborg (2002) i. 43–52; ii. 57–58, 264–75).

Same struck various silver and bronze coins from C5 onward. Denominations: triobols and smaller fractions. Obv. male head (Apollo? or Kephalos?) or Athena; rev. hound or ram; legend: ΣΑΜΑΙΩΝ, ΣΑΜΑΙ, ΣΑ or monogram (Postolakos (1868) 98–101; Biedermann (1887) 69–71; Head, ΗΝ 428; Babelon, Traité ii. 2. 803–6; Grose (1926) nos. 6695–6; cf. also IGCH 183; Kraay (1976) 96; SNG Cop. Acarnania 472–77).

137. Sollion Map 54. Unlocated. Type: A. The toponym is Σόλλιον, Ῥό (Thuc. 2.30.1 with schol.; 3.95.1, 5.30.2). The only source for a city-ethnic is Steph. Byz. 581.9–10, who suggests Σολλιευς. Sollion is called both a polisma and a polis in the urban sense at Thuc. 2.30.1. At 3.95.1 and 5.30.2 Thucydides uses the toponym without any site-classification.

Thucydides describes Sollion as Κορινθίων πόλισμα (2.30.1), which indicates that Sollion was a colony of Corinth (no. 227) (Graham (1962), (1964) 118–19), pace Salmon (1984) 277–78, who overlooked that Thuc. 2.30.1 uses polis synonymously with polisma. However, the colony was not an independent community, for at Thuc. 5.30.2 we are told that the Athenians had not complied with the terms of the Peace of Nikias and surrendered Sollion to the Corinthians. The inference is that Sollion was a dependent polis, a colony that to some extent was under Corinthian supremacy (Graham (1964) 118–42). Sollion was conquered by the Athenians in 431/0 and handed over to the polis of Palairos (no. 131), Thuc. 2.30.1: οὶ . . . Ἀθηναῖοι . . . Σόλλιον τε Κορινθίων πόλισμα αἱρόντε καὶ παραδίδοντε Παλαιρέσσαν Ακαράντων μόνος τὴν γῆν καὶ πόλιν νέμεσθαι. The presumption is that Sollion thereafter was the harbour of Palairos (Thuc. 3.95.1) and had ceased to be a polis.

9 Perhaps other Sameas are mentioned in Greek inscriptions, but sometimes the distinction between the various cities or ethnics beginning with Σαμα- is impossible.
The exact location is unknown (cf. Pritchett (1992) 87–88, (1994) 205–7; who identifies Sollion with the ruins of Sterna (see Palairos (no. 131)) and the recent discussions: Wacker (1996b) 96–97 and Schoch (1997) 21–22), but from Thuc. 3.95.1 one has to infer that Sollion lay on the south side of the Plagia peninsula, probably in or near Zaverda Bay.

138. Stratos (Stratios) Map 54. Lat. 38.40, long. 21.20. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Στράτως (Thuc. 2.80.8; IG iv².1 95.10 (356/5)), δ (Polyb. 5.13.10), or ἦ (Paus. 6.2.1). The city-ethnic is Στράτιτος (Thuc. 2.81.2; IG ix².1 390.1–2 (C5); CID II 1.11.17, 22 (362/1); cf. Στρατικός, IG ix².1 3A.25 (263/2)).

Stratos is called a polis in the urban sense by Thuc. 2.81.2, 4–5, 3.102.2, 3.106.1. The territorial sense is a connotation at Thuc. 2.80.8. The political sense is attested in a C5 proxeny decree of Stratos (IG ix².1 390.1–2). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Delphic contribution list CID II 1.11.17 (362/1) and by Thucydides (see supra), and internally in the proxeny decree mentioned above as well as on the coins (see infra). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in CID II 1.11.22 (362/1), and internally in a manumission inscription (IG ix².1 394.4,10 (C2)).

Stratos was part of Akarnania (IG iv².1 95.8 + 10 (356/5); SEG 36 331.A.15 + 38 (331/0–313); Strabo 10.2.2), lying in the interior (Thuc. 2.102.1; Strabo 10.2.3) beside the river Acheilos (Polyb. 5.6.6) as πόλις μεγάλη τῆς Ἀκαρνανίας (Thuc. 2.80.8). Its territory is called Στρατινῶν γῆ (Thuc. 3.106.2). The Στρατινῶν τέλος of the Aitolian Confederacy included at least, besides Stratos itself, the poleis of Oniadi (no. 130) and Matropolis (no. 128) (IG ix².1 3B.2 (C3 before 230)).

Stratos was a member of the Akarnanian Confederacy and the seat of the federal institutions (Xen. Hell. 4.6.4 (1389); IG ix².1 393 (C3)). Klaßenbach (197a) xiv suggests that the central position of Stratos in the Confederacy—attested by Xen. Hell. 4.6.4)—may be traced back to 424.

During the Peloponnesian War (in 429), citizens loyal to the Peloponnesians suffered expulsion by the Athenians (Thuc. 2.102.1). In 314, on the advice of Cassander, many Akarnarians moved to Stratos (Diod. 19.67.4; see Freitag (1994) 222–23 for the historical circumstances).

Stratos honoured Lysias from Megara (no. 225) and his two sons with προσευσία (IG ix².1 390 (C5)) and appointed theorodokoi to host theoroi from Epidauros (no. 348) (IG iv².1 95.10 (356/5)) and Nemea (SEG 36 331.A.38–40, B.38–40 (331/30–313)). A Stratian Olympic winner with unknown name is attested for 368 (Olympionikai 416(?)). He was honoured with a statue by Lysippus (Paus. 6.2.1).

The oldest attested public enactment is the proxeny decree of C5 (IG ix².1 390), which mentions a bolarchs from Phoibiai (no. 134) (ibid. 390.9).


The acropolis of Stratos was situated on the northern edge of the city. The circuit of walls (Pritchett (1989) 137–39) built of pseudo-isodomic masonry and surrounding both the fortified acropolis and the town was about 7.5 km long and enclosed an area of c.80 ha. According to Thuc. 2.81.2, Stratos was a walled city in 429, which suggests (pace Winter (1971) 112 n. 26) that the existing enceinte dates from at least C5 (Pritchett (1992) 115–16; Gehrke (1994–95) 44–45); at present archaeology dates the fortification to C4 (Schwaner and Kolonas (1996)).

Stratos struck silver coins c.450–400. Denominations: pentobols and smaller fractions. Types: obv. head of Acheilos; rev. head of Kallirhoe; legend: ΣΠΑΤΙΩΝ, ΣΠΑ, ΣΤΡΑ, Σ (Imhoof-Blumer (1878) 156–67; Head, HN² 331–32; Grose (1926) no. 5380; IGCH nos. 88, 208; SNG Cop. Acarnania 404). Besides that, there is a Pegasos type of C4 (Telbarg (1971) 62; Kraay (1976) 126 with pl. 24 no. 437). For the federal coins struck at Stratos, see supra.

139. Thyrrheion (Thyrieus) Map 54. Lat. 38.50, long. 21.00. Size of territory: 2. Type: B. The toponym is Θύρρειος, τό (IG iv².1 95.16 (356/5); SEG 36 331.A.26 (331/30–313); in Ps.-Skylax 34 one should read Θύρρειος instead of the MS’s Θύρτος; see Kirstén (1961); Marcotte (1985) 255) or Θύρειον (Polyb. 4.6.2, 24.3; Θύρειον in Polyb. 18.10.10, 28.5.1). The city-ethnic is Θύρρειος (IG ix².1 3A.23 (263/2)) or Θύρειος
Thyrreyon was never called a polis before Hellenistic times (IG ix².1 582.46 (c.207)), Θυρρεῖος (Xen. Hell. 6.2.37), Θυρρεῖες (SGDI 2658 (315–280)) or Θοῦριος (Androtion (FGrHist 324) fr. 65 = Steph. Byz. 320.21).

Thyrreyon was a member of the Akarnanian Confederacy, had a walled urban centre and struck coins in C4 (see infra); so it was probably a polis in the Classical period.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in inscriptions of C3 (IG ix².1 3B3; ix².2 2 243.2) and by Xen. Hell. 6.2.37, and internally on coins and tile stamps (IG ix².1 366; SEG 25 632 (C3)). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in Hellenistic inscriptions (SGDI 2658 (Delphi, 315–280); IG ix².1 3A.23 (263(?)) and internally in SEG 43 227.4–6 (1677).

Thyrreyon was part of Akarnania (Xen. Hell. 6.2.37; IG iv².1 95.8 + 16 (356/5); SEG 36 331.A.15 + 26 (331/30–313)). As a member of the Akarnanian Confederacy, it is not explicitly attested before about 263 (IG ix².1 3A.23; cf. also ix².2 582 (Magnesia, c.207)), but considering the mention of the community in Xen. Hell. 6.2.37 and in the theorodokoi lists (infra), membership can be traced back at least to C4.

Xenophon regarded the Thyrreians as brave soldiers (Hell. 6.2.37). c.300, Herakleitos of Thyrreyon was appointed proxenos by Delphi (SGDI 2658; cf. LGPN III A 195 s.v. Ἡπάκελετος). Thyrreyon appointed theorodokoi to host theoroi from Argos (no. 347) (SEG 23 189.1.4 (330–324, restored)). Epidauros (no. 348) (IG iv².1 95.16 (356/5)) and Nemea (SEG 36 331.A.26–7 (331/30–313)). A sanctuary of Zeus Melichios is attested in a C5 horos inscription (Mastrokostas (1965) 157 no. 11 = SEG 25 630).

The acropolis of Thyrreyon is mentioned in an unpublished inscription of C3; for the ruins, see Pritchett (1992) 89–90 with references. The walls are described by Kirsten (1956) 58–59 (with Noack’s plan) and Pritchett (1992) 89–90 (with bibliography); for recent excavations at Thyrreyon, see BCH 114 (1990) 758. According to Xen. Hell. 6.2.37, Thyrreyon must have been fortified already in C4 (cf. Lang (1994) 242).

According to an inscription found during excavation at Rouga by L. Kolonas, Thyrreyon had a harbour, probably by the name of “Neso”.

In C4, Thyrreyon struck stater of Corinthian type and standard (pegasi), with the legends Θ, ΘΥ, ΘΥΡ, ΘΥΡΡ (Imhoof-Blumer (1878) 168–74). Most of the surviving specimens (more than 300 pieces) have been found in hoards from Sicily and Magna Graecia (Talbert (1971) 62; Taliercio Mensitieri and Spagnoli (1993) especially pl. 3).


140. Torybeia (Torybeieus) Map 54. Lat. 38.45, long. 21.05(?). Size of territory: 2(?). Type: B. The toponym is Τοριβεία, ἳ (IG iv²:1 95.18 with SEG 11 411 (356/5)) or Τύρβειον, ἰ (SEG 23 189.1.7 (suppl., 330–324); F.Delphes 111.3 203.5 and Flacelière (1937) 441 n. 1 (suppl., both 272)). The city-ethnic is Τορίβειεύς (CID II 26.18, 19 (suppl., C4)) or Ακαρνανός ἐκ Τύρβειων (F.Delphes 111.3 203.5 and Flacelière (1937) 441 n. 1 (suppl.)).

Torybeia is not attested as a polis. But in C4 theorodokoi lists it is recorded under the heading Akarnania, and in C3 it is attested as a member of the Confederacy (see infra). If one accepts the identification of the ruins of Komboti with Torybeia (cf. Kirsten (1940) 298ff; Klaffenbach (1957) 36; Pritchett (1992) 104–8; Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994) 340 n. 333) and the interpretation of the coins given below, there can be little doubt that Torybeia was a polis already in the Classical period.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is perhaps attested internally on coins (in abbreviation, see infra); the external and individual use is attested in two Delphic inscriptions (CID II 26.18, 19 (suppl., C4); F.Delphes 111.3 203.5 (C3)).

Torybeia was part of Akarnania (IG iv².1 95.8 + 18 with SEG 11 411) and is attested in 272 as a member of the Akarnanian koinon (F.Delphes 111.3 203.5 and Flacelière (1937) 441 n. 1 (restored)). It appointed theorodokoi to host theoroi from Argos (no. 347) (SEG 23 189.1.7 (330–324, restored)) and Epidauros (no. 348) (IG iv².1 95.18; SEG 11 411); cf. Cabanes (1985) 346–47.

The kastro of Komboti, presumably the site of Torybeia, shows remains of an agora and stoas (Heuzey (1860) 30ff; Pritchett (1992) 104–8) as well as a circuit wall of mostly polygonal masonry (Pritchett loc. cit.). The city was built on a grid plan (“Streifenstadt”) with characteristic house types of a certain luxury (bathrooms); see Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994) 218, 306, 320 with fig. 305; Lang (1994) 242–43.

Imhoof-Blumer (1878) 112–13 reports two small silver coins of similar type and of equal weight with types: obv. Acheilos; rev. ΚΟ or ΤΟ below the cross of a capital Τ. Since
Imhoof-Blumer could not know of the inscriptions attesting Akarnanian Torybeia, he interpreted KO and TO as names of officials. Both Koronta (no. 124) and Torybeia were situated in central Akarnania and, in the light of the epigraphical evidence, we should now tentatively interpret the letters as abbreviations of the city-ethnics KO(PONTAIΩΝ) and TO(ΠΥΒΕΙΩΝ). If so, this would be the first evidence of Torybean coinage.

141. Zakynthos (Zakynthios) Map 54. Lat. 37.45, long. 20.55. Size of territory: 4. Type: A. The toponym is Ζάκυνθος, ἦ (Hdt. 6.70.2, 9.37.4; Thuc. 2.80.1; IG IV 619.9 (Argos, C3)). The city-ethnic is Ζακύνθιοι (Hdt. 3.59.1, 6.70.2; Thuc. 1.47.2, 2.9.4; SEG 40 507 (C5–C4); IG II² 43.B.35 = Staatsverträge 257 (373/2); for the date, see now Drehner (1995a) 18).

Zakynthos is called a polis in the urban sense by Xen. Hell. 6.2.3 and Ps.-Skylax 43. Under the heading πόλεις, Zakynthos is listed as an ally of Athens (no. 361) in 431 (Thuc. 2.9.1, 4) and in 373/2 as a member of the Second Athenian Naval League (IG II² 43.32.70, 78, B.35–38).

The use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in an Attic inscription (IG II² 43.B.35) and in the authors quoted above, and internally on the coins (see infra). The individual use is attested externally in various inscriptions (e.g. SEG 40 507 (Michalitsi, C5–C4); IG V 11457.7 (Messenae, C4–C3)).

The name of the territory is νήσος Ζάκυνθος (Thuc. 2.66.1). There was a place Νήλλος occupied by democrats during a stasis in 373/2 (IG II² 43.B.35; cf. Xen. Hell. 6.2.2; Diod. 15.45.2 calls it Ἀρκαδία; for a discussion, see Mitchel (1981) 73ff). The island was situated πρὸ τοῦ Κορυνθιακοῦ κόλπου (Strabo 2.5.20) near Elis (no. 251) (Thuc. 2.66.1; cf. Strabo 8.2.2, 10.2.18, 17.3.20), Kephallenia (Diod. 16.6.5, 9.4) and Ithaka (no. 122) (Heliod. Aeth. 5.22.5). Zakynthos formed a regional unit together with Korkyra (no. 123), Kephallenia and Akarnania (Thuc. 2.7.3).

According to Thuc. 2.66, Zakynthos was a colony of the Achaians. This seems not implausible. In the mythical tradition, the founder of the city was Zakynthos, son of Dardanos, from Arkadian Psophis (no. 294; Paus. 8.24.3), which is perhaps spun out of the name of the Zakynthian acropolis (cf. the alternative name Ἀρκαδία for Νήλλος; see supra). Another tradition is reflected in Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 1.50.3 and Steph. Byz. 294.3, who mentions Bateia as the oecist of the island.

In 433, 1,000 Zakynthian hoplites joined the Korkyraians against Corinth (no. 227) (Thuc. 1.47.2). At the beginning of the Peloponnesian War (431), Athens sent an envoy to Zakynthos to ascertain the Kephallenians’ loyalty (Thuc. 2.7.3; cf. Diod. 12.43.5). During the Peloponnesian War, Zakynthos was allied with Athens (e.g. Thuc. 2.7.3, 9.4, 66; Ar. Lys. 394) and supported the Athenians with money, infantry and ships (Thuc. 2.9.4–5, 3.94–95, 4.8.2–5, 4.13.2, 7.31.2, 57.7).

After the Peloponnesian War, Zakynthos became oligarchic. At the beginning of C4, the tyrant Dionysios of Syracuse settled, among others, 600 Messenian exiles from Naupaktos (no. 165) and Zakynthos in Sicilian Messana (no. 51) (Diod. 14.78.5 (1396)). Probably during the Corinthian War, the oligarchs were driven out of Zakynthos by the democratic faction (Diod. 15.45.2, misplaced); but a few years later, presumably after the King’s Peace (386), they in turn exiled the democrats. These democrats were brought to Νήλλος by the Athenian general Timotheos in 375. They sided with the Athenians, while the oligarchs in the town were allied with Sparta (no. 345), sent envoys to Sparta, and in 374 supported the Peloponnesian fleet under Mnaispos against Korkyra (Xen. Hell. 6.2.2–3; Diod. 15.45.2–3; IG II² 43.B.37–38; Gehrke, Stasis 198–99). Zakynthos entered the Second Athenian Naval League, probably in 373/2 (IG II² 43.B.35–38 = Staatsverträge 257; cf. Gehrke, Stasis 198). The island was the base for Dion’s operations before his return to Sicily (Plut. Dio 22.8–25.2), and he had Zakynthian mercenaries in his army (Diod. 16.31.7; Plut. Dio 57.2, 4 (357–354)). In 338/7 Zakynthos became a member of the Corinthian League (IG II² 236.b.12 (suppl.); cf. Staatsverträge 403).

The Zakynthian Menalkos was appointed proxenos by the Messenians (IG V.1 1425 (C4–C3)). A Zakynthian winner is attested for an unknown Athenian festival (IG II² 2312.7 (suppl., C4f)).

The following cult sites are attested: a temple of Apollo (Plut. Dio 23.3 (1357)) and a temple of Aphrodite (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 1.50.3) with statues of Aphrodite and Aineias. Benton (1932) 217 reports traces of another temple.

There existed a stadion in Zakynthos (Plut. Dio 23.4 (1357)) and a harbour (Ps.-Skylax 43), situated near the town (Heliod. Aeth. 5.18.3). The name of the acropolis was Ὡψοφίς (Paus. 8.24.3; Steph. Byz. 705.4, citing Paus.).

According to Strabo 3.4.6 and App. Hisp. 25, Saguntum in Spain was a colony of Zakynthos, but that seems to be derived from the similarity of the names (cf. SEG 42 972.2). Steph. Byth. (159.11–13) calls the Libyan city of Barka a κτίσμα Πέρσεως Ζακύνθου Ἀριστομέδωτος Λίκου, obviously a mythographical construction possibly connected with Psophis, which is attested as a Libyan polis in Steph. Byz. 705.2. Hdt. 3.59 mentions Zakynthians in Cretan Kydonia (no. 968). Their relationship to the inhabitants of our island is not clear.
From C5 onward, Zakynthos struck silver “drachms and smaller fractions with the type of a tripod, thus initiating the Apolline theme which was to remain prominent throughout Zacynthian coinage” (Kraay (1976) 96). Types: obv. Apollo laureate; rev. tripod; legend: ΖΑ, ΖΑΚΥΝΘΟΣ on the reverse (Postolakas (1868) 102–8; BMC Peloponnesus xxxix–xliii, 94–104; Babelon, Traité ii. i. 901–6; ii. 2. 773–92; Head, HN 429–31; Grose (1926) nos. 6700–11; Kraay (1976) 96, cf. IGCH153; SNG Cop. Acarnania 479–81).
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Tzouvara-Souli, Ch. 1992. Αµβρακία, Studies on Arta (Arta).
I. The Region

Already in the Homeric period (Hom. Il. 2.638) Ἕ Aἰτωλία (Hecat. fr. 15; Thuc. 3.96.1; Xen. Hell. 4.6.1) was a region north of the Corinthian Gulf bounded to the west by the river Acheles and to the east by Cape Antirrhol. In the north Aitolia bordered on the tribal territories of the Perrhaibians, the Athamanians, the Ainians and the Oitaians (Strabo 10.2.20). Of the coastal cities Homer and Hesiod mention only those connected with mythology (Hom. Il. 2.638–40; Hes. fr. 10.463). In C6/C5 they had developed into fully-fledged poleis which, apart from Prochion, were independent of the Aitolian tribal organisation (Thuc. 3.102.5), whose sphere of influence was restricted to the hinterland (Hdt. 6.127.2; Thuc. 3.94.3–98.5). Only in C5/C4 did the Aitolians regain possession of the coastal region, and only in stiff competition with the neighbouring Akarnanians, Achaians and Lokrians. The territorial changes are reflected in Strabo’s self-contradictory account of the western boundary of Aitolia (8.2.3 versus 10.2.1; cf. Funke (1991a) 181f.; cf. also Strabo’s subdivision of Aitolia into Aἰτωλία ἄργαεια and Αἰτωλία ἐπίκτητος (10.2.3)).

The reintegration of the Aitolian coast seems to have been closely connected with the transformation of the region from a tribal state into a federation (Larsen (1968) 78–80, 195–215; Funke (1997); Corsten (1999) 133–59; Grainger (1999); Scholten (2000) 9–25). Originally, the three major Aitolian tribes—the Apodotai, the Ophione and the Eurytanes—had been subdivided into numerous smaller units (Thuc. 3.94.4–5, 101.1). This organisation was now abandoned and replaced by a federal structure which combined a strong central power with a plurality of member states, formed by an emancipation of the sub-tribes. In C4, if not earlier, the old Aitolian coastal cities (Xen. Hell. 4.6.1) joined the federation as new member states.

The tribal ethnic is Aἰτωλός, attested externally in numerous archaic and classical sources (Hom. Il. 2.638; Hes. fr. 198.9; Hdt. 6.127.2; Thuc. 1.5.3; Soph. OC 1315; Ar. Eq. 79; SEG 28.408; IG 1’ 190). A rare variant form is Aἰτῶλος (Hom. Il. 4.399; Steph. Byz. 55.13). From C4 onwards the tribal ethnic denotes membership of the new federal state and is attested externally (RO 35 (367); Syll. 563 = IG ix².1 192 (C3l)) as well as internally on coins (Head, HNΩ 334–35) and in federal decrees (IG ix².1 1.5 (C3m)). The federation itself is called τὸ κοινὸν (τὸ) τῶν Αἰτωλῶν (IG ix².1 6.1 (C3f); RO 35.8 (367)). The names of the member states are sometimes recorded in interstate relations (I. Magnesia 28.9–26 (c.200); SEG 38 1476 (206.5)). Inside the Aitolian Federation a citizen’s affiliation with his polis is indicated by the addition of a city-ethnic, and usually in the form: name (+ patronymic) + city-ethnic. Internally the city-ethnic is added directly to the name (+ patronymic): Πολύκριτος Καλλιεύς (IG ix².1 3.1.16 (C3f)); Κλεισίας Λίκου Πλευρώνος (IG ix².1 53.1 (C3m)); Δαμύκριτος Στρατάγου Καλυδώνος (IG ix².1 30.21 (C2e)). Externally an Aitolian is identified either by the tribal ethnic alone: Φύλλακος Αἰτωλός (IG 11² 7994 (C4)); Φ. Delphes 111 4 387.1–4 (c.200–310) or by the city-ethnic alone: Θρασύβουλος Καλυδώνος (Lys. 13.71), or in the form of Αἰτωλός ἐκ/ἀπό + city-ethnic in the genitive: (—name patronymic—ο/ν Αἰτω/λω/ο ἐκ Μ/ακεν/έας (BCH 23 (1899) 356 no. 2 (C4l)). The ethnics which signify affiliation with a member state of the Federation can reasonably be described as city-ethnics, in so far as the members of the Aitolian Federation seem frequently to fulfil the political criteria for being a polis and, furthermore, seem frequently to have had an urban centre, thus conforming to the observation expressed in the Lex Hafniensis.

These ethnics are attested in great numbers in sources of C3/C2, but most of them have not yet been located, mainly because the archaeological investigation of Aitolia is still in its first stage. For a good survey of the state of research, see Bommelje (1987). An additional problem is that almost all these ethnics are attested in Hellenistic sources only, and cannot be added as evidence of classical poleis unless they are supported by archaeological evidence of earlier periods. Recently this problem has become a focus of discussion. The investigations once conducted by E. Kirsten induced him to
argue that, in large parts of north-western Greece, urbanisation began in C3/C2. But recent research shows that urbanisation in Aitolia was contemporaneous with the political shift from a tribal to a federal state, which in several member states began in C4 and resulted in the formation of urban habitation centres (Funke (1987), (1997)).

One example is the Aitolian city of Kallion/Kallipolis. According to Thucydides (3.96.3) the Καλλιέες were still a sub-tribe of the Ophionians, one of the three large Aitolian tribes, but later they became inhabitants of a separate member state of the Aitolian Federation, with an urban settlement, called Κάλλιον or, significantly, Καλλίπολις (Polyb. 20.11.11). The affiliation with the Aitolian tribe of the Ophionians had become obsolete, and instead we find in C3/C2 inscriptions one of the following forms of a city-ethnic: Καλλιέες (IG IX2.1 3A.16, 19) or Αἰτωλός ἐκ Καλλίων (SEG 11 415.38) or Καλλιπολίταις (IG IX2.1 18.4, 206.3) or Αἰτωλός ἐκ Καλλίσδολος (IG IX2.1 783). In the 1970s the excavations of the ancient nucleated settlement at Veluchovo (west of modern Lidoriki) not only confirmed the identification of this town with Kallipolis (SEG 28 504); they also showed that the town grew up already in C4 (Themelis (1979), (1983) 237ff; Bakhuizen (1992)).

Archaeological evidence of the same kind from other sites of inland Aitolia supports the inference that numerous member states of the Aitolian Federation were centred on a large nucleated settlement, i.e. a town. This conclusion matches the description of Aitolia at Ps.-Skylax 35; and the distinction between πόλεις and ἔθνη attested in an Akarnanian inscription of C31 (IG IX2.1 583.40) points in the same direction and seems to reflect the settlement pattern of north-western Greece in general.

The numerous unlocated Aitolian ethnic of C3/C2 combined with the unidentified remains of Aitolian urban settlements of C3/C4 must lead to the conclusion that, as the evidence stands, it is impossible to suggest even a rough estimate of the number of Aitolian poleis in the Classical period. What one can do, as an appendix to the Inventory of identifiable poleis, add (1) a list of all the unlocated Aitolian ethnic of C3 (infra 386–87) and (2) a list of Hellenistic and undated settlements which may have been poleis already in the Classical period (infra 387–88).

Finally, there are four communities which are attested in C4 sources, but excluded from the Inventory infra, because we cannot prove that they were poleis rather than ethne. Among the relatively few Aitolian inscriptions of the Classical period are two boundary stones, each recording the border between two named communities. One marks the border between the Eiteaioi and the Eoitanes (IG IX2.1 116.1–3 (C4): τέρμων Ειτεαίων Εοιτάνων[ι]), the other the border between the Arsaioi and the Nomenaioi (AD 22 (1967) 322 (C4): τέρμων Ἀρσαίων Νομεναίων). The two stones provide us with information about four communities which were all members of the Aitolian Federation (Funke (1997) 162 with n. 75). What we cannot know is whether these communities were organised as tribes settled in komai, like the Kallies mentioned by Thucydides at 3.96.3, or were poleis, like Makynea (see infra). It is impossible to ascertain whether the four ethnic records on the two stones are city-ethnics (testifying to polis status) or regional ethnics (testifying to some form of tribal organisation). In 1987, however, a C3 tombstone set over a certain Στομᾶς Νουµεναῖος was found at Palarios in Akarnania (Antonetti (1987) 97; cf. SEG 38 435). The editor connected the ethnic Νουµενεια<ε>υς with the Aitolian ethnic Νοµεναιοι, and, if she is right, the individual and the external use of an ethnic suggests that it was a city-ethnic rather than a regional ethnic (Funke (1997) 183 n. 75). Thus, one might list the Nomenaioi in the Inventory as a polis type C. But, as the evidence stands, it seems preferable to list all the four communities here rather than in the Inventory.

The Inventory of poleis, here, as elsewhere, is preceded by a list of pre-Hellenistic settlements excluded from the Inventory. The list consists of two parts: (1) named and identified settlements of the Archaic and Classical periods which seem not to have been poleis, or for which the information derived from written sources and archaeological evidence is insufficient to warrant inclusion in the Inventory. (2) Unidentified archaeological sites which have significant remains of urban structures of the Classical period (defence circuit, habitation quarters, etc.); see Bommeljé (1987) 75–113.

1. **Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis**

**Akragas** (Ἀκράγας) Steph. Byz. 62.16 (πόλεις Αἰτωλίας). Probably, Akragas, Akrai and Akropolis designate the same site (Pritchett (1989) 134ff). Akragas is identified with the ancient remains of Lithovounion. Bommeljé (1987) 93ff report on a totally vanished double-scaled wall which has never been dated precisely, some very scanty architectural remains probably of a temple, and a large cemetery dated from C3–C4. Barr. C.
Akrai (Ἀκραί) Polyb. 5.13.9 (περὶ τῆς καλουμένης πόλεως Ἀκραίας), probably identical with Akragas (Pritchett (1989) 134f; Antonetti (1990) 237f); see supra Akragas.

Akropolis (Ἀκρόπολις) Steph. Byz. 63.20 (πόλις Ἀιτωλίας), probably identical with Akragas (Pritchett (1989) 134f); see supra Akragas.

Ithoria (Ἰθώρια) Polyb. 4.64.9f (χωρίον ὁ δ’ ὄχυροτετμένον δεύτερον καὶ χειροποιητό διαφέρει). Ithoria is identified with Ag. Ilissos: C/H fortification, habitation site, acropolis walls, wall of a lower town, finds from C4 to C1 AD (Bommeljé (1987) 74). Not in Barr.

Krokyleion (Κροκύλειον) Thuc. 3.96.2 (without any site-classification). Krokyleion is identified with Filothei (Goumaioi). Hellenistic? fortified settlement, acropolis wall (Bommeljé (1987) 82). Barr. C.

Oichalia (Οἰχαλία) Hom. Il. 2.730 (πόλις Ἐδυρότου); cf. also Steph. Byz. 488.2; Strabo. 10.1.10 (Οἰχαλία, κοίμη ἐν Ἀιτωλίᾳ περὶ τοὺς Ἐδυρίτανας). No indication of polis status in the Classical and Hellenistic periods. Perhaps to be identified with modern Koryskhades. Barr. C.


Potidania (Ποτιδανία) Thuc. 3.96.2 (without any site-classification); cf. Livy 28.8.9 (in propinquis castellis Potidianae atque Apollonianae); Steph. Byz. 533.18 (πόλις Ἀιτωλίας). The city is also mentioned in the C3/C2 theodorokoi list from Delphi: ἐν ποτιδανίαι (BCH (1921) col. 1v 58). The city-ethnic is Potidaiarios (IG 1x2.19.23 (C3f)). Potidania is located near Kambos (Lerat (1952) i. 8, 76, 192; Antonetti (1990) 294f). Potidania issued coins in C3s/C2f (Liampi (1996) passim). Not in Barr.

Pylene (Πυλήνη) See the Inventory s.v. Proschion.

Rhion (Ῥίων) Steph. Byz. 545.14 (πόλις Ἀιτωλίας); cf. Thuc. 2.86.2 (τὸ Ῥίων τὸ Μολυκρικὸν). Dependent harbour of Molkyreion (see the Inventory s.v. Molkyreion). Not in Barr.

Teichion (Τείχιον) Thuc. 3.96.2 (without any site-classification). Teichion was part of the region of the Apodotoi. It must have been situated near the Locrian border (Fiehn (1934)). Barr. C.

Thermos (Θέρμος) Steph. Byz. 310.3 (πολίχνιον Ἀιτωλίας); Polyb. 5.6.6 (τὸν ἐν τοῖς Θέρμοις τόπον); Strabo. 10.3.2 (ἐν Θέρμοις τῆς Ἀιτωλίας). In Archaic and Classical times Thermos was the religious centre of the Aitolian tribes, since C4 of the Aitolian Federation (Funke (1997) 154). There is no explicit indication of polis-ness apart from the city-ethnic: Θέρμος (IG 1x2.1 102.8 (C2e)), Θέρμος (IG 1x2.1 91.1.4 (C3e)); ktiton: Θερμικός (Steph. Byz. 310.3). Barr. AC.

2. Unidentified Classical Settlements


Dorikon C/H, remains of a wall (Bommeljé (1987) 80). Barr. AC.


Kryonerion (Galatas) In the past the site was probably erroneously identified with ancient Chalkis, or with the harbour of Kalydon. C/H, scanty remains of walls (Bommeljé (1987) 91; Antonetti (1990) 283). Not in Barr.

II. The Poleis

142. Agrinion (Agrinieus) Map. 55. Lat. 38.40, long. 21.20. Size of territory: 2 square. The toponym is Αγρίνιον, τό (Polyb. 5.7.7; Hsch. A797). The city-ethnic is Άγρινεύς (Syll.3 603.3 (C2e)) or, once and probably in error: Άγρινεύς (IG ix.2.1 625.2 (C2e)).

Agrinion is called a polis in the urban sense (Diod. 19.67.4 (1314)). The individual and internal use of the city-ethnic is attested for citizens serving as magistrates in the Aitolian Confederacy (IG ix.2.1 618.3); the external use is attested for a Delphic hieronmemon (Syll.3 603.3, C2e).

At 19.67.4 Diodorus reports that, in 314, King Kassander of Macedon convened an ekklesia of the Akarnanians and persuaded them to leave the small and unfortified settlements and move into a few poleis of which Stratos, Sauria and Agrinion are explicitly mentioned. As a result the Derieis (SEG 36 331.A.41 (C4s); IG iv.1 96.61, 65 (C3m)) and other Akarnanians were synoecised into Agrinion (Diod. 19.67.4). Shortly afterwards Agrinion was besieged and conquered by the Aitolians (Diod. 19.68.1). It seems reasonable to infer that Agrinion must have been a polis during the last decades of the Classical period. Agrinion may have been an urban settlement founded by the Agrinian ethnos, but there is no evidence (Antonetti 1987; Dany 1999 37f).

Agrinion is identified with Megali Chora (once Zapanidi) situated 3.5 km north-west of modern Agrinion, with remains of a fortified settlement (defence circuit, stoa, houses) of uncertain date but undoubtedly going back to C4 (Bommeljé 1987 96; Antonetti 1990 236f; Strauch 1996 255f).

143. Aigion Map. 55. Lat. 38.30, long. 22.10. Size of territory: 9. The toponym is Αἰγίτιον, τό (Thuc. 3.97.3). In his account of the Athenian attack on Aigion in 426. Thucydides calls Aigion a polis in the urban sense, describing how the inhabitants found refuge in the hills above the city: ὑπέφευγον γὰρ οἱ ἄνθρωποι καὶ ἐκάθηνο τῶν ὀλίγων τῶν ὑπὲρ τῆς θάλασσας. From Thucydides’ account it is reasonable to infer that Aigion was a relatively small fortified settlement. On its polis status, see the exchange of views between M. H. Hansen and P. Funke in Funke (1997) 173–76 and Hansen (2000) 200. There is no other mention of Aigion in any source. Aigion was situated some 80 stades from the sea in the country settled by the Apodotai, one of the three major Aitolian tribes (Thuc. 3.97.2; Funke 1997 148). It must have been close to the border between Aitolia and Lokris, and has been identified with the ancient Classical–Hellenistic remains near Strouza. One km west of the village Strouza—now abandoned—is a fortified settlement ("Strouza A") and a hill-top stronghold ("Strouza B") and not far away is the so-called Fortress on Mt. Boucheri (Bommeljé 1987 75; Bommeljé et al. 1981–88; Pritchett 1991 67–75; Strauch 1996 256).

144. Akripos Map 55. Unlocated, not in Barr. Type: C. The toponym is Ακριπός (-ώς?). The only thing we know about Akripos is that, in, probably, 355 a theorodokos was appointed to host theoroi from Epidaurus: Ακριπόι. Μύστρωι (IG iv.1 95.34). In the document, Akripos, Hyporeiai, Therminea, Phylea, and Proschion (II. 34–38) are listed after Amphilocheian Argos (I. 33) and before Syracuse (I. 39). While Hyporeiai seems to have been part of Akarnania (cf. Robert 1940; LGPN s.v. Ἔχεμων and Φιλοϊτίσιος), the other sites were presumably Aitolian towns situated in the borderland between Aitolia and Akarnania; see Antonetti (1987b) 100f and Funke (1997) 183 n. 73.

145. Chalkis (Chalkideus) Map. 55. Lat. 38.20, long. 21.35. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is Χαλκίς, Ἡ (Hom. Il. 2.640; Thuc. 1.108.5; Strabo 9.4.8), or Χάλκεια, Ἡ
The city-ethnic is, possibly, Ἡλίκαρνα (Alcm. fr. 24.18, Calame), perhaps denoting both Euboian and Aitolian Chalkis.

Chalkis is called a πόλιν Ἐλευθέριον at Thuc. 1.108.5. It is unwarranted with some editors to delete πόλιν. Thus, Thucydides classified Chalkis as a polis, primarily in the urban sense, but the genitive Ἐλευθέριον points to the political sense as a connotation. Quoting Hekataios, Steph. Byz. (651.13) lists Hypochalkis as a polis, but it is uncertain whether the site-classification stems from Hekataios (Hansen (1997) 17–18).

Chalkis is called Aitolian by Homer (II. 2.639) and Alkman (fr. 24, Calame); but Thucydides' description of the city as Corinthian indicates that Chalkis was a Corinthian dependency, though probably not a colony settled by Corinthians (Salmon (1984) 213, 268, 277–79). During the later part of the Archidamian War Chalkis was controlled by Athens (Thuc. 2.83.3).

Chalkis was situated on a small coastal plain between M. Chalkis (Varassova) and M. Taphiassos (Klokova) (Strabo. 9.4.8). On the coast, upon the hill Hag. Triadha at modern Kato Vasiliki, are the remains of a defence circuit and some houses belonging to a settlement of the Classical and Hellenistic periods (Woodhouse (1897/1973) 106–14; Bommeljé (1987) 112; Antonetti (1990) 283f; Dietz et al. (1998), (2000)).

For the control of the Corinthian Gulf, Chalkis was a strategically important harbour (Thuc. 2.83.3; Polyb. 5.94.8; cf. Freitag (2000) 53–57). Above the city on the southern slope of M. Varassova are substantial remains of a C3/C4 fortress (Noack (1916) 238f; Bommeljé (1987) 112; Ober (1992) 165; Houby-Nielsen and Moschos in Dietz et al. (1998) 255–57). Chalkis may have struck coins in C4 (unpublished).

146. Halikyrrna

Map 55. Lat. 38.25, long. 21.30. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: [A]. The toponym is Ἡλίκυρνα, η̣ (Strabo 10.2.21; Steph. Byz. 74.17). At Ps.-Skylax 35 Ἡλίκυρνα is a conjecture for MS Μύκαρνα; cf. Plin. HN 4.6). The only attestation of a city-ethnic is in Steph. Byz. 74.17.

At Ps.-Skylax 35 Halikyrrna is one of three toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις ἐν αὐτῇ εἶσιν αἰῶν ἄδε, where the term polis is used in the urban sense. The late sources have κώμη.

According to Ps.-Skylax, Halikyrrna was situated between Kalydon and Pleuron. Halikyrrna is identified with the ancient remains near modern Agios Symeon (Khilia Spitia). Among the archaeological remains are scantly remains of a fortified settlement (C?) and graves of C8 (Bommeljé (1987) 74).

147. Kallion (Kallieus)/Kallipolis

Map. 55. Lat. 38.35, long. 22.10. Size of territory: ? Type: B. The toponym is Καλλίσπολις, η (IG ix².1 783.2 (C3)), 676.11 (C2m); Polyb. 20.11.11) or Κάλλιον (SEG 11 415.38 (C3s)).

The city-ethnic is Καλλιεύς (IG ix².1 3.A.16, 19 (C3m)) or Καλλιπόλιτας (IG ix².1 1154 (C3e); SEG 28 504 (C2/C1); SEG 48 602 (undated); cf. Nachmanson (1907) 64; Klaffenbach (1936) 367; Funke (1987) 95 Anm. 44).

The earliest references to Kallipolis as a polis are of the Hellenistic period (IG ix².1 154), but the toponym as well as the archaeological remains show that the polis status of the settlement goes back to the Classical period.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on a preserved specimen of the seal of the polis (Pantos (1985) 545f), and externally in a decree of C3 (IG ix².1 186); the individual and external use is found in a Delphic prosyne decree of c.425–375 (F.Delphes III.1 1.422–3–4) and in references to citizens serving as federal magistrates (IG ix².1 3.A.16, 19 (C3)).

The city was situated in the interior of Aitolia at Velouchovo, in the central part of the Mornos valley (= ancient Daphnos) (Laffineur (1977); SEG 28 504 (C2/C1)). In C4 Kallion/Kallipolis became the urban centre of the tribe of the Kallieis, who in C5/C4 were still part of the large Aitolian tribe of the Ophiones (Thuc. 3.96.3). Kallipolis was founded in C4m at the latest, and was from the outset laid out as a planned city. Excavations have revealed substantial remains of a defence circuit (enclosing an area of c.25 ha) with a separate wall of the acropolis, a C3 bouleuterion (Gneisz (1990) no. 29), a stoa, a theatre, and two sanctuaries (Antonetti (1990) 289–92).


Votive offerings of the Hellenistic period testify to cults of Demeter and Kore (SEG 40 458 (C3–C2)), Artemis (IG ix².1 155 (C3–C2)) and Eileithya (IG ix².1 156, undated). A C5 lex sacra contains a ban on entering an otherwise unknown sanctuary (SEG 16 368; cf. Antonetti (1990) 287–96).
148. Kalydon (Kalydonios) Map. 55. Lat. 38.20, long. 21.30. Size of territory: 21. The toponym is Kαλυθόν, η (Hom. Il. 2.640; Thuc. 3.102.5; Xen. Hell. 4.6.1). The city-ethnic is Kαλυθώνιος (Lys. 13.71; Pantos (1985) no. 238).

In the Iliad Kalydon is described as a polis in the Heroic Age (Hom. Il. 9.531). At Ps.-Skylax 35 Kalydon is the first of three toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις ἐν αὐτῇ εἶσαι αἰδε, where the term polis is used in the urban sense. The earliest epigraphical reference to a πόλις Kαλυθώνιων is on a C2 statue base (IG ix.2.1 140.1).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in a dedication of C5l (SEG 32.550, partly restored) as well as in the public seal (Pantos (1985) no. 238; cf. Pantos (1988), undated), and externally in Xen. Hell. 4.6.1. The individual and external use is attested in an Athenian citizenship decree for Thrasyboulos of Kalydon (Lys. 13.71; cf. IG iv.1 102 + add. 946).

In the Catalogue of Ships Kalydon is recorded as an Aitolian city (Il. 2.640), but it can be inferred from Thuc. 3.102.5 that in C6/C5 Kalydon had part company with the other Aitolians. Originally an independent polis, Kalydon became in C5/C4 a member of the Early Achaean Federation and in 389 Kalydon was besieged by the Akarnanians and their allies (Xen. Hell. 4.6.1–4); but in 367/6 Epameinondas expelled the Achaean garrison from Kalydon (Diod. 15.75.1–2), whereafter the city seems to have joined the Aitolian Federation (Buckler (1980) 188–91; Merker (1989); Bommeljé (1988) 310). A pair of damiourgoi served as eponymous officials (IG ix.2.1 138 (C4l)); cf. Veligianni-Terzi (1977) 64f; Sherk (1990) 260). In, probably, 355, theorodokoi were appointed to host theoroi from Epirus (IG iv.195.7).

According to Thucydides, Kalydon and its neighbour Pleuron were situated near the Corinthian Gulf in the northern part of the littoral in the region called Αἰολίς (Thuc. 3.102.5; Hsch. s.v. Αἰολικῶν θέαμα). According to Strabo 10.2.21 and Plin. HN 4.6, Kalydon was situated 7.5 Roman miles from the coast, near the river Euenos. The city possessed its own harbour at the coast (Paus. 7.21.5; cf. Freitag (2000) 40–52).

Kalydon is securely identified with the ancient settlement at the spur of Mt. Arakynthos c.9 km east of Messolonghion; and the archaeological investigation of the remains shows that, as early as the Archaic period, the city had close cultural connections with the other centres of the Corinthian Gulf, especially Corinth.

A C4 defence circuit of c.4 km with gates and towers encloses a settlement situated on and between two hills of which the western constituted a separately fortified acropolis with a citadel. The walls enclosed an area of c.25 ha. Of the ancient remains the most important are the temples of Artemis Laphria (C7, rebuilt several times), Apollo Laphrinos and Dionysos, all situated in a suburban temenos a little to the south of the city. On the archaeological evidence, see von Geisau (1919); Poulsen and Rhomaios (1927) 50f; Dygge et al. (1934); Dygge (1948), (1951); Knell (1973) 448–53. See also AR (2001–2) 44–45 for the new Danish–Greek excavations at the site.

The principal cult of Kalydonian Artemis Laphria goes back to the Archaic period (Paus. 4.31.7, 7.18.8–19.1, 7.20.2); the sanctuary of Apollo Laphrinos is attested through a C6 boundary stone (IG ix.2.1 149; cf. Strabo 10.2.21). A cult of Zeus Soter is mentioned in Hellenistic manumission records (IG ix.2.1 137.86 (C2am); SEG 25 621.8 (C2)), and Pausanias (7.21.1) has a reference to a cult of Dionysos Kalydonios (Antonetti (1990) 241–69). Stelai inscribed with public documents were set up in the sanctuary of Laphreion (IG ix.2.1 170.4 (C4l/3e); 186.6–7 (C3l)).

149. Makynea (Makynaeus) Map. 55. Lat. 38.20, long. 21.45. Size of territory: 21. The toponym is Μακυνεά, η (Bourguet (1899) 356 no. 2). Makynia (Strabo 10.2.21), Μακυνεία (Steph. Byz. 429.9–10), Μάκυνα (Archytas of Amphissa fr. 1, Powell). The city-ethnic is Μακυνεός (IG ix.2.1 13.21.22 (C3l)), Μακύνως (SEG 25 621.11f (C28)).

Makynia is not explicitly called a polis in any Archaic or Classical text. Strabo wavers between polichnion (10.2.4) and polis (10.2.21; cf. Steph. Byz. 429.16), and at 10.2.6 he criticises Hellanikos (fr. 118) for classifying Makynia as a polis founded in the Heroic Age. That Makynia was a polis in the Classical period is indicated by a C4 proxeny decree from Delphi, in which the individual and external use of the city-ethnic is attested (Bourguet (1899) 356 no. 2: Αἰτωλίων ἦκ Μακυνεός; cf. Sordi (1969) 356f; Funke (1997) 161).

Makynia seems originally to have been a Lokrian community (Plut. Mor. 294E; cf. L rat (1952) i. 7, 34f), but by C5 it had become part of Aitolia (Hohmann (1908) 17f; Bosworth (1974) 177).

Makynia was situated in the borderland between Aitolia and Lokris near Cape Rhion at the eastern spur of Mt. Taphiasos (modern Klokova). A suggested identification is with Palaikastro at Mamaku, c.3 km north-west of Rhion. Here are the remains of a fortified settlement of C4(?)/C3 with a theatre extra muros (Woodhouse (1897/1973) 327; L rat (1952) i. 82–84, 189–91; Bommeljé (1987) 95; Bommeljé and Vroom (1995) 94).
150. Molykreion (Molykreus) Map. 55. Lat. 38.20, long. 21.45. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is *Molykreion, τὸ (Thuc. 2.84.4, 3.102.2), *Molykreia, ἦ (Hellen. (FGHist N. S.) fr. 118; Ps.-Skylax 35; Strabo 9.4.8, 10.2.6; Plut. Mor. 162E), *Molykría (Polyb. 5.94.7; Diod. Sic. 12.60.3; Paus. 9.31.6; Steph. Byz. 455.12), *Molykron (Paus. 5.3.6), or *Oλύκρα (Hecat. fr. 112). The city-ethnic is *Molykreus (IG ix.2.1 14.6 (C3f), 35.7 (C2m)) with *Molykros and *Molykraios as attested variant forms (Steph. Byz. 455.14–16).

At Ps.-Skylax 35 Molykreia is the last of three toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις ἐν αὐτήν ἐλαίν αὐτῆς, where the term polis is used in the urban sense. Molykreion is explicitly called a polis at Diod. Sic. 12.60.3 (f 426) again in the urban sense.

In C6/C5 Molykreion was within the Corinthian sphere of influence (Gschnitzer (1958) 124f; Graham (1962), (1983) 137ff), but by C5m it had passed into the Athenian sphere (Salmon (1984) 266) and from, probably, C3 it was under Aitolian influence (Benecke (1934) 8). Thucydides (3.102.2) describes Molykreion as a Corinthian colony that had become an Athenian satellite (τὴν Κορινθίων μὲν ἀποικίαν, Ἀθηναίων δὲ ὑπήκοον).

In the sources Molykreion is located at the spur of Mt. Taphissos (modern Varassova) (Strabo 10.2.4, 21) near Cape Rion (Polyb. 5.94.7; Strabo 9.4.8, 10.2.21; Plut. Mor. 162E; Plin. HN 9.28; Ptol. 3.15.3; Steph. Byz. 545.13–14). The phrase τὸ ὅτι Πλιών τὸ Μολυκρικῶν (Thuc. 2.86.2; cf. Strabo. 8.2.3; Steph. Byz. 545.14) indicates that the cape was within the territory of the city, which, then, must have been situated at the cape itself (Oldfather (1918), (1933) 36), or a little inland by modern Velvina. Here, c.4 km from the coast at modern Helleniko, are the remains of a C4 settlement (defence circuit, temple, sta and houses; cf. Woodhouse (1897/1973) 328; Lerat (1952) i. 84–86; 188–89; Bommeljé (1987) 112; cf. Freitag (2000) 58–67).

At Cape Rion was a major sanctuary of Poseidon (Thuc. 2.84.4; Ps.-Skylax 35; Paus. 10.11.6; Diod. Sic. 12.48.1; Plut. Mor. 345C). Molykreion was responsible for the administration of the sanctuary and the organisation of the festival associated with the sanctuary, called τὰ Ἱπέια (IG iv.4 428.10 (C3); Plut. Mor. 162E; cf. Klaftenbach (1936) 375; Pfister (1914); Knell (1973) 454ff; Cabanes (1988) 65ff).

151. *Phola (Pholaius) Map 55. Unlocated, not in Barr. Type: C. The toponym is, presumably, *Φολάδα (reconstructed from the various forms of the city-ethnic). The city-ethnic is either *Φολαίες (IG N. I 10482 (C4f)) or *Φολάντιος (IG ix.1 17.28, 24.11, 13 (C38); 25.61, 71 (C38)) or *Φολάδας (IG ix.1 31.115, 138 (C2f)). Phola was indisputably a polis in the Hellenistic period (strategos (IG ix.2.1 31.115, 138), grammateus (IG ix.2.1 25.61, 71, 71)). The only evidence that it was already a polis in the Classical period is the name *Τύρωμα Φολαίες, recorded in two Attic sepulchral inscriptions (IG ii.2 10036 (C3f–C4e), 10482) where the individual and external use of the ethnic indicates that it is a city-ethnic rather than a sub-ethnic; see Hansen (1996) 172–73, 195.

152. Phylea Map. 55. Unlocated, not in Barr. Type: C. The toponym is *Φυλεά, ἦ. The only thing we know about Phylea is that in, probably, 355 a *θεορόδοκος was appointed to host *thesoi from Epidauros: Φυλεία. Φιλοίτιος (IG iv.2 95.37), see Akripos (supra).

153. Pleuron (Pleuropion) Map. 55. Lat. 38.25, long. 21.25. Size of territory: ? Type: A. The toponym is *Πλευρών, ἦ (Hom. II. 2.639; Thuc. 3.102.5). The city-ethnic is *Πλευρώνιος (Hom. II. 23.635; IG ix.2.1 32.17 (C3); Strabo 10.2.24).

Pleuron was called a polis in the urban sense by Bacchylides at Ep. 5.149–51; cf. Daimachios (FGHist N. S.) fr. 1. The earliest epigraphical reference to a πόλις *Πλευρωνίων is on a C3 statue base (IG ix.2.1 70.1). The collective internal use of the city-ethnic is attested at IG ix.2.1 70.1. For the external use, see lV Mag. 28.9 = IG ix.2.1 186.9 (C3). The individual and external use is attested in a proxeny decree from Delphi (Syll. A 621.1–2 (C2f)).

In the Catalogue of Ships Pleuron is recorded as an Aitolian city (II. 2.639; cf. Visser (1997) 601ff); but it can be inferred from Thuc. 3.102.5 that in C6/C5 Pleuron had part-company with the other Aitolians. Pleuron was originally an independent polis. In C5/C4 it became—like Kalydon—a member of the early Achaean Federation. In C4m/s it became integrated into the Aitolian Federation, as did the neighbouring *polis (Bommeljé (1988) 302ff). The affiliation with Aitolia, however, is not explicitly attested until C3, when citizens of Pleuron repeatedly filled federal offices (e.g. IG ix.2.1 13.13–14 (C3f)).

In C5/S Pleuron was destroyed, but the city was soon rebuilt at a nearby but more elevated place (Strabo 10.2.4; cf. Ehhardt (1978) 251ff; Funke (1987) 94 with n. 40). According to Strabo 10.2.23, old Pleuron was situated on the coast between the rivers Acheloos and Euenos near Kalydon (cf. Strabo 10.2.4, 3.6). The settlement has not yet been found, but presumably it was close to new Pleuron, which has been identified with the ancient settlement at modern Kato Retsina, on the southern side of Mt. Arakynthos; cf.

The only cult attested is one of Athene (Stat. Theb. 2.727; Dion. Calliphon. 57; cf. Antonetti (1990) 282).

154. **Proschion** (Proschieios) Map. 55. Unlocated. Type: B. The toponym is Ἰπ. Πρόσχειος, τό (Thuc. 3.102.5, 106.1; Steph. Byz. 536.22) or Πρόσχειος (IG iv² 95.38 (355)). The city-ethnic is Πρόσχειος (F.Delphes iii 4 213.2 (325–275)).

Proschion is not called a polis in any ancient text, but in, probably, 355 theoerodoki were appointed to host theoroi from Epidauros (IG iv² 95.38), and a citizen of Proschion is honoured in a Delphic proxeny decree of the early Hellenistic period (supra). Combined, the two sources indicate that Proschion was a polis, at least in the late Classical period. The individual and external use of the city-ethnic is attested in the proxeny decree from Delphi (supra).

According to Strabo (10.2.6) Pylene—mentioned in the Homeric Catalogue of Ships (II. 2.639)—was later moved to a more elevated place and renamed Proschion; cf. Ath. 411A; Hsch. s.v. Πυλήνη. Proschion was situated west of Pleuron and Kalydon near the river Acheloos (Thuc. 3.102.5, 106.1). The city must have been close to modern Aitolikon, but has not yet been securely identified; cf. Woodhouse (1897/1973) 138f; Kirsten (1951b); Antonetti (1990) 278–80; Pritchett (1991) 18ff; Strauch (1996) 356f.

155. **Therminea** Map 55. Unlocated, not in Barr. Type: C. The toponym is Θερμινέα, ἦ. The only thing we know about Therminea is that in, probably, 355 a theoerodokos was appointed to host theoroi from Epidauros: Θερμινέας (IG iv² 1.95.36), see Akripos (supra).

156. **Trichoneion** (Trichonieus) Map 55. Lat. 38.30; long. 21.30. Size of territory: ? Type: B. The toponym is Τριχόνειος, τό (F.Delphes iii 4 125.1 (C38); Syll.3 509.9 (C38)), Τριχονειεύς (Polyb. 5.7.8). The city-ethnic is Τριχονειεύς (IG ix² 1.5.6 (C3m)), Τριχονειεύς (Tod 137.12). Τριχονειεύς (IG ix² 1.17.8 (C3f)), Τριχονειέας (Pol. 18.10.9), Τριχονιεύς (Pol. 4.3.5.5), Τριχόνειος (IG ix² 1.3A.2), Τριχονιεύς (Paus. 2.37.3); for other forms, see also Steph. Byz. 638.8–10.

The only author to call Trichoneion a polis is Steph. Byz. (638.8), but that Trichoneion was a polis and a member of the Aitolian Federation already in C4f is implied by an Athenian decree of 367 in which the Trichoneians are charged with having broken a sacred truce (Tod 137). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in an inscription from Magnesia (IG ix² 187.2–3 (C2e)).

Trichoneion was one of the most important cities in Aitolia. The identification of Trichoneion with modern Gavalou on the south bank of Lake Trichonian was first suggested by Leake (1835) 55. In this area have been found very scanty remains of a large fortified settlement of the Classical and Hellenistic periods, as well as numerous tombs (Bommeljé (1987) 83, 110f; Antonetti (1990) 238–240).

APPENDIX

1. **Unidentified Ethnic Attested in Hellenistic Sources**

Only one occurrence recorded for each ethnic.

Aiklymios IG ix² 1.36.8 (C2m): Νίκοβολος Ἀικλύμιος. Andreatas IG ix² 1.101.10 (C2m): Ἀριστάς Ἀνδρέατας. Antaeus IG ix² 1.17.11 (C3m): Γρίπταλος Ἀνταίες. Perhaps part of Locris or Phocis (Lerat (1952) i. 72).

Aperantos Syll.3 539A.8f (C3l): Θεόδωρος Ἀπεραντός; cf. Antonetti (1987b) 98.

Apeirulos F.Delphes iii 4 163 = Rigsby (1996) 163.3 (C3l): Τελέσαρχος Ἀπειροκός.

Arakyneus IG ix² 1.117.81 (C3m): Ἀστόλος (?) Ἀρακυνεύς. Attaleus IG ix² 1.95.2 (C3l): Ἐδεξίθεος Ἀτταλεύς. Bouteiaus IG ix² 1.3.34 (C3f): Φιλέας Ἀλέγαθου Ὑπηνειεύς. Perhaps part of Locris (Lerat (1952) i. 20f, ii. 183; cf. infra 391).

Chasilius IG ix² 1.17.92 (C3m): (name) Φυσκίνιος Χασίλιος (= Kasilios?).

Choleos IG ix² 1.9.10 (C3): Ἀρχίδαμος Χωλέος. Dairian IG ix² 1.3A.21 (C3f): Ἀρίστως Δαιάν. Dardios, -eos IG ix² 1.96.21 (C2): Σύμμαχος Εὐρυδάμου Δάρδιος; IG ix² 1.99.12 (C2m): Φερένικος Δάρδεος. Dastiadas Syll.3 539A.6 (C3l): Λάμιος Δαστιάδας. Perhaps part of Locris (Lerat (1952) i. 68; cf. infra 391).
Dexieus IG ix.3.1 25.71–2 (C38): Ἄγις Δεξιεὺς. Perhaps part of Locris (Lerat 1952 i. 71, ii. 184).

Eggaraios IG ix.3.1 31.51 (C38): Ἐγγαραῖος Ἐγγοραῖος.

Eidaios IG ix.3.1 117.22 (C31): Λυκίσιος Εἰδαῖος.

Ertaios IG ix.3.1 3A.18 (C3m): Ἀρίσταρχος Ἐρταῖος.

Ethanios IG ix.3.1 31.185–6 (C63): Φαλαινίας Ἡθαῖος.

Eukyileis IG ix.3.1 652.15 (C2e): Ἐὐκυῖλης; cf. Lerat (1952 i) 91.

Perhaps part of Locris (Lerat 1952 i) 70) (= Oikyleis?).

Haimonius F.Delphes iii 3 222.13 (C3l): Νικόφιδος Λιμινιαῖος.

Hermattios IG ix.3.1 1188.35 (C3l): Ἀλέξιος Ἐρμάκτιος.

Hyposeirios IG ix.3.1 17.6–7 (C3m): Στρατόνικος Ὑποσεῖριος.

Istoriqo IG ix.3.1 638.3.5 (C2f): Ἐπιλαος Σεννία Ἰστόριος.

Perhaps part of Locris (Lerat 1952 i) 66; cf. also Kirsten (1942) 2367 and infra.

Kaphreus IG ix.3.1 632.3 (C2m): Λύκος Καφρεύς. Perhaps part of Locris (Lerat 1952 i) 66; cf infra 391.

Kasios IG ix.3.1 25.56 (C3h): Διὸν Κασίλος (= Chasilios?).

Kerreatas Syll. 603.4 (C2e): — λαος Κερεάτας.

Kottaeus F.Delphes iii 4 103.5–6 (C3l): Θεόδωρος Κοτταίος.

Lepadaioi F.Delphes iii 4 362.6–7 (C3l): Μενεκράτας Λεπαδάιος. Part of Aitolia (?) (LGPN s.v. Μενεκράτης).

Machteius IG ix.3.1 69.3–4 (C2f): Στόμιος Χαβρία Μακεβεύς. Perhaps part of Locris (Lerat 1952 i) 71.

Mystakeus IG ix.3.1 59.87 (C3l): Ταυρίων Μυστακεύς.

Perhaps part of Locris (Lerat 1952 i) 64.

Neapolitas IGI 3.1 96.15 (C2): Ἀγίας Νεαπόλιτας.

Oikilei(eus) IG ix.3.1 31.90 (C38): Διόμεικος Ὀἰκυλεύς; Syll. 564.4 (C3l): Λαμίος Οἰκυλεύς. Perhaps part of Locris (Lerat 1952 i) 70) (= Eukyleis?).

Oribatos IG ix.3.1 137.25 (C2m): Αὐτίφιλος Ὀρίβατος.

Paphanos IG ix.3.1 17.13 (C3m): Λεκμισμένης Ψάφανος.

Pelos IG ix.3.1 97.14f. (C2e): Δρωπᾶς Πελόας.

Pelliotos IG ix.3.1 12.23 (C3l): Παντάρχης Πελλώτιος.

Perochtheos IG ix.3.1 639.8.9f. (C2m): Τελέσαρχος Νικομάχου Περόχθεος. Perhaps part of Locris (Lerat 1952 i) 677; cf. infra 391.

Phalikaios SGGI 2136.2 (C2s): Φαλικαίος. Perhaps part of Locris (Lerat 1952 i) 63f.

Philotheus IG ix.3.1 96.23 (C3m): Λέων Μικκία Φιλωταιεύς; cf. IG ix.3.1 1105.2f. (C2m): Νῖκασω Φιλωταίς.

Phoistan Syll. 523.5 (C3s): (name) Φωιστάν.

Phyllaios IG ix.3.1 634.8 (C2s): Στρατόλαος Φυλλαῖος. Perhaps part of Locris (Lerat 1952 i) 65; cf. infra 391.

Phyrtaios SGGI 1949.16 (C2f): Ἐφιάλης Φύρταιος; cf. also the first list s.v. Phytaios.

Plygoneus SGDI 1978.7 (C2e): Κλέως Πλυγονεὺς. Perhaps part of Locris or Phocis (Lerat 1952 i. 59; cf. infra 391).

Porphios IG ix.3.1 638.13.14 (C2m): Νικαρχὸς Πόντος.

Perhaps part of Locris (Lerat 1952 i) 65f; cf. infra 391.

Potamiaios SGDI 2137.15 (C2s): Ἐπίκουρος Καλλιμάχου Ποταμίαυς.

Proennoi IG ix.3.1 109.10 (C2m): Αὐρᾶνοι Προέννοι.

Psalountios SEG 25 621.10 (C2): Ἀγίος Κλεοζένων Ψαλλόντιος.

Potelamiaous F.Delphes iii 3 220.6 (C3l): Τύμαρχος Πτολεμαῖος.


Rhadasmos F.Delphes iii 4 362.8 (C3l): Λυκείας Ῥαδάνιος.

Rhadois IG ix.3.1 96.24–5 (C2): Νίκοστρατος Ἀρίστωνος Ῥάδους.

Spatios IG ix.3.1 188.33–4 (C3l): Πεθύλαος Σπάττιος.

Perhaps part of Locris (Lerat 1952 i) 67.

Taphieius IG ix.3.1 13.18 (C3f): Αὐτάλεως Ταφείευς.

Thaioi IG ix.3.1 638.13.11 (C2): Πολεμαίνετος Θαῖος; IG ix.3.1 639.2.13 (C2): Λέων Θαῖος. Perhaps part of Locris (Lerat 1952 i) 66f, 69; Nachmanon (1907) 65; cf. infra 391.

Thyrikois IG ix.3.1 4.7–8 (C3l): Πολεμάρχου Θυρικαίος.

Tithaioi IG ix.3.1 9.11 (C3l): (name) Τιθαίοι (= Tithaioi?).

Titraios IG ix.3.1 11.48 (C3m): Λάμος Τιτραίος (= Tithaioi?).

Tnimaioi IG ix.3.1 1105.11–2 (C2m): Σεννίας Τημαιοί.

Tragantios IG ix.3.1 109.7–8 (C2m): Ἐμπέδιχων Τραγαντίου.

2. Hellenistic and Undated Settlements


Apollonia (Ἀπόλλωνια). Livy 28.8.9 (in propinquis castellis Potidaniae atque Apolloniae); city-ethnic: Ἀπόλλωνεῖος (F.Delphes iii 4 164.6f. (C3l)). Apollonia probably issued coins in C38/C2f (Liami 1996 passim). Unlocated.


Boukation (?). IG ix.3.1 97.14 (Βουκατίεις (C2e)). Boukation (?) is identified by some with the remains of a large fortified Hellenistic settlement in the modern village of Paravola; cf. Bommeljé (1987) 101.

Ellopion (Ἐλλόπιον). Polyb. 11.7.4; Steph. Byz. 269.1 (πόλις Αἰτωλίας). Identified with ancient remains near to
Mesovouni, south-east of Morosklava (Woodhouse (1897/1973) 1f), not in Barr.

Ephyra (Ἐφύρα). Strabo 8.3.5 (καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἡγερίᾳ τῆς Αἰτωλίας Ἐφύρα κόμη); Steph. Byz. 291.4 (κόμη Ἀἰτωλίας Ἐφύρα); Plin. HN 4.6 (Aetolorum populi . . . Ephyrî). Unlocated, not in Barr.

Konope/Arsonoe (Κωνόπη/Ἀρσινόη). Strabo 10.2.22 (Ἀρσινόης πάλεως, ἢ κόμης μὲν ἤν πρότερον καλουµένη Κωνώπα, κτίσµα δ’ ὑπῆρξεν Αρσινόης); Steph. Byz. 126.1 (Ἀρσινόη, πόλις Αἰτωλίας), 401.6 (Κωνώπη, πόλις Ἀκαρνανίας); cf. also Polyb. 4.64.3f, 5.7.7, 5.13.9 (without any site-classification); city-ethnic: Άρσινοεύς (IG ix².1 624.4 (C2)). Konope/Arsonoe is identified with modern Angelokastron. Hellenistic remains (Bommeljé (1987) 77). Unlocated in C3f (Antonetti (1989) 73f, (1990) 273–76). It is uncertain whether Konope—the settlement replaced by Arsonoe—can be classified as a polis; at Strabo 10.2.22 it is classified as a κόμη.

Κυνιάδαι (Κυνιάδαι). C3/C2 theorodokoi list from Delphi: ἐν Κυνιάδαις (BCH (1921) col. iv 121); cf. Strabo 10.2.21 (λίµνη Κυνία). Unlocated, not in Barr.

Lysimacheia (Λυσιµάχεια). Steph. Byz. 423.10f (Λυσιµάχεια, πόλις Αἰτωλίας); cf. also Polyb. 5.7.7f and Strabo 10.2.22 (polis status not indicated). The city is also mentioned in the C3/C2 theorodokoi list from Delphi: ἐν Λυσιµάχεια (BCH (1921) col. iv 74). The city-ethnic is Λυσιµάχεος (IG iix².1 3A.20 (C3m)). Lysimacheia is identified with modern Mourstaniou. Scanty Hellenistic remains of a walled settlement (Bommeljé (1987) 94). The city of Lysimacheia was founded between 285 and 281 (Antonetti (1989) 73f; Hatzopoulos (1988) 21); there is no indication of polis status before this time.

Mesata (Μεσάτα). IG xi 8 151.12 (Σείρακον Ιαθοµάχου Αἰτωλοῦ ἐν Μεσάτας (C3)). Unlocated, not in Barr.

Metapa (Μέταπα). Polyb. 5.7.8f (πόλις); Steph. Byz. 448.12 (πόλις Ἀκαρνανίας); city-ethnic: Μεσατίος (Syll. 3 539 A.8f (C3l)). No indication of polis status before C3. Metapa is identified with modern Ano Boursela, where remains of an ancient habitation have been found (Bommeljé (1987) 97).

Pamphia (Παµφία). Polyb. 5.8.1 (κόμη Παµφία); cf. also Polyb. 5.13.7; city-ethnic: Παµφιεύς (IG ix².1 105.9 (C2m)). Pamphia is identified with the modern site Goustaní (= Foustiani). “Ancient remains are only suggested” (Bommeljé (1987) 100).


Phana (Φάνα). Herod. De prosod. cath. 3.1.256.11 (πόλις Αἰτωλίας); Paus. 10.18.2 (Φάναν πυργήρεα κόμην). Steph. Byz. 657.15 calls Phana πόλις Ιταλίας, convincingly emended by Klaffenbach (IG ix².1 p. 81.53f) to πόλις Αἰτωλίας; cf. the note in Herod. (supra). Phana is identified by Bommeljé ((1987) 107) with the ancient remains at the modern site Stamna (Stathmos Sideroporta), whereas Pritchett (1991) 36f localises Phana at modern Trei Ekkliesies; not in Barr.


Phistyos (Φιστυος). IG ix².1 97.2 (C2e); cf. Nikandros (FGrHist 271–2) fr. 3). The ethnic is Φίστυος (IG ix².1 109.9 (C2m)). The identification of Phistyos with the remains of the modern site Neromanna is only a conjecture. The suggestion is based mainly on the proximity of the sanctuary of Aphrodite Phistyis at nearby Kryonerou. Bommeljé ((1987) 99f; cf. Antonetti (1990) 230) reports undated remains of a well-preserved fortified settlement. The principal cult was that of the Syrian Aphrodite in Phistyos (IG ix².1 108.4–5 (C2m), 95.2 (C3l); cf. Antonetti (1990) 230–35.

Phytain (Φίταιον). C3/C2 theorodokoi list from Delphi: ἐν Φίταιοι (BCH (1921) col. iv 46); Polyb. 11.7.5 = Steph. Byz. 675.15 (πόλις Αἰτωλίας); cf. also Polyb. 5.7.7 (without any site-classification); city-ethnic: Φυταιεύς (IG iix².1 24.6f (C3e); 186.14 (C3l); perhaps also Φυταιαί (SGDI 1949.16 (C2f)). Phytain is identified by Pritchett (1989) 33f with the ruins at Palaiochori south of Kapsorachi; cf. also Bommeljé (1987) 100.

The(s)stai (Θεστίαι). C3/C2 theorodokoi list from Delphi: ἐν Θεστίαις (BCH (1921) col. iv 75); Polyb. 5.7.7 (Θεστίες); city-ethnic: Θεστίες (IG ix².1 30.6 (C3l); F.Delphes. 111 3 220.4 (C3l)). Civic institutions (ἐκκλησία, ταµία, πολιτικόν νόµον τὰς πόλις τῶν Θεστίεων) in C2 (SEG 23 398). Thesitia is identified with modern Ano Volochos. Hellenistic fortifications (Bommeljé (1987) 112).
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WEST LOKRIS

DENIS ROUSSET

I. The Region

The name of the region is Λοκρός, Ἡ (Thuc. 3.95.3; Hell. Oxy. 21.3; Ps.-Skylax 35). The same name is used for the region inhabited by the East Lokrians (see Nielsen (2000) 95–96 and infra). The East and West Lokrians belonged in fact to the same ἔθνος, as is apparent from Aeschin. 2.116 and the lists of hieromnemones of the Amphiktyonic League in which the two seats for the Lokrians were given one to the hieromnemones in the same infra 2000 in inhabited by the East Lokrians (see Nielsen (2000) 95–96 and infra). The East and West Lokrians belonged in fact to the same ἔθνος, as is apparent from Aeschin. 2.116 and the lists of hieromnemones of the Amphiktyonic League in which the two seats for the Lokrians were given one to the East and one to the West Lokrians (Lefèvre (1998) 79–83). Thus the ethnic Λοκρός without further qualifications may designate a West Lokrian (e.g. CID ii 31.34; IG vii 3055 (C4m); cf. Hecat. fr. 113; Thuc. 3.97.2; Dem. 18.150). Within the region, Λοκρός alone is used both collectively (IG ix2.1 667: τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Λοκρῶν (C2m)) and individually (IG ix2.1 681 (C2m)).

In inscriptions the official and unambiguous designation of the West Lokrians is Λοκροὶ of Ἑσπέριοι. This regional ethnic is attested in the collective and internal sense in IG ix2.1 718: Λοκροὶ τῶν Ἑσπερίων (C5f) and IG ix1.1 665: τῶν Λοκρῶν τῶν Ἑσπερίων (C4m). The collective and external use is attested in CID ii 5.11.46 (C4m). For the individual and external use, see CID ii 74.1.70 (337). This form of the regional ethnic is also found in literary sources (Hell. Oxy. 21.3; Arist. fr. 574; Theopomp. fr. 80.7; Ps.-Skylax 36; cf. προσεπέριοι in Diod. 14.34.2 (1904). The designation οἱ ὁ Ἐσπέριοι, however, is attested in literary sources only from C3m onwards (Hdt. 8.32.2; Thuc. 1.5.3; Xen. Hell. 4.2.17; Ps.-Skylax 36; Arist. fr. 574).

The frontiers of the region inhabited by the West Lokrians are difficult to establish, because lists of Lokrian cities are few and fragmentary, and because the boundary between the Lokrians and the Aitolians was drawn differently at different periods. To the east the Lokrian cities bordered on the port of Kirra, the hiera chora dedicated to Apollo and the polis of Delphi (no. 177). Towards the north-east the Lokrians extended as far as the foothills of Parnassos and the Phokian poleis (infra 399). To the north, it is hard to establish the precise extent of the mountainous hinterland inhabited by Lokrians. There is no doubt that the frontier with Aitolia ran north of Physkeis and the land belonging to the Laphrioi (located only recently: BCH 93 (1969) 86; infra). But in the Hellenistic period there were many communities whose affiliation with either Lokris or Aitolia is unknown, such as the Peleoi, the Phalikaioi and the Potanaioi, all in the neighbourhood of Amphissa (Lerat (1952) i. 62–64; Rousset (2002) 13–15). North of Naupaktos (no. 165) and near the Bouttians there were several communities that have not yet been located (Akotieis, Boutaieis, Dastiadai, Istorioi, Kaphreis, Perochtheoi, Phyllaiori, Porioi and Thaioi); see Lerat (1952) i. 65–70, 192. Finally, to the west, Makynea and Molykrion, both originally belonging to Lokris, became Aitolian at an early date,¹ and that happened to Naupaktos too after 338 (infra). Similarly, other cities, such as Eupalion, became part of what Strabo at 10.2.3 calls Extended Aitolia (Ἀἰτωλία Ἐπίκτητος); see Lerat (1952) i. 7, ii. 62.

The Lokrian settlements were scattered along the north coast of the Corinthian Gulf and in the mountainous hinterland, which no doubt explains the region’s lack of political unity in the Classical period and later. In C4m, as well as after 167, the centre of the Lokrian Federation was Physkeis, a mountain town near the Aitolian border (infra). But the two major Lokrian cities—the port of Naupaktos (no. 165) and Amphissa (no. 158), facing the plain of Kirra—each had its own history. Furthermore, Amphissa seems not to have belonged to the Lokrian Federation.

Were it not for Thucydides’ account of the events of 426 (3.95.3–96.2 and 101–2), we would know almost nothing of the Lokrian communities of the Classical period, apart from Amphissa and Naupaktos. Thucydides, however, did not describe the communities he mentions in 3.101.2–101.1 as poleis, and one may ask whether the ethnics he lists are

¹ Makynea, originally a Lokrian settlement (Plut. Mor. 295A; Lerat (1952) i. 7, 34) but Aitolian from the Classical period onwards (supra 384). Molykrion, presumably originally a Lokrian settlement (Plut. Mor. 162E; Ptol. 3.14.3; Lerat (1952) i. 7, 35–36) but Aitolian from the Classical period onwards (supra 385).
city-ethnics or regional ethnics denoting peoples scattered across quite a wide area and settled in a number of villages. It is worth remembering that, according to Thuc. 1.5.3, the Lokrians—like the Aitolians and Akarnanians—lived in the old-fashioned way, i.e. in unfortified villages. In that case, when did the West Lokrians begin to live in urban fortified centres, each organised as a polis in the political sense? Given the absence of archaeological excavations in the region, it is better to follow Lerat ([1952] i. 218–19) and refrain from dating the preserved fortifications to C4 rather than to the Hellenistic period. It is therefore impossible with any certainty to date the organisation of West Lokris into poleis before the Hellenistic period. This uncertainty is a serious obstacle to classifying all the Lokrian communities according to the categories applied in the present work. Some settlements, however, can tentatively be classified as type C poleis on the basis of what is known about their status in the Classical and Hellenistic periods combined with an evaluation of how far it might be legitimate to interpret this evidence retrospectively.

A final note of warning: our ignorance about the northern frontier of West Lokris and about the number of separate communities and cities, including their location, makes it hard to assess the size of their territories. An estimate is given only for some of the cities in the eastern part of the region, near Delphi (no. 177), where the political map can be reconstructed with some confidence, at least for the Hellenistic period.

Pre-Hellenic Settlements not Attested as Poleis


Eupalion (Εὐπαλίων) Lokrian settlement mentioned by Thucydides at 3.95.3, 98.3 and 102.1. It was probably a harbour, as stated by Steph. Byz. 485.18–19: Οἶνεών, Λοκρίδος λιμήν; cf. Lerat (1952) i. 195–96. Near Oineon was a sanctuary of Nemean Zeus, where, reputedly, Hesiod died (Thuc. 3.96.1). This Oineonas is probably identical with Οἰνόη, where Hesiod died according to two other sources (Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi 14; Tzetzes, Vita Hesiodi). Similarly, it is possible that the Οἶνοων—attested in inscriptions from Aitolia (IG ix².1 6, 7 (C3f)), Delphi (Syll. 539A (C3f)) and Lokris (IG ix².1 681 (C3m))—were the inhabitants of Oineonas/Oinóη. The settlement must be located east of Eupalion and Erythrai in the region of Klima, Marathias or Glypha (Lerat (1952) i. 195–97; Pritchett (1991) 52–60). Barr. C.

Phaistinos (Φαιστῖνος) A Lokrian from Phaistinos is honoured with proxenia in a C3s inscription from Delphi (F.Delphes 111.1 442), and C2s manumission inscriptions found in Panormos testify to its sanctuary of Apollo (Lerat (1952) i. 47–48, 115–23). Barr. C.

Physkeis (Φυσκεῖς) IG ix².1 680.11.2; Plut. Mor. 294.E. In the Hellenistic period a polis (IG ix².1 704.1 (c.200)) but unattested in sources of the Archaic and Classical periods. It was the centre of the Lokrian Federation after 167 (IG ix².1 667; Lerat (1952) ii. 97–98) and an inscription of C3m found in Physkeis shows that it must by then have been the capital of the federation of the Hesperian Lokrians (IG ix².1 665). There is, however, no indication that Physkeis was a polis at that time. Physkeis was situated at modern Malandrino. Some remains date from the Classical period, but the impressive fortifications enclosing an area of c.15 ha are still unattested (Lerat (1952) i. 123–37, esp. 136). Barr. AC.

Polis (Πόλεις) Classified as a kome by Thuc. 3.102.1, a civic subdivision of the Hyaians (no. 160). Barr. C.

II. The Poleis

157. Alpa (Αλπαίοι) Map. 55. Lat. 38.25, long. 22.10, but see infra. Type: C. The toponym is Ἀλπα (BCH 45 (1921) 25
The city-ethnic is Ἀλπαῖος, used in the external and individual sense in three inscriptions of C2 (Rouset 2002) 251.51, 89; IG iv² 1.672 and 708), and in the external and collective sense in Thuc. 3.101.2, where the evidence of the three Hellenistic inscriptions shows that Ἀλπαῖος is a convincing conjecture for MSS Ὀλπαῖοι.

Apart from Steph. Byz. 77.12, Alpa is not called a polis in any source, and the main reason for interpreting Ἀλπαῖος as a city-ethnic and including Alpa in this inventory of Archaic and Classical poleis is the C3 list of theorodokoi, interpreted retrospectively, and combined with Thucydides' information at 3.101.2 that, in 426, the Alpaioi had to provide hostages to the Peloponnesian League alongside a number of other Lokrian communities, three of which were presumably poleis (Amphissa (no. 158), Chaleion (no. 159) and Oianthea (no. 166)) and the others of which may have been. The passage shows that Alpa must have been a political community, and may perhaps have been a polis.

Lerat (1952 i. 13–15 and 212–13) showed that the Alpaioi must have been settled in the neighbourhood of Physkeis and Phaistinos, but he refrained from placing Alpa on the map. Philippson and Kirsten (1951) map and 740 no. 64) suggested one possible location, but a different one in (1958) 629 n. 34 and 669 no. 62: viz. Makrysi-Kokorista, accepted in Barr. for no good reason. As the evidence stands, Alpa ought to be left unlocated.

158. Amphissa (Amphisseus) Map. 55. Lat. 38.30, long. 22.20. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Ἀμφίσσα, Ἡ (Hdt. 8.32.2; Dem. 18.143; Aeschin. 3.125; Ps.-Skylax 36; IG iv² 1.95.4 (C4m)) or, in inscriptions, sometimes Ἀνφίσσα (SEG 39 441 (C3)). The city-ethnic is Ἀμφίσσαιος (Thuc. 3.101.2; Dem. 18.150; Aeschin. 3.113; CID n 118.5 (C4f)) or, in inscriptions, sometimes Ἀφίσσαιος (CID v index s.v.). Apart from the feminine Ἀμφισσά, Ἀμφίσσαια is also attested (IG ii 12 8088 (C3l)). Both the toponym and the ethnic may have the geminate -σσ- written simplex (CID n 31.79 (C4m)). Amphissa is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 8.32.2 and Ps.-Skylax 36. That it was a polis in the political sense as well is indicated by the appointment of an Epidian theorodokos in Amphissa (IG iv² 1.95.4 (C4m)), the presence of Amphissaians among the Delphic naopaioi (CID n 31.79 (C4m)) and hieronmomenes (CID n 43.23 (341)), and by the Amphiktyonic League’s declaration of war upon Amphissa in 340/39 (Aeschin. 3.128–29). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in an inscription of C2 (BCH 126 (2002) 85; IG ix².1 750.29) and on Hellenistic coins (Head, HN 337), and externally in Thuc. 3.101.2 and in a Delphic dedicatory inscription of C4-C3 (BCH 73 (1949) 258). The individual use is attested externally in Delphic C4 inscriptions (CID n 118.5, 31.79) and internally in a first century AD inscription from Amphissa (IG ix².1.755.4).

The territory of Amphissa bordered on that of Myania (no. 164) to the south (Thuc. 3.101.2). To the north it extended as far as the Phokian poleis, as appears from the sources for the conflict of 395 (Hell. Oxy. 21.2–3; Paus. 3.9.9; contra Xen. Hell. 3.5.3; cf. Rouset (2002) 162–64). To the east the C4 frontier with Delphi (no. 177) is mentioned at Plut. Mor. 249F (1354 or 353). To the south-east the territory of Amphissa was contiguous with the sacred land of Apollo. The occupation of the hiera chora at the beginning of the Fourth Sacred War of 340–338 (Dem. 18.150; Aeschin. 3.113) was followed by a redrawing of the frontier to the detriment of the Amphissaians (Rouset (2002) 86.8.30–31 (1335/4)). From these Classical sources, as well as from later documents, it appears that Amphissa possessed a larger territory than the other Lokrian poleis.

In 480 Amphissa served as a place of refuge for the Phokians and the Delphians (Hdt. 8.32.2, 36.2). Amphissa is then not mentioned again in the sources until the Peloponnesian War (on the reference to the Amphissaians at Diod. 12.42.4 (1431), see Lerat (1952) ii. 37). Among the West Lokrians, who in 426 were allied with Athens, the Amphissaians were the first to change sides and join the Spartans (Thuc. 3.101.2). In the Third Sacred War, the Amphissaians were prepared to relieve Delphi from Phokaian occupation (Diod. 16.24.4 (1356)), but soon had to submit to the Phokians (Diod. 16.33.3 (1354 or 353)). The Fourth Sacred War (340–338) was provoked by the Amphissaians (Aeschin. 3.113–29; Dem. 18.140–59), and ended with Philip’s conquest of the city (Polyaen. 4.2.8) and the exile of some of the citizens. Aeschin. 3.129 states that the Amphissaians recalled the exiles soon after, and had their opponents exiled instead, but according to Diod. 18.56.5, the exile of the Amphissaians who had caused the Sacred War was still effective in 319. However, in spite of Strabo 9.4.8 (cf. 9.3.4), it seems that the city was not destroyed in 338 (Lerat (1952) ii. 53–54). It is apparent from the Amphiktyonic lists of 341–323 that Amphissa was not a member of the C4m federation of the Hesperian Lokrians which had its centre at Physkeis (supra). During this period an Amphissaias and a Hesperian took turns serving as the hieronmomen of the West Lokrians (Lerat (1952) ii. 57–60; Lefèvre (1998) 79, 295–96).
The mythical founder of Amphissa was Andraimon (Arist. fr. 569), whose tomb could still be seen in Amphissa in the second century AD (Paus. 10.38.5). Nothing is known about the political institutions of Amphissa prior to C2. In C4, the Amphithesians appointed a theodorokos to host the theoroi from Epidaurus or C5 (IG IV.2.1 95.4).

In 321, when Amphissa was besieged by the Aitolians (Diod. 18.38.2), the city must have been fortified. There are still remains of the ancient acropolis wall, built partly in 1805. Furthermore, excavations have revealed sections of what may be a C4s defence circuit enclosing the town (ArchDelt 33 (1978) 147–48, 44 (1989) Chron. 201 and 204).

159. Chaleion (Chaleius) Map 55. Late 38.20, long. 22.20. Size of territory: 2? Type: A. The toponym is Χαλείον (IG ix.2.1 717.7 (C5m); BCH 45 (1921) 23 iv.69 (C3l)) or, once, Χάλλειον (Hecat. fr. 113 or, in late inscriptions, Χαλεῖον, Χαληδόν (CID V 862, 1115 (C1)). The city-ethnic is Χαλείες (IG ix.2.1 718.47 (C5f), 717.7 (C5m)). Variant forms are Χαλείο (IG ix.2.1 738 (C5)), Χαλεῖος (BCH 92 (1968) 30 (C4l–C3e)), Χαληδεύς (CID IV 20 (1987)), Χαλείης (CID IV 1249 (first century AD)) or Χαλείος (Thuc. 3.101.2). Chaleion is attested as a polis both in the urban sense (Hecat. fr. 113; IG ix.2.1 717.4 (C5m)) and in the political sense (BCH 92 (1968) 30 (C4l–C3e) = IG ix.2.1 739). The citizen is called astos (IG ix.2.1 717.14). The collective and internal use of the city-ethnic isattested in the treaty with Oianthea (IG ix.2.1 717 (C5m)) and on a C5 weight (IG ix.2.1 738); the collective and external use is attested at Thuc. 3.101.2. The individual use is attested both internally (IG ix.2.1 721(C.5, 7 (C3)) and externally (BCH 92 (1968) 30.14 (C4l–C3e), Delphi).

The inscription, BCH 92 (1968) 30, which concerns the ownership of landed property in one polis by citizens from another polis, shows that Chaleion bordered on Triaitea (no. 168). The treaty with Oianthea (IG ix.2.1 717) mentions the name of the territory (1: Χαλείες) and refers to the harbour of the city (4: λιμένες τὸ κατὰ πόλις).

Apart from IG ix.2.1 718—attesting to the participation of Chaleion in the C5f colonisation of Naupaktos (no. 165)—the best source for the status of Chaleion in C5 is the treaty with Oianthea (no. 166) IG ix.2.1 717; see Gauthier (1972) 222–25, 242–44, 286–92). It regulates the presence of Chaleian metics (6: μεταξφιάκειι) in Oianthea, and vice versa. The inscription refers to proxenoi, xenodikai, damiourgoi, and to institutions of an aristocratic type, e.g. that jurors are to be appointed aristidai. The Chaleian board of damiourgoi is also attested in a C5f dedication to an unnamed hero (IG ix.2.1 720).

On the basis of the epigraphical evidence, Letat ((1952) i. 198–205) has shown that Chaleion was situated at modern Galaxidi. The defence circuit at this site encloses an area of 8 ha and dates from C4l or C3e (ibid. 152–58; ArchDelt 33 (1978) Chron. 147–48, 44 (1989) Chron. 201 and 204).

160. *Hyia (Hyaios) (with Polis) Map 55. Hyiai unlocated and not in Barr; Polis located at lat. 38.25, long. 22.05, but see infra. Type: C. The toponym is Υαία (Steph. Byz. 644.4: ’Υαία, πόλις Λοκρῶν τῶν Ὀζωλών, τὸ ἐθνικὸν ’Υαίος, ἑθνικὸς τρίτων) (’Υαίους at Thuc. 3.101.2). In this note the toponym is probably generated by Stephanos from the ethnic in Thucydides and has no authority. Hyiai is attested as a polis in Hellenistic sources only (infra). The collective and external use of the city-ethnic is attested at Thuc. 3.101.2; for the individual and external use, see F.Delphes 111.3 221 (C3l); SEG 44 438.6 (C2); IG ix.2.1 34.18 (C2).

Among the Lokrian peoples who were in contact with the Spartan Eurylochos in 426, Thucydides mentions the Hyaii, “who did not submit to giving hostages until he had taken their village called Polis” (’Υαίοι οὐκ ἔδωσαν δράκων πρὸς αὐτῶν ἐδωσαν δράκων κόμαι Πόλιαν ὅμως ἕχουσαν Πόλιαν ὅμως ἕχουσαν 3.101.2). This, our only early source, is open to several interpretations: (a) most of the Hyaians lived scattered around a single village which they called Polis; (b) the Hyaians were settled in a number of villages, one of which was called Polis; (c) the Hyaians were settled in one town (polis) plus one or more villages (komai), one of which was called Polis. Irrespective of which of the three interpretations one prefers, it can be assumed that the name Polis is derived from the term polis in the sense of akropolis (Hansen (1996) 36).

In the Hellenistic period the Hyaios and the Polies were distinct political communities, and each was a polis. c.200 the polis of Υαίαν set up a statue in Thermos (IG ix.2.1 71a), in C3e a Δράκων Πολείς served as hiparch of the Aitolian Federation (IG ix.2.1 8.12–13; cf. 17.5), and in 208 the Πολεῖς were among those who recognised the Leukophryenea of Magnesia on the Maiander (I.Magnesia 28.13).

If the Polies of the Hellenistic period can be connected with the komos called Polis at Thuc. 3.101.2, the inference is that Polis had changed its status from komos to polis. A further inference is that the polis of the Hyaians did not have its urban centre at the settlement which in 426 was called Polis. Letat ((1952) i. 197, ii. 239) refrained from locating the Hyaios and Polis. Polis was tentatively located at modern
Hypnia (Hynneus) Map. 55. Lat. 38.25, long. 22.20. Size of territory: 1. Type: C. The toponym is ‘Ὑπνία, ἦ (F.Delphes iii.1.4 352.11.4 (c.190)). The city-ethnic is ‘Ὑπνεῖς (F.Delphes iii.1.4 352.11.24). In Steph. Byz. 335.17 the toponym is ‘Ὑπνος, ἤὙπνεά, possibly generated from the city-ethnic Ὑπνεάς (acc. plur.) at Thuc. 3.101.2, where, however, Ὑπνεάς is a plausible conjecture for MSS Ὑπνεάς.

Hypnia is explicitly called a polis in the C2 sympoliteia with neighbouring Myania (no. 164; F.Delphes iii.1.4 352.11.4–5). The treaty records the name of the territory (‘Ὑπνίας, 11.24–25), and refers to troops and officials in Hypnia (11.14–16). The Hellenistic evidence should be combined, retrospectively, with Thucydides’ information at 3.101.2 that, in 426, the Hypnians had to provide hostages to the Peloponnesian League alongside a number of other Lokrian communities, three of which were presumably poleis (Amphissa (no. 158), Chaleion (no. 159) and Oianthea (no. 166)) and the others of which may have been. The passage shows that the Hypnians must have been a political community, and may perhaps have been a polis.

161. Hypnia (Hynneus) Map. 55. Lat. 38.25, long. 22.20. Size of territory: 1. Type: C. The toponym is ‘Ὑπνία, ἦ (F.Delphes iii.1.4 352.11.4 (c.190)). The city-ethnic is ‘Ὑπνεῖς (F.Delphes iii.1.4 352.11.24). In Steph. Byz. 335.17 the toponym is ‘Ὑπνος, ἤὙπνεά, possibly generated from the city-ethnic Ὑπνεάς (acc. plur.) at Thuc. 3.101.2, where, however, Ὑπνεάς is a plausible conjecture for MSS Ὑπνεάς.

Hypnia is explicitly called a polis in the C2 sympoliteia with neighbouring Myania (no. 164; F.Delphes iii.1.4 352.11.4–5). The treaty records the name of the territory (‘Ὑπνίας, 11.24–25), and refers to troops and officials in Hypnia (11.14–16). The Hellenistic evidence should be combined, retrospectively, with Thucydides’ information at 3.101.2 that, in 426, the Hypnians had to provide hostages to the Peloponnesian League alongside a number of other Lokrian communities, three of which were presumably poleis (Amphissa (no. 158), Chaleion (no. 159) and Oianthea (no. 166)) and the others of which may have been. The passage shows that the Hypnians must have been a political community, and may perhaps have been a polis.

162. Issioi Map. 55. Unlocated. Type: C. Only the city-ethnic is known, viz. Ισσαίος, attested in numerous Hellenistic inscriptions (IG 11x.1.17A.56 (C3f), 638.13; CID v 17, 22, 104; SEG 41.514f). In Steph. Byz. 304.17 the toponym Ἰσσαῖος is probably generated from the city-ethnic Ἰσσαίους (acc. plur.) at Thuc. 3.101.2, where, however, Ἰσσαῖος is a plausible conjecture for MSS Ἰσσαίους. Apart from Steph. Byz. 304.17, the Issioi are not described as a polis in any source, and the main reason for interpreting Ἰσσαῖος as a city-ethnic and including the Issioi in this inventory of Archaic and Classical periods is Thucydides’ information at 3.101.2 that, in 426, the Issioi had to provide hostages to the Peloponnesian League alongside a number of other Lokrian communities, three of which were presumably poleis (Amphissa (no. 158), Chaleion (no. 159) and Oianthea (no. 166)) and the others may have been. The passage shows that the Issians must have been a political community, and may perhaps have been a polis. The Issioi were probably settled between Tolophon (no. 167) and Oianthea (no. 166) (Lerat (1952) i. 32–34, 212–13).

163. Messapioi Map. 55. Unlocated. Type: [A]. Only the city-ethnic is known, viz. Μεσσαπίος, attested at Thuc. 3.101.2 in the collective and external sense, and in the individual and external sense in a single Delphic inscription recording a West Lokrian treasurer of 337 named Χαυρέας Ὄρθαγωρ(α) Μεσσαπίος ἤ τοις τοιούτοις πόλεισ (CID II 74.1.51). The list of treasurers is headed by the stipulation τῶν ταμιάν ἀποτεμέπτειν τὰς πόλεις (1.4), an indication that the Messapioi were a polis in the political sense. There is no longer any basis for the traditional view (cf. Lerat (1952) i. 35) that Messapioi was the earlier name of the community called Physkeis from C3 onwards (Rousset (2002) 18). The attestation of a Messapian treasurer of 337/6 should be combined, retrospectively, with Thucydides’ information at 3.101.2 that, in 426, the Messapians had to provide hostages to the Peloponnesian League alongside a number of other Lokrian communities, three of which were presumably poleis (Amphissa (no. 158), Chaleion (no. 159) and Oianthea (no. 166)) and the others of which may have been. The passage shows that the Messapians must have been a political community, and may perhaps have been a polis.

164. Myania (Myaneus) Map. 55. Lat. 38.30, long. 22.20. Size of territory: 1. Type: C. The toponym is Μυαία, ἦ (F.Delphes iii.1.4 352.11.15 (c.190); CID v 631, 632 (1387)) or Μυώνια (Paus. 10.38.8; Steph. Byz. 462.9) or, once, Μούων (Steph. Byz. 465.17). The city-ethnic is, apparently, Μυώνες (pl.), on an ancient shield dedicated to Zeus in Olympia and quoted by Pausanias at 6.19.4–5 (Μυώνων) and 10.38.8 (Μυώνες). The form Μυώνες (Μυώνες) appears in F.Delphes iii.1.4 352.11.23–24, and the Attic-Ionic form Μυώνες (Μυώνες) at Thuc. 3.101.2.

Myania is attested as a polis in the sympoliteia with Hypnia (no. 161) of c.190 (F.Delphes iii.1.4 352.11.12–15). The main reason for classifying Myania as a polis in the Archaic and Classical periods is Thucydides’ information at 3.101.2 that, in 426, the Myonians had to provide hostages to the Peloponnesian League alongside a number of other Lokrian communities, three of which were presumably poleis (Amphissa (no. 158), Chaleion (no. 159) and Oianthea (no. 166)) and the others of which may have been. The passage shows that the Myonians must have been a political community, and may perhaps have been a polis.

The persistence of the toponym down to the sixteenth century has made it possible to locate Myania at modern Αγία Ειφυμων, where there are remains of an ancient cemetery and of a defence circuit enclosing an area of c.8 ha (Lerat (1952) i. 78–80, 170–72) and at least in part to be dated to C4 (ArchDelt 44 (1989) Chron. 214).

165. Naupaktos (Naupaktios) Map. 55. Lat. 38.20, long. 21.50. Size of territory: 2? Type: A. The toponym is
Naupaktos, Ἕ (IG ix².1 718 (Csf); IG iv² 1 95.6 (C4m); Thuc. 1.103.3; Isoc. 12.94; Dem. 9.34). The city-ethnic is, once, Naupάκτος (IG ix².1 718.40), but elsewhere in the same inscription (ll. 2, 14, 16, etc.) and in all other sources Naυπάκτος (IvO 259 (C3l?); Thuc. 2.92.3). Naupaktos is called a polis in the urban sense by Thuc. 3.102.5 and Ps.-Skylax 35. For polis in the political sense, see IG ix².1 609.10, a law of C6l, often assigned to Naupaktos (Koerner (1993) no. 47), though the ascription is far from certain (Nomima i no. 44). At Thuc. 2.9.1 and 4, the Messenians in Naupaktos are subsumed under the heading poleis and listed among the allies of Athens in 431. See also Dio. 15.66.5 (t1460/59 or 456/5), 12.48.1 (r429). The city-ethnic is used in the collective and external sense in IG ix².1 718.2, etc.; IvO 259.1. The individual use is attested from C4s onwards, both externally (SEG 26 697 (C4); IG ix².1 3A.17; F.Delphes 111.4 12.3 (C3f)) and internally (IG ix².1 613.5 (C3l)).

The territory is called Ναυπακτεία (Aesch. Suppl. 262; Thuc. 3.102.2). Its frontiers are virtually unknown (see introduction supra). In the Hellenistic period the Bouattioi, situated c.5 km north of Naupaktos, are attested as a dependency of Naupaktos (Lerat (1952) i. 20–23, 76, 93–96, 91–92). On the frontier between Lokris and Aitolia north of Naupaktos, see supra 391. An Archaic law on landed property (IG ix².1 609) concerns the region of Naupaktos or the borderland towards Aitolia, but the ascription of the law to the city of Naupaktos is uncertain (supra).

According to Ps.-Skynmos 479, Naupaktos was a Dorian polis founded in the Heroic Age by Temenos. In Csf contingents of colonists were sent to Naupaktos from East Lokris and Chaleion (no. 159) (IG ix².1 718 = ML 20 = Koerner (1993) no. 47). In 456/5 the Athenians took Naupaktos away from the West Lokrians and gave it to Messenian exiles from the Peloponnese (Thuc. 1.103.3; Dio. 11.84.7; cf. Hornblower (1991) 160). The Messenians and the Naupaktians formed a sympoliteia (IGix².1 fasc. 3 ix; see also Nielsen (2002) 60 n. 87; for a C2 echo of this sympoliteia, see SEG 41 331 and BE 1994 no. 341); they won several victories: one over Kalydon (no. 148), commemorated at Delphi (BCH 106 (1982) 196–99, 204), and one over the Akarnanians and Oiniaidae (no. 130), commemorated in Olympia (IvO 259 (C3l?); Paus. 5.26.1). The Messenians of Naupaktos remained loyal to Athens during the Peloponnesian War (Thuc. 2.9.4; Dio. 12.48.1) and provided strong contingents of hoplites, testifying to the large size of the population (500 hoplites in 427 (Thuc. 3.75.1), 600 in 410 (Dio. 13.48.6)). In 400, after the end of the war, the Messenians were expelled, and Naupaktos was given back to the Lokrians (Dio. 14.34.2; Paus. 4.26.2, 10.38.10). Twice in C4 Naupaktos became an Achaian dependency, first between 389 and 367, and then again during the Third Sacred War and down to 338 (Dio. 15.75.2; Dem. 9.34; Lerat (1952) ii. 44–45, 49). In that year Naupaktos was captured by Philip II, who killed the Achaian garrison and gave the city to the Aitolians (Theopomp. fr. 235; Strabo 9.4.7; cf. Lerat (1952) ii. 54–55; Freitag (2000) 87).

IG ix².1 718 contains some information about the Lokrian political institutions in Csf. The inscription regulates the status and rights of the new colonists from Naupaktos, mentions the laws of Naupaktos, and refers to an official called archos, and the agora as the place where proclamations take place. IG ix².1 609 refers to damiourgoi and to three types of assembly: preiga, polis and apoklesia, but the ascription to Naukratos remains doubtful.

The divinities attested in the Classical period are Athena Polias (unpublished sympoliteia, cf. supra) and Apollo (Thuc. 2.91.1). In Csf Naupaktos appointed a theorodokos to host theoroi from Epidaurus (no. 348) (IG iv².1 95.6).

Naupaktos is the only Lokrian city that we know for certain was fortified in C5. Thuc. 3.102.2–4 distinguishes an unfortified suburb (prostasioi) from the “big wall” (μεγα ρεῖχος), which ought to be a wall enclosing the town below the acropolis. The harbour seems to have been fortified too (Lerat (1952) i. 89). Remains of the ancient fortifications and other buildings have been unearthed during numerous excavations, but there is not yet a chronologically organised synthesis that indicates which of the urban remains can be dated to the Archaic and Classical periods.

166. Oianthea (Oiantheus)  Map. 55. Lat. 38.15, long. 22.10. Size of territory: ? Type: A. The toponym is Οιάνθεα, Ἔ (IG ix².1 717.7 (C5m); IG iv².1 95.5) or Οιάνθη (Hecat. fr. 113) or Οιάνθεα (Hellan. fr. 120); Polyb. 4.57.2; Paus. 10.38.9; and in the C2 manumission inscriptions (see infra), or Ειάνθης (Ps.-Skylax 36) or Ειάνθης (Ptol. 3.14.3). The city-ethnic is Οιάνθεως in the Archaic and Classical periods (ML 4.2 (C7–C6); IG ix².1 717.7 (C5m); Thuc. 3.101.2). Ειάνθης is an alternative form attested in the Hellenistic period (CID v 17 (C2f); IG ix².1 709a.2 (C2m)); cf. Lerat (1952) i. 41–44.

Oianthea is called a polis in the urban sense at Hecat. fr. 113; IG ix².1 717.4 (C5m) and Ps.-Skylax 36. The earliest attestation of Oianthea as a polis in the political sense is in a C2 manumission inscription (IG ix².1 709a.2); that it was a polis community in the Classical period as well is apparent from the treaty with Chaleion of C5m (IG ix².1 717.1); and the attestation of a C3m theorodokos to host theoroi from Epidaurus
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tory of Oianthea in the Classical period. In from this treaty—which concerns the presence of Oianthean citizens in Chaleion and vice versa—little is known of the history of Oianthea in the Classical period. In 426 Oianthea had to provide hostages to the Peloponnesian League (Thuc. 3.101.2). C.373 the city was ruled by a tyrant (Polyaen. 8.46). Oianthea’s relations with the Greek world are attested, for the Archaic period, by the proxenos buried in Korkyra (ML 4; see Nomima 1 no. 34) and, for the Classical period, by the theodorokos of Cám (IG iv².1 95.5). According to Plut. Mor. 294E, the city was founded by the hero Lokros. Plutchar’s account may stem from an Aristotelian politeia (no. 104, Gigon).

167. Tolphon (Tolophonios) Map. 55. Lat. 38.20, long. 22.15. Size of territory: ? Type: C. The toponym is Τολφών (BCH 45 (1921) 23.4v.70 (C3)); CIDv 560, 564 (C2m); IG1x².1 715 (C2m) or Τολφών, ἦ (Dion. Calliphon. 66, Marcotte; Steph. Byz. 628.1). The city-ethnic is Τολφώνιος, attested at Thuc. 3.101.2, where it is used in the collective and external sense. The individual use is attested both internally (IG1x².1 715 (C2m): Τολφώνιος) and externally at Delphi (Rousset 2002) 251.14 (C2)).

Tolphon is attested as a polis in the political sense in an inscription of C2m (IG 1x².1 715) found in situ at Vidavi/Marmara and thus identifying the site. The reason for including Tolphon in this inventory of Archaic and Classical poleis is Thucydides’ information at 3.101.2 that, in 426, the Tolophonians had to provide hostages to the Peloponnesian League alongside a number of other Lokrian communities, three which were presumably poleis (Amphissa (no. 158), Chaleion (no. 159) and Oianthea (no. 166)) and the others of which may have been. The passage shows that the Tolophonians must have been a political community, and may perhaps have been a polis. The remains of a defence circuit enclosing an area of c.3 ha are still undated (Lerat 1952 i. 50–51, 138–44).

168. Tritea (Triteus) Map. 55. Lat. 38.20, long. 22.20. Size of territory: 1. Type: A. The toponym is Τριτέα, ἦ (BCH 92 (1968) 30.8–9 (C4l–C3e) = IG ix².1 739). The city-ethnic is Τριτέιος (ibid. 14). Tritea is attested as a polis in the political sense (ibid. 14). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally at Thuc. 3.101.2 and BCH 92 (1968) 30.14 (C4l–C3e). For the individual and external use, see IG ix².1 31.148, 174, 177 (214/13), and CID iv 96 (204/3).

The treaty between Chaleion (no. 159) and Tritea (BCH 92 (1968) 30, Delphi), which concerns the ownership of landed property in one polis by citizens from the other polis, shows that Tritea bordered on Chaleion, and that both communities were poleis. For C5 we have Thucydides’ information at 3.101.2 that, in 426, the Triteans had to provide hostages to the Peloponnesian League alongside a number of other Lokrian communities, three of which were presumably poleis (Amphissa (no. 158), Chaleion (no. 159) and Oianthea (no. 166)) and the others of which may have been. The passage shows that Tritea must have been a political community, and may perhaps have been a polis. These sources as well as the manumission inscriptions from Delphi show that Tritea was situated at modern Pendeoria, where there is an undated defence circuit enclosing an area of c.1 ha (Lerat 1952 i. 51–52, 145–49, 211).
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I. The Region

The name of the region is Φωκίς, ἡ (Hdt. 8.32.2; Thuc. 4.76.3; Xen. Hell. 3.5.4). The regional ethnic is Φωκεῖς (Hom. Il. 2.517; Hdt. 1.46.2; Thuc. 1.107.2). The collective and internal use of the ethnic and/or kletic is attested in abbreviated form (ΦΩ or ΦΩΚΙ) on coins of, allegedly, C6f/C5e (Williams (1972) 9ff) and in its proper ethnic form on C4 coins (ΦΩΚΕΩΝ; Head, HN² 339) and in inscriptions (CID II 1.1.24 (361); IG IX.1.111.3 (C48)), sometimes combined with a city-ethnic (CID II 5.11.50: Φωκεῖς Τειθρώνων (C4f)). The collective and external use is attested in inscriptions (IG II² 70 (C4f); cf. Klaffenbach (1949) 224; IG II² 236b.11.8 (338/7)) and in literature (Hdt. 7.203; Thuc. 1.107).

The individual and internal use is attested in the naopoioi accounts (CID II 5.1.14 (C4f); cf. CEG II 799 (C4f)). The individual and external use is found on a C4 Attic tombstone (IG II² 10.493) and in literature (Dem. 23.124). Phokis is described as a χώρα (Hdt. 8.32.2; Thuc. 8.108.3) and is once called πατρίς (CEG II 799 (C4f); cf. Nielsen, Patris). The term ἐθνὸς ὁ τῶν Φωκεῶν, see Dem. 19.81.

To the east Phokis borders on Boiotia (Thuc. 3.95.1), and the territory of Phanoteus (no. 190) is explicitly described as the frontier district (Thuc. 4.76.3). Mt. Heduleion, which lies north-east of Parapotamioi (no. 188), is often taken to be the boundary between Phokis and Boiotia (Strabo 9.16; schol. Dem. 19.148, 313–14c, Dilts). Orchomenos (no. 213) is the Boiotian frontier town to the north-east (Hdt. 8.34). According to Ps.-Skylax 37 and Paus. 10.1.2 (who do not mention Boulis (no. 174)), Antikyra (no. 173) is the easternmost Phokian town towards the south-east. To the west Phokis borders on West Lokris. To the south-west, the plain of Kirrho is sometimes described as Lokrian (schol. Hom. Il. 2.520, Erbse). Hell. Oxy. 21.2–3 mentions a disputed region near Parnassos as being the origin of a conflict between the Phokians and the West Lokrians. Paus. 3.9.9 specifies that the Lokrians involved were the Amphissaians (no. 158). Xenophon, however, traces the origin of the conflict to a disputed region between Phokis and East Lokris (Hell. 3.5.3). To the north-east Phokis borders on Doris (Hdt. 8.31–32), and to the north it borders on East Lokris (Xen. Hell. 3.5.3). The strategic importance of the mountain pass at Hyampolis (no. 182) has been stressed by Ellinger (1993) 22–24, contra Pritchett (1996)). Strabo 9.3.1 reports that, previously, Phokis reached the coast of the Euboian Gulf, where it controlled the port of Daphnous (intra 401).

Involvement in the Persian War is the first securely dated attestation of the Phokians in Greek history (Hdt. 7.203.1). There can be no doubt that the Phokian koinon (IG IX.1.101 (C31)) antedated the Persian War, but neither Phokian participation in the Delphic Amphiktyony nor the war between Phokis and Thessalia can be securely dated (Larsen (1968) 43–44; Giovannini (1971) 50–51; Sanchez (2001) 37–44; Ellinger (1993) 17–22). For the Phokian dedications in Delphi, see Jacqueline (1999) 52–53. In the sanctuary of Kalapodi, the oldest Archaic temples of C7e and the building programme of C6f have been attributed to the Phokian koinon (Felsch (1987); Kalapodi i: xvi; Ellinger (1993) 27–34). On purely a priori grounds the beginning of the Phokian coinage has been dated to C6f/C5e (Williams (1972) 11–12).

Next to nothing is known about the place of the poleis in the organisation of the koinon. Lack of sources makes it impossible to determine whether the dioikismos of 346 was accompanied by a shift from a primary assembly open to all Phokians to a federal assembly of representatives from the poleis (Daverio-Rocchi (1994); contra Larsen (1968) 40–48, 300–8). In a C6 context Plutarch mentions magistrates and tyrants installed by the Thessalians (Mor. 244B), but elsewhere he mentions a C6 tyrant of the Phokians (Mor. 859C). From the Archaic period (C6?) onwards, the strategoi were the principal magistrates (Kazarow (1899) 7–12), and in
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Pausanias two of the Phokian strategoi in the war against Thessalia are identified by city-ethnic: Roios of Ambryssos (no. 171) and Daiphantes of Hyampolis (no. 182) (Paus. 10.1.8 (rC67); cf. Plut. Mor. 244C). The magistrates were elected by an assembly of unknown composition (Diod. 27.2 (rC4)), and the criterion for election was competence, which excludes rotation among the poleis. Strategoi were elected from those who had served as phyarchoi or tamiai (Vat.Gr. 2306B.205–15). The poleis seem to have retained some independence in foreign policy; thus, Abai (no. 169) was not forced to join the other poleis in the Third Sacred War (Paus. 10.3.2). Also, the Phokian envoys were those of the poleis (Aeschin. 2.142 (343)). Some C5 Phokian coins are inscribed with the abbreviated legend of one of the poleis: Lilaia in C5e? (Williams (1972) 17–18) and Neon in C6l (ibid. 42).

The Hellenistic treaty by Polemon on the foundation of Phokian poleis is lost except for the title: Κτίσεις τῶν ἐν Φωκίδι πόλεων καὶ περί τῆς πρὸς Ἀθηναίους συγγενείας αὐτῶν (FGHist IIIB p. 484). The Homeric Catalogue of Ships records the following nine (?) communities: Kyperisso, Python, Krisa, Daulis, Panopeus (= Phanoteus), Anemorea, Hyampolis, Parapotamioi(?) and Lilaia (Hom. Il. II 517–26).

In the Archaic period the Phokian poleis appear in the accounts of the First Sacred War (Robertson (1978); Càssola (1980); Davies (1994)) and the war between the Phokians and the Thessalians (Ellinger (1993) 12–22), but the historiographic tradition of these events poses serious problems of interpretation. Only three poleis are attested: Krisa/Kirrha (no. 183), Hyampolis (no. 182 (city-ethnic, supra)) and Ambryssos (no. 171 (city-ethnic, supra)), and the status of Kirrha is highly questionable. Phokian participation in colonisation is so poorly attested that it is impossible to suggest a diffusion of the Phokian political system in the Archaic period (Schober (1924) 57–58).

For C5 there is no epigraphical evidence, apart from the attestation of two city-ethnics: Delphoi (CID I 8) and Hyampoloi (SEG 37 422). However, Phokian cities are attested by Herodotos (8.32–38; cf. Paus. 10.3.2, 33.8), who, however, restricts his list to sixteen πόλεις passed and destroyed by the Persians in 480: viz. Drymos, Charadra, Erochos, Tethronion, Amphikleia, Neon, Pediei, Triteis, Elateia, Hyampolis, Parapotamioi, Abai, Panopeus (= Phanoteus), Daulis, *Aiolidia and Delphoi. The cities of southern Phokis are missing from the catalogue. Lilaia and Neon are also attested, by their C5 coinage.

In C4 sources, on the other hand, the Phokian poleis appear in several sources and in different contexts. In his account of the prelude to the Corinthian War, Hell. Oxy. 21 mentions Parapotamioi, Daulis, Phanoteus (no. 190), Elateia, Pediei and Hyampolis, which reappears in Xenophon’s account of Jason of Pherai’s attack in 371 (Hell. 6.4.27).

Several Phokian poleis appear in the Delphic naopoioi’s lists of contributions to the rebuilding of the temple of Apollo in 373–346 (cf. CID II 4.14–15: τάδε πόλεις καὶ ἰδιῶται ἐσπάρξαντο). Some of these contributions are from the poleis themselves, viz. Charadra (CID II 8.15), Pediei (CID II 5.11.54) and Teithronion (CID II 5.11.50), some are from individual citizens identified by city-ethnic, viz. Lilaia (CID II 2.1.6) and Phanoteus (CID II 2.4.11). Above all, the Phokian cities are attested in connection with the Third Sacred War. Their destruction in 346 is mentioned by Demosthenes at 19.61, and at 19.123 he reports that there were twenty-two poleis altogether. Pausanias has a list of twenty named poleis (in the urban sense) which were destroyed at the end of the Third Sacred War (10.3.2; καὶ ἐσδαφος ἀλώσαι κατεβλήθησαν τῶν Φωκέων αἱ πόλεις). Pausanias distinguishes between (a) ancient cities known, first of all, from Homer: Lilaia, Hyampolis, Antikyra, Parapotamioi, Panopeus (= Phanoteus) and Daulis (Antikyra is missing from the Catalogue of Ships but included by Paus at 10.36.5); (b) the cities burnt down by Xerxes: Erochos, Charadra, Amphikleia, Neon, Tithronion and Drymea; and finally, (c) the other cities which, apart from Elateia, had no record in history prior to 346: Trachis, Medeon, Echedamia, Ambryssos, Ledon, Phlygonion and Stiris. To these cities, all exposed to dioikismos (Diod. 16.60), Pausanias adds Abai, the only one that was not split up into κοιναί (10.3.2: τότε δὲ κατεσκάφησαν τε αἱ κατελεγμέναι καὶ ἐς κόμμας πλήν Ἀβαίς ἤκισθησαν αἱ ἄλλαι). Thus, Pausanias records twenty-one poleis, Demosthenes has twenty-two. The difference of one is variously explained (Beloch (1911) 439–40, contra Schober (1941) 477).

Due to the paucity of Classical sources about the regions of central Greece, the Hellenistic inscriptions must sometimes be used retrospectively, and they testify to the reliability of the list found in Pausanias; thus, the inclusion of Echedamia and Phlygonion may be based on an older inscription (Paus. 10.33.11). On the other hand, the list in Pausanias and the number of poleis reported by Demosthenes are not above suspicion. Inscriptions and the coins of C4 testify to the existence of some of the cities listed by Pausanias, but also to the existence of some cities which are absent from the list. Thus, Pediei is mentioned in a list
of 358 of contributions to the rebuilding of the temple of Apollo (CID ii 5.11.55) but is omitted by Pausanias. Furthermore, the payments of the Phokian fine to Delphi suggest the existence of two (?) other poleis, of which a broken city-ethnic is all that is preserved: To[...] (CID ii 38.5 (C45)) and Τροίνεσ (CID ii 108.9). Finally, the existence of Triteis and *Aiolidai in C4 may seem suspicious but, conversely, of the cities attested exclusively in later sources (Boulis, Helikonioi, Stephe), at least Boulis seems to have existed in C4. Thus, the total of twenty-two poleis is a minimum. Furthermore the number may have varied over time due to ecological factors (changes of the stream bed of the Kephisos), external military pressures, and rivalry between neighbouring poleis. Triteis and *Aiolidai are attested only in Herodotos, and they may well have disappeared with their destruction in 480. Conversely, Boulis may have been founded in the course of C5.

The dioikismos suffered by the Phokian poleis in 346 did not lead to their disappearance as polities, and the poleis appear in the payments of the Phokian fine to Delphi: Elateia, Erochos, Lilia, Medon, Po[---] in c.340 (CID ii 37–38) and Charadra, Lilia, Medeon, Teithronioi, Tronieis (?) and Πθυγ[oneis in c.320 (CID ii 108). The dioikismos (Diod. 16.60.6) consisted in the destruction of the urban centres and their defence circuits and in the breaking up of the urban centres into villages. Furthermore, one may question the degree of the destruction, presumably exaggerated by Demosthenes in his emotional description (19.65) and by the example of Ambryssos, adduced by Pausanias (4.31.5, 10.36.3). Here the archaeological evidence calls for circumspection. There are impressive remains of numerous defence circuits in Phokis, but there is no stratigraphic analysis of the evidence. Nevertheless, the communis opinio is that these walls are later than 346. The typology and date of these walls are based on the a priori assumption that all Phokian fortifications were completely destroyed in 346, and that this year, or rather the year 339/8, constitutes the terminus post quem. Even with the help of the Athenians and Thebans, one wonders how the Phokians, in addition to the huge fine, could afford such fortifications before C4. But recent analyses of several Phokian defence circuits tend to place their date earlier than 346 (Ober (1992) 163–64; Lilia c.356–346; Winter (1997) 262: Tithorea, Lilia; Mclnerney (1999) 340–51). Whatever the merit of these dates, careful handling of the data is required. All Phokian fortifications were not razed to the ground in 346, and it seems that some of them underwent various repairs at various times.

However that may be, by Athenian and Theban intervention the Phokian cities were apparently refounded soon after the dioikismos (Paus. 10.33.8). Pausanias tells us that the Thebans in 339/8 had Ambryssos fortified with a double defence circuit (10.36.3). Without reporting the date or the context, Pausanias refers to the anoikismos of Lilia (10.33.3) and that of Neon, refounded with the name of Tithorea (10.32.9). One may add Elateia, apparently fortified in 338 (Aeschin. 3.140, but cf. Dem. 6.15).

We do not know whether all cities were rebuilt. At least, the dioikismos resulted in the disappearance of Parapotamioi as a polis. Pausanias reports that the population of Parapotamioi had become impoverished and reduced in size, and that the Athenians and Thebans had it distributed among the other poleis (10.33.9). Other poleis may have suffered the same fate. Pedieis, already absent from Pausanias’ list of dioikised poleis at 10.1.3, is unattested in later sources, and so is Trachis; but the silence of our sources may be fallacious.

Several sympoliteiai resulted in the temporary or definitive disappearance of Phokian cities. Some of them date from C2 (Phlygonion–Delphi, Phlygonion–Ambryssos, Stiris–Medeon). On the other hand, the annexation of Troneia by Daulis (infra 427) and of Erochos by Lilia (infra 421) may go back to the Classical period.

In consequence of their expansionist policy, the Phokians succeeded for shorter periods in conquering poleis situated outside Phokis, and it is difficult to ascertain whether the Phokians’ control of these poleis resulted in their incorporation into the Phokian koinon. In 457 the Phokians were forced by the Lakedaimonians to cede a polis in Doris which they had occupied (Thuc. 1.107.2). During the Third Sacred War Onomarchos took possession of three Boiotian poleis: Orchomenos (no. 213; Diod. 16.33.4) and Koroneia (no. 210; Diod. 16.35.3), both in 353/2, and, at an unknown date, Chorsiai (no. 202) and the fort of Tiphosaion (Dem. 19.148; Diod. 16.58.1). Two of these poleis, and perhaps all three, were exposed to andrapodismos in 346 (Dem. 19.325) and, perhaps, the destruction of their walls as well (Diod. 16.60.1; contra Sanchez (2001) 208–9 and 218). The inference is that they had been members of the Phokian koinon. Similarly, the Phokians took possession of some poleis in East Lokris in 351/50 (Diod. 16.38.2): Alponos (no. 379), Nikaiia (no. 385) and Thronion (no. 388) (Aeschin. 2.138; Diod. 16.33.3). Strabo holds that once (τὸ παλαιόν Daphnous in East Lokris belonged to Phokis (9.3.1), and refers to Daphnous as a Phokian polis at 9.3.17; cf. Steph. Byz. 222.14. It is not known when this Lokrian port belonged to Phokis (Glotz (1909) 531; Nielsen (2000) 107–8; contra Beloch (1911)). Onchoe
(infra 406), Pharygai (infra 403) and Knemis (Ps.-Skylax 61) may belong in the same context.

We know next to nothing about the exact size of the territory of the Phokian poleis, and comparison with modern centres does not help (contra Ruschenbusch (1991)). Furthermore, it is impossible to determine the frontiers of the poleis around Mt. Parnassos, of which at least a part was a no man’s land. Here the approximate size of the territories is assessed by the drawing of Thiessen polygons, admittedly an imprecise method, but often sufficient when the purpose is to place a polis in one, or at most two, of the five groups used in this work.

1. Ancient Toponyms not Denoting Pre-Hellenistic Poleis

Some toponyms and names of communities are excluded from the inventory of poleis. They are listed below and belong to at least one of the following five categories. (1) Communities of unknown status mentioned in Classical literary sources: Kragalidai. (2) Communities not attested as Phokian poleis earlier than the Hellenistic period: Antaieis, Helikonoi, Pharygai, Pyrrha(?), Stephe. (3) Toponyms erroneously classified as Phokian poleis in late sources: (a) sites belonging in other regions: Agostheneia, Erannos; (b) toponyms invented by misreading manuscripts: Groneia, Larisa, Patronis(?); (c) extrapolation or misinterpretation in late sources of information in earlier sources: Anemoria, Apollonia, Boukaia, Hyainpeia, Kirphis/Skirphai, Krisa, Kyparissos, Lykorea, Melainai, Onchoe(?); (d) mythological poleis: Agatheia, Lykorea; (e) pseudo-historical poleis: Krisa. (4) Toponyms designating sites attested in a context in which polis status is questionable: Naulochos. (5) Sites erroneously interpreted as poleis by modern historians: Glechon, Kleonai, Marathon.

1.1 Communities of unknown status mentioned in Classical literary sources

Kragalidai (Κραγαλίδαι) Unlocated. Various spellings of the name are attested in lexicographers and scholiasts, all probably derived from poor copies of Aeschin. 3.107–8: Κραγαλίδαι (Aeschin. 3.107, 108, Dilts; schol. Aeschin. 3.107); Κραγαλίδαι (Aeschin. 3.107k; Suda Σ2349); Κραγαλίδαι (Harp. Κ80; Suda Σ2349); Κραγαλλίδαι (Didymos in Harp. Κ80); Κρακαλίδαι (Hsch. Κ3923); Ακραγ(γ)αλ(λ)ίδαι (Aeschin. 3.107β); Ακραγάλις (Suda A951). The hinterland of Kirrha is called Κραγαλλίδαι by the C3 historian Xenocrates (FGrHist 240) fr. 22, but this toponym is probably derived from Κραγαλλίδαι (Schober (1924) 34; Rousset (2002) 33–34). Reminding his audience of the exploitations leading up to the First Sacred War, Aischines (3.107) mentions that the Kirrhaioi and Kragalidai had settled in the sacred land: τὴν χώραν κατωτίζοντον Κίρραιοι καὶ Κραγαλίδαι, γένη παρομοιότατα. And these Kragalidai are once again associated with the Kirrhaioi in the oracle quoted in 3.108: ἀναίρετη η Πυθία πολεµεῖν Κιρραῖοι καὶ Κραγαλίδαις ... καὶ τὴν χώραν καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἐκπορθήσαντας καὶ αυτοὺς ἀνθραποδιοικήσαντος ἀναθεῖναί τῷ Αὔγισθον. The historiographic context of the First Sacred War is a moot point (Robertson (1978); Davies (1994)), and the absence of the Kragalidai in other sources for the war calls for circumspection. Some modern historians have connect ed the Kragalidai with an undatable crystallisation of local legends of Delphi (Davies (1994) 202). Thus, the existence of a hero Kragaleus allied with Herakles against Apollo (Ant. Lib. 4) may have led to the invention of these Kragalidai at the time when the struggle between Apollo and Herakles over the tripod came to constitute a representation of the First Sacred War (Parke and Boardman (1957) 276–78). Thus, even the existence of the Kragalidai is subject to doubt. The variant spellings attested in the lexicographers testify to their ignorance. But since there is no explicit evidence to the contrary, it seems better to assume the historicity of the Kragalidai. On the other hand, it is more difficult to decide their status. The text of Aischines is open to several interpretations, depending on (a) whether the term γένος denotes a race or a lineage or a civic subdivision; (b) whether the word γένος qualifies the Kragalidai only, or the Kirrhaioi and the Kragalidai combined; (c) whether the word πόλιν in the singular means the polis of the Kirrhaioi and the Kragalidai, or the polis of the Kirrhaioi and the polis of the Kragalidai. There is no way we can decide these issues, and it seems prudent not to trust the account of the Presbeutikos Logos (Hippoc. Ep. 27), who in connection with the Sacred War mentions the ethnos of the Krisaians and the cities found there in order to represent the Kragalidai as a polis. The description of the Κρακαλίδαι as τῶν Κρισσαίων βασιλείς (Hsch. Κ3923) is probably just an interpretation of Aichines’ text. Not in Barr.
1.2 Communities not attested as Phokian poleis earlier than the Hellenistic period

Antaieis (Ἀνταίεις) The ethnic Ἀνταίεις is attested in post-Classical inscriptions (e.g. IG ix2.1.17A.11 (C3m–s)), but it cannot be determined whether this possible polis was Aitolian, Lokrian or Phokian (Lerat (1952) i. 72). No date or location in Barr.

Helikonioi (Ἑλικώνιοι) Unlocated. The Delphic munimission inscriptions of C2 provide us with at least one unquestionable attestation of the ethnic ὙΕλικώνιος (SGDI 2241 (C2e); cf. F.Delphes iii.1 333 (C2l): ‘Ἐλικώνιοι’). A C2–C1 sepulchral inscription from Thisbe (Νείκη Ἑλικώνια (IG vii 2348)) may provide us with the only other attestation of the ethnic. That this community should be located in the south-eastern part of Phokis is apparent from (1) the similarity between the ethnic and the name of Mt. Helikon, (2) the origin of the guarantor (Medeon) and the witnesses (Ambryssos) listed in the C2 munimission inscription, (3) the provenance of IG vii 2348. It can be cautiously suggested that the Helikonioi inhabited the site of Kyriake, where some ancient remains have been dated to C4 (Fossey (1986) 35–39; Rousset (1999) 43–44); but the existence of a city in western Boiotia cannot be precluded. The nature of the inscriptions does not allow us to presume that the ethnic is a sub-ethnic rather than a city-ethnic (Robert (1946) 87; Hansen (1996) 194; Rousset (1999) 55). Irrespective of the status of the Helikonioi in the Hellenistic period, the silence of the sources for the Archaic and Classical periods precludes the inclusion in the Inventory of a polis of the Helikonioi. Not in Barr.

Pharygai (Φαρύγαι) reporting an embassy of 318, Plut. Phoc. 33.7 mentions the toponym Φαρύγαι, which he calls a κάμων τῆς Φοικίδος, but at Strabo 9.4.6 Φαρύγαι is identified with Τάρφη in East Lokris. Pritchett (1992) 151–55 denied its existence and took it to be an error for Ναρύκα, but Buckler (1989) 96 n. 17 has defended Plutarch’s reference to a Pharygai in Phokis. Not in Barr.

Pyrrha (Pyrrha) In his list of Lokrian and Phokian toponyms (HN 4.7), Pliny mentions Pyrrha, which has been associated with Πῦρρης in a list of Aitolian hieromnomones of C3s (CID iv 81). The site is unlocated and unattested before the Hellenistic period (Lerat (1952) i. 62). Barr. unlocated and undated.

Stephane (Στέφανη) Unlocated. Both Herodian and Steph. Byz. mention a πόλις Φωκίδος called sometimes Στέφανη (Hdn. iii.1 328.24, 370.18; Steph. Byz. 585.9) and sometimes Στέφαναίων (Hdn. iii.1 370.18).

Two other passages are sometimes adduced in connection with this πόλις Φωκίδος: Herodian mentions a Στέφαναῖος, δόμον τόπου (iii.2 426.33) and Suda has the entry Στέφανη πόλις (Σ2165). Finally, Steph. Byz. has the ethnic Στέφαναιος. A Boiotian inscription confirms the information brought by the lexica. In a C1f list of proxenoi of an unknown polis is the heading Στέφαναίτις followed by three names, of which the second is . . . άνδρις Διονυσιόδωρου (SEG 37 374.14–17). Although Stephanos attributes the ethnic Στέφαναίτις to a Stephane in Paphlagonia, a name ending in -άνδρις suggests a proxenos coming from central Greece (SEG 42 436); thus the link between the ethnic and the toponym is likely, but not enough to show that Stephane was a Phokian polis in the Archaic and Classical periods. Barr. unlocated, C, town in Phokis, but no evidence supports C.

1.3 Toponyms erroneously classified as Phokian poleis in late sources

1.3a Sites belonging in other regions


Eranos (Ἑράννος) See Kyparissos (infra).

1.3b Toponyms invented by misreading manuscripts

Groneia (Γρώνεια) At Steph. Byz. 213.16, Γρώνεια is a misreading by Stephanos or his source of Τρώνεια (Schober (1924) 30; Robert (1960) 75; cf. no. 197). Barr. lists it as an unlocated Phokian city.

Larisa (Λάρισα) A Larisa is mentioned among other Phokian toponyms in two sources of the Roman imperial period: Dion. Calliphon. 81, Marcotte: Ἐν τῇ μεσογείῳ . . . Κυπαρισσαύς πόλις, Λαρίσα τε, μετ’ αὐτῆς Δαυλίς, a passage which is probably the source of Plin. HN 4.27: introrsus autem Larisa, Elatae et in ripa Cephesi, ut diximus, Lilaea (cf. Rousset (1994) 302, contra Marcotte (1990) 135).
But even if one rejects the plausible conjecture of Κρίσα (Marcotte (1990) 133), there is no reason to make a polis of this Larisa, which is otherwise unattested in Archaic and Classical sources. Not in Barr.

Patronis (Πατρωνίς) The only source for this toponym is the account in Plut. Sull. 15.6 of the preparations for the battle of Chaironeia in 86. Some commentators have suggested an emendation of Plutarch's text. His Πατρωνίς was situated north-east of Tithorea near Τρωνίς, which is epigraphically attested and according to Pausanias was situated in the territory of Daulis (cf. Troneia (no. 197)). It is tempting in Plutarch to read {πα} Τρωνίς. On the other hand, a C4 Delphic inscription may provide us with an attestation of the ethnic Πατρωνείς. At CID 11 108.9 [...] ΤΡΩΝΕΙΕΙΣ is normally interpreted as Τρωνείς, the ethnic corresponding to Τρωνίς, but an equally possible restoration is [...] Πατρωνείς. Thus, Robert (1960) 75 (pace Schober (1924) 43) argues in favour of two distinct cities. But the topographical argument which permitted Robert to establish a distinction between Troneia and Patronis has been countered persuasively by McInerney (1997) 197–99. There is no proof that the sanctuary of a hero Archegetes at Troneia is to be located in the neighbourhood of the Phokikon. Thus, there is no basis for arguing that Troneia was situated south of Daulis and was different from Patronis, probably to be located north of Daulis (Plut. Sulla 15). As the evidence stands, the identification of Πατρωνίς with Τρωνίς seems the preferable solution (Leake (1835) ii. 104; Tillard (1911) 65; Kirsten (1951) 713; Barr. Barr. C.

1.3c Extrapolation or misinterpretation in late sources

Anemoria (Ἀνεµώρεια) Unlocated. The toponym is Ανεµώρεια, η (Hom. II. 2.521; cf. schol. 522a, Erbse; Eust. II. 1 421.17, van der Valk; Lycoph. Alex. 1073; Strabo 9.3.15; Hdn. 111.1 276.23, 2 476.10; Steph. Byz. 95.1; Hsch. A4483; Eust. II. 421.17, van der Valk) or Ανεµώλεια (Strabo 9.3.13; Steph. Byz. 95.1, taking it to be the contemporary toponym; cf. Eust. II. 1 421.17, van der Valk). Eustathios’ statement that the toponym Anemoria was changed into Hyampolis rests on a misreading of Strabo. The only sources to classify Anemoria as a πόλις Φωκίδος are lexicographers (Steph. Byz.; Hsch.), grammarians (Herodian) and scholiasts (in Lycoph. Alex.). Apart from the scholiast, these sources paraphrase Strabo. He describes Anemoria as a τόπος serving as the boundary between the Delphians and the Phokians after the Second Sacred War in C5m. Such an economical solution, which reduces the polis status of Anemoria to a mistaken item of information in sources all derived from Strabo, does not accord with the observation that some items of information are absent from Strabo’s account and too precise to be pure invention: εξ οὗ δι’ ήµερας καὶ νυκτός καταγίζεται (Herod.; Steph. Byz.) and κειµένη ἐπὶ λόφου υψηλοῦ (Steph. Byz.). These details must stem from an independent source, and so may the classification of Anemoria as a polis. On the other hand, the evidence is insufficient to show that Anemoria was a polis in the Archaic and Classical periods. It was probably just a topos (Rousset (2002) 29–30). It is not possible to verify the identification with the toponym Ανέµεια, mentioned in the Amphiktyonic regulations of 380 (CID 1115 n. 147). Attempts to locate Homeric Anemoria are unconvincing. The frontier regulation attested at F.Delphes 112.136 mentions a place called Katopterion, which must have been situated somewhere between Phlygonion and Delphi. According to Strabo, Anemoria was situated below Katopterion: “a cliff extending from Parnassos”. However, since it is impossible to locate Katopterion, there is no basis for the common identification of Anemoria with the prehistoric site at Kastrouli or the village of Arachova (pace Lazenby and Hope Simpson (1970) 43; Dassios (1992) no. 114; CID 1 115 n. 147; McInerney (1999) 307–8). Barr. unlocated and undated.

Apollonia (Ἀπολλωνία) Lexicographers and scholiasts mention an Ἀπολλωνία (Steph. Byz. 106.7) or Ἀπολλωνίας (Steph. Byz. 395.10 = schol. Hom. II. 519; Eust. II. 519), stating that it was a new name for Homeric Κυπάρισσος (II. 2.519). In Step. Byz. 106.7 it is listed among the poleis called Apollonia. It is undoubtedly a “ghost-toponym”, derived from the adjective Ἀπολλωνίας, often used to designate some locality in the territory of Delphi; cf. e.g., Pind. Pyth. 6.8–9 with schol.: θησαυρός ἐν πολυχρώμῳ Ἀπολλωνία τετείχισται νάπα. The identification with Kyparissos is explained by the juxtaposition of Kyparissos and Delphi (Πυθῶν) at Hom. II. 2.519. Any attempt to locate Apollonia is therefore doomed to fail (pace McInerney (1999) 306). Barr. unlocated and undated.

Boukaia (Βούκαια) The only source is Etym. Magn. 207.23: Βούκαια. πόλις Φωκίδος ἐν τῷ Παρνασῷ. But the entry shows that Βούκαια is the name of a famous sacrifice performed on Parnassos in memory of Deukalion and Pyrrha. The toponym Βούκαια is coined either directly from the name of the sacrifice or from the adjective βουκαιεύς (signifying a person participating in the sacrifice?), misinterpreted as an ethnic. The only other attes-
tation of the toponym is Schober’s conjecture Βούκαια for MSS Βοι’ καὶ Δρμία in Hierokles Synekemos (643.9, Honigmann). By rejecting this conjecture and suggesting instead Βοι’ καὶ, Honigmann has eliminated the other source for a polis called Boukaia. Not in Barr.

**Hyam(peia)** (‘Υάμπεια) The toponym Hyampeia designates one of the cliffs surmounting the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi (Hdt. 8.39.1; Plut. Mor. 557A). But, knowing only the spelling ‘Υάμπεια, Steph. Byz. 644.14 classifies Hyam(peia as a πόλις Φωκίδος. His interpretation is based on an erroneous interpretation of Strabo 9.3.15, where the geographer distinguishes Hyampolis from Hyampeia. Conversely, Eust. II. 2.521 imagines a Hyampolis on Parnassos. Barr.: unlocated Phokian town.

**Kirphis (Κήφης)** See Skirphai (infra).

**Krisa (Κρίσα)** Hom. II. 2.520 (Κρίσα); Pind. Isthm. 2.26 (Κρίσας); Hymn. Hom. Ap. 269 (Κρίσας); schol. Pind. Pyth. I, inscr. b. There is no epigraphical attestation. For the relation to the toponyms Κιρρα and Κίρρα, see infra 419. Κρίσα is a Homeric toponym from which is derived the ethnic Κρισαῖοι (Hymn. Hom. Ap. 446). The aetiological aspect of this hymn is probably the reason why the future sanctuary of Apollo is called Κρίσαγε and its inhabitants Κρισαῖοι (Lerat 1948, contra Skorda (1992) 62–63). The attestations in Homer and the hymn do not allow any localisation of the site (contra Lerat (1948), but see infra). Later occurrences of the toponym Κρίσα and the ethnic Κρισαῖοι are often a mere citation or reminiscence of the Homeric name in a poetic context (Pind. Isthm. 2.26; Soph. El. 180) or in a mythical context (Hecat. fr. 115a; Ephor. fr. 141). Alternatively, they are late authors’ often confused attempts to give a historical interpretation of the Homeric poems (Strabo 9.3.3–4), and/or they are second-hand citations of sources referring sometimes to Κρίσα and sometimes to Κιρρα (Plin. HN 4.7; Dion. Calliphan. 81(?); cf. supra s.v. Larisa; Ptol. Geog. 3.14.17). Modern scholars have mostly identified Homeric Krisa with the fortified Mycenaean site at Ag. Georgios (Hope Simpson 1981) 77; Skorda (1992) 44–46; Dassios (1992) no. 124), which, however, has no remains of the Archaic period. Scholars believing in an Archaic Krisa, as attested in the Hymn to Apollo or the sources for the First Sacred War, have suggested alternative locations, none of which is convincing (Skorda 1992) 62–65 followed by Barr.: Ag. Varvara; McNerney (1999) 312: Khyrsso). With the toponym is associated an area called Κρισαὶον πεδίον in Classical sources (Hdt. 8.32.2; Isoc. 14.31). This plain—situated between Amphissa and the port of Kirrha—is identical with the Κιρραῖον πεδίον which constituted part of the Sacred Land (infra 419). For the confusion of the two toponyms, see Lerat (1948); Robertson (1978); Cassola (1980); and Roussell (2002) 32–33. It may have added to the confusion that, in sources which had no connection with the First Sacred War, the name Κρισαῖοι κόλπος was used to designate the Corinthian Gulf (Thuc. 2.69.1). Krisa is classified as a polis in numerous late sources (Paus. 10.37.5; Steph. Byz. 385.4; Hsch. K 4145; Suda K 2440; Eust. II. I 419.7–8, 420.15, van der Valk). Stephanos and Eustathios cite Hekataios, but the context is probably mythological, so that nothing can be inferred from their use of the term polis. In the other sources it is impossible to determine whether the reference is to Homeric Krisa, in which case their use of the term polis can be dismissed, or to the Krisa mentioned in connection with the notoriously problematical First Sacred War, for which see Robertson (1978); Cassola (1980); and Davies (1994). The variation between the toponyms of Krisa and Kirrha is inextricably bound up with the historiographical tradition about the First Sacred War, and anything said about Krisa can be said about Kirrha as well; see infra 419. The distinction between the two entries in this inventory is purely formal. The First Sacred War, called Κρισαῖοι πόλεμος by Kallistenenes ((FGHist 124) fr. 1), was conducted against a polity called Κρισαῖοι in some sources and Κιρραῖοι in others (catalogue in Robertson (1978) 43; Cassola (1980) 258–59). The longest account we have of the First Sacred War is a rhetorical composition of C4–C3, called Presbeutikos Logos and inserted into the Hippocratic corpus (Littre 4.404–28 no. 27; cf. Smith (1990) 2–4). The speaker mentions the Κρισαῖον πεδίον, inhabited by the Κρισαῖοι θέσως which was settled in numerous πόλεις, of which one, lying near the later hippodrome, was fortified and exposed to a long siege (Littre 9.406–8). To conclude: (1) whatever historical reality may be hidden behind this tradition, its inaccuracies and inconsistencies preclude any reliable reconstruction, and nothing can be deduced from the terminology used in these sources. (2) There is much to be said for the view that the polis status of Krisa/Kirrha in C6e is an aetiological invention which became prominent in the context of the Third and Fourth Sacred Wars in order to explain the obscure origin of the hiera ge. In that case, there is no reason to debate the historicity of such a polis any longer (cf. Kirrha (no. 183)). Barr. ACH.

**Kyparissos (Κυπάρισσος)** The first Phokian community recorded in the Homeric Catalogue of Ships (II. 2.519). A variant form Κυπαρισσοῦς is found at Steph. Byz. 395.2 = Eust. II. 2.519. Believed to have been the residence of...
the hero Kyparissos (Nonnos, Dion. 13.123–24; Steph. Byz. 395.3, schol. Hom. II. 2.519), it is also attested in the periphrastic form Κυπαρίσσον πόλις (Dion. Calliphon. 80). Citing Homer, Steph. Byz. 395.6 describes Kyparissos as a πόλις ἐν Παρνασσῷ κατὰ τοῦς Δέλφους. On the other hand, Strabo 9.3.13 = Eust. II. 2.519 classifies Kyparissos as a κώμη ὑπὸ τῆς Λυκωρείας. The absence of sources antedating the Roman period indicates that the information found in the late authors is pure guesswork concerning the status and location of a community known exclusively from Homer’s text. The ignorance explains Pausanias’ suggestion at 10.36.5 that Kyparissos was the ancient name for Antikyra. According to Steph. Byz. 295.10, Kyparissos was called Apollonia in a later period (supra 404). That its former name was Erannos (Ἐραννος) stems from its being mixed up with the Messenian Kyparissia (Steph. Byz. 395.7 with the note). The various attempts to locate Kyparissos are highly hypothetical (contra Lazenby and Hope Simpson (1970) 40; McInerney (1999) 306). Not in Barr.

Lykoreia (Λυκώρεια) In the Roman imperial period, apart from the Corycian Cave, the pilgrims coming to Delphi visited on Parnassos a site named Λυκώρεια (Plut. Mor. 394F, emendation of MS Λυκουρίαν). No matter whether this Lykoreia was a natural site or some kind of building, it was just a place in the territory of Delphi (cf. Rousset (2002) 34–35). But some ancient sources took Lykoreia to be a mythological polis founded by Deukalion (see supra 404). The sources do in fact disagree, some classifying Lykoreia as a polis (Paus. 10.6.2; Suda L829; Marm. Par. (FGrHist 239) A2, A4), others as a kome (Steph. Byz. 422.15) or just a topos (Strabo 9.3.3, cf. 9.3.13). The formulas used are even self-contradictory (Etym. Magn. 571.46: πόλις Δελφῶν; Steph. Byz. 422.16–17: κώμη versus πολίτης). Barr. unlocated, C, but no evidence supports C.


Onchoe (Ὀνχόη) Hdn. iii.1 306.20 and Steph. Byz. 483.10 record an ’Onchô, πόλις Φωκίδος. There is no other evidence, but see ad Stephane supra. K. O. Müller (1824) 51 suggested that in Steph. Byz. Ὤνχων had been mixed up with Ἰχραῖα, attested as an East Lokrian toponym at Strabo 9.2.18 and Plin. HN 4.26; cf. Oldfather (1918); Fossey (1990) 27–32. The reason for placing Anchoe in Phokis may have been either that the Kephisos, principally a Phokian river, was supposed to reappear at Anchoai (Strabo 9.2.18) or that this part of Lokris had once been under Phokian control; cf. supra 399. Not in Barr.

Skirphai (Σκίρφαι) Steph. Byz. 576.9 records Skirphai as a πόλις Φωκίκη, and he quotes the C4 historian Dieuchidas for the ethnics Σκίρφιος and Σκιρφαῖος ((FGrHist 485) fr. 11). Stephanos provides us with the only attestation of the toponym, which must be a variant form of Κίρφιος. In Strabo 9.3.1 Kirphis is juxtaposed with Delphi and Daulis, and all three are called χωρία; but Κίρφιος is nevertheless not a community but a mountain to the south of Delphi (Strabo 9.3.3; Hippoc. Ep. 27: Κίρφιον; Ant. Lib. 8.1; Pind. Hyp. Pyth. b. d; cf. Rousset (2002) 32). Not in Barr.

1.3d Mythological polis

Agatheia (Ἀγάθεια) Called a πόλις Φωκίδος by Steph. Byz. 10.19, quoting Hellan. fr. 11. The fragment is about Deukalion, the father of Phokos, the eponymous hero of Phokis, and the reference is probably to an imaginary polis. However, it cannot be precluded that Stephanos is mistaken Ἀγάθεια for Ἀγάθα, a colony founded by the Phokaians of Massalia (cf. Ps.—Skym. 208).

Lykoreia (Λυκώρεια) See supra.

1.3e Pseudo-historical polis

Krisa (Κρίσα) See supra.

1.4 Toponyms designating sites attested in a context in which polis status is questionable

*Naulochos (Ναυλοχός) The toponym Naulochum appears in Plin. HN 4.7 in a muddled list of Phokian and Lokrian toponyms, some of which were names of polis. The toponym reappears in the form Nalo[chum] in a second century AD delineation of frontiers (F.Delphes iii.4 294), which permits us to place Naulochum somewhere between Kirrha and Antikyra, but as a local toponym without the status of polis (cf. Rousset (2002) 37). Barr. C.
1.5 Sites erroneously interpreted as poleis by modern historians

Glechon From Strabo’s erroneous quote of Hesiod at 9.3.16: παρέκειν Πνοσίτηδα διὰ Γλήσσων τ’ ἐρέμησιν, Schober (1924) 30 assumed the existence of a Phokian Glechon situated between Phanoteus (no. 190) and Orchomenos (no. 213). The improved reading [διὰ \( \Gamma \) \( \lambda \chi \rho \omega \alpha \) τέρευμαν] in \( \textit{P} \text{Yale} \textit{A} \text{J} \text{A} \textit{1.17} \) (= Hes. fr. 70.21, MW) has disposed of Glechon as a “ghost-toponym”. Not in \textit{Barr}.

Kleonai (\( \text{Κλεωναί} \)) In his account of a war between the Phokians and the Thessalians, Plutarch (\textit{Mor.} 244D) tells us that the decisive battle took place περὶ \( \text{Κλεωνάς τῆς Υαμπόλιδος. Τὸ } \text{Κλεωναί,} \) Thus, Kleonai must have been a site somewhere in the territory of Hyampolis (no. 182). A mutilated inscription has led to the assumption that there was a community of “Kleonai” (\textit{AJA} 19 (1916) 334: \( \text{Κλεωναίοις Κλεωναῖς} \) \( \text{Κλεωναί} \); see Schober (1924) 33). But a different reading of the inscription, which is probably just an ordinary tombstone, gives \( \text{ΚΛΕΩΝΙ, e.g. Κλεωνί[δας].} \) As the evidence stands, there is no reason to assume the existence of a community of Kleonai. The identification of Kleonai with modern Smixi, suggested by Pritchett (1996) 141–45, is unconvincing. \textit{Barr}, unlocated, HR, but A attested as well.

Marathon (\( \text{Μαραθῶν} \)) At 9.3.13 Strabo writes: ἐξῆς γὰρ ἐν τῇ παραλίᾳ μετὰ τὴν Ἀντίκυραν πολέμιον ὀπίσθεν ὁ \( \text{Μαραθῶν}. \) On the basis of this passage some have assumed the existence of a \textit{polichnion} called Marathon (Schober (1924) 36; cf. Baladié’s translation in the Budé edn.). But the term \textit{polichnion} may just as well be construed with Antikyra, in which case Marathon is a site in the territory of the \textit{polichnion} of Antikyra. Even on the traditional interpretation of the passage, it must be taken into account that Strabo’s site-classifications cannot be interpreted retrospectively, and that there is no other attestation of Marathon in Archaic or Classical sources. Marathon may have been situated at modern Aspra-Spitia, where there are no ancient remains antedating the Roman period (\textit{contra} Rousset (1999) 74 and map no. 46; on the site, see Fossey (1986) 25; Dassios (1992) no. 91). \textit{Pace} Dassios (1992) no. 83, the ruins mentioned at Palaioamas are not impressive enough to be those of a \textit{polis}. The same may be said of the small remains at Grammatiko (= Dassios (1992) no. 84), where Rousset (1999) 74 no. 46 and (2002) 61 no. 45 tentatively proposes to locate Marathon. Not in \textit{Barr}.

2. Unidentified Settlements

Of the archaeological sites mentioned in the bibliography (Dassios (1992)), some have not been identified and some are unidentifiable (Rousset (1999)). One must distinguish between (1) sites that should presumably be identified with a Phokian \textit{polis}, although which one is not beyond doubt; (2) sites whose identification with a named \textit{polis} can be questioned; (3) sites whose identification with a named \textit{polis} must be rejected.

2.1 Drossochori Possibly not in Phokis (Dassios (1992) no. 122; Rousset (1999) no. 81, (2002) 66 no. 96). The precise date of the remains is unknown (from Archaic to Hellenistic?). Not in \textit{Barr}.

Kastro Tseresi Fossey (1986) 54–56; Dassios (1992) no. 62; Rousset (1999) no. 36, (2002) 61 no. 36; cf. \textit{Aiolidai} (no. 170) and Trachis (no. 195). The site has produced ceramic material dating from C4 to Imperial times. \textit{Barr}, registers the site as “Ano Tseresi, Palaiokastro” and (wrongly) identifies it with Phyligion (no. 191).


Modi Dassios (1992) no. 21; Rousset (1999) no. 18, (2002) 61 no. 19, \textit{Barr}, dates the site C, but the reference to Dassios (1992) 42 is wrong (Dassios is discussing Gournes (\textit{infra}), tentatively (and questionably) identifying it with Ledon (no. 184)).


2.2 Gournes Dassios (1992) no. 32; Rousset (1999) no. 21, (2002) 61 no. 21. The nature and the date of the remains are poorly known; Dassios (1992) no. 32 tentatively suggests a C date; cf. Ledon (no. 184). Not in \textit{Barr}.

Rosoufi Dassios (1992) no. 68. The nature of the remains is poorly known; cf. *Aiolidai (no. 170); Dassios (1992) no. 67 hypothetically describes the scanty ceramic material at the site as prehistoric and Classical. Not in Barr.

Theotokos Dassios (1992) no. 3; cf. Lilaia (no. 185). The site has produced ceramic material dating from prehistoric to Byzantine times. The fortification may be C6 (Kase et al. (1991) 53). Not in Barr.

2.3 Grammatiko Dassios (1992) no. 84. Traces of walls hypothetically described as Classical (?) and Hellenistic (?) by Dassios; here Rousset (1999) 74 no. 46 and (2002) 61 no. 45 tentatively propose to locate Marathon (cf. supra 407).


Panagitsa Dassios (1992) no. 30, pace Kirsten (1951) 741; cf. Triteis (no. 196). Finds from tombs excavated at the site have been dated from Geometric to Classical times (cf. Dassios (1992) no. 30). Not in Barr.

II. The Poleis

169. Abai (Abaios) Map 55. Lat. 38.35, long. 22.55. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is Αβαί, α' (Hdt. 8.33; Diod. 16.58.4; E.Delphes iii.2 230.5 (C2s)) or Αβαι (Kallisthenes (FGHrHist124) fr. 11) or Αβαι/Αβη (Arist. fr. 617; Hdn. 111.1 308.24–26; Steph. Byz. 1.1) or Αβαιωρα (Hsch. A65). The city-ethnic is Αβαιοι (IG x.1 7.82 (C3); Paus. 10.3.2). Abai is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 8.33 in connection with Xerxes’ invasion of Phokis in 480, when Abai was burnt to the ground and, retrospectively, at Paus. 10.3.2 (346). The collective and external use of the city-ethnic is attested in a letter of Philip V to the Abaians (IG x.1 78.2) and, retrospectively, in Paus. 10.3.2 (rC4m); cf. also 10.35.4. The individual and external use is attested in a C2s Delphic muniamission (F.Delphes iii.2 230.7) and in a first century AD proxeny decree (F.Delphes iii.4 443).

Abai is commonly mentioned in literary sources in connection with the oracle of Apollo situated in its territory (Hdt. 8.27.5 (rC6?); for the date, see Ellinger (1993) 17–22; Hdt. 1.46.2 (rC6m), 8.33, 8.134; Soph. OT 899; Paus. 4.32.5 (r371); Diod. 16.58 (1347/6); Paus. 10.35.1–5). The location of the sanctuary is unknown (Ellinger (1993) 25, contra Yorke (1896) 298–302; McInerney (1999) 288–89). Abaios as the epithet of Apollo is attested in Hsch. A50 and confirmed by onomastic material (Sittig (1911) 52). The identity between the epithet and the city-ethnic may be the explanation of the use of the toponym to designate the sanctuary itself (Strabo 9.3.13).

There can be no doubt that Abai was a member of the Phokian koinon, although there is no explicit attestation. In the idiom είς Αβαις θαύμα Φωκέων (Hdt. 1.46.2 (rC6m) and 8.134.1 (rC5f)) the reference to the Phokians indicates location rather than political status, and that applies also to Kallisthenes (FGHrHist 124) fr. 11. On the other hand, Pausanias’ account of the fate of Abai in 346 implies that Abai belonged to the Phokian koinon. Pausanias asserts that Abai avoided the diotikmos because it participated neither in the occupation of the sanctuary in Delphi nor in the war (10.3.2). Diodorus, on the other hand, tells us that in 347 the Phokians built a phrourion on what was undoubtedly Abaios territory (16.58.4; cf. Dassios (1995), (1992) no. 43). The possible inferences from these two pieces of information are (a) that in 347 the Abaians no longer had control of their own territory, or (b) that Abai’s participation in the war was purely defensive, or (c) that Abai’s pacifist attitude is a later rewriting of history.

The site is enclosed by a fortification wall in polygonal masonry, a part of it in Lesbian style. Both the acropolis and the lower town were fortified, and the walls enclosed an area of c.16 ha. The wall enclosing the acropolis may be older than that enclosing the lower town, but the dates, based on style and a priori historical arguments, are disputed (Yorke (1896) 294–96: Cs or earlier; Scranton (1941) 160: C6; Fossey (1986) 78–79, 122–27: Cs; Winter (1971) 103: the wall enclosing the lower town not earlier than C4). Pausanias mentions an agora and a theatre both of ancient construction (10.35.4: κατασκευής ἀρχαίας). The remains found in the neigh-
bouring sanctuary and in the cemetery date back to C7 (Fossey (1986) 164–65).

170. *Aiolidai (Aioliideus)  Map 55. Lat. 38.25, long. 22.45. Barr. (with a query) locates it at modern Karakolithos, although in the directory this site is named “Bania”, a modern site not marked on the map itself; cf. supra 468, s. v. karakolithos, and see infra). Size of territory: ? Type: A. The toponym is unattested and reconstructed from the city-ethnic. The city-ethnic is Aiolidai, attested at Hdt. 8.35.1 in its collective and external use. The πόλις of the Aiolidai is known exclusively from Herodotos’ account at 8.35.1 of Xerxes’ march in 480 from Phanouteus towards Delphi when *Aiolidai was burnt to the ground: Καὶ γὰρ τῶν Πανοπέων τὴν πόλιν ἐνέπρησαν καὶ ∆αυλίων Αἰολίδων (Aiolidai MS P). Tillard (1991) 64 demonstrated that Valkenaer’s conjecture Aioliadeu must be rejected for topographical reasons. At Mor. 418a Plutarch mentions a group of persons in Delphi perhaps called the Aiolidai, but there is no reason to connect them with the Aiolidai attested in Herodotos (Rousset (2002) 28).

At Hdt. 8.35.1 polis is used in the urban sense, but the use of the city-ethnic instead of the toponym indicates that the political sense is a connotation; see Hansen (2000) 176, 205. The passage from Herodotos shows that the polis of the Aiolidai must have been situated between Daulis and Delphi. Assuming that the polis was fortified, one would have to exclude the site of Phokikon, where, however, some epitaphs of the Archaic period have been found (Fossey (1986) 57). On the other hand, *Aiolidai must then be identified with one of the three sites found along this route: (a) Rosoufi (= Dassios (1992) no. 68), the remains of which, however, are poorly attested; or (b) Kastro-Zemenou (McInerney (1999) 304 = Dassios (1992) no. 112), but the remains do not look like a permanent settlement and the alleged Archaic remains are questionable; (c) Kastro Teresi, where no remains of the Archaic period have been found (Tillard (1991) 66–68 = *Aiolidai; Fossey (1986) 54–56 = Phlygonion; Rousset (2002) 43 n. 46 = Trachis). In any case, one must abandon the identification of *Aiolidai with the remains at Bania (Schober (1924) 22). This site is to be identified with ancient Phlygonion (no. 191), and there is no basis for assuming a change of name from *Aiolidai to Phlygonion. To conclude, the location of *Aiolidai remains unresolved.

171. Ambryssos (Ambryssios)  Map 55. Lat. 37.55, long. 22.40. Size of territory: probably 2. Type: B. The toponym is Ἀμβρυσ(σ)ος, ἡ (SGDI 2147.1 (C2m); Strabo 9.3.13; SGDI 2314.1 (C2l); Polyb. 4.25.2 (rC35)). In late sources the toponym is sometimes Ἀμβροςσος (IG IX.1 12.2–3 (third century AD); Paus. 10.36.3) or Ἀμβροσσός (schol. Ap. Rhod. A54) or Ἀμβρος (Steph. Byz. 91.9). The city-ethnic is Ἀμβρύσ(σ)ος (SGDI 2125.2 (C2e), 2147.5–6 (C2s) or Ἀμβρύσ (Lycohp. Alex. 900) or, in late sources only, Ἀμβρόσιας (F.Delphes II.11.3 431.6 (C1m)) or Ἀμβρωσίας (F.Delphes II.11.3 136.24 (C2m)) or Ἀμβρωσίας (IG IX.1 18.12 (third century AD); Paus. 10.1.8 (rC67); IG IX.1 18.12 (third century AD)). The earliest attestation of Ambryssos as a polis is of C2 (IG IX.1 10.1–2), but it is retrospectively attested as a polis in the urban sense at Paus. 10.3.2, where it is listed among the Phokian cities dioikised in 346. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in IG IX.1 10.1–2. The individual and external use is attested in a proxeny decree of C3 (IG IX.1 1.4) and in Pausanias’ account of the C6(!) war between the Phokians and the Thessalians, where ‘Ποίοι Ἀμβροσσός was the general of the Phokian infantry (Paus. 10.1.7–8). If one accepts the historicity of this war (but cf. Ellinger (1993) 17–22, contra Pritchett (1996)) we have here the oldest attestation of Ambryssos as a polis.

By C2s Ambryssos and Phlygonion (no. 191) had formed a sympoliteia with Phlygonion as the subordinate party, and a preserved delimitation of frontiers (F.Delphes II.1.3 136) shows that, at least then, the two communities bordered on Delphi (Rousset (2002) 128,140,155–60).

The dioikismos suffered in 346 shows that Ambryssos belonged to the Phokian koinon. Pausanias tells us that the defence circuit he saw had been built by the Thebans when they were at war with Philip II of Makedon, probably in the year between the Theban–Athenian alliance of 339 and the battle of Chaironeia in 338 (Ellis (1994) 781).

Ambryssos had a double defence circuit built by the Thebans in 339/8 (Paus. 4.31.5,10.36.3). But some sections of the walls found during the excavations are a little later (Fossey (1986) 30; BCH 110 (1986) 706,114 (1990) 762; for the date, see ArchDelt 38 (1985) 190–91). Pausanias mentions a small agora of unknown date. The principal sanctuary was that of Artemis Diktynnaia, whose statue was of Aiginetan workmanship (Rolley (1994) 276–77).

172. Amphikiaia (Amphikleieus)  Map 55. Lat. 38.40, long. 22.35. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is Ἀμφικία, ἡ (Hdt. 8.33, most MSS; Steph. Byz. 90.3) or τά ἄμφικλια (Hdt. 8.33, Vat.gr. 123) or Ἀμφικλεία (Paus. 10.33.9, quoting the dioikismos decree of 346 as his source for the changed spelling of the toponym). A local tradition according to which the toponym was Ὁμίτεια is reported by Paus.
10.33.11. Apart from Steph. Byz. 90.4, our only attestation of the city-ethnic is Ἀμφικλείεις at Paus. 10.33.11.

Amphiklea is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 8.33 and, retrospectively, at Paus. 10.3.1 and 2, in both passages in connection with Xerxes’ invasion of Phokis in 480, when Amphiklea was burnt to the ground. Pausanias treats Amphiklea as a polis once again in connection with the dioikismos of the Phokian cities in 346 after the Third Sacred War (10.3.2–3 and 10.33.9: in the decree (dogma) about the destruction of the Phokian poleis the Amphikleitans called it Amphiklea). Both sources show that Amphiklea was a member of the Phokian koinon.

The almost quadrangular fortification wall (c.250 m (east–west) × c.200 m (north–south)) is in trapezoidal masonry and has at least three towers on the western and two on the eastern side. A diateichisma encloses a small area in the eastern part of the fortification. The wall cannot be dated more precisely than C4–C3 (Frazier (1889) 420).

173. Antikyra (Antikyraeus) Map 55. Lat. 38.20, long. 22.35. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Ἀντικυρα, ἧ (Ps.-Skylax 37; Polyb. 27.16.6; Demetrios of Kallatis (FGHist 85) fr. 5; Paus 10.3.1; BCH 66–67 (1942–43) 69 no. 1 (Czm)) or Ἀντικύρα, ἧ (Strabo 9.3.1). Paus. 10.36.5 reports a local tradition according to which the original toponym was Κυπάρισος. Thus, the Antikyreis could claim mention in the Homeric Catalogue of Ships (Il. 2.519; cf. Paus. 10.3.1). This invention of a glorious past (for which see also Paus. 10.36.6, 10 and Steph. Byz. 99.4–5) may date from the time of the Third Sacred War (Diod. 16.23.5–6). The city-ethnic is Ἀντικυρείς (SGDI 1872.8 (C21); Polyb. 9.39.2 (rC31)). Antikyra is called a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 37 and, retrospectively, by Paus. 10.3.1 in connection with the dioikismos of 346. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on Hellenistic coins (Head, HN2 339) and in Hellenistic proconex decrees (IG 1x.11–3) and externally in Polyb. 9.39.2 (rC31). The individual and external use is attested in Delphic inscriptions of C2 (SGDI 1872.8; SEG 18 190.5). In C3–C2 some federal coins were inscribed AN, probably an abbreviation of the city-ethnic Ἀντικυρείς (Head, HN2 339; SNG Cop. Phocis 134).

A bronze statuette found in a sanctuary of Athena that was probably situated in the territory of Antikyra (Rousset (1999) 77 n. 55) has a dedicatory inscription which, according to the editor, is “Archaic”: ΄Διόνατα λ’ υ’ ἀνέθεκαν τ’ Ἀθάνατα (BCH 89 (1955) 257 (C6–C5?)). It is tempting to take the Diondai to be a civic subdivision, in which case the inscription is the oldest testimony we possess about Antikyra’s political institutions.

A defence circuit is attested for C3 (Livy 26.26.1–3), but the few uncovered remains do not allow of a more precise date (ArchDelt 37 (1982) 205–6; Dassios (1992) no. 76). Pausanias lists an agora, a fountain and two gymnasia, one of which is called “ancient”, but none can be dated. Excavations have revealed a sanctuary of Athena of the Archaic and Classical periods (BCH 89 (1955) 257 (C6f)). Pausanias mentions other sanctuaries: one of Poseidon and, first of all, one of Artemis (10.37.1), whose statue, by Praxiteles or his sons, was reproduced on the C2 coins struck by the city (AM 14 (1989) 229–32; Lacroix (1949) 309–10; Head, HN2 339).

174. Boulis (Boulis) Map 55. Lat. 38.15, long. 22.50. Size of territory: 2. Type: C. The toponym is Βούλης, ἴ, exclusively attested in late literary sources (Paus. 10.37.2–3; Steph. Byz. 182.5) or Βουλιά, Βούλεια, Βολιά (Ptol. Geog. 3.14.18). The city-ethnic is Βούλεος (Paus. 10.37.1–2, most MSS) or Βολιάδος (some MSS and Steph. Byz. 182.6). According to Pausanias, the toponym was derived from the name Βούλος, the oecist of this colony founded by some of the poleis of Doris: ὑναμένετατ απὸ Βούλωνος ἀγαγώντως τὴν ἀποκίνην ἄνδρος, συνικότθη δὲ ἐκ πόλεων τῶν ἐν ἄρχαιᾳ Δωρίδι (10.37.2).

The only sources in which Boulis is classified as a polis are Steph. Byz. and Ptol. Geog., which lists Bouli among the πόλεις μεσόγειοι, using polis in a purely topographical sense, as in the case of the Attic demes which are also called πόλεις μεσόγειοι (3.15.22). Even if Pausanias’ link between Boulis and Boulon is suspicious, there is no reason to reject his testimony about the foundation of Boulis. And the status of apokhia implies the status of polis. The date of the foundation, however, is unknown. With Herakleia as a possible analogy (Thuc. 3.92), it is tempting to connect the foundation with the strained relations between Doris and its neighbours in C5 (Thuc. 1.107). But that remains a hypothesis.

It is problematic, on the other hand, that Boulis is not listed by Pausanias as one of the poleis subjected to dioikismos in 346 (10.3.1–2). But this list is not exhaustive (see supra 400), and an argument from silence carries no weight. On the contrary, in a mutilated passage Pausanias connects the Boulioi with Philomelos, the Phokians and their assembly: λέγονται δὲ οἱ Βούλοι Φιλομήλων καὶ Φωκέων . . . σύλλογον τῶν κοινῶν (Paus. 10.37.2). No matter how the passage is emended, there must be some connection between the Boulioi and the Phokian assembly in the period 356–354. The inference seems to be that Boulis was a polis in the years 356–354. It is unknown whether the relations between the Boulioi and the Phokians were friendly or hostile. That depends on how the passage is emended. The text
has been interpreted in different ways (see the *apparatus* in the editions by Hitizig-Bluemner (1896–1910) and Rocha Pereira (1973–81)). The attempt to restore a form of the city-ethnic in IG 11.111.5 = CID II 38 is too far-fetched to be further discussed here; cf. *infra* no. 192.

The remains of Bouli’s city walls are undated. The circuit is partly constructed in local limestone in trapezoidal masonry and a part of reddish *poros* stone in ashlar masonry (Leake (1835) ii.520–23; Dassios (1992) 65 no. 70; ArchDelt 36 (1981) 193–94 pl. 122d). The discovery of sherds of the Classical period ensures that the site was inhabited at that time (ArchDelt 36 (1981) 193). Pausanias mentions three sanctuaries: one of Megistos (undoubtedly Zeus), one of Artemis and one of Dionysos. The cult statues of the two last gods were of wood, but that does not warrant any conclusion about their date (Donohue (1988) 173–74).

175. Charandra (Charadraioi) Map 55. Lat. 38.40, long. 22.30. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is *Χαράδρα*, η (Hdt. 8.33; BCH 57 (1933) 68 (C3e)). The city-ethnic is *Χαράδρασις* (SGDI 1789.11 (C2f); Paus. 10.33.6). The form [*Χαρα*δραίοι] [Φωκ]έις is attested in a C4f Delphic inscription (CID II 8.1.5). A C3e proxeny decree has Φωκείας ἐκ Χαράδρας (BCH 57 (1933) 68.2–3).

Charandra is called a *polis* in the urban sense at Hdt. 8.33 and, retrospectively, at Paus. 10.3.2, in both passages in connection with Xerxes’ invasion of Phokis in 480, when Charandra was burnt to the ground. In the accounts of the Delphic *nauphoi* the [Chara]draioi are recorded as contributors (CID II 8.1.5: [*Χαρα*δραίοι] [Φωκ]έις) in a fragmentary list whose lost heading undoubtedly had ταὐδε τάμι πολίων ἄρισκεν vel sim. (cf. CID II 4.1.3–4), and here *polis* is used in the political sense. Pausanias treats Charandra as a *polis* once again in connection with the *dioikismos* of the Phokian cities in 346 after the Third Sacred War (10.3.2–3). Pausanias’ information is confirmed by the Delphic accounts where the Charadraioi are recorded among the Phokian communities that paid the annual fine (CID II 1108.2 (322)). The collective and external use of the city-ethnic is attested in Delphic inscriptions (CID II 8.1.4, II 108.2). The individual and external use is found in the C3 Delphic proxeny decree (BCH 57 (1933) 68.2–3). The *dioikismos* suffered in 346 and the fine paid in 322 show that Charandra belonged to the Phokian *koinon*.

The identification of Charandra with Mariolata was established definitively by Tillard (1911) 62–64. The site is protected by an undated defence circuit in trapezoidal and pseudo-isodomic masonry, in some cases joggled. A *diateichisma* separated the acropolis to the south from the lower town to the north (Frazer (1898) 416). The southern part of the wall was enforced with at least five towers. The northern part is too poorly preserved to estimate the area enclosed by the city wall.

176. Daulis (Daulius) Map 55. Lat. 38.30, long. 22.45. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym recorded in inscriptions and in authors of the Classical period is *Δαυλία*, η (SGDI 2118.3 (C2e); Thuc. 2.29.3; *Hell. Oxy*. 21.5, Chambers), in later literary sources *Δαύλεια* (Steph. Byz. 221.10; Eust. II. 2.520). Nevertheless, the lexicographers treat this form as recent (Steph. Byz. 221.10; *Etym. Magn.* 250.7), compared with *Δαυλίς*, -ίος, η attested in the Catalogue of Ships (Hom. II. 2.520). The Homeric form is probably the reason why Daulis is the only form attested in Strabo (7.7.1, 9.3.1, 13) and Pausanias (10.3.1, 35.8). The form *Δαύλοις*, τό is found once in Polyb. 4.25.2 (rC3e). The restoration of the proxeny decree for Διάων [Β]ο[λ]ι[ων]ος ἐγ’ *Δαυλίον* [τ] (ArchEph (1907) 102 (C1)) is questionable, and a preferable restoration is ‘Ἐπ’<i>κι<sub>δαυλίου</sub>’.

The city-ethnic is *Δαυλεύς* attested both in inscriptions (SGDI 1969.5 (C2e)) and in literary sources (Aesch. Cho. 674; Theopomp. fr. 385; Paus. 10.4.9), whereas *Δαύλος* is found exclusively in literary sources (Hdt. 8.35.1; *Hell. Oxy* 21.5).

Daulis is called *polis* in the urban sense by Hdt. 8.35.1 in connection with Xerxes’ invasion of Greece in 480, when Daulis was burnt to the ground, and by *Hell. Oxy* 21.5 in connection with a Theban attack on some Phokian cities in 395. In both passages the political sense is a connotation (Hansen (2000) 176). The collective use of the ethnic is attested internally in a decree of C2s passed by the *polis* of the Daulies (BCH 59 (1935) 206–7) and externally in texts of the Classical period (Hdt. 8.35.1 and *Hell. Oxy*. 21.5). The individual and external use is attested in a C4s Delphic account in which a Daulian *grammateus* witnesses the payment of the fine imposed on the Phokians *poleis* (CID II 112.11: [*Δαυλ*]εύς γραμ[α]τ] [---]). Daulis is recorded by Paus. 10.3.2 among the cities exposed to *dioikismos* in 346, which shows that it belonged to the Phokian *koinon*, an inference further confirmed by the Daulian citizen who witnessed the payment of the fine (*supra*). The territory is indirectly termed χώρα at *Hell. Oxy*. 21.5.

In 395 the Boiotians failed to conquer Daulis (*Hell. Oxy*. 21.5). The abortive attack suggests that Daulis was fortified; but the location of Daulis on the top of a steep hill may in itself have provided sufficient protection. The undated remains of the ancient defence circuit enclose an area of
c.200 × 250 m (Frazer (1898) 222; Dassios (1992) no. 54). Some sections are in polygonal masonry, some in trapezoidal, which is interpreted by Scranton (1941) 162 and 172 as evidence of successive phases of construction. The principal gate in the western side of the wall is cautiously dated by Winter (1971) 216 as “late Classical or Hellenistic”. A terminus ante quem is, in any case, 198, when Daulis was conquered by the Romans (Livy 32.18.7).

177. Delphi (Delphos) Map 55. Lat. 38.30, long. 32.30. Size of territory: probably 2 or 3. Type: A. The toponym is normally Δελφοί, οἱ (Hdt. 1.50.1; Pl. Ap. 20Ε; F.Delphes 11.1 68.1 (c.400)); the epichoric form is sometimes Δαλφοί (coins (infra); F.Delphes III.1 294.13 (C5l/C4e)). The Boiotian form is Βελφοί (Syll.3 201.23 (C4m)). The toponym is used with the definite article (οἱ Δελφοί) only rarely (Diod. 16.27.3). Referring to the sanctuary of Apollo rather than the town of Delphi, poets prefer the toponym Πνθων (Hom. II. 2.519; Soph. ΟΤ 152) or Πνθοί (Hymn. Hom. Ap. 372; Ar. Av. 188–89). In prose Δελφοί often denotes the whole settlement, of which the sanctuary of Apollo was only a part (Thuc. 1.112.5), but sometimes the sanctuary alone (Thuc. 3.57.2). In Hymn. Hom. Ap. 269 the use of the toponym Krisa to designate Delphi is aetiological (Lerat (1948), contra Skorda (1992) 62–63). For the toponym Krisa, see 419. The city-ethnic is Δελφὸς (Bacchyl. 3.21, Maehler; CID i 8.1 (c.400)). Delphi is called a polis both in the urban sense (Hdt. 8.36.2; Ps.-Skylax 37) and in the political sense (CID i 9A.2–3 (C4m)). The earliest epigraphical attestation of a πόλις τῶν Δελφῶν is of 363/2 (IG iv² 1094a.27; cf. CID ii 31.3 (358/7)). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in kletic or abbreviated form on coins (infra) and in decrees (CID i 8.4 (c.400); SEG 16 307.3 (C4f); F.Delphes 11.1.391.3 (C4f)) and externally in inscriptions (IG iv².1 122.77 (C4)) and in literary sources (Hdt. 8.36.2; Aeschyl. 3.122). The individual use is attested internally in the naopoioi accounts (CID i 10.1.10 (357/6)) and externally in sepulchral inscriptions (IG iv² 8478: Δελφὸς (C4s)) and in literary sources (Hdt. 5.72.4).

It is difficult to determine the exact relation between the sanctuary of Apollo Pythios and the polis of Delphi. As far as territory is concerned, as demonstrated by Rousset (2002) passim, cf. 286–88, one must distinguish between (a) the territory of the polis, called Δελφὸς (F.Delphes 11.4 175 (C3l)), in which houses and landed property were owned by the citizens (CID ii 67.31–13 (C4f)) and controlled by them through grants of enktesis (F.Delphes 11.4 378.7; ἐμπασις (C4s)); (b) land which was part of Δελφὸς, but consecrated to Apollo (?) (cf. Rousset (2002) 292); it was let out to individuals (CID ii 67.1) or communities (CID ii 67.5) and was a source of income administered by the Amphiktyony (Sanchez (2001) 142–44); (c) the hiera chora, the former territory of Krisa/Kirrha(?), consecrated to Apollo after the First Sacred War; it was administered by the Amphiktyony and strictly separated from the territory of Delphi in the Classical and Hellenistic periods, see infra 419–20.

The extent of the territory of Delphi in the Classical period is not known, but the presumption is that it was roughly the same as in the Hellenistic period (cf. Rousset (2002) 71–175). To the west Delphi bordered on Amphissa (no. 158) (F.Delphes i11.3 383 (C2e); Plut. Mor. 249E–F (rC4m)); to the east it bordered on the Phlygonians (no. 191), incorporated into Delphi in C2e, whereafter the borderland was the territory owned in common (?) by Ambryssians (no. 171) and Phlygonians (F.Delphes 11.2 136 (C2m)). According to Strabo 9.3.15 (rC5m), the site called Anemoreia (unlocated) was made the frontier between Delphi and the Phokians when the Lakedaimonians cut Delphi out of the Phokian koîn. To the south and south-west the territory bordered on the “Sacred Land” (cf. Krisa/Kirrha). To the north, it is unknown how far the territory stretched up Parnassos; it may have reached the Korykian Grotto (Rousset (2002) 160–62).

We have no information about the total number of citizens (Rousset (2002) 290), but the minimum number of adult male citizens can be established from some decrees passed by the Delphian assembly. When the people voted with pebbles, the decree passed sometimes records the number of votes cast, and three such decrees are preserved: the first records a total of 454 votes (F.Delphes 11.1 294.1.2–3 (C4f); cf. Rougemont (1998) 164), the second over 400 votes (CID i 13.35–37 (C4f)), and the third 353 votes (Lerat (1943) 63). A decision made in C4m by the Labydies, one of the civic subdivisions (infra 414), was passed with 182 votes (CID i 19.A.21–22).

Being the seat of one of the two sanctuaries of the Pylo–Delphic Amphiktyony, Delphi, as the only polis, had two seats in the Amphiktyonic Council (CID i 36.1.24–25 (343/2); cf. Lefèvre (1998) 34–51). Delphi’s participation in the Council is securely attested in 343/2 (CID i 36.1.24; cf. Lefèvre (1998) 34–51), but probably antedates this occurrence (Theopomp. fr. 63; cf. Sanchez (2001) 119). The original date of Delphi’s admission to the Amphiktyony, however, cannot be positively established (Sanchez (2001) 118–20). It has sometimes been dated to the Archaic period and seen as a consequence of the First Sacred War in C6e.
(e.g. Roux (1979) 16–19). Alternatively, it has been dated to the Classical period and seen as a consequence of the Lakedaimonian invasion of Phokis in C5m (e.g. Kahrstedt (1993) 750).

The original position of the sanctuary of Apollo, serving both the polis and the Amphiktyony, promoted collaboration as well as competition between the two organisations in religious (Lefèvre (1998) 239), military (ibid. 43) and financial (ibid. 257–64) matters. Nevertheless, the disputed view that the independence of the polis was sometimes interfered with by the Amphiktyony may merely reflect our ignorance of the organisation and working of the institutions; cf. for example the opposed interpretations of the Amphiktyonic involvement in the exile of Astykrates (Lefèvre (1998) 49, contra Sanchez (2001) 142–44, 171).

Geographically, Delphi was situated in Phokis (Hdt. 8.35.1; Eur. Or. 1094; Ps.-Skylax 37), but the Delphians refused to be called Phokians (Paus. 4.34.11). Supported by interested allies, the Delphians often clashed with the Phokians who tried to control the sanctuary of Pythian Apollo.

There is no mention of Delphi in the sources for the First Sacred War against Kirrha/Krisa (see 419–20 and no. 183). A number of sometimes conflicting sources concern what modern scholars call the Second Sacred War (cf. Thuc. 1.112.4), in which the Lakedaimonians opposed Phokian attempts to control the resources of Apollo's sanctuary in Delphi (schol. Eur. Tro. 9; Diod. 16.33.1; Paus. 10.15.1). The issue is difficult; thus it remains problematic that there is no mention of the Amphiktyony (Sanchez (2001) 106–9), and modern scholars agree in preferring Thucydides' account of a single Lakedaimonian intervention in 449 (1.112.4) to other sources' accounts of two interventions, one in 457 (Plut. Cim. 17.4) and one in 449, as well as a Boiotian intervention (Philochr. fr. 34a). Thucydides reports that the Lakedaimonians took possession of the sanctuary and gave it to the Delphians. Strabo (9.3.15) adds that the Lakedaimonians separated Delphi from the Phokian koinon. When the Lakedaimonians had left Phokis (Thuc. 1.112.5)—or three years later (Philochr. fr. 34b)—the Athenians sent an army, took possession of Delphi, and gave it to the Phokians (Thuc. 1.112.5). (Sanchez (2001) 116 prefers to connect the Strabo passage with the Peace of Nikias in 421, and Meiggs (1972) 423 is convinced that the Athenian campaign took place immediately after the Lakedaimonians' retreat.)

The status of the polis of Delphi was guaranteed in the Peace of Nikias in 421: "The sanctuary and the temple at Delphi, and the Delphian people shall be their own masters in legislation, in taxation and in administration of justice, both concerning their persons and their territory, according to their ancestral customs" (Thuc. 5.18.2; cf. Hornblower (1996) 472). This clause probably means that Delphi was free of the Phokian koinon after 421, and this state of affairs seems to have persisted in 356 when, at the beginning of the Third Sacred War, the Phokians justified their occupation of the sanctuary with a reference to their ancestral right to the oracle. Such a legitimation would have been superfluous if Delphi had been a member of the Phokian koinon. It was in all cases the Delphians who made decisions about access to the oracle, granted to the Phaselitans (no. 942) (CID 1 8 (c.400) = Staatsverträge 218) and the Asklepiadai (CID 11 11 (C457) = Staatsverträge 295). There is no evidence that, during the Sacred War, the Delphians were forced to join the koinon. On the contrary, independence of the koinon is indicated by the fact that the Delphians kept their seats in the Amphictyony while the Phokians were excluded in 346.

Internal strife in, probably, C4f is indicated by the mention of penalties for "organisation of stasis" (τ' ας στασιαρ[χίας] in the so-called Law of Kadys (BCH 50 (1926) 18.viii.14). In, presumably, C4e (but cf. Rougemont (1998) 161–62), the first of a number of stases was caused by the dispute between two Delphic families (Arist. Pol. 1303b37–43; Heracl. Lemb. 52; Plut. Mor. 825B–C; Carrère (1984)). In 363, Astykrates and his associates, all Delphian citizens, were exiled by the Amphiktyonic Council and fled to Athens, where they obtained Athenian citizenship (IG II2 109). Their property was confiscated and leased as property belonging to Apollo (CID 11 67–72 (C458)). Perhaps their enemies were, in turn, sent into exile a little later (CID 11 73 (C4m)). This episode is often seen as reflecting international interference in the government of Delphi in C4f (Pomtow (1906); cf. Syll.3 175–78; Buckler (1985); contra Sanchez (2001) 170). The penalty of exile, however, is attested already in C5e, when the Delphian Kobon was exiled for having subverted the Pythia (Hdt. 6.66).

The Aristotelian collection of politeiai included a constitution of the Delphians (fr. 494; see Musielak (1993)). In C2 Delphi was a democracy (Gauthier (1992)). The constitution of the Classical period has often been interpreted as an oligarchy (Roux (1979) 61–93; Salviat (1984); contra Gauthier (1990); Musielak (1993)), but, pace Roux (1979) 62–65, there is no basis for the view that the citizens were divided into two classes with different political rights. There was a popular assembly (Lerat (1943) 70–79), to which apparently all
citizens were admitted (contra Roux (1979) 70); it was called ἀγορά (F.Delphes III.1 294.1.1 (C4f)), which is the ancient term (Lerat (1943) 74), and later ἐκκλησία (CII 32.58–60 (C4s)). An ordinary meeting of this assembly was called τέλειος. The formula σὺν ψάφοις τάς ἐννόμοις is not attested before C3, but similar phrases show that a quorum was also required in C4: πλῆθο[ι] ὅτις ἄγορας (Syll. 257.14 (340/39)), or σὺν ψάφωι τὰι νικεσθάι (Syll. III 265.3 (336/5)); cf. Lerat (1943); Gauthier (1990) 86–89. Furthermore, three documents record the number of votes cast in favour of the motion (Gauthier (1990) 87): 454 votes (F.Delphes III.1 294.1.2–3 (C4f)), 400+ (CII 13.35–37 (C4f)), and 353 (Lerat (1943) 63); for another fragmentary attestation, see Salvati and Vatin (1971) 52. The quorum is not known, but the strange formulation of CII 13 suggests that it could have been 400 votes (Roux (1979) 69). The decisions passed by the assembly were tethmoi (F.Delphes III.1 294.1.1: δῆτ᾽ ὃ τέθήκες) or nomoi (Lerat (1943) 62: τῶν νόμον ἃν γυράθωσιν), or treaties (CII 3/2 (C4f)) or honorific decrees (Syll. III 265 (336/5)). The boula had thirty members, divided into two sections of fifteen members, each serving six months (CII 32.78–86; cf. Roux (1979) 71–77); the view that it may have been further subdivided into subsections is unconvincing (Tréheux (1980) 523–24). There is no evidence of probouleusis before C2 (Gauthier (1992) 23–26). In C4 the powers of the Council were primarily judicial and financial (Roux (1979) 76–77; Salvati (1984)). It did not, however, possess full powers in either judicial matters (Gauthier (1992) 130) or in financial administration, where, at least on one occasion, the boula was assisted by a board of thirteen προαιρετοὶ ὑπὸ τᾶς πόλεως (CII 32.27–29 (C4s); cf. Bousquet (1988) 184; Roux (1979) 71, 76–77). There is no information about the composition of the Delphian law-courts in C5–C4, but the existence of law-courts in C4m is ensured by the grant of προδικία ποτὲ Δελφοῖς (F.Delphes III.1 392.7–8). A C4 law on maltreatment of parents mentions a public prison (Lerat (1943) 63: δαµοσίαν οἰκίαν). The archon who was the eponymous official is indisputably attested in C4f (F.Delphes III.1 391), possibly in C6 (Roux (1969) 47; contra Rougemont (1998) 161–62), and perhaps even in C5e (Pind. Hyp. Pyth. b). He must be distinguished from the board of eight prytaineis, a financial magistracy in charge of the sacred treasures of Apollo (Bousquet (1988) 143m; contra Roux (1979) 81–92).

Of the civic subdivisions, phylai are not attested earlier than C2 (F.Delphes III.1 238.10–11), and their number is unknown (for a hypothesis, see Roux (1979) 88). An enfranchisement act of C1 (F.Delphes III.6 79) mentions money lent by the tribe δάνειον φυλοτικόν. The entry Λαφριάδαι in HscH. 1436 is the only explicit attestation of phratriai. The Labyades are often called a phratrai (cf. CII 1 p. 43 n. 68); however, we have no explicit evidence (Sebillote (1997)), but the mention of Poseidon Phratrios in CII 9.53–14 supports the view. The Labyades are first attested in, presumably, Cél (CII 1.9 bis Roux (1969) 47–56). In C4m they had an assembly (alia A.4), some of its decisions required a quorum of 101 votes (B.9–10), and one of the enactments was passed with 182 votes (A.21–23). The group had laws (A.3) and magistrates (tagō: A.23, damiorgoi: D.19–20); they performed public functions which in Attika were performed by the phratriai (CII 1 pp. 26–88). The group was subdivided into patriai. In the Law of Kadyon on interest on loans (BCH 50 (1926) 15.9–10) a patria is mentioned alongside other groups called ἱπποσταί and Θίασος, which may or may not have been civic subdivisions. We are totally ignorant of the nature of the Thrakikaidai mentioned at Diod. 16.24.3 in connection with the Phokians' occupation of the sanctuary in 356.

In C4s the Delphians conferred proxenia and other honours on citizens from e.g. Selinous (no. 44), Pellene (no. 240), Arethousa (no. 546) and Phleious (no. 355) (F.Delphes III.1 391, 395, 396; SEG 16 309). A citizen of Delphi was granted proxenia by the Athenians (no. 361) in C4e (IG II² 31). In Cél Timesitheos of Delphi was victorious in the Olympic and in the Pythian Games (Olympionikai 140, 146; Hdt. 5.72.4; Paus. 6.8.6).

Apollo Pythios was the protective divinity of the Delphians (CII 10.8, 35 (C4e)). The Delphians controlled the oracle; they had the exclusive right to grant promantia, and themselves possessed the first claim to consult the oracle (F.Delphes III.1 375 (C4m); Pouilloux (1952)). Strangers needed the assistance of Delphian proxenoi in order to consult the oracle (CII 1.4 (C5²); Syll. 3 548 (C3s); cf. Gauthier (1972) 46–52; Pouilloux (1974)). Treaties about consultation of the oracle were concluded between Delphi and Phaselis (no. 942) (CII 1 8; Staatsverträge 218 (c.400) and Delphi and Skiathos (no. 520) (CII 13 = Staatsverträge 295 (C4f)). Some of the revenues of the Delphians, such as the pelanos, were directly connected with the oracle (Amandry (1950) 86–103; cf. CII 1 ii: ἀπελευθερῶν τὸν ἀδίκων). The temple of Apollo was, if not the property, then at least the possession of the Amphiktyones. In Cél (La Coste-Messelière (1946)), when the Amphiktyones had undertaken for the sum of 300 talents to reconstruct the temple, the Delphians had to pay a quarter of the costs and send out envoys to the various poleis to ask for contributions (Hdt. 2.180). Remains of this temple
are preserved, whereas the attribution to the previous temple of some architectural remains of C7 is still a moot point (Bommelaer (1991) 181–84). The Amphiktyony organised the Pythian Games, but the theoroi who performed the epanegoria were sent out by the Delphians (CID 1 10.45–46 (380) with pp. 118–19; SEG 24 379 (C3m); cf. Sourvinou-Inwood (1990) 299). These theoroi were hosted by theorodokoi appointed by the Delphian polis (Daux (1949) 4–11 = Syll. 90 (C58?); F.Delphes 111.4 4 (C45)). Conversely, a Delphian theorodokos was appointed to host theoroi from Epidauros (no. 348) in 356 (IG iv2 1.95.3). The other major sanctuary of the Delphian polis was that of Athena (Hdt. 8.39), whose temple of the Archaic period has been dated to C7–C6 (Bommelaer (1991) 56–59). Cults of other gods are known, but their existence in the Archaic and Classical periods is often unattested (Pomtow (1912); Roux (1976) 165–208). For the religious festivals, see CID 1 58–60.

Apart from remains of the Mycenaean period (S. Müller (1992) 455–90), evidence of a settlement within the sanctuary can be traced back to C10, and remains of a house have been dated to C8m (Luce (1993)). The earliest dedications to Apollo(?) date from C9l (Rolley (1977) 135), and the first traces of the administration of the sanctuary can be dated to C7e (La Coste-Messelière (1969) 731–40). The first peribolos of C575 may be connected with the formation of the Amphiktyony in Delphi (Luce (1992) 704). In its original form the fountain of Kastalia may date from C7l–C6m (Bommelaer (1991) 81–83). The Pythian hippodrome and stadion were probably placed in the Kirrahaean plain in the Classical period (Bommelaer (1991) 215; cf. infra 419).

The Panhellenic sanctuary at Delphi has been excavated and studied in detail by, principally, the French school. The sanctuary (2.3 ha) is densely built and centres on the so-called Sacred Way which winds its way down the slopes of the temenos. The most conspicuous features are: (1) the C4 Doric peripteral (6 × 15) temple of Apollo, which dominates the sanctuary; built after the earthquake of 373, it replaced a monumental C6 temple adorned with pedimental sculptures, which itself replaced one or more earlier buildings. Later tradition locates the oracle of Apollo in an underground chamber of the temple, no trace of which, however, has been found (Bommelaer (1991) 176–84); (2) a C4—Hellenistic theatre (TGR ii. 188–90; Bommelaer (1991) 207–12); (3) the treasuries: twenty buildings among the numerous constructions in the sanctuary have been identified, with varying degrees of certainty, as treasuries dedicated by individual Greek poleis or even non-Greek polities (cf. Strabo 5.1.3 (Etruscan Agylia)); apparently, most treasuries were constructed prior to the Hellenistic period, but the attribution of individual buildings to specific poleis depends largely on Pausanias. The poleis known to have constructed treasuries are (numerals prefaced with # to refer to pl. V in Bommelaer (1991)); Syracuse (no. 47), cf. Jacquemin (1999) no. 453 (after 413); Kroton (no. 56), cf. Jacquemin (1999) no. 127 (C6l); Sybaris (no. 70), cf. Jacquemin (1999) no. 445 (C6); Spina (no. 85), cf. Jacquemin (1999) no. 443 (C3); Korkyra (no. 123), cf. Jacquemin (1999) no. 123 (C580); #124 Thbes (no. 221), cf. Jacquemin (1999) no. 461 (after 371 or after 346); #216 Megara (no. 225), cf. F.Delphes 111.1 91–111, Jacquemin (1999) no. 659 and p. 54 (C6l/C5e); #308 Corinth (no. 227), cf. Hdt. 1.14.2, 51.3, 4.162.3, and Jacquemin (1999) no. 124 (C7l?); #121 Sikyon (no. 228), cf. Jacquemin (1999) no. 436 (C6l); #223 Athens (no. 361), cf. Xen. An. 5.3.5 and Jacquemin (1999) nos. 85 (C6e) and 86 (C5e); #122 Siphnos (no. 519), cf. Hdt. 3.57.2 and Jacquemin (1999) no. 441 (C5e); Akanthos (no. 559), cf. Jacquemin (1999) no. 2 (C6l or earlier); Poteidaia (no. 598), cf. Jacquemin (1999) no. 414 (C6 or C5); Klagomenai (no. 847), cf. Hdt. 1.51.2 and Jacquemin (1999) no. 112 (C6l); #219 Knidos (no. 903), cf. Jacquemin (1999) no. 118 (C6m; for the C6m dedicatory inscription F.Delphes 111.1 289, see Bommelaer (1991) 142); #302 Kyrene (no. 1028), cf. F.Delphes II and BCH 112 (1988) 291–305, and Jacquemin (1999) no. 132 (334–324). The treasuries of the Athenians, the Sikyonians and the Siphnians were decorated with pedimental sculptures and reliefs in exquisite late Archaic style (Bommelaer (1991) 118–26, 133–36). And (4) commemorative dedications, outstanding among which are e.g. the Monument of the Admirals, dedicated to commemorate the Spartan victory at Aigos potamoi (cf. ML 95 (405)), and the Athenian thank offering for the victory at Marathon, honouring the commander Miltiades (Bommelaer (1991) 108–11), and, of course, the Greek thank offering for victories in the Persian War (ML 27). For treasuries and other monumental dedications, see the synthetic study by Jacquemin (1999).

Below the sanctuary of Apollo is the sanctuary of Athena (0.5 ha). The central features of this sanctuary are, from west to east: (1) the C6l temple of Athena Pronaia, which replaced an earlier construction; it is Doric peripteral (6 × 12); (2) a C56 Doric treasury, of unknown ownership; (3) the C6s Aiolic Treasury generally ascribed to Massalia (no. 3), which also housed dedications by Rome (cf. Diod. 14.93.4 (395)); (4) a C4f tholos and (5) a C4f Doric prostyle hexastyle temple, of Athena or possibly Artemis (Bommelaer (1991) 46–71).
obscure (on the toponym of Thuia, see Jacquemin (1992)). It is not known where the assembly met (contra Roux (1979) 70); a public prison (δαµοσία οἰκία) is mentioned in a C4 text (Lerat (1943) 63); texts of C2 mention a bouleion (F.Delphes 111.11 89) which has not been securely located (Bommelaer (1991) 144); and the location of the prytaneion is likewise unknown (CID II 81.A.16 (C4s)). A dikasterion—either a law-court or a court-room—is mentioned in a C4f document (F.Delphes 111.1 295, inv. 1373). The gymnasion in Delphi is of C4s (Bommelaer (1991) 72–79). It is commonly believed that the town of Delphi was unpolluted. The walls situated on the rocky west side of the sanctuary have, tentatively, been attributed to Philomelos (Diod. 16.25.1; Bommelaer (1991) 217). The Logari tower east of the sanctuary may date from the same period (Bommelaer (1991) 41). South of the sanctuary are some undated remains of walls (P. Leriche, pers. comm.).

Delphi struck silver coins on the Aiginetan standard from C6 to C4m (356/5). (1) Several series of small denominations struck from C6 to C5m, and from C5l to C4m. Trihemiobol: obv. ram’s head, beneath: dolphin; rev. goat’s head facing between two dolphins; legend: at first anepigraphic, then ΔΑΛΦΙΚΟΝ on coins of C5m, ΔΕΛΦΙΚΟΝ on coins of C4. Tritartemorion: obv. head of (Ethiopian) negro; rev. goat’s head facing between ΔΑ reversed, or three T’s in triangular pattern. Tetartemorion: obv. bull’s head; rev. goat’s head facing between ΔΑ reversed. (2) Tridrachms and didrachms struck in C5. Tridrachm: obv. two rams’ heads in juxtaposition, faces downwards, above two dolphins; legend: ΔΑΛΦΙΚΟΝ; rev. four incuse squares, in each of which a dolphin and a flower. Didrachm: obv. ram’s head, beneath dolphin; legend: ΔΑΛΦΙΚΟΝ; rev. four incuse squares, in each of which a star (Kraay (1976) 121–22; Picard (1991) 33–36; SNG Cop. Aetolia-Euboea 139–48).

178. Drymos (Drymios) Map 55. Lat. 38.45, long. 22.35. Size of territory: probably 2. Type: A. The toponym is Δρυµίας (Hdt. 8.33) or Δρυµός, ὅ (Eust. II. 2.298.7, van der Valk) or Δρυµαία, ἦ (Paus. 10.3.2; 33.12) or Δρυµιαί (Steph. Byz. 239.18). The city-ethnic is ΔΡΥΜΙΟΙ (IG IX.1 226.2 (C2f); F.Delphes 111.4 277.25 (C2s); SGDI 17121.1 (C2m)). Apart from ΔΡΥΜΙΟΙ at Steph. Byz. 239.19–20, the only attestation in literary sources of a city-ethnic is ΔΡΥΜΙΑΙΟΣ in Paus. 10.33.12. According to Paus. 10.32.12, the original toponym (or city-ethnic?) was Ναυβολείς.

Drymos is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 8.33 and, retrospectively, at Paus. 10.3.1 and 2, in both passages in connection with Xerxes’ invasion of Phokis in 480, when Drymos was burnt to the ground. Paus. 10.3.2 treats Drymos as a polis in the urban sense in connection with the dioikismos of the Phokian cities in 346 after the Third Sacred War. The dioikismos suffered in 346 shows that Drymos belonged to the Phokian koinon. The collective and internal use of the city-ethnic is attested in a C2f agreement between Drymos and the Oitaian Federation (IG IX.1 226.2: ἡ πόλις τῶν Δρυµίων). The individual and external use is attested in Delphic inscriptions (F.Delphes 111.4 277.25 (C2s)).

Drymos was protected by a large defence circuit of triangular shape. Today its base toward the south has completely disappeared, but remains of it were seen by Frazer (1898) 423–24. The western and eastern side stretched c.450 m and 350 m respectively, and were equipped with towers at regular intervals of c.50 m. At the northern end the circuit was divided by two diateichismata also equipped with towers. The whole fortification was thus subdivided into three sections of unequal size. The upper part enclosed an area of c.20 ha (Frazer (1898) 423–24; Dassios (1992) no. 2). It was built in irregular isodomic masonry, and was dated to C4l by Winter (1971) 36, 158. Paus. 10.33.12 mentions an ancient sanctuary of Demeter Thesmophoros and the celebration of Thesmophoria.

179. Echedameia (Echedamieus). Map 55. Unlocated. Type: B. The toponym is Ἐχεδάµεια, ἦ (Paus. 10.3.2) The city-ethnic is Ἐχεδαµείες (SGDI 1983.13 (C2e)). Echedameia is listed by Paus. 10.3.2 among the poleis (in the urban sense) exposed by Philip to dioikismos in 346. Pausanias was the only source for Echedameia until the discovery in 1863 (Wescher-Foucart) of a Delphic manumission inscription of 194 (SGDI 1985) in which both the vendors and one of the guarantors are recorded with the city-ethnic Ἐχεδαµειεύς as the second part of their name. The two vendors are further described as living in Tithronion.

Echedameia is still unlocated. Its absence from the list of cities sacked by the Persians in 480 has induced some scholars to assume a location in the southern part of Phokis (Bursian (1862) 1.182), but Lilaia is likewise absent from the list, which calls for circumspection. No topographical conclusion can be based on the fact that two Echedameiai were living in Tithronion (SGDI 1983).

180. Elateia (Elateus) Map 55. Lat. 38.40, long. 22.50. Size of territory: 3 or 4. Type: A. The toponym is Ἐλατεῖα, ἦ (Hdt. 8.35; Hell. Oxy. 21.5; F.Delphes 111.4 219.2 (C4l)) or Ἐλατή (Hsch. E1887) or Ελατηῖ (in a Boiotian inscription of C3s (IG III 3171.26). The city-ethnic is Ἐλατεῖος (C1D 11 38.14–16 (C4s)) or Ἐλατειεύς (CID 11 38.3–5 (C4s); SEG I 199.3 (C3m)). Elateia is called a polis in the urban sense at
Hdt. 8.33, and in Ps.-Skylax 61 Elateia is the third toponym listed after the heading πόλεις... αἵδε, where polis is again used in the urban sense; the political sense is found in IG IX.1 130.2 (C4). The collective and internal use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in a Hellenistic proxeny decree (IG IX.1 100.1: ἡ πόλις τῶν Ἐλατέων (C3)). The individual and external use is found in a Delphic proxeny decree of C4s (BCH 73 (1949) 263 no. 11.4–5).

The territory is called Ἐλατέια (Theophr. Hist. pl. 8.8.2) and it covered a large part of the Kephisos valley (Hell. Oxy. 21.5; Plut. Sull. 16.1: τὰ Ἐλατικὰ πέδια). Elateia controlled the valley, and its strategic importance is frequently attested (Dem. 18.169; Diod. 16.84.2; Strabo 9.3.2; see Pritchett (1982) 123–75). In later sources Elateia is repeatedly, and sometimes retrospectively, singled out as the largest of the Phokian poleis (schol. Dem. 18 no. 262, Dict; Harp. Εξ2; Strabo 9.2.19; Paus. 10.3.2, 34.1; Steph. Byz. 264.3). The exact size of the territory is unknown, but the possible disappearance of Pedieis (no. 189) after 346 and the unquestionable disappearance of Parapotamioi (no. 188) may have made Elateia the largest polis of Phokis. Thus, Elateia came to control the main pass between Phokis and Boiotia, which would explain the Athenian panic in 339 at the news of the fall of the city (Dem. 18.169).

Like the other Phokian poleis, Elateia was sacked and the city burned down by the Persians in 480 (Hdt. 8.33). In 395 the Boiotians overran the plain around Elateia and Pedieis (no. 189), and the population settled in the plain (Hell. Oxy. 21.5). In 346 it was one of the cities diokised by Philip (Paus. 10.3.1). Membership of the Phokian koinon is ensured by the recording in C4s of two Elateians among the archontes of the Phokians (CID II 38.3–5) and by the Phokian dedication in Delphi in 304 and 301 celebrating the liberation of Elateia (F.Delph. II.1.29; Paus. 1.26.3, 10.18.7, 34.2; cf. Flacelière (1937) 47, 53–55, 61; Jacquemin (1999) 347).

The principal divinity of Elateia was Athena Krania (Paus. 10.34.7). Enactments of the Phokian koinon were set up in her sanctuary from at least C4 onwards. The records of the payments of the Phokian fine to Delphi were found there (IG IX.1 109–15 = CID II 37–42; cf. also IG IX.1 96 (C3)). Excavations of the sanctuary have revealed remains of the Archaic and Classical periods (Paris (1892) 253–99).

According to a tradition reported by Paus. 8.4.4, 10.34.2–3 and attested already in C2 (SEG 11 1107 (C2e); Paus. 7.15.5 (rC2m); cf. Habicht (1998) 67–69), Elateia was founded by the Arkadian Elatos, the son of Arkas. If it is true that the C5 Delphic statue group of Zeus, Kallisto and Elatos was dedicated by the Elateians, this foundation myth can be traced back to the Classical period. However, the attribution of the group to the Elateians is not above suspicion (F.Delphes II.4 142–44 (C5 rescribed in C4; see Jacquemin (1999) 53)).

In C5 Elateia had a defence circuit, part of which collapsed in the earthquake of 426 (Demetrios of Kallatis (FGHist 85) fr. 6). An anecdote of doubtful value reports a siege of Elateia by Pelopidas in 374 and refers to the gates of the wall (Polyaen. 2.38.1; cf. Schober (1924) 69, contra Ellinger (1993) 332). The defence circuit, or at least part of it, must have been destroyed as a consequence of the dioikismos in 346, as is confirmed by Demosthenes, who in 344 told the Athenians that there were rumours that Philip intended to have Elateia fortified (Dem. 6.14). In 338, after his capture of Elateia, Philip built a palisade and placed a garrison in the city (Aeschin. 3.140). In C2e both the acropolis and the lower town were protected by a circuit (Livy 32.24). Remains of walls in polygonal masonry were reported by nineteenth-century travellers (Lolling (1898) 177; Paris (1892) 25–33). All that can be seen today are some parts of a wall in Lesbian masonry and some of one in isodomic masonry (Dassios (1992) no. 38). The wall in isodomic masonry uncovered in the early twentieth century is undoubtedly the circuit enclosing the lower town (Paris (1892) 39).

The Archaic-looking drachm with the legend ELATEON (retr.) recorded in Head, HN² 342 is rejected as a forgery by Babelon, Traité ii.3. 317–18 n. 2.

181. Erochos (Erochos) Map 55. Lat. 38.40, long. 22.35. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is Ἐρώχως (Hdt. 8.33) or Ἐρώχως (Hdt. 8.33, Codex D; Paus. 10.3.2). The form Ἐρόχος (C1) attested in an undated inscription (SEG 27 143) is probably an Archaic spelling of Ἐρώχως; cf. infra. The city-ethnic is Ἐρώχως (CID II 38.6 (337/6)). Erochos is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 8.33 and, retrospectively, at Paus. 10.3.2, in both passages in connection with Xerxes’ invasion of Phokis in 480, when Erochos was burnt to the ground. Paus. 10.3.2 treats Erochos as a polis once again in connection with the dioikismoi of the Phokian cities in 346 after the Third Sacred War. The external and individual use of the city-ethnic is attested for two magistrates of the Phokian koinon, an archon and a grammateus, and a witness to the payment of the fine (CID II 38.4, 6, 14–15; cf. IG IX.1 111 (337/6)).

Erochos was situated at Ano Souvala (not Kato-Souvala as misprinted in Barr.,). The location was definitively established by Tillard (1911) 61–65 and has been confirmed by the discovery of a dedication to Δόμαστηρι ἐν Ἐρώχως found in a sanctuary of Demeter situated c.2.5 km north-east of the
fortified settlement (SEG 27 143) at Kato-Souvala. In the sanctuary were found votive offerings of the Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic periods (ArchDelt 27 (1972) Chron. 386). The inscriptions are published only provisionally and cannot be dated with precision. But since all other attestations of toponym and ethnic have omega, the omicron in EPOX[OI] must stand for an omega. It follows that the terminus ante quem of the dedication is C4e, when omega became used for the long sound and omicron was restricted to the short.

The phrase ἐν Ἰπόχαι[OI] shows that in C4e the sanctuary was situated in the territory of Erochos and that the toponym Ἰπόχαι[OI] could be used to denote the territory as well as the city. But in the sanctuary were also found stamped tiles inscribed ΑΙΛΑΙΗΞΩΝ in letters datable to the Hellenistic period. Thus, at least the sanctuary was now controlled by the Lilaieis (no. 185), and, following Robert and Robert (BE (1978) 236), the presumption is that, when the tiles were made, Erochos had been incorporated into Lilaia. This assumption is probably confirmed by the double eponymous archons attested in Lilaia in Cleisthenes (F.Delphes III.4 133–35). To have two eponymous officials is not attested in any other Phokian polis, and a sympoliteia with Erochos offers a plausible explanation of the anomaly. When the incorporation took place is not known, but a terminus post quem is 337/6, the date of CID 11 38 = IG IX.1 111; see supra.

The town of Erochos was situated on the top of the hill of Ag. Vassilios and was protected by a defence circuit, the cemetery excavated at Kato-Souvala contains remains of C8 onwards (AAA 15 (1982) 76–85).

182. Hyampolis (Hyampolios) Map 55. Lat. 38.35, long. 22.55. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is usually Ὕαμπολες, Ὕαμπολες (Hom. II. 2.521; Hdt. 8.28; Paus. 10.1.3; IG IX.1 Η6.1 (c. AD 100)). However, a scholiast on Homer (schol. Hom. II. 521) and Estor. II. 275, 3 both citing the same source, claim that the locals (ἐγχώριοι) call it Ὀμάπολες. In inscriptions, the city-ethnic is invariably Ὕαμπολοες (SEG 37 422 (C58)), whereas literary sources have Ὀμάπολες (Xen. Hell. 6.4.27). The interpretation of the toponym as a composite word whose second part is πόλεις—whether correct or not—has led to the construction of variant forms of both toponym and city-ethnic. From the accusative written in two words, Ὕαμπολες (Hell. Oxy. 21.5) or Ὀαμπολες (Diod. 16.56.1), some authors invented the nominative Ὕαμπολες (Strabo 9.2.3, 3.15), and this form was then connected with the Hyantes of Thebes (Paus. 10.35.5; Strabo 9.2.3), whereas the schol. Eur. Or. 1094 claim that Hyampolis is a foundation of Hyamos, the son of Lykoros. By analogy with polis—politeis, the authors construct the city-ethnic Ὀαμπολες, which is the only form found in literary sources (Xen. Hell. 6.4.27; Paus. 10.1.8; Steph. Byz. 644.10).

Hyampolis is called a polis in the urban sense by Hdt. 8.33 in connection with Xerxes’ invasion of Phokis in 480, when Hyampolis was burnt to the ground; by Hell. Oxy. 21.5 in connection with the Boiotian campaign into Phokis in 395; and retrospectively by Paus. 10.3.1, where Hyampolis is listed as one of the polis exposed to dioikismos in 346. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in SEG 37 422.5 (C58), where the Ὀαμπολες appear as guarantors of a loan. For the individual and external use, see IG VII 3055.39 (C4m), where an Ὀαμπολες is attested as consulting the oracle of Trophonios at Lebadeia (no. 211).

The city was situated in the middle of a pass which was one of the main approaches to Phokis from the north (Paus. 10.1.11; Ellinger (1993) 22–27). In C1 the city bordered on Opous (no. 386; Strabo 9.2.23) and, being a border town, Hyampolis became the centre of legendary stories about the conflicts between Phokis and Thessalia in the Archaic period (C6; cf. Ellinger (1993) 17–22). The sanctuary of Artemis Elaphebolia was situated in the territory of Hyampolis (SEG 37 422–23), and from C6 (?) the Phokians celebrated the annual Elaphebolia in this sanctuary, commemorating their victory over the Thessalians (Plut. Mor. 244B–D, 660D, 1099E–F; cf. Ellinger (1993) 22–37). The recent excavations of the sanctuary of Artemis Elaphebolia and Apollo have revealed continuous habitation and utilisation from the Mycenaean age (LH IIIC) to the Byzantine period (Felsch and Kienast (1975); Felsch et al. (1980), (1987); Felsch and Siewert (1987); Kalapodi 1: xvi–xvii). A C2 inscription lists the landed property belonging to Apollo and Artemis (IG IX.1 87). In connection with the Archaic wars between the Phokians and the Thessalians, Plut. Mor. 244D (rC6) mentions the toponym Κλεώνα, and some commentators have erroneously assumed the existence of a community dependent on Hyampolis (supra 407).

If one can trust Pausanias’ piece of information that, in the C6 war against Thessalia, the Phokian cavalry was commanded by a Δασφάντης Ὀμάπολες, it follows that Hyampolis was a member of the Phokian koinon, and that is further confirmed by the Phokian federal coinage: the female head on the reverse of some of the triobols struck in
Cōl by the Phokians is usually taken to be the head of Artemis Elaphoebolia (Williams (1972) 2), and a rare issue of C4m has on the obverse a kneeling Artemis armed with bow and quiver (Williams (1972) 43; Felsch and Siewert (1987) 687).

In C4e Hyampolis was fortified with a defence circuit, and in 395 the Boiotians made an abortive attack on the walls of the city (Hell. Oxy. 21.5). In 371 Jason of Pherai invaded Phokis, conquered the suburb (τὸ προάστιον) of Hyampolis and ravaged the χώρα (Xen. Hell. 6.4.27). Remains of the fortifications are still visible on the plateau where Hyampolis once lay. A circuit wall encloses an area of some 280 m (north–south) by 200 m (east–west). The wall is in trapezoidal masonry, with a dozen interval towers and is 6 m (east–west). The wall is 8 m (east–west). The wall is 10 m (east–west). The wall is 12 m (east–west). The wall is 16 m (east–west). The wall is 20 m (east–west). The wall is 24 m (east–west). The wall is 28 m (east–west). The wall is 32 m (east–west). The wall is 36 m (east–west). The wall is 40 m (east–west). The wall is 44 m (east–west). The wall is 48 m (east–west). The wall is 52 m (east–west). The wall is 56 m (east–west). The wall is 60 m (east–west). The wall is 64 m (east–west). The wall is 68 m (east–west). The wall is 72 m (east–west). The wall is 76 m (east–west). The wall is 80 m (east–west). The wall is 84 m (east–west). The wall is 88 m (east–west). The wall is 92 m (east–west). The wall is 96 m (east–west). The wall is 100 m (east–west). The wall is 104 m (east–west). The wall is 108 m (east–west). The wall is 112 m (east–west). The wall is 116 m (east–west). The wall is 120 m (east–west). The wall is 124 m (east–west). The wall is 128 m (east–west). The wall is 132 m (east–west). The wall is 136 m (east–west). The wall is 140 m (east–west). The wall is 144 m (east–west). The wall is 148 m (east–west). The wall is 152 m (east–west). The wall is 156 m (east–west). The wall is 160 m (east–west). The wall is 164 m (east–west). The wall is 168 m (east–west). The wall is 172 m (east–west). The wall is 176 m (east–west). The wall is 180 m (east–west). The wall is 184 m (east–west). The wall is 188 m (east–west). The wall is 192 m (east–west). The wall is 196 m (east–west). The wall is 200 m (east–west). The wall is 204 m (east–west). The wall is 208 m (east–west). The wall is 212 m (east–west). The wall is 216 m (east–west). The wall is 220 m (east–west). The wall is 224 m (east–west). The wall is 228 m (east–west). The wall is 232 m (east–west). The wall is 236 m (east–west). The wall is 240 m (east–west). The wall is 244 m (east–west). The wall is 248 m (east–west). The wall is 252 m (east–west). The wall is 256 m (east–west). The wall is 260 m (east–west). The wall is 264 m (east–west). The wall is 268 m (east–west). The wall is 272 m (east–west). The wall is 276 m (east–west). The wall is 280 m (east–west).

The port of Kirrha was situated on the territory consacrated to Apollo (Aeschin. 3.107) and administered by the Amphiktyony, which interfered with the collection of harbour dues (Aeschin. 3.119; BCH 118 (1994) 99–112 (C5)) and in the accommodation arrangements (CID 1 10.2.2 (380)). Consequently, the port did not belong to the city of Delphi.

The extra-territorial status of Kirrha fits the only secure attestation of the ethnic Κιρραῖοι not related to the First Sacred War. At Dem. 18.152 the collective form Κιρραῖοι appears as a kind of pseudo-ethnic denoting the persons who in C4m had fraudulently held the land consecrated to Apollo, the Κιρραία χώρα (18.149). The suggestion that the Kirrhaioi struck coins is based on an erroneous reading (Williams (1972) 72), and the only epigraphical attestation of the ethnic is questionable (SGDI 2505 (C4–C3); cf. Rousset (2002) 33, 213).

The Κιρραία χώρα was part of a larger area called γῆ ἱερά (CID 1 10.21; Aeschin. 3.118). This sacred area
comprised, to the south, a large part of the Desphina peninsula (Rousset 1996), (2002) 58–59, and to the east it bordered on the Phokian poleis of Antikyra (no. 173) and Ambrysos (no. 171) (F.Delphes 11:4 280B–D (C28); Rousset (2002) 168–69). Agriculture and, in general, any kind of exploitation of the territory consecrated to Apollo was prohibited (CID I 11.15;–17; Aeschin. 3.108–9); only the herds of Apollo were allowed to graze the plain (Rousset 2002 192–205). The prohibition was repeatedly ignored by the Phokians during the Second and Third Sacred Wars (Paus. 10.15.1 (C5m); cf. Parke (1939) 65–71; Diod. 16.23.3 (C4m)). In 340, in the prelude to the Fourth Sacred War, the Amphissaiaioi were accused by Aischines of having built farms and brickworks in the plain, of having refortified and resettled the harbour town, and of having levied taxes from the visitors (Aeschin. 3.113, 119).

The only Classical classification of Kirrha as a polis occurs in this context. In a speech delivered in 340, Aischines reminds the Amphiktyonic Council of the oracle which triggered the First Sacred War in C6e: to fight the Kirrhaioi and Kragalidai (described as γείνηι) to ravage their territory (χώρα) and their town (πόλεις used in the urban sense), to expose the population to andrapodismos, to consecrate the land to Apollo, Artemis, Leto and Athena Pronoia, and to leave it unented (Aeschin. 3.108; Fontenrose (1978) 270). According to Aischines, the Council voted for war, and the Kirrhaioi and Kragalidai were exposed to the penalties described in the oracle, including the destruction of the polis (Aeschin. 3.109–11). It is unclear what genos denotes, and whether the polis is that of the Kirrhaioi or the Kragalidai, or a city common to both groups; see supra 402.

In addition to Aischines’ account of the historical background to the Fourth Sacred War, we have a number of later historiographic accounts of the First Sacred War (Kallisthenes (FGrHist 124) fr. 1; Hippoc. Ep. 27, pp. 406–8, Littré; Diod. 9.16; Strabo 9.3.3–4; Plut. Sol. 11; Polyain. 3.5, 6.13; Paus. 10.37.4–8; Pind. Hyp. Pyth. a and b). But these accounts are notoriously muddled and contradict one another (Robertson (1978); Lehmann (1980); Càssola (1980); Davies (1994)).

No Archaic remains antedating C6m have been found at Xeropighado (supra 419). No site fits the historiographic account of the events (siege and destruction of a fortified settlement), or the location (between Delphi and the Corinthian Gulf), or the chronology (C6e) (cf. Rousset (2002) 43–44). Another point to be taken into account is the marginal location of the port of Kirrha in relation to the peninsula of Desphina, which constituted the central part of the sacred land. This topography does not fix the historical traditions (cf., however, Pind. Hyp. Pyth. b).

The state of the evidence speaks against accepting Kirrha as a polis destroyed in C6e. On the contrary, the sources seem to substantiate the opposite view: that, in the Archaic period down to C6e, there was no polis of the Kirrhaioi whose territory had been consecrated to Apollo. The polis status of Kres/Kirrha in C6e is an aetiological invention which became prominent in the context of the Third and Fourth Sacred Wars in order to explain the obscure origin of the hiera ge. In that case, there is no reason to debate the historicity of such a polis any longer (see Krisa, supra 419).

184. Ledon (Ledontios) Map 55. Lat. 38.40, long. 22.40, but see infra. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: B. The only attestations of the toponym Λέδων, ουσία, η are in Paus. 10.2.2 and 33.1, also our only source for the city-ethnic: Λεδόντιος (10.33.1). The C3 bronze coins inscribed ΛΕ must be assigned to Elateia (no. 180); cf. supra 417.

Ledon is retrospectively called a polis by Pausanias, both in the political and in the urban sense: he tells us that Ledon, one of the poleis among the Phokians, was the fatherland of the strategos Philomelos (πατρίς δὲ αὐτῷ Λέδων τῶν Φωκείων ἤν πόλεων (10.2.2 (1357))); and we hear that Ledon was one of the poleis exposed to dioikismos in 346 (10.3.2). The urban sense is dominant at 10.33.1, where Pausanias reports that Ledon had once been a polis, but that in his time the few surviving Ledontians had abandoned their polis and settled near the Kephisos. Ledon’s fate in 346 shows that it was a member of the Phokian κοινοι (Paus. 10.3.2). The absence of Ledon from Herodotos’ account at 8.35 has induced some scholars to suppose that Ledon may have been the successor of one of the settlements that disappear in the course of the Classical period, e.g. Pedieis (no. 189) (Leake (1835) ii. 89), but such an assumption does not square with the documents found later (Hell. Oxy.; CID II 5; cf. infra 424).

The location of Ledon cannot be established with certainty. According to Paus. 10.33.1, it lay in the Kephisos valley: a road leads from Tithorea to the ancient site of Ledon, situated some 40 stades from the river Kephisos, where the Ledontians were settled in the time of Pausanias. In light of the uncertain nature of the physical remains, the identification of Ledon with the site of Gournes Aghia Marina (Dassios (1992) no. 32) is questionable. An identification with Modi remains more satisfactory (Tillard (1991) map; Klaffenbach (1937); Kirsten (1951) 716, 741; Barr.), although others have suggested an identification of Modi with Triteis
Lilaia (Lilaieus) Map 55. Lat. 38.40, long. 22.30. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: B. The toponym is Λιλαία, ἡ (Hom. Il. 2.523; Theopomp. fr. 385; Paus. 10.3.1 (rC4m); BCH 45 (1921) 1v.41 (C2f), Oulhen). The form Λίλαιον is late and is only found in literary sources (Ptol. Geog. 3.1.14; Suda A538). The city-ethnic is Λιλαιεύς (IG ix.1.111 (C4s)).

Lilaia is not explicitly named as a polis in any Archaic or Classical source. Paraphrasing Theopomp (fr. 385) and quoting the Homeric Catalogue of Ships (Il. 2.523), Strabo classifies Lilaia as a polis in the territorial sense (9.3.16). Theopomp is cited for the information that the river Kephisos rose near Lilaia (ἐκ Λιλαίας . . . Φωκικής πόλεως). We cannot be sure, however, that the term polis stems from Theopomp (cf. Jacoby ad loc.). Lilaia is retrospectively listed as a polis in the urban sense at Paus. 10.3.1, describing the dioikismos of the Phokian poleis in 346, and at 10.33.3 Pausanias reports that the city was refounded (ἀνωμείσθη αὐτοίς ἡ πόλις), presumably in C4 (infra).

The collective and external use of the city-ethnic is found in abbreviated form on some C5f coins (infra) and in an inscription of 322 recording the Phokians’ payment of the fine imposed in 346 (CID II 108.6). For the individual and external use, see the Λιλαιεύς and the Λιλαιεύς who made a contribution to the sanctuary of Apollo in Delphi (CID II 2.1.6, 9 (C4f) and Νικόδωρος Λιλαιεύς who in 337/6 witnessed the Phokians’ payment of the fine imposed in 346 (IG ix.1.111.14 = CID II 38).

Lilaia is not mentioned by Hdt. 8.33, 35, among the cities destroyed by the Persians in 480. Several commentators have suggested a topographical or historical explanation for the absence of Lilaia from Herodotos’ list. For Valkenaer’s unconvinving conjecture Λιλαιεύς instead of MSS Λιλαϊδεύν at Hdt. 8.35, see supra 409. Some have taken Herodotos’ omission of Lilaia as proof that, in 480, the city was part of Doris and had joined the other Dorian cities in siding with the Persians (Hdt. 8.31; cf. Leake (1835) ii. 89–90). A slightly modified version of this explanation has induced Williams (1972) 16–18 to interpret the coins inscribed ΛΙ as an autonomous issue struck immediately after the Persian invasion. But the coins are federal, and the precise dating is questionable, although stylistic criteria do point to a date in C5f (infra). The coins, the dioikismos in 346, and the recording of a Lilaian witnessing the payment of the Phokians’ fine in 337/6 (IG ix.1.111) are sufficient proof that Lilaia was a member of the Phokian koinon in C5 and C4. Consequently, the inclusion of Lilaia as one of a Dorian hexapolis must be abandoned (Rousset (1989) 224–25).

After the dioikismos of 346 (Paus. 10.3.2) Lilaia was refounded (Paus. 10.33.3). Stamped tiles of the Hellenistic period (C3?) inscribed ΛΙΛΑΙΕΩΝ have been found in the sanctuary of Artemis at Erochos, from which Robert and Robert (BE (1978) 236) inferred that a sympoliteia had resulted in the incorporation of Erochos (no. 181) into Lilaia. In this context it may be worth noting that Lilaia is the only Phokian polis that had two eponymous officials, as attested in a series of documents of C3 (F.Delphes III 11.4 133–35). Later documents mention only one eponymous archon (F.Delphes III 11.2 125 (C2s)).

Lilaia bordered to the south on the foothills of Parnassos, to the east on a declivity dominating a small valley beneath which was the source of the river Kephisos. The lower town was presumably situated here (Frazer (1898) 411–44; Dassios (1992) 29–30 no. 5). Today only the uppermost part of the circuit wall is preserved (plan in Tillard (1911) 70). It is a kind of acropolis, and its connection with the circuit wall enclosing the lower town can no longer be determined. It is in isodomic masonry, with bevelled joints, and cannot be dated with certainty. A date after 338 was suggested by Tillard (1911) 75, a date c.356–46 by Ober (1992) 163–64. The wall is mentioned in connection with the siege of Lilaia by Philip V in C3 (Paus. 10.33.3).

It is uncertain, however, whether Archaic Lilaia was situated here. On a hill c.1 km north-west of the C4 fortifications are remains of a wall in polygonal masonry, perhaps of C6, covering an area of c.100 by 60 m (Keramopoulos (1917) 53 (C6?); Kase et al. (1991) 53 pl. 4.14 and 35; Dassios (1992) no. 3). Sherds of the early, middle and late Helladic periods have been found as well (Lazenby and Hope Simpson (1970) 44; Teiresias (1979) 19–27). Rather than a second-order settlement depending on Lilaia (Dassios (1992) no. 3), this site may well be Archaic Lilaia. Such a hypothesis is supported by the fact that excavations of the Classical site of Lilaia have produced no material of the Archaic period (ArchDelt 33 (1978) B1, 154–64). The hypothesis disproves the topographical argument adduced by Tillard (1911) 63 in order to explain the absence of Lilaia from Herodotos’ account at 8.33–35 (supra).

Pausanias mentions an agora and a theatre, both undated (10.33.4). The source of the river Kephisos was traditionally
located at Lilaia (Hom. Il. 2.523; Theopomp. fr. 385; Paus. 9.24.1). It was the object of a cult performed by the Lilaianks (Paus. 10.8.10), and a priest of Kephisos is mentioned in the documents of C3 mentioned above (F.Delphes III 1.4 133–35). A retaining wall in polygonal masonry near the source of the river may be dated to C6 (Frazier (1898) 414).

Some silver coins, usually dated to the period 480–421, were struck by the Phokian koinon, but instead of ΦΘ the legend is AI, probably an abbreviated form of ΑΙΔΟΥΕΩΝ, indicating that they were struck for Lilaia in particular. Denominations: triobol, diobol and obol on the Aiginetan standard. Types: obv. bull’s head facing; rev. head of nymph or forepart of wild boar; legend: AI (Head, HN² 343; Babelon, Traitée iii.3: 349–50 nos. 420–21).

186. Medeon (Medeonios) Map 55. Lat. 38.20, long. 22.40. Size of territory: probably 2. Type: B. The toponym is Μεδεών -ων, ó (Syll. 667.36 (C2 or C2f); Paus. 10.3.2; Steph. Byz. 439.19). The city-ethnic is Μεδεώνος (CID 11 37.3–4 (C48); SGDI 2057.2 (C2e)). Medeon is not called a polis in any Archaic or Classical source, and the first explicit attestation of a πόλις Μεδεωνίων is in a C2e sympoliteia agreement between Medeon and Stiris (no. 193) (Syll. 667.6 (C2 or C2f); cf. Migeotte (1984) no. 28); but Medeon is retrospectively attested as a polis in the urban sense at Paus. 10.3.2, where it is listed among the Phokian cities dioikised in 346. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in an inscription of 322 recording the Phokians’ payment of the fine imposed in 346 (CID 11 108.1: Μεδεωνίων) and internally in the C2f sympoliteia agreement (supra). For the individual and external use, see Θρασύβουλος Αθηρμόνος Μεδεώνος, the archon of the Phokian koinon in 342 (CID 11 37.3–4).

The fate of the city in 346 as well as the federal archon of 342 ensure that Medeon was a member of the Phokian koinon. There is no other public act of Medeon than the C2 sympoliteia agreement according to which Medeon disappears as a polis and becomes a phratria of Stiris.

The defence circuit surrounding the town of Medeon is built in an unparalleled type of regular polygonal masonry, with three towers in the north-western part (Camp (2000) 42). It measures 200 m (east-west) by 150 m (north-south) (Vatin (1969) 4 fig. 4). On the top of the hill are numerous terraces on which are the remains of some (public?) buildings. The cemetery was abandoned in C3m, according to Robert and Robert (BE (1970) 310) in connection with the sympoliteia which was probably entailed by a synoikismos. Only ruins were left in the time of Pausanias (10.36.6).

187. Neon (Ne(-))/Tithorea (Tithoreus) Map 55. Lat. 38.35, long. 22.40. Size of territory: probably 2. Type: A. The older toponym is Νεών (Hdt. 8.32.1) or Νεών (Paus. 10.2.4) or Νέων (Dem. 19.148) or Νεώνεις (Andron) (FGrHist 324) fr. 23; Paus. 10.3.2; cf. Harding (1994) 119–20). The corresponding city-ethnic is attested only in abbreviated form (as ΝΕ) on some C5 coins (infra). Steph. Byz. 473.11 suggests the forms Νεώνος and Νεώνεις. The later toponym is Τιθορέα, η (Hdt. 8.32, cited by Paus. 10.32.8–9, in both sources designating a summit of Parnassos). At Paus. 10.32.9 the toponym is taken to designate first the region and later the town, replacing the older toponym of Νεών. The form Τιθόρα is attested both in texts and in inscriptions (Plut. Sull. 15.5 (rC1); IG IX.1 190.2 (2nd century AD)). Τιθόρα (BCH 45 (1921) 111.29, Oulhen (C2f) and Τιθόρα (CID 11 131.9 (C3)) are variant forms found only in inscriptions. The city-ethnic is Τιθορεως, attested only in inscriptions (IG XI.1 99.3 (C3l)). Τιθορεως is attested both in inscriptions and in literary texts (IG IX.1 66.25 (C2m); Paus. 10.32.11). Τιθορεως is attested once (Paus. 9.17.4).

Neon is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 8.32.1 and 8.33 and, retrospectively, at Paus. 10.3.2 and 32.9, in both authors in connection with Xerxes’ invasion of Phokis in 480, when Neon was burnt to the ground. Pausanias mentions Neon as a polis in the urban sense in connection with the battle of Neon in 354 (10.2.4) and also in connection with the dioikismos of the Phokian cities in 346 after the Third Sacred War (10.3.2–3). The collective and internal use of the city-ethnic is attested in abbreviated form (ΝΕ) on C5 coins (infra). All attestations of the city-ethnic Τιθο(ρ)εως are Hellenistic or later (supra).

The problem of whether Tithorea was built on the top of the ruins of Neon depends on how one interprets Hdt. 8.32.1 and the slightly different story told by Plut. Sull. 15.5 and Paus. 10.32.9. Pace Leake (1835) ii. 79 and Ulrichs (1863) 119, the preferable solution is, with Tillard (1911) 56–60, to follow the account found in Pausanias: (a) in 480 Tithorea was the name of the peak of the mountain towering over the polis of Neon (Hdt. 8.32.1; Paus. 10.32.9); (b) the toponym Tithorea came to designate the surrounding region, i.e the territory of the polis of Neon (Paus. 10.32.9: ἀπάσης τῇ χώρῃ); (c) the polis of Neon, demolished in 346, took the name of Tithorea when it was refounded on the same site by people returning from their temporary residence in the surrounding villages (Paus. 10.32.9: ἀνακατισθῆσαν ἀπὸ τῶν κωμῶν). It follows that the attempts to locate Neon somewhere in the Kephisos valley must be abandoned (Dassios (1992) no. 26, who identifies Neon with Palai Thiva; see Pediies (no. 189)). The date
of the refoundation is not known, and the earliest attestations of the new toponym (CID ii 131) and city-ethnic (IG 11.1.99) are of C3.

The federal coins inscribed NE, as well the fate of the city in 346, ensure that Neon was a member of the Phokian koionon. The classification of Tithorea as a Boiotian polis at Steph. Byz. 623.14 is probably just a mistake: the Theban occupation of Neon during the Third Sacred War, from 354 to 349, was apparently not followed by a political annexation of the city (Paus. 10.2.4; Dem. 19.148; Buckler (1989) 44–45, 100–11).

The events of 349 (Dem. 19.148) suggest that the city was fortified, but the remains of fortifications still visible may well be of a later date. The north-eastern part of the wall with its towers is in a fine state of preservation, and the date would be of a later date. The north-eastern part of the wall is fortified, but the remains of fortifications still visible may be of a later date. The wall enclosed an area of max. 580 m (north–south) × 250 m (east–west). Paus. 10.32.10 mentions a peribolos wall enclosing an ancient agora. He also mentions several undated sanctuaries and the tomb of Antiope and Phokos (10.17.4, 32.10). According to legend, the city of Phokos was named after Phokos, who settled at Tithorea (Paus. 2.4.3, 29.3, 10.1.1).

Some silver obols, usually dated to the period 480–421, were struck by the Phokian koionon, but with the legend NE on the reverse, probably an abbreviated form of the city-ethnic, indicating that they were struck for Neon in particular. Types: obv. bull’s head facing; legend: ΟΦ; rev. forepart of wild boar in incuse square; legend: ΝΕ (Head, HNP 343; Babelon, Traité ii.3, 349–52 no. 422; Williams (1972) 42).

188. Parapotamioi (Parapotamians) Map 55. Lat. 38.35, long. 22.50. Size of territory: probably 2. Type: A. The toponym is Parapotámioi, αἺ (Hdt. 8.33; Strabo 9.3.16; Paus. 10.3.1); the form Parapotamía, η is attested only twice (Strabo 9.3.16 and Steph. Byz. 503.4), and dates from a time when Parapotamioi had disappeared as a city and denoted a geographical area only. The city-ethnic is Parapotámios (Hell. Oxy. 21.5; Paus. 10.33.8 (r586)). In the Homeric Catalogue of Ships the line όι ι Τ’ άρα παρ’ ποτάμιον Κήφισον έναιον (Il. 2.522) is commonly interpreted as a periphrastic reference to the Parapotamioi (Paus. 10.3.2, contra 10.33.7). The pseudo-ethnics Ἐπικηφήσιοι (schol. Hom. Il. 2.522) and Παρακηφήσιοι (Steph. Byz. 707.6) are derived from the line in Homer and have no independent authority. All indisputable attestations of the city-ethnic are in literary sources, and at SEG 3 408.7 [Τ]αρα[ν]/τήκα[τάκα]. Parapotamioi is called a polis in the urban sense by Hdt. (8.33) in connection with Xerxes’ invasion of Phokis in 470, when Parapotamioi was burnt to the ground, and by Paus. 10.3.1–2 in connection with the dioikismos in 346. It is implicitly called a polis by Hell. Oxy. 21.5 in connection with the Boiotian campaign into Phokis in 395, where polis is used in the urban sense with the political sense as a possible connotation (Hansen and Nielsen (2000) 146). The collective and external use of the city-ethnic is attested in Hell. Oxy. 21.5. The only attestation of the individual and external use is Pausanias’ mention of an Αἰχµέας Παραπόταµιος, allegedly a victor in the first Pythian Games of 586 (10.33.7). The merging of the toponym and the city-ethnic makes it difficult to distinguish between attestations of the city-ethnic (found at Hell. Oxy. 21.5: ἦ τῶν Παραποταµίων χώρα) and the toponym (found at Plut. Sull. 16.12: ἦ ἀκρόπολις τῶν Παραποτάµιων).

Parapotamioi was situated on the north-western side of a hill called Ἡδύλειον, at a strategic point controlling the access to the Kephisos valley and close to the frontier of Phokis (schol. Dem. 19.148, nos. 313–14cf, Dilts; cf. Daviero-Rocchi (1993)). Owing to its strategic position, it repeatedly became the battleground where the Phokian and Boiotian armies clashed during the Third Sacred War (Theopomp. fr. 385 = Strabo 9.3.16; schol. Dem. 19.20, no. 73b, Dilts; cf. Plut. Sull. 16.8).

At Hell. Oxy. 21.5 the territory is referred to as ἦ τῶν Παραποτάµιων χώρα. According to Theopomp. fr. 385, Parapotamioi bordered on the poleis of Ambryssos (no. 171), Phanoteus (no. 190) and Daulis (no. 176). (Ambryssos is a mistake, but so far no satisfactory emendation has been suggested (Fossey (1986) 69; Marctote (1988) 489; cf. the comment in the Budé edn. ad loc.).

Parapotamioi was never rebuilt after the dioikismos in 346, but its population was distributed between the other poleis refounded in the 330s by the Boiotians and Athenians (Paus. 10.33.8 (rC48); cf. Plut. Sull. 16.12; Strabo 9.3.16). The polis ceased to exist, and its territory was presumably divided among some or all of the neighbouring poleis.

Parapotamioi had a small defence circuit of 0.100 m × 80 m (Fossey (1986) 69–71; Dassios (1992) no. 51). The wall was built of small stones in Lesbian polygonal masonry. The workmanship is undistinguished, and the wall is difficult to date (Frazer (1898) 419; Fossey (1986) 69). This defence
circuit was retrospectively described as the *akropolis* of Parapotamoi by Plut. *Sull.* 16.12.

189. **Pedieis** (Pedieis)  Map 55. Lat. 38.40, long. 22.40, but see *infra* for a discussion of the unresolved location. Size of territory: probably 2 (if identified with Palaia Phiva). Type: A. The toponym is *Πεδείες, οἶ* (Hdt. 8.35; *Hell. Oxy.* 21.5). The city-ethnic is *Πεδείως* (*CID* 11.5.54: Πεδείες), dated between 373 and 346 (*CID* 11 5.11.55) and headed by the formula: τάος τομιοισιν γ'ινακα (11.25–26). This list testifies to the collective and external use of the city-ethnic.

In 395 the Boiotians overran the plain round Elateia and Pedieis (no. 189), and the population settled in the plain (*Hell. Oxy.* 21.5). Pedieis is not listed by Pausanias among the *poleis* exposed to *dioikismos* in 346; but that Pedieis was still a member of the Phokian *koinon* in 479 can be inferred from the Boiotian attack in 395 and the occurrence of the city-ethnic in *CID* 11 5.11.54: Πεδείου *Πεδείως*, dated between 373 and 346. The presumption is that Pausanias omitted the city from his list by mistake, and that it disappeared for good in 346 (cf. Parapotamoi (no. 188)). But, depending on the date of *CID* 11 5, Pedieis may have disappeared earlier, which would also explain Pausanias' silence. For some historians' unconvincing link between Ledon (no. 184) and Pedieis, see *infra* 420.

Pedieis is still unlocated. The toponym as well as the account of *Hell. Oxy.* indicate that the city was situated in the plain, and probably adjacent to Elateia (no. 180). In Hdt. 8.33, Pedieis is placed between Neon (no. 187) and Trites (no. 196), itself an unlocated town. Consequently, Pedieis is normally identified with the ancient site of Palaia Phiva (Schober (1924) 38; Klaffenbach (1937); *Barr.*). The remains described by early travellers are no more visible (Ulrichs (1863) ii. 119; Frazer (1898) 407; Dassios (1992) no. 26): viz. a quadrangular defence circuit with a side of c.790 m and interval towers, semicircular on the outside and rectangular on the inner side. Such a description does not fit an Archaic wall, and accordingly Klaffenbach (1937) preferred to identify this site with the later site of Ledon (Paus. 10.33.1). But that remains a doubtful hypothesis. The recently described defence circuit at Vourlia (Rousset (1999) no. 16) is an alternative candidate according to Dassios (1992) no. 20.

190. **Phanoteus, Panopeus** (Phanoteus, Panopeus)  Map 55. Lat. 38.30, long. 22.50. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is *Πανοπεύς* (Hom. *II*. 2.520; Ps.-*Skylax* 61; Ephor. fr. 31a), ὥ (Paus. 10.4.2), ὅ (Εὐμν. *Magn.* 111.25) or, in the plural, *Πανοπεύς* (Hdt. 8.34; Strabo 9.3.12 = Ephor. fr. 31b) or *Φανοτεύς* (*Thuc.* 4.89.1; Strabo 9.3.14) or *Φανατεύς* (*CID* 19.D.29–30 (C41m); *IG* vii 3376.9 (C2)). A variant form, *Φανοτεία*, is exclusively attested in late authors (Polyp. 29.12.7; *Livy* 32.18). For other forms invented by the grammarians, see Steph. *Byz.* 657.17–18. The city-ethnic is identical with the toponym, and is either *Πανοπεύς* (Hdt. 8.35.1; Theopomp. fr. 385) or *Φανοτεύς* (*Hell. Oxy.* 21.5; *CID* 11 24.11.14 (C41s); *SEG* 42.479.4 (C3)) or *Φανατεύς* (*SGDI* 1770.1 (C2f)); *IG* vii 3376.12 (C2)). According to Strabo 9.3.14, *Πανοπεύς* is the older, and *Φανοτεύς* the later, form of the toponym, and the same observation applies to the city-ethnic. *Πανοπεύς* is found in literary sources only, whereas *Φανοτεύς* both in literary sources and in inscriptions, whereas *Φανατεύς* is an epichoric variant form attested exclusively in inscriptions. At *SEG* 3 345.3, the restoration of *Πανοπεύς* is not beyond suspicion.

Phanoteus is called a *polis* in the urban sense, with the political sense as a connotation, at Hdt. 8.35.1 in connection with Xerxes' invasion of Phokis in 480, when the town was burned to the ground, and it is listed as a *polis* in the political sense in the Delphic *naupoioi* accounts, where the Pedieis appear as contributors in a list dated between 373 and 346 (*CID* 11 5.11.55) and headed by the formula: τάος τομιοισιν γ'ινακα (11.25–26). This list testifies to the collective and external use of the city-ethnic. In connection with Xerxes' invasion of Phokis in 480, when the town was burned to the ground, and it is listed as a *polis* in the political sense in the Delphic *naupoioi* accounts, where the Pedieis appear as contributors in a list dated between 373 and 346 (*CID* 11 5.11.55) and headed by the formula: τάος τομιοισιν γ'ινακα (11.25–26). This list testifies to the collective and external use of the city-ethnic. The city-ethnic is identified with the toponym, and is either *Πανοπεύς* (Hdt. 8.35.1; Theopomp. fr. 385) or *Φανοτεύς* (*Hell. Oxy.* 21.5; *CID* 11 24.11.14 (C41s); *SEG* 42.479.4 (C3)) or *Φανατεύς* (*SGDI* 1770.1 (C2f)); *IG* vii 3376.12 (C2)). According to Strabo 9.3.14, *Πανοπεύς* is the older, and *Φανοτεύς* the later, form of the toponym, and the same observation applies to the city-ethnic. *Πανοπεύς* is found in literary sources only, whereas *Φανοτεύς* both in literary sources and in inscriptions, whereas *Φανατεύς* is an epichoric variant form attested exclusively in inscriptions. At *SEG* 3 345.3, the restoration of *Πανοπεύς* is not beyond suspicion.
The Boiotian attack on Phanoteus in 395, as well as the *dioikismos* in 346, ensure that the *polis* belonged to the Phokian *koinon* in C4. Membership in C5, too, is to be assumed, but there is no explicit evidence (Thuc. 4.76.3, 89.1).

The eponymous hero of Phanoteus was Phanoteus, son of Phokos (Steph. Byz. 500.19; Paus. 2.29.2), and this foundation myth can be traced back to Archaic and Classical sources (Hom. *Il.* 23.665; Soph. *El.* 45; Pl. *Ion* 533B, Resp. 620C).

Phanoteus is situated on a steep-sided hill measuring c.600 m by 100 m, described as an *áker* by Polyb. 5.96.5. From *Hell. Oxy.* 21.5 it can be inferred that the site was fortified in 395. On the eminence are two types of remains: (a) on the southern slope is a stretch of a wall in "cyclopean" masonry, often interpreted as traces of a Mycenaean acropolis (Lazenby and Hope Simpson (1970) 42–43; Fossey (1986) 63–64; cf. Hom. *Il.* 17.307–8; Paus. 10.4.2); (b) apart from stretches where the escarpment offers sufficient protection, the entire hill is enclosed by a defence circuit, with eight interval towers on the western and southern sides. The length of the *peribolos* was seven stades according to Paus. 10.4.2. The wall was built partly in irregular trapezoidal masonry, unique in Phokis, and partly in isodomic masonry (Kirsten (1949a) 641–47; Fossey (1986) 63–64). A part of the wall may correspond to an internal *diateichisma*. This fortification, of which the western and southern parts are well preserved, cannot be dated with certainty: Camp (2000) 45 suggests the late 340s; but according to Winter (1971) it is "post Chaironeian", see supra 401. The early travellers describe a section of a wall which is no longer visible, perhaps the defence circuit of the lower town (Leake (1835) ii. 110–11; Frazer (1898) 218; Camp *et al.* (1997) 267 n. 29). The occupation of the suburbs (*proastion*) by the Boiotians, mentioned at *Hell. Oxy.* 21.5, indicates that the lower town was not fortified in 395. The famous passage in Paus. 10.4.1 about the absence of public buildings of Phanoteus in his own time carries no weight as evidence for the Archaic and Classical periods (Alcock (1995) 326–27).

**191. Phlygonion** (P(h)lygonus)  Map 55. Lat. 38.30, long. 22.45. Size of territory: probably 2. Type: B. In literary sources the toponym is *Phlygonion*, τό (Paus. 10.3.2 (tC4m); Steph. *Byz.* 668.11; cf. *Phlegya* at Plin. *HN* 4.7.12). The variant form *Phlegonia*, suggested by Steph. *Byz.* 668.12, is either a mere invention of the grammarians or a misinterpreted form of the name of the territory. In inscriptions of C3l and C2e the city-ethnic is invariably *Phlygonēs* (*SGDI* 2049 (C3l); for a list of attestations, see Daux (1936) 234–58; Lerat (1952) i. 59–60), but in a C2m regulation of the frontiers the city-ethnic is *Phlygonēs* (*F.Delphes* 111.2 136.22) or *Φλυγονεῖς* (*F.Delphes* 111.2 136.29). The only attestation of the city-ethnic in an inscription of the Classical period is restored, viz. *Φλυγονεῖς* or *[Π]λυγονεῖς* in *CID* 1108.10 (322). *Φλυγονεῖς* and *Φλυγόνος* are found only in Steph. *Byz.* 668.12 and are presumably invented by the grammarians.

Phlygonion is recorded in Pausanias’ list of *poleis* exposed to *dioikismos* in 346 (10.3.2). Pausanias’ information is confirmed by the Delphic accounts, where the Phlygonians ([(Φ)Πλυγονεῖς] are recorded among the Phokian communities that paid the annual fine (*CID* 1108.10 (322)). Both sources ensure that Phlygonion belonged to the Phokian *koinon* in C4. The collective and external use of the city-ethnic is attested in this inscription. The individual and external use is attested in the Delphic manumission inscriptions of C3l/C2e (*SGDI* 2049.3, 20).

The existence of two different city-ethnics—viz. *Πλυγόνος* versus *Φλυγονεῖς* derived from *Φλυγόνος*—has for a long time induced commentators to postulate the existence of two different cities: the Phokian city of *Φλυγόνοις* inhabited by the *Φλυγονεῖς*, and the Lokrian city of *Πλυγόνος*, an unattested toponym derived from the city-ethnic *Πλυγονεῖς* (Schober (1924) 39–40; Daux (1936) 234–58; Lerat (1952) i. 59–61; contra Colin at *F.Delphes* 111.2 136), but both city-ethnics do in fact denote the same city (*Rousset* (1999) 43 n. 37 and (2002) 20–27).

Although the Persians must have passed Phlygonion on their march in 480 from Phanoteus to Delphi, the city is absent from Herodotos’ list at 8.35. But no argument from silence can be based on this chapter. The *dioikismos* of Phlygonion in 346 (Paus. 10.3.2), as well as the Phlygonians’ contribution to the fine in 322 (*CID* 1108) ensure that Phlygonion was a member of the Phokian *koinon*. The inscriptions of C2f show that, in 191/90, all Phlygonians had become Delphians (Daux (1936) 252–53). The C2m regulation of the frontiers between the Delphians (no. 177) and, on the other hand, the Ambryssians (no. 171) and Phlygonians shows that the two latter cities by then were united in a *sympolitia* (*F.Delphes* 111.2 136).

The ruins at Bania, where *Αιolidai has often been located (no. 170), are to be identified with Phlygonion (Robert and Robert, *BE* (1941) 8; *Rousset* (1999) 43 n. 37, (2002) 45). At the site is a small defence circuit in isodomic masonry, but its poor state of preservation does not allow of any more precise description (Schober (1924) 22; *Dassios* (1992) no. 113; *Rousset* (2002) 63 no. 69).
192. Po[---] Map 55. Unlocated. Type: C. The preamble of a payment in 337/6 of the fine imposed on the Phokians in 346 lists as one of the archons of the Phokians a Κρίτωνος Πο[---]ος (CID 11 38.5). The letters Πο[---]ος must be a city-ethnic in the genitive case, but no other source testifies to a Phokian city whose city-ethnic fits Πο[...4–5...]. So far no satisfactory restoration or emendation has been suggested. J. Bousquet’s suggestion at CID 11 38 is unconvincing. The place called Πούρεω (Syll. 3 826.1134 = E.Delphes 111.4 280.C.34) from which he derived Πο[υρεώς]ος is certainly not the name of a community. We have a choice among four possibilities: (a) an error by the mason; (b) a dialectal variant of a well-known Phokian ethnic Π/Πο[υλδί]ος; (c) an ethnic of an unlocated polis of central Greece called Πο[ταναί]ος (Lerat 1952 i. 62–64, contra Rousset (2002) 15, 38); or (d) an ethnic of an otherwise unknown Phokian polis.

193. Stiris (Stirios) Map 55. Lat. 38.25, long. 22.45. Size of territory: 2. Type: B. The toponym is Στίρις, -ος (Syll. 3 647.24 (C2f); Paus. 10.3.2 (1346)) or Στείρης (IG IX.1 36.1 (C2f); Plut. Cim. 1.9). The city-ethnic is Στίριος (SGDI 1727.6 (C2f); Syll. 3 647.15 or Στείρος (SEG 42 479.3 (C3); Syll. 3 647.9). The variant form Στείρεύς is attested once in an inscription of the Roman Imperial period (IG IX.1 48.7 (third century AD), and Στείρης is found once (Paus. 10.3.2). Neither the toponym nor the city-ethnic is attested prior to the Hellenistic period; but Stiris is listed by Paus. 10.2.3 as one of the poleis exposed to dioikismos in 346, which shows that, in C4m, it was a member of the Phokian koinon.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in a sympoliteia agreement with Medeon (no. 186) of C2f? (Syll. 3 647) and externally in a C3 inscription which regulates the frontier between Stiris and Phanoteus (no. 190; SEG 42 479 (C3b)). The individual and external use is found in a Delphic manumission inscription of C2f (SGDI 1727).

Paus. 10.35.10 records a sanctuary of Demeter Stritis with a temple in mudbrick in which was a very old image of the goddess. The epithet indicates that Demeter was the protective divinity of Stiris.

Stiris is situated on a low rocky hill, c.700 m long and 100 m across. Along the east side are the remains of an undated defence circuit in isodomic masonry (Fossey (1986) 32–33; Dassios (1992) no. 75; McInerney (1999) 319–20).

194. Teithronion (Teithronions) Map 55. Lat. 38.40, long. 22.35. Size of territory: probably 2. Type: A. As attested in inscriptions, the toponym is Τεθρώνιος (SEG 1 198.5 (C4f/C3e); SEG 16 351.3 (c.200); SGDI 1983.3–4 (C2e)); in literary sources it is Τεθρώνιος, τό (Hdt. 8.33 most MSS; Paus. 10.3.2) or Τεθρώνος (Hdt. 8.33, RSV) or Τεθρώνος (Paus. 10.33.12; Steph. Byz. 624.6). On Θρώνος at Ps.-Skylax 61, see Nielsen (2000) 107–8. The city-ethnic is Τεθρώνος (CID 11 108.7, 322; SGDI 1983.13 (C2e); in CID 11 5.11.50 (C4f) it is combined with the regional ethnic: Φωκείς Τεθρώνοι).

Teithronion is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 8.33 and, retrospectively, at Paus. 10.3.1 and 2, in both passages in connection with Xerxes’ invasion of Phokis in 480, when the town was burned to the ground. Paus. 10.3.2–3 treats Teithronion as a polis in the urban sense in connection with the dioikismos of the Phokian cities in 346 after the Third Sacred War. The city is listed as a polis in the political sense in the Delphic paroikiai accounts, where the Teithronion appears as contributors in a list (CID 11 5.11.50) headed by the formula: ταίδε τόμι πολίων ἔννοιαν (11.25–26). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in one of the receipts of the Phokian fine (CID 11 108.7 (322)), and internally in a proxeny decree of C3–C2 (IG XI.1 222.10); the individual use is attested externally in a C4–C3 proxeny decree from Delphi (no. 177) (SEG 1 198.5).

The dioikismos of Teithronion in 346 (Paus. 10.3.2), as well as the city’s contribution in 322 to the payment of the fine (CID 11 108.7), ensure that Teithronion was a member of the Phokian koinon.

Teithronion is situated north of the river Kephisos at a bend of the river which surrounds the southern part of the city. It was protected by a defence circuit (c.400 × 200 m) in pseudo-isodomic masonry, with interval towers (Frazer (1898) 422–23; Dassios (1992) no. 14).

Tithorea (Tithorea) See 187. Neon (Ne(-)).

195. Trachis (Trachinios) Map 55. Lat. 38.20, long. 22.45, but see infra for a discussion of the unresolved location. Type: B. The toponym is Τραχίς, ἡ (Strabo 9.3.14) or Τραξίς (Paus. 10.3.2). The only attestation of a city-ethnic is at Strabo 9.3.14: οἱ δ’ ἐνοικοῦντες Τραχίνιοι. Neither the toponym nor the city-ethnic is attested prior to the Hellenistic period; but Trachis is listed by Paus. 10.2.3 as one of the poleis exposed to dioikismos in 346, which shows that, in C4m, it was a member of the Phokian koinon.

The location of Trachis is unknown. The only indication is provided by Strabo, who places Trachis near Labadeia (no. 211) (9.3.14: πλησίον δὲ Λεβαδείας καὶ ἡ Τραχίνις). This piece of evidence leaves us with a choice between three different sites: Kyriaki (Fossey (1986) 35–39; Barr.), Kastro-Tservesi (Tillard (1911) 66–68; Fossey (1986) 54–56; Dassios (1992) no. 62) and Korakolithos (Dassios (1992) no. 57).
McInerney (1999) 300–3). Kastraki should probably be identified with Helikonioi (supra 403). At Kastro-Tserei there is a small enclosure of roughly triangular shape, but only the north-western side of c.100 m and the north-eastern side of c.180 m are fortified. The longer southern side is protected by steep cliffs. The wall is in rusticated isodomic masonry which cannot antedate the Classical period, and no traces of the Archaic period have been found. Thus, the identification with *Aiolidai as proposed by Tillard (1911) 66–68 is dubious, whereas the site might fit Trachis (Rousset 1999) 43 n. 46, but more cautiously (2002) 45–46. The topographic information found in Strabo, however, makes a third site a better candidate: viz. Korakolithos. A small emer- nence is all that is still visible (Fossey (1986) 59; Dassios 1992) no. 57, but the existance of a settlement is indicated by a Cs5–Csf cemetery found c.1 km to the west (ArchDelt 33 (1978) 152). Furthermore, Lolling mentions the remains—no longer visible—of a defence circuit of 240 “paces” (= 200m?) with the foundations of a tower. However, the regulation of the frontier between Phanoteus (no. 190) and Stiris (no. 193) (SEG 42 479) is not easily compatible with a C3 polis situated at Korakolithos; cf. the map in Roussel and Katzouros (1992) 211.

196. Triteis  Map 55. Unlocated. Type: A. Triteis is known exclusively from one passage in Herodotos: at 8.35, enumerating the Phokian poleis burnt down by the Persians in 480, Herodotos records *Τριτείες* between Pedieis (no. 189) and Elateia (no. 180). The city is not mentioned in any other source (Lerat (1952) i. 51 n. 7). At 8.32.2 Herodotos tells us that many Phokians found refuge at Amphissa (no. 158) in Lokris, and Steph. Byz. 637.16 reports that there was a *Τριτεία* situated between Phokis and West Lokris. On the basis of these two pieces of evidence Oldfather (1939) sug- gests that Lokrian Tritea, attested from C5m only, may have been founded by Triteians coming from Phokis; but cf. Klaffenbach (1937).

The location of Triteis is discussed by McInerney (1999) 281–83. The text of Herodotos suggests a location west of Elateia, which has induced some scholars to identify Triteis with the fortified enclosure at Modi (Lolling (1989) 90; Schober (1924) 43). But the chronology of this small fortifi- cation fits Ledon (no. 184) better than Triteis. Alternatively, Triteis has been located between Modi and Elateia at the vil- lage of Turkochorion-Panagitsa (Kirsten (1951) 741 no. 106, followed by Dakoronia, ArchDelt (1979) 194). To date, how- ever, the only remains found there are of a cemetery used from the Geometric to the Classical period (ArchDelt 34 (1979) 193–94, 36 (1981) 222, 43 (1988) 232–33, 44 (1989) 221). The recent discovery of a fortification 2 km south-east of Modi (Dassios (1992) no. 20; cf. supra Pedieis) invites a reassessment of the issue.

197. Troneia (Troneieus)  Map 55. Lat. 38.45, long. 22.40. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: B. The toponym is *Τρώνεια*, η, attested in a Delphic manumission act to designate the place of origin of the slave (SGDI 2132.3 (188/7)). Steph. Byz. 213.16 and Hdn. ii 1 276.35 both mention a *Γρώνεια*, πόλις Φωκίδος. This *Γρώνεια* is usually interpreted as a misreading of *Τρώνεια* (Robert (1960) 74–75; cf. supra 403, s. v. Groneia). The masculine form of the city-ethnic has become an issue. In an inscription of 322 recording the Phokians’ pay- ment of the fine imposed in 346 (CID ii 108), one of the contrib- uting communities is recorded as [--]ΤΡΩΝΕΙΕΙΣ (9), usually interpreted as the city-ethnic Τρονειείς. But an equally possible restoration is [--]Πολειείς, derived from the toponym Πατρονείς attested in Plut. Sull. 15.6 (Robert (1960) 75). Patronis, however, seems to be a ghost toponym (supra 404), from which it follows that the Troneies are in fact attested in the inscription.

The only sources to classify Troneia as a polis are Steph. Byz. and Herodian (accepting the conjecture *Τρώνεια* for *Γρώνεια*). Furthermore, Troneia is absent from Pausanias’ list of poleis exposed to dioikismos in 346 (10.3.1–2), but its contribution to the fine in 322 ensures that it was a member of the Phokian koinon and undoubtedly a polis. The external use of the city-ethnic is attested collectively in the payment of 322 (CID ii 108.9). The individual and external use of the city-ethnic can be deduced from a manumission of C26 in which the origin of a slave is recorded as τὸ γένος Τρωνείδα (SGDI 2130.3).

Paus. 10.4.10 mentions a part of the territory of Daulis (no. 176) called *Τρώνια* in which was situated the shrine of a founder hero, either Xanthippos or Phokos, who reappears in a second century AD inscription from Daulis (IG ix.1 61.50). This *Tronis* is undoubtedly the name of the territory of the city of Troneia, and the presumption is that, in the time of Pausanias, Troneia had been incorporated into Daulis (Robert (1960) 78–80).

Interpreting the three sources (Paus. 10.4.10; Plut. Sull. 15.6; IG ix.1 61), all commentators agree that Troneia should be located in the neighbourhood of Daulis, and two identi- fications have been suggested: (a) Kato Tseres, south of Daulis, and (b) Ag. Marina west of Daulis.

Re (a): the historians who distinguished Troneia from Patronis suggested the site of Kato Tseres lying south of
Daulis (Kirsten (1939)). Considering that this site can be identified with a small fort only, Robert (1960) 78–82 cautiously suggested a location somewhat south of Daulis (contra McInerney (1997) 197–99).

Re (b): a preferable site for Troneia has been proposed by historians who identify Patronis with Troneia (Tillard (1911) 64–66; Kirsten (1951) 713; cautiously Fossey (1986) 53; Barr.) and thus follow the topographical indication given by Plut. Sull. 15.6. This site is identified with Patronis by historians who, wrongly in my opinion, distinguish between Troneia and Patronis (Schober (1924) 38; Kirsten (1949b); Robert (1960). The site in question is at Ag. Marina, where there are remains on a rocky hill of which only the northern and eastern part had to be fortified. The wall is in two different types of masonry: the curtain is in joggled trapezoidal masonry, and the towers in isodomic masonry. The wall and the western escarpment enclose an area of 1.100 m north–south by 150 m west–east and rise above the remains of a grid-planned lower town.
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I. The Region

The name of the region is Βοιωτία (Hes. fr. 181; At. Ach. 160; Thuc. 1.12.3; SEG 28 461.28 (287–280)). The ethnic is Βοιωτός (Hom. Il. 2.494; Ducat (1971) no. 257) or Βοιώτος (Hom. Il. 14.476; CID 11 31.93 (C4f)). The collective use of the ethnic is attested externally in the epigram commemorating Phokis, and the westernmost Boiotian Thuc. 1. The name of the region is 


gενσε Βοιωτών: IG 19 501 = CEG 179, restored from Hdt. 5.77.3–4) and internally on the obverse of the coins (BOI, BOIΩ: Head (1881) 21, 54) and in the C4 Βοιώτος civic (πρόξενον είμεν Βοιώτων: IG VII 2407–8). For the individual and external use, see [Ἑ]πιδδαλος τόποι/λανει Βοιώτως ἔχει Ἐρχ/ομένο (Lazzarini (1976) 374 (C5f)); for the internal use, see Ἐξονος Παναρμόστου Βοιώτος (BCH 99 (1975) 51.4 (C3f)). The Boiotian region is described with the terms χώρα (Hdt. 8.44.1; Hell. Oxy. 19.2) or γῆ (Soph. fr. 314.31, Radt; Hdt. 5.57.1), and from c.500 the term ἔθνος is used of the people (IG 19 501; Hdt. 9.31.4–32.1; Hell. Oxy. 19.4; Aeschin. 2.116; Bakhuizen (1891)).

In the Homeric Catalogue of Ships, Orchomenos (no. 213) and Aspledon are described as Minyan settlements outside Boiotia (Hom. Il. 2.511; cf. Thuc. 4.76.3). In later sources both Orchomenos (Hdt. 8.34.1; Thuc. 1.113.1) and Aspledon (Strabo 9.2.41; Paus. 9.38.9) were considered Boiotian, and in the Archaic and Classical periods the frontiers of the whole region were the following: Boiotia bordered on Phokis, and the westernmost Boiotian poleis were Orchomenos (Hdt. 8.34.1), Chaireneia (no. 201) (Hecat. fr. 116; Thuc. 4.76.3), Lebadeia (no. 211) (Strabo 9.3.14) and Chorsiai (no. 202) (Ps.-Skylax 38). To the north Boiotia bordered on East Lokris, and the frontier must have run north of Hyetnos (no. 207) and Kopai (no. 209) (no explicit evidence, Etienne and Knoepfler (1976) 197) and west of Anthedon (no. 200) (Strabo 9.2.13; cf. Hom. Il. 2.508). The easternmost Boiotian settlement was Delphinion in the Oropia (Strabo 9.2.6). Oropos (no. 214) was contiguous with Attika (Thuc. 4.99.1); it was under Athenian domination in the years c.500–411, c.375–366 and 338–322, but never integrated into Attika. Moving westward from Oropos (Herac. Cret. 7–8, GGM 1.101) the Boiotian poleis bordering on Attika were Tanagra (no. 220) (Thuc. 3.91.3–5; Dem. 18.96), Hysiai (no. 208) (Hdt. 6.108.6) and Plataiai (no. 216) (Hdt. 6.108.3). In the years around 500 Hysiai was an Attic “deme” (Hdt. 5.74.1), and Plataiai may have been part of Attika as well (see infra 450). Eleutherai was originally a Boiotian settlement (Polemon fr. 2; Steph. Byz. 265.10) incorporated into Attika (Paus. 1.38.8) in, probably, 506 (Connor (1989) 8–16). After the Athenian defeat at Koroneia in 447, it became a Theban military outpost (Schachter (forthcoming)). It is a moot point whether it belonged to Boiotia once again in C4 (for: Camp (1991); against: Munn (1993) 8–9). Towards the Isthmus Boiotia bordered on Megaris, and the frontier ran along the ridge of Kithairon between Boiotian Kreusis and Megarian Aigosthena (no. 224) (Xen. Hell. 5.4.17–18).

The earliest attestation of a liaison among Boiotian poleis is a C6e dedication to Apollo Karykaios in Tanagra (no. 220) by a group of soldiers from Thebes (no. 221) (LSAG 94 no. 7; cf. Schachter (1996b) 16–17). Collaboration between the Boiotian poleis is attested in numerous sources of C6l. (a) Several Boiotian poleis began to strike coins in C6l, and from the very beginning all coins except those struck by Orchomenos (no. 213) had a common obverse type: the “Boiotian” shield. These early coins were struck by Akraiphia (no. 198), Hyetos (no. 207), Koroneia (no. 210), Mykalessos (no. 212), Tanagra (no. 220), Thebes (no. 221) and Thespiai (no. 222). (b) From c.520 onwards Herodotos and other sources refer to the Boiotians and make it clear that in war and diplomacy the Boiotian cities often acted in concert (Hdt. 5.74.2, 77.1–4, 6.108.4–5; Thuc. 3.65.2). (c) A Delphic inscription from c.500 records a treaty between the Boiotians and the Lokrians (SEG 41 506), and an Athenian dedication of 506 commemorates a victory over the Boiotians (IG 19 501 = CEG 179). (d) Boiotarchs are attested in connection with Mardonios’ invasion of Boiotia in 479 (Hdt. 9.15.1). This is commonly taken as evidence of an early federation or league led by Thebes and subsequently
dissolved in connection with the subjection of that city in 479 (Busolt and Swoboda (1926) 1431; Larsen (1968) 29–32). An alternative view is that the federation or league persisted, and from some coins of C5f with the legends T or TA (obv.) and BO or BOI (rev.) it is inferred that Tanagra took the place of Thebes as the head of the union (Buck (1979) 141–42; Beck (1997) 89).

A proper Boiotian federation, however, cannot be traced further back than C5m, and I shall here follow the generally accepted terminology and refer to the First Federation 446–386, the Second Federation 378–338, and the Third Federation 329–171.

(1) The constitution of the First Federation is known from Hell. Oxy. 19, describing its organisation in 395 (Salmon (1978)). The earliest explicit references to the federation are Thucydides’ mention of Boiotarchs at the battle of Delion in 424 (Thuc. 4.91), and his mention of the Boiotarchs and the federal council in connection with the Boiotians’ refusal to join an alliance with Corinth (no. 227) and Megara (no. 225) (Thuc. 5.38.2). There is no explicit evidence antedating the Peloponnesian War, but it is commonly (and reasonably) believed that this federation was formed in 447/6 after the Athenian defeat at Koroneia (Thuc. 1.113), and that Plataiai (no. 216) controlled two of the eleven Boiotian districts in the period down to 431 (Hell. Oxy. 19.3). The federation was dissolved in 386 in consequence of the King’s Peace (Xen. Hell. 5.1.33).

(2) The federation was re-established in 378 (Xen. Hell. 5.4.65, 6.1.1; Isoc. 14.9; Diod. 15.28.1; cf. Buckler (1980) 15–45), and new Boiotarchs elected (Plut. Pel. 13.1; Ages. 24.6; cf. Buckler (1979)). The dissolution of this federation after the battle of Chaironeia in 338 is inferred from late sources (Diod. 16.87.3; Paus. 9.1.8, 4.27.10). A dissolution is rejected by Busolt and Swoboda (1926) 1431 n. 4, followed by Larsen (1968) 175–80. A re-establishment of the federation is assumed by Roesch (1965) 46–71, followed by Etienne and Knoepfler (1976) 241–42.

(3) That the defeat of Thebes in 338 and its destruction in 335 resulted in a reorganisation, perhaps even a re-establishment of the federation, is indicated (a) by the transfer of the capital of the federation from Thebes to Orchomenos, infra 435; (b) by a new board of aphedriasteuontes, attested from C3 onwards (IG viii 2723–4b; for the date, see Knoepfler (1992) 451, (2001b) 15–19).

The Boiotian etnos was one of the members of the Amphiktyonic League (Lefèvre (1998) 70–73) and provided two hieromnemones (Aeschin. 2.116). Poleis attested in C4s as providing a hieronmnon are Haliartos (no. 206), Lebadeia (no. 211), Orchomenos (no. 213), Plataiai (no. 216), Tanagra (no. 220), Thebes (no. 221) and Thespiai (no. 222).

In Boiotia names of months are attested from C3 onwards, and since the same sequence of months is attested in all poleis without any discernible variation, the inference is that it is a federal calendar adopted by all the members during the Classical period. There is no evidence of individual polis calendars of the Archaic period. Some of the months are peculiar to Boiotia (Παµβοιώτιος and Άλαξκοµένως). Others, like Ερμαῖος, are found in Thessaly and north-west Greece (Roesc (1982) 1–85; Trümper, Monat. 244–46).

In recent years the traditional dates of Boiotian coins have been changed as follows. (a) In Head, HN2 and in SNG volumes published before the 1970s the earliest Boiotian coins are dated c.600–550; today a more recent date is universally accepted, either c.550–500 (Kraay (1976) 109) or c.500 (Schachter (1989) 85 n. 44). (b) The generally accepted chronology of the Boiotian coinage of the Classical period is based on the a priori assumption that, apart from Thebes, the individual poleis struck coins only when the federation was dissolved, i.e. in the years after the battle of Oinophyta (457–446), then after the King’s Peace (386–374), and after the battle of Chaironeia in 338. The following three observations must lead to a revision of this chronology. (1) Some of the coins allegedly struck in the years 386–374 have legends in the epichoric alphabet, indicating a date before c.394 (Salmon (1978) 45–47). (2) There was no activity in the sanctuary of Nemea between c.410 and c.330, and of over 4,000 coins found in Nemea only four have been dated to that period: viz. one of Thebes (395–386), two of Tanagra (386–374), and one of Thespiai (386–374). Now, of the two coins of Tanagra, one (C177) was found in a context of which 99 per cent antedate c.410 and 1 per cent postdate c.330, and the other (C1401) in a context of which 30 per cent antedate c.410, 70 per cent postdate c.330. The coin from Thespiai was found in a C3 context (Hesperia 48 (1979) pl. 25e, 51 (1982) pl. 15c, 53 (1984) pl. 34d; letter from S. G. Miller of 17 March 1995). The presumption is that the first coin was struck before c.410 and the two others presumably after 374. (3) The Myron hoard (IGCH 62), buried c.365 (Hepworth (1986) 37), includes fifteen of the so-called autonomous staters traditionally dated 386–374; two are from Haliartos (no. 206) and thirteen from Orchomenos (no. 213). Most of these coins are more worn than even the earliest of the Theban coins which were struck c.390 or even earlier (Hansen (1995a) 63 additional note). The inference from these three observations is that some of the “autonomous” Boiotian coins were struck before 386 and others after 374. Similarly, it seems likely that the period
457–446 has been too narrowly defined as well, and that many of the coins assigned to this period should be dated either before 457 or after 446.

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis

Apart from major extra-urban sanctuaries, our written sources provide us with information about sixty-six named Boiotian sites of the Archaic and Classical periods. Of these sixty-one have been identified, most beyond reasonable doubt, some with a certain degree of probability only. Five ancient toponyms, however, remain unlocated, and, conversely, we have remains of two fairly small ancient settlements which cannot be convincingly matched with any of the toponyms found in the written sources. Thus we know of a total of sixty-eight Archaic and Classical sites. Twenty-six are described below in the inventory of poleis. Of the remaining forty-two sites, ten were probably not settlements of the Archaic and Classical periods; some were just alternative names of poleis, some did not belong in Boiotia, etc. It follows that, in addition to the twenty-six poleis, we have evidence of thirty-two non-polis settlements of which only one is an unidentified site known exclusively from the physical remains. Including two unidentified sites, forty-two sites are as follows.

Askra (Ἀσκρῆ)  
Hes. Op. 639–40 (κώμη); Ephor. fr. 1 (κώμη); Strabo 9.2.25; Paus. 9.29.1–2; Steph. Byz. 133.12

1. The list of settlements excludes extra-urban sanctuaries (cf. Fossey (1988) 433 n. 107), each briefly treated under the poleis to which it belonged: the Amphiarraion (Oropos), the Kabicernion (Thebes), Apollo Potios and the hero Potios (Akraiphia), Apollo Tegyraios (Orchomenos), Apollo Thomios (Chaironeia), Athena Itonia (Koroneia), Dionysos (Orchomenos), the Muses (Theopisai) and Zeus Hypatos (Thebes).

2. Doubtful or spurious settlements mentioned in late sources only include a number of toponyms recorded in Strabo: Θερσιππα (9.2.24) and Φωτεικής (9.2.27) or in Steph. Byz.; Λεχυρα (140.18), Λιμήν (152.17–18), Περίποις (9.2.2) Tanagra, Fossey (1988) 54); Ζαίη (293.20), Παυραί (338.21), Τρώης (342.10); cf. Arnedines (FGrHist 378 fr. 1); Κέλαια (372.8), Ολύμπος (400.3), Φεληστόν (665.1) and Φελεύς (667.15). Furthermore, following Bakhuisen (1898) 65–66), I have left out Άρνη (Hom. Il. 2.507; Hes. fr. 218; Strabo 9.2.35; Steph. Byz. 123.18, πόλεις), which allegedly was swallowed up by Lake Kopais (Strabo 9.2.35). It seems to be a mythical toponym, not even to be placed on an atlas of Bronze Age settlements. However, Fossey (1988) 382–83 identifies Homeric Arne with a settlement (Magouna Balomenou) which has substantial remains from the Bronze Age plus some Roman and Late Roman.


4. Eteonos/Skaphi(1)ai, Keresos, Midea, Metachoion and Nisa.

5. Gla and Mali both recorded in Barr, as settlements of the smallest size.


Askra had a walled acropolis with a C4 signalling tower surrounded by a presumed Archaic circuit with gates enclosing an area of c.4,000 m². The whole settlement covered an area of c.10 ha (Bintliff (1997a) 244). Sherds show resettlement of the site in the Dark Ages and a peak of activity in the Archaic and Classical periods, dropping off in the Hellenistic period. Askra was apparently under Thebes (no. 222) in Hesiod’s lifetime, but Arist. fr. 580 suggests that the Thebians drove out the Askra people after Hesiod’s death (Snodgrass (1985); Fossey (1988) 142–43; Bintliff (1996)). Barr. AC.

Aspledon (Ἀσπληδών)  

Aulis (Ἀὐλῖς)  
Hom. Il. 2.496; Hes. Op. 651; Aesch. Ag. 191; Xen. Hell. 3.4.3; Ephor. fr. 119; Hell. Oxy. 20.3 (?); Ps.-Skylax 59 (ἱερόν); Nikokrates (FGrHist 376) fr. 1; Ps.-Skymnos 495 (πόλεις); Dion. Calliphon. 88, GGM 1.241 (πόλεις); Strabo 9.2.8 (χωρίον, κώμη, λιμήν); Paus. 9.19.6; Steph. Byz. 147.1. The sanctuary was that of Artemis Aulidía (SEG 25 542 (Roman)). The cult is attested from C6 (SEG 25 534; Schachter (1981–94) i. 94–98), and the remains of an aperipteral Doric temple are still visible. Aulis was one of the small unwalled settlements whose population was moved to Thebes (no. 221) (Hell. Oxy. 20.3; [AԴ]λίδος) in connection with the major synoecism at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War (Demand (1990) 83–85; Moggi, Sin. 197–204 prefers a date c.426–424). The archaeological record shows that the settlement was still inhabited in C4 and later (Fossey (1988) 68–74). Barr. AC.

Chalia (Χαλία)  
Theopomp. fr. 211–12 = Steph. Byz. 681.4–8 (πόλεις). In fr. 212, Theopompus lists the Chalioi (Χαλίοις) alongside Aiolians, Boiotians, Orchomenians and Thebans. According to Jacoby’s comment on the fragment, the context is a digression in book 15 about the prehistory of Thebes, which means that it is impossible from the use of the ethnic to make any inference about the status of Chalia in the Archaic and Classical periods (Fossey (1988) 77–78). Barr. AC.

Delion (Δῆλον)  
Hdt. 6.118.2; Thuc. 4.76.4–5 (ἱερόν); Ps.-Skylax 59 (ἱερόν); Strabo 9.2.7 (ἱερόν, πολίχνιον); Paus. 9.20.1; Steph. Byz. 226.13–14 (ἱερόν, πολίχνιον). A sanctuary of Apollo with a gilded statue allegedly dedicated by the Thebans (no. 223; Hdt. 1.118.2). In 424, when only a ruined stoa was left in the sanctuary, it was fortified by the Athenians (Thuc. 4.90.2) (Fossey (1988) 62–66; Schachter (1981–94) i. 44–47). Barr. C.
Delphinium (Δελφίνιον) Strabo 9.2.6 (ἱερὸς λιμήν).


Drymos (Δρυμός) Harp. Α8ι (πόλις) = Arist. fr. 405.
Unlocated settlement near Panaktos and sometimes belonging to Athens (no. 361); see 624. Drymos means “oak wood”. At Paus 9.3.4 it is uncertain whether the reference is to another settlement near Alkomenai (no. 199) called Δρυμός, or to an oak wood described as ὀξύμω. Barr. 59 C.

Eileison (Εἰλέσιον) Hom. ll. 2.499; Strabo 9.2.17; Steph. Byz. 261.13 (πόλις). The term Εἰρέσιον is found at Ετυμ. Magn. 303.11 (πόλις) and Συνδ. ΕΙ 183 (πόλις); 'Ερέσιον is an unconvincing emendation at Dion. Calliphon. 90, GGM 1.241 (Fossey (1988) 127–30). Barr. AC.

Eleutherai (Ἐλευθεραῖ) Strabo 9.2.31; Steph. Byz. 265.10 (πόλις). Originally a Boiotian settlement which passed to Athens (no. 361) in, presumably, 506, but was not incorporated into Attika; see supra and infra. Eleutherai was famous for its sanctuary of Dionysos, with a ξωαν removed to Athens (Schachter (1981–94) i.174–76). Barr. AC.

Glisas (Γλίσας) Hom. II. 2.504; Hdt. 9.43.2; Hellan. fr. 100; Strabo 9.2.31 (κατοικία); Paus. 9.19.2 (ἐρείπια); Steph. Byz. 209.16 (πόλις). Remains of a walled acropolis and (once) a walled lower town, both walls in polygonal masonry, with structures of C6–C5f. Above it was the sanctuary of Zeus Hypatos (Fossey (1988) 217–23). Barr. AC.

Graia (Γραία) Hom. II. 2.498. In the sources Graia was identified sometimes with Tanagra (no. 220) (Callim. fr. 711; Strabo 9.2.10; Paus. 9.20.1–2; Ετυμ. Magn. 228.58), sometimes with Oropos (no. 214) or, rather, a place in the territory of Oropos (Arist. fr. 406.1–2; Strabo 9.2.10; Thuc. 2.22.3 and 3.93.1 as emended in accordance with Steph. Byz. 712.6–7). Most modern historians prefer the Aristotelian view, but disagree about the location. Fossey ((1970), (1988) 66–67; Barr.) suggests an identification with a Bronze Age settlement and points to modern Dhrames. Beister (1985) prefers an identification with a settlement of the Archaic and Classical periods situated somewhere on the coast, but not yet located. See also Cosmopoulos (2001) 14, 127 n. 37. Barr. AC.

Harma (Ἄρμα) Hom. II. 2.499; Philoch. fr. 113 (κωμηταί) = Strabo 9.2.11 (κωμή ἐρημοί), 14 (τῆς τετρακομίας); Paus. 9.19.4 (ἐρείπια πόλεως); Steph. Byz. 122.6 (πόλις). Settlement centred on a walled acropolis with structures of the Classical period. The walls, in polygonal masonry, are older than the buildings {Fossey (1988) 85–89. Barr. AC.

Helenon (Ἑλεών) Hom. II. 2.500; Strabo 9.2.12 (κώμη), 14 (τῆς τετρακομίας); Plut. Mor. 301A; Paus. 1.29.6. Acropolis settlement with well-preserved walls in Lesbian masonry and remains of several buildings (Fossey (1988) 89–95). The settlement covered c.3.3 ha (Bintliff (1979a) 244). Barr. AC.


Hyle (Ὑλή or Ὡλαί) Hom. II. 2.500; 5.708; Mosch. Ep. Bion. 3.88 (cf. Gaertner (2001)); Strabo 9.2.20 (κώμη); Steph. Byz. 647.13. Remains of a walled acropolis and a walled lower town. The acropolis had two walls: a larger one of LH III B and a smaller one of the Archaic period, both in rubble masonry. In the lower town a small aperipteral temple of the late Geometric period (Fossey (1988) 235–43). Barr. AC.


Keressos (Κέρησσος) Plut. Cam. 19.4; cf. Mor. 866F; Paus. 9.14.2–4 (ἐχυρὸν χωρίον = Anth. Pal. App. 6.73; see Fontenrose (1978) Q 204). Cf. the tombstone set over Κερεσσότος (IG vii 1927 (C5)) and the dedication by Κερεσσίτος (SEG 28 458 (C6–C5)). Unlocated fortified settlement in the territory of Thespiai (no. 222), where a major battle was fought between Boiotians and Thessalians in the Archaic period, but variously dated (Buck (1979) 108–10; Sordi (1993)). Not in Barr.


Kreusis (Κρεύσις) Xen. Hell. 5.4.16–17, 6.4.3 (τείχος); Xen. Ages. 2.18; Strabo 9.2.25 (ἐπινείον); Paus. 9.32.1 (ἐπίνεων); Steph. Byz. 383.6 (πόλις); Κρεύσιν (SEG 24 361.27 (C4f)) is either a misspelling or a variant. Fortified port with substantial remains of a C4 circuit wall in ashlar masonry with a small section in Lesbian and polygonal


**Lektra** (Λεκτρά) Xen. Hell. 6.4.4 (ἐν Λεκτρά ἡ πόλις Θεσπικής); Dem. 9.23; Diod. 15.35.2 (τὸ Λεκτράτων πεδίον); Harp. Λ14 (χωρίον Βοιώτιον περὶ Θεσπιάς); Plut. Mor. 773B (κόμιον τῆς πολιτείας ὑφαίσθενος); Strabo 9.2.39 (τοῦ πόλεως). Possibly a settlement (Fossey (1988) 154–57). **Barr. C.**


**Mideia** (Μίδεια) Hom. Il. 2.507; Strabo 8.6.11 (Μίδεια); Steph. Byz. 451.17 (πάλις). Perhaps to be identified with Lebadeia (no. 211) (Paus. 9.39.1). If not, an unlocated settlement. Not in Barr.

**Nisa** (Νίσα) Hom. Il. 2.508; Dion. Calliphon. 102, GGM 1.242. Unlocated.


**Olmones** (Ὀλμονεὶς) Paus. 9.24.3, 34.10 (κόμη); Steph. Byz. 490.7 (κόμη); IG VII 280815 (after AD 212). Walled hilltop settlement with remains of a small number of buildings, one of them perhaps an early aperipteral temple (Fossey (1988) 296–98). **Barr. C.**

**Onchestos** (Ὅκχηστός) Hom. Il. 2.506; IG ix2.1 170.5 (292); Heracl. Cret. 25, GGM 1.104 (πάλις); Paus. 9.26.5 (πάλις). In 338 Onchestos became the capital of the Boeotian Federation (Roesch (1982) 266–82), and the federal archon was thereafter referred to as the “Archon in Onchestos” (SEG 27 60 (Ca4); IG VII 1747.1 (Ca3)). The remains of a C6 temple of Poseidon have been found (Schachter (1981–94) ii. 207). The settlement itself has been tentatively identified with a site of c. 5 ha about 1 km west of the sanctuary of Poseidon. On the site were found fragments of monumental Doric architecture, traces of a fortification wall and of a Hellenistic bouleuterion, perhaps serving the Federation, and the plan of what appears to be an agora of Hellenistic date (Bintliff and Snodgrass (1985) 140; Schachter (1981–94) ii. 208). **Barr. AC.**


**Salganeus** (Σαλγανέος) Nicocrates (FGrHist 376) fr. 1; Heracl. Cret. 26, GGM 1.105; Strabo 9.2.9 (χωρίον); Steph. Byz. 551.6 (πάλις). Settlement fortified in 333/2 (Diod. 19.77.4) with very few remains of the Classical period, and the circuit walls seen by early travellers were probably not ancient (Bakhuizen (1970) 6–12; Fossey (1988) 78–80; Gehrke (1988)). **Barr. C.**


**Schoinos** (Σχοῖνος) Hom. Il. 2.497; Strabo 9.2.22. Schoinos was one of the small unwalled settlements whose population was moved to Thebes (no. 221) (Hell. Oxy. 20.3) in connection with the major synoecism at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War (Demand (1990) 83–85; Moggi, Sim. 197–204 prefers a date c.426–424). Remains of a circuit wall partly in polygonal masonry (Ca4?, postdating the synoecism?) and partly in rubble work (Ca4?) (Fossey (1988) 229–32). **Barr. AC.**

**Stephon** (Στέφων) Plut. Mor. 299C: fortified place (χωρίον) in the Heroic period when Tanagra (no. 220) was still settled in villages (ἦν τῆς Ταναγρικῆς κατὰ κόμας
Tilphosaion (Τιλφωσσιόν) Lycoiph. Alex. 646; Callisthenes (FGrHist 124) fr. 11 = Steph. Byz. 611.3 (πόλις); Plut. Pelop. 16–19. Settlement with a temple of Apollo Tilfossios and an oracle active in the Archaic period but closed down in C4 (Plut. Pelop. 16.5; Mor. 412B–D; Schachter (1981–94) i. 75). Walled acropolis with defence circuit in polygonal masonry observed by early travellers. In the neighbourhood, remains of what may be an aperipteral temple (Fossey (1988) 367–72). Barr. AC.


Tilphosaion (Τιλφωσσιόν) According to Strabo (9.2.27), Tilfossa was a spring (ἡ Τιλφῶσσα κρήνη) beneath Mt. Tilfossion (τὸ Τιλφωσσιοῦν ḍρος) with a sanctuary of Apollo Tilfossios (ὁ Τιλφωσσιοῖος Ἀπόλλων). Again, τὸ Τιλφωσσιόν is attested as a mountain (schol. Dem. 19.141, 314C, Dilts; Ephor. fr. 153; Theopomp. fr. 301) and as a spring (Aristophanes Boeotus (FGrHist 379) fr. 4 (κρήνη δ᾽ ἐν Βοιωτίᾳ ἡ Τιλφωσσα). The spring was deified as a goddess Τιλφωσσα or Τιλφωσσα (Pind. fr. 198b) and worshipped together with Apollo (Hymn. Hom. Ap. 383–87) and Artemis (SEG 27 74 (C4–C3)). Remains of the sanctuary have been found c.400 m from the spring perhaps consecrated to the Praxidikai (Schachter (1990), (1981–94) iii. 60–62). According to Dem. 19.141, 148, there was a fort on the mountain; cf. Fossey (1992) 112–14, followed by Barr. (C).


2. Unidentified Settlements

Gla Mycenaean settlement with a few remains of the Classical period, lying in the north-east bay of the Kopaïs in the territory of Kopai (no. 209) (Fossey (1988) 288). Barr., C.


Of these forty-two sites, thirty-two were probably settlements of the Archaic and Classical periods. But some of them may have been poleis rather than non-polis settlements. Heleon, for example, seems to have had a territory of its own bordering on the territory of Tanagra (no. 220) (Paus. 1.29.6), and that is an indication that the settlement was a polis. Similarly, Harma is a rather sizeable settlement with impressive fortifications (Fossey (1988) 86–88) and is described by Pausanias as the ruins of a polis (9.19.4). Thus we must consider the possibility that all four members of what in the Hellenistic period was called the Tetrakomia, i.e. Pharae (no. 215), Mykalessos (no. 212), Heleon and Harma (Strabo 9.2.14), were poleis in the Archaic and/or Classical period (Etienne and Knoepfler (1976) 225–26). Conversely, some of the settlements included in the Inventory of poleis might perhaps be omitted, e.g. Alalkomenai (no. 199). Even allowing for some uncertainty, the Inventory leads to the conclusion that more than two-fifths of all the Boiotian settlements must have been considered to be poleis, either throughout the Archaic and Classical periods or at least for some time within these periods.

Many of these poleis, however, were small dependencies, and at least in the Classical period the Boiotian poleis seem to have formed a hierarchy with at least three different layers: during the First and Second Federations (c.446–386 and 378–338), the only truly independent polis was Thebes (no. 221), which, in addition to being the leading member of the confederacy, preserved its capacity to enter into relations with other poleis (Staatsverträge 273, 277, 283, 345; see infra 455). Below Thebes were several poleis which, being member states of the Federation, provided magistrates and councillors to the federal government and contingents to the federal army. Below these poleis were several little poleis, each depending on one of the larger poleis and with its own territory inside the territory of the larger polis but without any representation in the federal government. Chorsiai (no. 202), Eutresis (no. 205), Siphai (no. 218) and Thisbai (no. 223) were poleis depending on Thebaisa (no. 222); Mykalessos (no. 212) and Pharae (no. 215) belonged to Tanagra; Erythrai (no. 203), Skolos (no. 219), Eteonos/Skaphlai (no. 204) and Hysiai (no. 208) were first connected with Plataiai (no. 216) in some form

\footnote{Of the 42 non-polis sites recorded above 1 exclude the following 10: Drymos (belongs rather with Attika), Eleutherai (Athenian after C6), Gla (the Classical remains too insignificant to ensure that Gla was a settlement after the Mycenaean period), Graia (a settlement listed in the Homeric Catalogue of Ships, but unknown to all later commentators), Kyrtone (perhaps an East Lokrian settlement), Metachoion (a fortress rather than a settlement), Mideia (probably an old name for Lebadeia), Nisa (known only from the Catalogue of Ships, perhaps identical with Isos), Oinophyta (a fortress, not a settlement) and Tilphosaion (a fortress, not a settlement).}
of sympolitiea, but were later subdued by Thebes, which also possessed Anthedon (no. 200), Oropos (no. 214) and Potniai (no. 217); Chaireoneia (no. 201) lay within the territory of Orchomenos (no. 213) until after 424.

We are poorly informed about the status of all the settlements which were not poleis. The orthodoxy is that they were komai and, mutatis mutandis, had a status similar to the Attic demes (see Hansen (1995b) 69–71). But apart from phratries, attested in the late Hellenistic period only (Knoepfler (1981) 148–49), we know of no civic subdivisions in Boiotia (Jones, POAG 79). So, even supposing that these settlements were in fact komai, there is no evidence to show that komai were an element in the political organisation of Boiotia in the same way as they must have been in, e.g., Mantinea (no. 281) or Megara (no. 225).

Furthermore, only one Boiotian settlement is called kome in Archaic and Classical sources, viz. Askra (Hes. Op. 639–40; Ephor. fr. 1). Philoch. fr. 113 may have used the term kometai about the inhabitants of Harmas. In all other cases the authority for Boiotian komai is either Strabo or Pausanias, but it is not legitimate to project their site-classifications back into the Archaic and Classical periods (see Hansen (1995b) 48–52). To conclude: the territory of a major Boiotian polis, e.g. Thebes or Thespiai or Tanagra, comprised a number of settlements of which some were poleis but some were not, and the relation between dependent poleis and other dependencies remains obscure.

II. The Poleis

198. Akraiphia (Akraiphieus) Map 55. Lat. 38.25, long 23.15. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Ἀκραίφια, τά (IG vii 4135.6 (C3S), 2871.1 (C1)) or (in literary sources only) Ακραίφια, ή (Hdt. 8.135.1; Steph. Byz. 63.1), Ἀκραίφια (Strabo 9.2.27), Ἀκραίφιων (Hell. Oxy. 19.3), Ἀκραίφια (Theopomp. fr. 362). The toponym denotes either the town (Hdt. 8.135) or the polity (Hell. Oxy. 19.3). The city-ethnic is Ἀκραίφιευς (Ducat 1971 no. 260 = SEG 31 393 (C5f)) or (in literary sources only) Ἀκραίφιευς (Theopomp. (FGHist 115) fr. 362); Ἀκραίφιων, Ἀκραίφιευτής (Ephor. fr. 229).

Akraiphia is called a polis both in the urban sense (Hdt. 8.135.1) and in the political sense (Hell. Oxy. 19.3).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in a dedication: Πολιτικάς ἐκραίφιεύς [ἵεσ] (LSAG 93 and 95 no. 15 (c.500)) and externally in a list of aphedrietouneontes (IG vii 2724a.2 (c.280–270)).

An inscription of C4f–C7m cut in the rock near Vristika marked the border between Akraiphia and Kopai (no. 209) as determined by the Boiotians (IG vii 2792; SEG 36 411; Lauffer (1986) 136; Vottéro (2001) 115), and, similarly, a C6 horas (Vottéro (2001) 117) probably records the border between the two poleis (SEG 30 440, 42 407): [ὑψός Ἀ]κραίφια[φιέων κ]ταῖ Ἐκτο[πίαν]. The size of the territory has been assessed at c.35 km² (Fossey (1988) 264, 198).

The eponymous official of Akraiphia was an archon (LSAG 93 and 95 no. 13 (C6f)). In C4f Akraiphia was united with Chaireoneia (no. 201) and Kopai, and constituted one of the eleven Boiotian districts (Hell. Oxy. 19.3). The principal body of government was a boule to which only propitious citizens were admitted (Hell. Oxy. 19.2, 3). There is no explicit evidence for membership of the Second Federation whereas the attestation of an aphedrietumon from Akraiphia testifies to membership of the Third Federation (IG vii 2724a.2 (c.280–270)). An eponymous archon is attested in C6f (LSAG 93, 95 no. 13).

The protecting god of Akraiphia was perhaps Zeus of some sort (IG vii 2733 (C5)); Schachter (1981–94) iii. 93–95; cf. the C6f–C7e dedication to Zeus Oporeus (SEG 46 528). On Mt. Ptoion (Paus. 9.23.5–7; Pind. fr. 528.5) since C7m consecrated to Apollo Ptoieus (Ducat 1971) 89 no. 50b (c.640); IG vii 27–29 (c.640–620), 4155 (C4f) in association with a goddess and served by a male Akraiphian prophet (IG vii 4155). The oracle was especially famous in C6f (Schachter 1981–94) i. 52–73. Dedications of this period abound (Ducat 1971); Schachter (1981–94) iii. 295, including two by the Alkmaionids and Peisistratids (IG 13 1469–70). At the sanctuary are remains of a peribolos, an oracular cave and a temple of C4f built on top of an older one (Lauffer (1959) 1528–40). The sanctuary was controlled by Akraiphia in the Archaic period (Ducat 1971) 448–50 as well as in the Hellenistic age (IG vii 4139.20–21 (C2f); Roesch (1982) 225ff); but when the oracle was consulted by Mys in 479, it was under Theban control (Hdt. 8.135.1; cf. Strabo 9.2.34). The Thebans may have dispossessed the Akraiphians of the oracle in C6f (Gullath (1989) 166), but a preferable explanation is that “the oracle may have remained within the direction of Akraiphia, although formally the sanctuary and the territory of Akraiphia were under Theban control” (Schachter 1981–94) i. 69).
Halfway (as the crow flies) between Akraiphia and the sanctuary of Apollo Ptoieus was a sanctuary of the Hero Ptoios, the descendant of Athamas, here worshipped in association with some goddess. A lower terrace has altars and a stoa of the Archaic period, the upper terrace a temple of C4 built over a C7 edifice. Between the two levels is an avenue of monumental tripod bases, dedicated by the polis of Akraiphia c.525–450 (IG vii 2734–35; SEG 22 430; Schachter (1981–94) iii. 11–21).

The acropolis was fortified with a double-faced wall: an outer face of hard limestone in trapezoidal coursed masonry, perhaps of C4, and an inner face of poros stone in ashlar coursed masonry, built in C3 and probably destroyed in 196. A diateichisma in polygonal work work is either contemporary with or older than the limestone wall. There are substantial remains of a pentagonal tower of the Hellenistic period. The circuit enclosed an area of c.17 ha (Fossey (1988) 266–68; Garlan (1974) 98–112 and information from John Camp). The size of the lower town is unknown (Bintliff (1997a) 231) nor do we know whether there was a defence circuit enclosing the entire town. Buildings and streets have been uncovered at the western end of the town, and outside the town are four cemeteries with remains from the late Geometric, Archaic and Classical periods (Fossey (1988) 268). So far, more than 2,000 graves have been found (AR (1999–2000) 56). The settlement can be traced back to C8 (Fossey (1988) 269).

Akraiphia struck silver coins on the Aiginetan standard from c.500 to 480, from 456 to 446, and from 386 (or earlier) to 374 (or later). Denominations: stater, obol, hemiobol, tri-hemitertemorion; obv. Boiotian shield; rev. kantharos in incuse square (some). Legend: A (C5e) or AK (C5m) or AKPH (C5e) (Head, HN 344; Babelon, Traite ii.3. 257–58; Schachter (1989) 85; Baldwin Brett (1955) 137 no. 1011; Etienne and Knoepfler (1976) 221 n. 768 suggest that the earliest issues may have been minted at (H)alaiartos).

199. Alalkomenai Map 55. Lat. 38.25, long. 23.00. Located at Vouno c.1 km east of Solinario (Knauss (1987) 42–68). Size of territory: 1. Type: C. The toponym is Ἀλαλκομενεῖον (IG ix2.1 170.5 (C4l–C5e)) dedicated to the cult of Ὄλυμπος/ Ἰβήρη (Hom. Il. 4.8; see Schachter (1981–94) i. 11–14). According to Steph. Byz. 68.18–19, the goddess had the epithet Polias, and her cult was linked with that of Zeus Polieus (Etym. Magn. 56.8–10; Schachter (1981–94) iii. 96). Since the sanctuary was in the lowlands (Paus. 9.33.5), the epithets Polias and Polieus must refer not to an acropolis but rather to cults of divinities protecting the polis (cf. Cole (1995) 301–3). The cult of Athena at the Alalkomenion was presumably an old one (Schachter (1981–94) i. 12), which would indicate that at least in the Archaic period Alalkomenai was probably a polis (Hansen (1995a) 32–33) with the cult of its protecting god located in an extra-mural sanctuary. Later Alalkomenai was incorporated into Koroneia (no. 210). The territory is called Ἀλαλκομενεῖα; it must have been very small, but at least it included the fortified mountain Tilphosion (Ephor. fr. 153; Diod. 19.53.7). The Alalkomenion was located c.300 m north of Alalkomenai (Knauss (1987) 50).

200. Anthedon (Anthedonions). Map 55. Lat. 38.30, long. 23.25. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Ἰαθηδών, Ἡ (Hom. Il. 2.508; Ps.-Skylax 59; Archestratos fr. 15.1; I.Stratonikeia 508.43 (C1)). The city-ethnic is Ἱαθηδώνος (Palaiphatos 27; IG ix2.1 27.4 (C3)), in the Boiotian dialect: Ἰαθηδάνος (IG vii 2723.4 (C3e)). Anthedon is called a polis in the urban sense in a C4 mythological treatise (Palaiphatos 27) and again in Herac. Cret. (23, CGM1.104 (C38)); that it was a polis in the political sense as well is apparent from the fact that Ἰαθηδώνεια Ἰαθηδώνος appears c.285–280 among the aphedriateuontes (IG vii 2723.4). That its status as a polis in the political sense stems at least from the beginning of the Third Federation (i.e. from 338) is indicated by the eight victories at the four major Panhellenic games won c.300 by the pankratist Nikon of Anthedon (Steph. Byz. 96. 17–18; Phlegeton of Tralles (FGrHist 257a) = P Oxy. 2082 4.27; see Knoepfler (1986a) 602–3). In Ps.-Skylax 59 Anthedon is described as a teichos, but it is unclear whether he took it to be a polis as well. The only epigraphical reference to Anthedon as a polis is a heavily restored proxeny decree of C3 (SEG 36 413 = Knoepfler (1986a) 624–30. The individual and external use of the city-ethnic is attested at IG vii 2723.4 (C3f); Plut. Mor. 305F: Μυρτὶς Ἡ Ἰαθηδώνια ποιήμα (rC5); and Steph. Byz. 96.18–19 Λεωνίδῆς Ζωγράφου, Εὐθράνονος μαθητής, Ἰαθηδάνος (rC4).

The territory is called Ἡ Ἰαθηδώνια (Strabo 9.2.13) and its size has been assessed at c.85 km² (Fossey (1988) 250).
Anthedon bordered on Tanagra (no. 220) to the south-east (Nicocrates (FGrHist 376 fr. 1) and on Thebes (no. 221) to the south-west (Heracl. Cret. 23, GGM 1.104). Herakleides tells us that the soil was poor and that almost all the inhabitants lived as fishermen (Heracl. Cret. 23, GGM 1.104; cf. Archestratos fr. 15.1). Although there is no explicit evidence, it is usually assumed that Anthedon belonged to Thebes (no. 221) and that its harbour was used as a naval base by the Thebans when in the 360s they built a fleet (Schläger et al. (1968–69) 90), but see Fossey (1992) 117–20). The attestation of an aphédratéuon from Anthedon testifies to membership of the Third Federation (IG vii 2723.4 (c.280–270)).

The protecting god of Anthedon was probably Zeus Karaios and Anthas, whose cult, however, is unattested before C2 (IG ii² 2360; Schachter (1981–94) iii. 97 and letter of Dec. 1994).

The ancient town lay beside the sea around a tiny harbour (Strabo 9.2.13; Schläger et al. (1968–69)) A separately fortified hill about 30 m high was used for the acropolis. On the north side of the hill are the remains of a Hellenistic (Roesch (1969)) fortification wall built in ashlar masonry with interval towers. The city walls encompass both the hill and the harbour and enclosed an area of 30 ha (Wallace (1979) 58; Bintliff (1997a) 244). Herakleides mentions an agora flanked with two stoas. The settlement can be traced back to the Neolithic period, and there are remains of the Geometric, Archaic and Classical periods (Fossey (1988) 255).

201. Chaironeia (Chaironeus) Map 55. Lat. 38.30, long. 22.55. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Χαίρωνεα, ἦ (Thuc. 1.113.1; F.Delphes iii.3 96 = SEG 32 529 (c.312–300)), but in some Boiotian inscriptions Χ[ῃ]ρων[εια] (IG viii 3170.10 (C3)) or Χαίρωνεα (SEG 38 380.1 (C1)). The toponym denotes either the town (Thuc. 1.113.1) or the polity (Hell. Oxy. 19.3) or the territory (Lycurg. 1.16). The city-ethnic is Χαίρωνείς (SEG 15 282.4 (263–255)).

Chaironeia is called a polis presumably in the urban sense (Hecat. fr. 116; cf. Hansen (1995a) 55 n. 44) and in the political sense (Thuc. 4.76.3, 89.2; cf. Hansen (1995a) 21–24; Theopomp. fr. 407; Hell. Oxy. 19.3). The term πόλις is used by Aristophanes Boeotus (FGrHist 379 fr. 3 (C4)).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally as ΧΑΙΡΩΝΕΩΣ on coins of C4e (Head (1881) 44) and externally by Polyb. 27.1.4. For the individual use of the city-ethnic, see e.g. Εὐρυφάοντος Καλλήφρωνος Χαίρωνεός (SEG 15 282.4, grammateus (263–255)).

The territory is called Χαίρωνεα (Lycurg. 1.16: ἦ ἐν Χαίρωνεαῖς μάχης), and it was the westernmost region of Boiotia, bordered by Phokis to the west (Thuc. 4.76.3; cf. Hecat. fr. 116) and by Orchomenos (no. 215) to the north (Plut. Cim. 2.1). In C5 its territory was a part of the territory of Orchomenos (inference from Hdt. 8.34.1). The size of the territory has been assessed at c.55 km² (Fossey (1988) 342).

In C5 Chaironeia was a dependent polis under Orchomenos (πόλις Ὄρχομενιών: Theopomp. fr. 407, probably referring to 446; ἐς Ὄρχομενον εἰσπελεῖν: Thuc. 4.76.3, referring to 424), and was perhaps without any representation in the federal government. In 395, however, Chaironeia was united with Akraiphia (no. 198) and Kopai (no. 209), and constituted one of the eleven Boiotian districts (Hell. Oxy. 19.3). It is not known when Chaironeia changed its status from an Orchomenian dependency to one of the six poleis that provided one Boiotarch every third year. The principal body of government was a boule, to which only property-tied citizens were admitted (Hell. Oxy. 19.2, 3). Chaironeia was a member of the Second Federation (ἐπὶ Βοιότείας, Diod. 16.39.8) and of the Third Federation as well (IG vii 2724c.6 (245–240)). After 457 Chaironeia and Orchomenos served as a refuge for oligarchs from the other Boiotian poleis (Hellan. fr. 81); but in 446 Chaironeia was conquered by the Athenians and exposed to andropadosimos (Thuc. 1.113.1; Theopomp. fr. 407). From the abortive attempt in 424 to introduce a democracy, we can infer that Chaironeia must have had an oligarchic constitution. The democratic faction was supported by Athens and by some Orchomenians, but the stasis was quelled by armed assistance from the other Boiotians (Thuc. 4.76.2–3, 89.2; Hansen (1995a) 21–24).

Chaironeia must have been fortified in 424 (Thuc. 4.89.2) and again in 354 when the town was besieged by Onomarchos (Diod. 16.33.4; cf. Buckler (1989) 56). On the acropolis there are remains of (1) a circuit of cyclopean masonry, probably of the Archaic period; (2) Lesbian blocks, presumably Archaic; (3) a C4 ashlar circuit. Small extensions at the north-east corner of the cyclopean wall and at the north-west corner of the ashlar wall suggest that the lower city in the Archaic and Classical periods was walled and lay north of the acropolis. The acropolis walls enclose an area of c.15 ha. The size of the lower city is unknown (Fossey (1988) 376–79); Bintliff’s guessestimate is c.23 ha ((1997a) 244). The settlement can be traced back to the early Helladic period (Fossey (1988) 380). Of public architecture the only known building is a small rock-cut theatre. A rectilinear koi/on with eight steps, probably of the Classical period, was replaced in the early Hellenistic period by a curvilinear koi/on of which fifteen steps are preserved (Dilke 45 (1950) 35–37; Isler (1994) 146).
The protecting god of Chaironeia may have been Zeus (Paus. 9.41.6; Schachter (1981–94) iii. 99). Other major divinities presumably worshipped in the Archaic and Classical periods are Apollo Thourios (Plut. Sulla 17.7, interpreted retrospectively by Schachter (1981–94) i. 43–44) with an extra-urban sanctuary at Thourion (Camp et al. (1992) 454–55), Dionysos (Plut. Cim. 2.2; Schachter (1981–94) i. 173–74) and Herakles (Plut. Dem. 19.2; Schachter (1981–94) ii. 2).

Chaironeia struck hemidrachms on the Aiginetan standard and bronze coins between 386 (or earlier) and 374 (or later). (1) Silver: obv. Boiotian shield; rev. club. Legend: XAI. (2) Bronze: obv. Boiotian shield; rev. club. Legend: XAIPΩNE (Head (1881) 44, HN² 344).

### 202. Chorsiai (Chorsieus)

Map 55. Lat. 38.15, long. 22.55. 
Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym Κορσαί, i (Dem. 19.141 codd. AY; Harp. K77; Ps.-Skylax 38) is attested in literary sources, and from the city-ethnic Χωρσαίοις (SEG 3 342; Migotte (1984) no. 11 (C2e)) we can infer that in the Boiotian dialect the toponym must have been Χορσαί, which is the spelling offered by Steph. Byz. at 696.1, and perhaps attested in the Delphic list of theorodokoi of c.230–210 (SEG 36 500). It has been suggested that the Χορσαί referred to by Demosthenes must be Κορσαίεια in north-west Boiotia near East Lokris (Etienne and Knoepfler (1976) 32–41), but Demosthenes’ mention of Orchomenos (no. 213), Koroneia (no. 210) and Tilphoseion side by side with Κορσαί, as well as the notes in Harp. and Ps.-Skytall, strongly support the traditional location of the site in southern Boiotia.

Ps.-Skytall 38 lists Chorsiai as the first toponym after the heading πόλεις αἵδε, where polis is used in the urban sense, and the settlement is presumably called a polis by Theopomp. fr. 167 = Harp. K77, quoting Dem. 19.141 for the toponym and Theopompos for the site-classification.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in a treaty with Thespiai (SEG 3 342 (C2e)) and internally in a proxeny decree (SEG 22.410 (C2f)). There is no attestation of the individual use.

The name of the territory is unknown; its size has been assessed at c.40 km² (Fossey (1988) 186). A C4e inventory of hestiatorion equipment, presumably found in Chorsiai, indicates that Chorsiai in C4e was a dependent polis lying inside the territory of Thespiai (no. 222) (SEG 24 361, 30 441 (386–380), but cf. 47 520). The inscription testifies to a Heraion and a cult of Hera in Chorsiai (Schachter (1981–94) i. 238). For a possible cult of Zeus Soter, see SEG 36 417 (C6–C4 but heavily restored: Schachter (1981–94) iii. 99–100).

In 346 Chorsiai was destroyed by the Thebans, had its walls demolished and, like Orchomenos and Koroneia, the city was perhaps exposed to an andrapodismos (Dem. 19.141). The epigraphical and archaeological evidence shows that the city was soon resettled.

The only reference in written sources to walls is χώρον μεν οἱ Χορσαίοι φέρουσιν at Diod. 16.58.1, describing the Phokians’ occupation of Chorsiai during the Sacred War down to 346. Remains of a coursed trapezoidal wall enclosed both the acropolis and the lower town on the east, north and west sides, whereas the south side was protected by cliffs. This circuit seems to date from the years after the battle of Leuktra; it was probably destroyed by the Thebans in 346 (Dem. 19.141), but re-erected later on in C4 in isodomic aslar work. The walls enclose residential quarters of c.1 ha (Büsing and Büsing-Kolbe (1972) 79–87; Fossey (1986)). According to Bintliff (1997a) 244, the habitation area amounted to between 1.7 and 4.5 ha. The settlement can be traced back to the early Helladic period, and there are remains of the Geometric, Archaic and Classical periods (Fossey (1988) 193).

### 203. Erythrai

Map 54. Lat. 38.15, long. 23.25. Size of territory: 1. Type: C. The toponym is Ἐρυθραῖα, ai' (Hom. Il. 2.499 (for the accent see schol. ad loc.); Thuc. 3.24.2), denoting either the town (Ev. Bacch. 751) or the polity (Hell. Oxy. 19.3). There is no attestation of the toponym in epigraphical sources, and the only attestation of a city-ethnic is Ἐρυθραῖας Παντίας [SEG 30 457 (C6)]; cf. Fossey (1991) 181–89; Hansen (1995a) 46–47; for the sequence ethnic-name, see IG vii 2796. But [Δ]ημαρέτ[η] Μ[οίρ]χου [Ἐ]ρυθρα[ί]α[ία] [IG ii 8500 = SEG 14 194 (C4b)] may come from Boiotian Erythrai too, since Μοίρξου is a good Boiotian name, and since the stele was found in Eleusis, where several other sepulchral inscriptions commemorating Boiotians have been found (Koumanoudis (1961) 104).

The only reference in ancient literature to Erythrai having been a polis is Pausanias’ remark: ‘Ὑσίων καὶ Ἐρυθρῶν ἑρείπια ἔστιν. πόλεις δὲ ποτὲ τῶν Βοιωτῶν ᾠσάε’ (9.2.1). Pausanias’ retrospective site-classification is supported by two observations: (a) in 479 Erythrai had a territory which must have been very small (Hdt. 9.15.3, 25.2: ὅ Ἐρυθραῖός χώρος), and (b) a sympoliteia with Plataiai (no. 216) in C5m suggests that Erythrai had been a polis before it joined the sympoliteia and may perhaps still have been a dependent polis even after the union (Hell. Oxy. 19.3; Hansen (1995a) 16) by which its territory seems to have become a part of Plataiai.
Erythrai must have been annexed by Thebes (no. 221) before the synoecism of c.431 when its population was moved to Thebes (Hell. Oxy. 20.3; Demand (1990) 83–85; Moggi, Sin. 197–204). By 395, however, Erythrai had been repopulated, but was still lying within the territory of Thebes (Hell. Oxy. 19.3).

The acropolis was fortified by an undated defence circuit of rubble with no pretence to style enclosing an area of 1,600 m² (Fossey (1988) 117–18). A wall of the lower town “is only visible as a line in the fall of the land” (letter from Fossey, Jan. 1995). The walls are probably later than 431, when Erythrai is described as unfortified (Hell. Oxy. 20.3). Apart from a few LH III sherds, the settlement cannot be traced further back than the Classical period (Fossey (1988) 118).

**204. Eteonos/Skaphai (Skaph(λ)eus)** Map 55. Unlocated.

Type: C. The toponym was originally Ἰτεώνος, Ṽ (Hom. Il. 2.497; Strabo 9.2.24), but it was changed into Σκαφαί, αἱ (Hell. Oxy. 20.3) or alternatively Σκαφεῖ (IG II 11654 (C4m); Strabo 9.2.24, erroneously emended Σκάρφη by all eds.). The change of name may perhaps be connected with the refoundation of the town in c.400 after the synoecism with Thebes (no. 221) in c.431. We know that Eteonos/Skaphai was located near Skolos (no. 219) and occupied a hill (Hom. Il. 2.497) in the Parasopia (Strabo 9.2.24), but the precise location is unknown (Fossey (1988) 130–31).

Apart from Steph. Byz. (283.8), Eteonos/Skaphai is never called a polis, and the reasons for including the site in this inventory are (a) that a city-ethnic is attested in Classical sources (Hansen (1995a) 28, 48) and (b) that a sympoliteia with Plataiai in C5m suggests that Eteonos/Skaphai had been a polis before it joined the sympoliteia and may perhaps still have been a dependent polis even after the union (Hell. Oxy. 19.3; Hansen (1995a) 16). Skaphai was one of the small unwalled settlements whose population was moved to Thebes (Hell. Oxy. 20.3) in connection with the major synoecism at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War (Demand (1990) 83–85; Moggi, Sin. 197–204 prefers a date c.426–424).

Apart from Steph. Byz. 283.10, there is no attestation of a city-ethnic derived from the toponym Eteonos, but the city-ethnic Σκαφῆ(λ)εύς is attested in three Attic sepulchral inscriptions of C4: IG II 11652: Σκαφῆ(λ)εύς (C4f); SEG 15161: Σκαφηκά, Σκαφηκαί (C4m, Eleusis); SEG 22 191: Σκαφηκαί (C4s, Eleusis); cf. also SEG 22 192 (second and third centuries aD). The only other attestation is in Men. Dysc. hypoth. 14: ὑπεκρίνατο Ἀριστόθηκος Σκαφῆς, ὑπεκρίνατο Ἀριστόθηκος Σκαφῆς, ὑπεκρίνατο Ἀριστόθηκος Σκαφῆς, ὑπεκρίνατο Ἀριστόθηκος Σκαφῆς, ὑπεκρίνατο Ἀριστόθηκος Σκαφῆς. Cf. IG II 11654: ἑΣκαφήλαω (C4m) (Koumanoudis: a<ί>, but see δραχμαὶν in IG VII 395.4).

205. Eutresis (Eutretidieus) Map 54. Lat. 38.15, long. 23.15.

Size of territory: 1. Type: C. The toponym is Εὐτρητις, η (Hom. Il. 2.502; Eust. Il. 1.409.20, van der Valk; Hell. Oxy. 19.3, where the toponym denotes the polity). The only surviving attestation of the city-ethnic is in a Hellenistic dedication to Apollo: Εὐτρητίδειες Ἀπόλλωνι (BCH 28 (1904) 430–31 no.1).

Strabo calls Eutresis a κωμόιον Θεσπίων (9.2.28), and in Steph. Byz. (287.21) it is classified as a kome. Eutresis is not called a polis in any extant source, but the reference at Hell. Oxy. 19.3 to what was probably a sympoliteia between Thespiai (no. 222), Thibhai (no. 223) and Eutresis suggests that Eutresis during the First Federation was a dependent polis dominated by Thespiai (Siewert (1977) 463; Hansen (1995a) 16); cf. τοι Ἐπιπέδεις καὶ τοῖς συν αὐτῶς (SEG 31 358.5 (C5f)). The attestation of the city-ethnic further suggests that Eutresis was still a polis in the Hellenistic period during the Third Federation.

Excavations have revealed a part of a circuit wall. Its compartment construction has been taken to suggest a C4m date (Fossey (1988) 152), and it enclosed an area of between 13 and 20 ha (Bintliff (1997a) 244). The settlement can be traced back to the Neolithic period (Fossey (1988) 152).

206. Haliartos (Haliartios) Map 55. Lat. 38.25, long. 23.05.

Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Ἀλιάρτος, ὁ (Armenidas (FGrHist 378) fr.7) or Ἀλιάρτος, ὁ (Hom. Il. 2.503, cf. PLond. Lit. 6; Lys. 16.13; IG VII 2850 (C2–C1)), denoting either the town (Diod. 14.81.2 (r395)) or the territory (Xen. Hell. 3.5.17). In Boiotia the city-ethnic is either Ἀλιάρτης (SEG 25 554 (C5); Etienne and Knoepfler (1976) 221–25) or Ἀλιάρτης (IG VII 2724,4–5 (c.280–270)); outside Boiotia it is always Ἀλιάρτης (Thuc. 4.93.4). For the late appearance of the form Ἀλιάρτης, see most recently Knoepfler (1992) 480–81.

Haliartos is listed as one of the Boiotian poleis in Thucydides’ description of the battle of Delion (4.91.1, 93.4). It is called a polis in the urban sense by Herac. Cret. 25 (GGM 1.104 (C3)) and in the political sense by the Oxyrhynchus historian (Hell. Oxy. 19.3). The term ἀπίτια (citizenship) in a proxeny and citizenship decree of C4f (SEG 28 453.8) strongly supports Knoepfler’s restoration τὰς πόλεις Ἀλιαρτίων in lines 3–4 of the decree (BCH 102 (1978) 381, pace Fossey in Boeotia Antiqua 4 (1994) 49–51).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on the reverse of a coin of C4f (APIAPTION: Head, ἸΝΠ 345; see Etienne and Knoepfler (1976) 222 n. 771) and externally in a C5 dedication found near Orchestos (SEG 25 554).
For the individual and external use, see [Ἠλία]άρτιος (CID ii 94.5), a hieromnemón of 327.

The territory was called Ἁλίαρτος (Xen. Hell. 3.5.17) or Ἁλιαρτία (Strabo 9.2.33; Paus. 9.33.4). Together with Lebadeia (no. 211) and Koroneia (no. 210), Haliartos constituted one of the eleven Boiotian districts (Hell. Oxy. 19.3). The size of the territory has been assessed at c.80 km² (Fossey 1988). It comprised Onchestos (Strabo 9.2.33; SEG 25 554; Etienne and Knoepfler 1976) 223; Schachter (1981–94) ii. 206), Tilphossa and Okalea, as well as Medeon (Strabo 9.2.26). A line of fortifications, now dated to 371 (Fossey 1992) 112–14), indicates the border of the city towards Koroneia (Fossey 1988) 320). The Cambridge/Bradford survey of Boiotia has revealed that there is a band of almost empty territory running east–west just north of Asakra, probably the border zone between the territory of Haliartos and that of Thespiai (no. 222) (Snodgrass 1990) 129). The Thebans’ remark at Hdt. 5.7.9.2 that the Koroneians and Thespians are their neighbours indicates that Haliartos in 507/6 was a dependent polis and situated in what was then the territory of either Koroneia or Thebes.

Haliartos was a member of the First Federation (Hell. Oxy. 19.3), and the principal body of government was a boule to which only propertied citizens were admitted (Hell. Oxy. 19.2, 3). Haliartos was a member of the Third Federation; it provided one of the hieromnemones in 327 (CID ii 94.5) and one of the aphedriateuontes in c.280–270 (IG vii 2724b.2). We have no evidence relating to the Second Federation. In C4 Haliartos seems to have awarded proxenia and politeia to a citizen from an unknown polis (SEG 28 453, restored).

On the acropolis have been found the remains of an Archaic sanctuary with a stoai (Coulton 1976) 240) and a temple of Athena (C7–C6), and the protecting god of Haliartos was probably Athena Itonia (SEG 32 4568–9, cf. 44 408 (C3); Schachter (1981–94) i. 116). Cults of Dionysos, Alkmene and the hero Alean has been inferred from Plut. Lys. 28 (Schachter (1981–94) i. 9–10, 11–12, 176).

A small circuit of cyclopean masonry (Mycenaean?) with Lesbian (Archaic?) and trapezoidal (Classical?) repairs encloses the acropolis. An ashlar circuit, probably of C4, encloses the lower city and covers an area of c.42 ha (Fossey 1988). It was fortified when attacked by Lysandros in 395/4 (Xen. Hell. 3.5.17–19; Diod. 14.81.2; Paus. 3.5.3–5). All three passages refer to a circuit wall enclosing the whole city and not just the acropolis. Haliartos seems to have been an early Iron Age settlement located in and round the acropolis, and from there it spread down the slope to the south. The settlement can be traced back to the Neolithic period (Fossey 1988). The urban centre reached its maximum size in C4 (Bintliff and Snodgrass 1988) 61–65). An important Classical cemetery outside Haliartos is reported in AR (1999–2000) 56.

Haliartos struck silver coins on the Aiginetan standard from c.456 to 446 and from c.400 (or earlier) to 374 (or later), and bronze coins from c.338 to 315. (1) Silver, 456–446: denominations: stater, triobol, obol, tetartemorion; obv. Boiotic shield, rev. amphora or kantharos in incuse square. Legend: Ά or AP or API. (2) Silver, C5–C4: denominations: stater, hemiobol; obv. Boiotic shield on which trient; rev. naked Poseidon. Legend: ΑΠΙΑΠΤΙΟΝ (or -ΙΟΣ) in epichoric letters, which points to a date around 400 rather than after 386 (supra 432). (3) Bronze, 338–315: obv. Boiotic shield; rev. legend: ΑΠΙ or ΑΛΙ in concave field (Field, HN 345; Babelon, Trésor ii.3. 270–74; Kraay (1976) 11–12; Etienne and Knoepfler (1976) 222; Hansen (1995a) 63 add. note; SNG Cop. Boetia 187). The Archaic coins inscribed with an epichoric H and traditionally assigned to Haliartos are now believed to have been struck by Hyettos (no. 207; Etienne and Knoepfler (1976) 218–26). Conversely, Etienne and Knoepfler (1976) 221 n. 768 suggest that the C5e issues usually ascribed to Akraiphia (no. 198) may have been minted at (H)aliartos.

207. Hyetos (Hyettios) Map 55. Lat. 38.35, long. 23.05. Size of territory: 2. Type: [A]. Apart from the Latinised version in Plin. HN 36.128, the toponym Υηττος, ά is attested in two late sources only: Paus. 9.24.3–4, 35.6 and Steph. Byz. 646.14–15. But the personal name Υηττος (Hes. fr. 257 (C7–C6)) implies that the toponym goes back to the Archaic period. The city-ethnic is Υεττίος (SEG 24 300 (C6s)), Υεττίτος (IG vii 1673.4 (c.240)), Υετίτως (IG vii 416.78 (C1)) or Υετίτιος (IG vii 2834.4 (c.200)).

The earliest explicit reference to Hyettos as a polis is in a military catalogue of c.250 (SEG 26 498.3–4). But other evidence implies that Hyettos was a polis in the Archaic and Classical periods as well. (a) SEG 24 300 (C6s): Θέβαιαίοι τὸν ήετον inscribed on a greave and undoubtedly commemorating a Theban victory over the Hyettans. (b) Hell. Oxy. 19.3: δύο δέ παρείχοντο βουλατάρχας Όρχυμένοι καὶ Υέττιοι (con. Wilamowitz; Etienne and Knoepfler (1976) 230). MS ‘Υαταιοί), which shows that in c.400 Hyettos was one of the poleis that participated in the running of the federal administration; cf. 19.2: παρ’ έκάστη τῶν πόλεων. Further evidence of the close relations between Hyettos and Orchomenos (no. 213) is provided by a public dedication of c.400 set up by the Orchomenians on the acropolis of...
Hyetos (now lost but seen in 1938 by M. Feyel, BCH 62 (1938) 165 n. 5; Etienne and Knoepfler (1976) 228–29).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on the coins if ἢ is an abbreviation of ἡμετέρων (infra), and externally in the Theban dedication SEG 24.300 (C65). The individual and external use of the city-ethnic is attested in a list of aphedriateutes: ... Ἑρίκιος IG vii 1673.4 (c.240). The name of the territory is unknown; its size has been assessed at 0.55 km² (Fossey (1988) 292).

During the First Federation, Orchomenos and Hyetos constituted two of the Boiotian districts and provided two Boiotarchs (Hell. Oxy. 19.3). The difference in size between the two cities indicates that, like the other small poleis around Lake Kopais, Hyetos provided one Boiotarch every third year and Orchomenos the others (Etienne and Knoepfler (1976) 229–33). The principal body of government was a boule to which only propertied citizens were admitted (Hell. Oxy. 19.2, 3). Hyetos was a member of the Third Federation (IG vii 1673.4 (c.240)). There is no evidence concerning the Second Federation.

The acropolis was fortified by a wall of Lesbian masonry dating from c.500 with repairs of C4 and C2. The circuit encloses an area of 0.6 ha. There are no traces of any wall around the lower city, which seems to have lain south and east of the acropolis (Etienne and Knoepfler (1976) 45–65). A surface survey of the urban centre shows that it covered 0.26 ha (Bintliff (1999) 15). There are no traces of habitation antedating the Archaic period (Fossey (1988) 294–95).


208. Hysiai  Map 55. Lat. 38.15, long. 23.20. Size of territory: 1. Type: C. The toponym is ‘Ὑσιαὶ, αἱ (Hdt. 5.74.2; Eur. Bacch. 751), denoting the polity (Hdt. 6.108.6) or the town (Hdt. 9.15.3) or the territory (Thuc. 3.24.2). There is no attestation of the toponym in epigraphical sources, and the only attestation of a city-ethnic is in Steph. Byz. 653.9.

Apart from Pausanias’ description of Hysiai as the ruins of what had once been a Boiotian polis (9.2.1), the only reference in ancient literature to Hysia as a polis is in Harp. 15: ‘Ὑσιαὶ, τῆς Βοιωτίας πόλις, quoting Hypereides’ speech For Xenophilos (fr. 156, Sauppe) for the toponym and Euripides’ Antiope (fr. 180, Nauck) for the site-classification, which, however, is applied to the Heroic Age and cannot be used as evidence for the status of Hysiai in the Archaic and Classical periods. The two main reasons for including Hysiai in this inventory are (a) that it had a territory of its own and (b) that it was placed right between Plataiai (no. 216) and the three small cities which are named by the Oxyrhynchus historian as συμπολεμόμεναι with Plataiai (Hell. Oxy. 19.3): viz. Erythrai (no. 203), Skolos (no. 219) and Eteonos/Skaphai (no. 204). This location strongly indicates that Hysiai must have been one of the small members of the sympoliteia not mentioned explicitly by the Oxyrhynchus historian but referred to in the phrase πῶν ἄλλων χωρίων, and thus Hysiai was presumably a polis, perhaps a dependent polis after it joined the sympoliteia.

Hysiai had been annexed by Athens, probably in 519, and was still part of Attika in 506 (Hdt. 5.74.2, 6.108.6); but in 479 Hysiai was lying in Plataian territory (Hdt. 9.101.1), yet at the same time had a territory of its own which, however, must have been very small (Hdt. 9.25.3, cf. 6.108.6) bordering on Plataiai to the west (Hdt. 9.15.3, 25.3), Thebes to the north (Hdt. 6.108.6), Erythrai to the east (Hdt. 9.15.3) and Eleutherai to the south (Paus. 9.1.6). Later in Ἕσι Hysiai seems to have been a member of the sympoliteia led by Plataiai (Hell. Oxy. 19.3) and must accordingly have been a part of Plataiai (cf. Paus. 9.2.1).

A cult of Demeter is attested in inscriptions (IG vii 1670–71 (both C5e)) and in the sources for the battle of Plataiai, in which the sanctuary is described as that of Demeter Eleusinia (Hdt. 9.57.2, 62.2, 65.2, 69.1; Plut. Arist. 11.6; Paus. 9.4.3; Schachter (1981–94) i. 152–54). Pritchett (1979) associated the sanctuary with some remains of C5e found in the plain near modern Pantanassa, but a location on the hills just north of modern Kriekouki was suggested by Wallace (1985) 97–99. Of the settlement itself, remains of a circuit wall (undated) could still be seen at Kriekouki in the early twentieth century (Fossey (1988) 113), and there are pottery and small finds of the Archaic and Classical periods (ibid. 114).

209. Kopai (Kopaius)  Map 55. Lat. 38.30, long. 23.10. Size of territory: 3. Type: [A]. The toponym Κόπαι, αἱ is attested in literary sources only (Hom. Il. 2.502; Hell. Oxy. 19.3, where it denotes the polity). The city-ethnic is Κοπαιεῖς (Thuc. 4.93.4; IG vii 4149.15 [C1f]) or Κοπαιός (Head, HN 344 [C4f]) or Κοπηγός (IG vii 2792 [C4s]), which is the more common form in Boiotian inscriptions (Fossey in LCM 10 (1985) 39).
Kopai is listed as one of the Boiotian poleis in Thucydides' description of the battle of Delion (4.91.1, 93.4) and in the Oxyrhynchus historian's account of the federal constitution (Hell. Oxy. 19.3), both passages using polis in the political sense.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally on a C₄₅ boundary stone (IG vii 2792) and internally on the reverse of a coin of C₄₅ (ΚΟΡΩΝΙΩΝ: Head, ΗΝ 344); the individual use is attested externally in a list of aphedriatea: Ἀμισσοτοκράτος [Ἐμύτοκος Κωτ[ὴ]ς ος (IG vii 2724.5 (c.240)) and internally in a Hellenistic grave epigram (IG vii 2796.1).

An inscription of c.315 cut in the rock near Vristika marked the border between Kopai and Akraiaphia (no. 198) (IG vii 2792; SEG 36 411; Lauffer (1986) 136), and, similarly, a horos of the late Archaic period probably records the border between the two poleis (SEG 30 440). The size of the territory has been assessed at c.105 km² (Fossey (1988) 264).

In 395 Kopai was united with Akraiaphia and Chaironeia (no. 201) and constituted one of the eleven Boiotian districts (Hell. Oxy. 19.3). The principal body of government was a boule, to which only propertied citizens were admitted (Hell. Oxy. 19.2, 3). There is no explicit evidence concerning the Second Federation, but Kopai was a member of the Third Federation (IG vii 2724.5 (c.240)).

A temple of Demeter is mentioned in Pausanias' description of Kopai (9.24.1), and a cult of Demeter Tauropolos is attested in an undated inscription found in Kopai (IG vii 2793, now lost); the bull on the C₄₅ coins of Kopai (infra) indicates that Demeter Tauropolos was worshipped in Kopai already in the Classical period (Schachter (1981–94) i. 154–55).

A line of an ashlar wall (presumably of C₄₅) and possibly the position of a tower can still be observed (Fossey (1988) 278). The settlement is supposed to have covered c.23 ha (Bintliff (1997a) 244); it can be traced back to the Neolithic period, and there are remains of the Geometric, Archaic and Classical periods (Fossey (1988) 279).


210. Koroneia (Koroneus) Map 55. Lat. 38.25, long. 22.55. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Κορώνεα, Ἱ (Hom. ll. 2.503; Thuc. 1.113.2; IG ii 5222 (394); SEG 19 363 (C₄₅)), but a C₆ dedication in Olympia has Ῥορόνεα (LSAG 93 and 95 no. 11). The toponym denotes either the town (IG iv 1.94.4) or the polity (Dem. 19.325) or the territory (IG ii 5222.vii.11 (394)). In most literary sources the city-ethnic is Κορωναῖοι (Hdt. 5.79.2; Thuc. 4.93.4), but in inscriptions and some literary sources it is Κορωναῖοι (Lazarini (1976) 916; CID ii 74.1.50 (337/6); Hell. Oxy. 19.3); once it is Κορώναοι (Strabo 9.2.29). Again, [Ῥο]ρόνεα [ἐς] has been restored on a C₆ helmet dedicated to Olympian Zeus (SEG 42 381), and the oldest coins (500–480) are marked with a ρ, whereas the coins of the next series (from c.456–446) have the legend ΚΟΡΟ (Head, ΗΝ 345).

Koroneia is perhaps called a polis in the urban sense by Hecat. fr. 117 (= Steph. Byz. 377.12, where Hekataios is quoted for the toponym but not necessarily for the site-classification). Koroneia is called a polis in the political sense in Thucydides' description of the battle of Delion (4.91.1, 93.4) and in the Oxyrhynchus historian's description of the Boiotian constitution (Hell. Oxy. 19.3).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form on coins (infra) and externally in a C₆ dedication in Thebes (Lazarini (1976) 916) as well as in literary sources (Hdt. 5.79.2; Thuc. 4.93.4). The individual use is attested internally in a list of victors at the Pamboiotia (SEG 26 551 (C₃₅)) and externally in a sepulchral inscription from Thespiae: Ἑόρπας Κορωνεῦ χαῖρε (IG vii 2114 = Choix 49 (Hellenistic)).

The territory was called Κορωνεῖα (Thuc. 1.113.2; Arist. Mir. ausc. 842b3) or Ἱ Κορωνεῖακη (Strabo 9.2.19, 28). The territory comprised Hermoaion (a valley), Metachoion (a fortress between Koroneia and Orchomenos (no. 213), Ephor. fr. 94a), the sanctuary of Athena Itonia (Strabo 9.2.29; schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.51a) and Alalkomenai (no. 199) (Schachter (1981–94) i. 113). Its size has been assessed at c.95 km² (Fossey (1988) 322). Together with Haliartos (no. 206) and Lebadeia (no. 211), Koroneia constituted one of the eleven Boiotian districts (Hell. Oxy. 19.3). The principal body of government was a boule, to which only propertied citizens were admitted (Hell. Oxy. 19.2, 3).

Koroneia was allied with Thebes in 506 and earlier (Hdt. 5.79.2). The city was a member of the First Federation (Hell. Oxy. 19.3–4), the Second Federation (Diod. 16.35.3) and the Third Federation (CID ii 74.50). A citizen of Koroneia was appointed proxenos by Delphi (no. 177) (F.Delphes ii 113.102 (C₄₅)). In 359 a theorodokos was appointed to host theoroi from Epidaurus (no. 348) (IG iv 1.94.4.7).

The protecting god of Koroneia was Athena Itonia, whose sanctuary seems to have been located just to the north of the acropolis (Alc. fr. 325; Bacchyl. fr. 15; Schachter (1981–94) i. 93).
where excavations have uncovered the foundations of three buildings that can be traced back to C6 (Fossey 1988 326). The cult is attested on a C6 lekane (Brit. Mus. B80) depicting Athena, her priestess and a serpentine consort, later identified with the chthonic Zeus. Her festival included hippic competitions (Pind. Parth. 2.46–49). The pan-Boiotian festival postdates the Classical period. Another important deity at Koroneia was Herakles Charops (Schachter 1981–94 ii. 3–10), whose sanctuary was close to and possibly shared with Zeus Laphystios (SEG 23 297.6–7; Schachter 1981–94 iii. 104–6). In inscriptions of C4–C3 is attested a cult of Demeter Thesmophoros (IG vii 2876; Schachter 1981–94 i. 155).

In 353/2 Koroneia was conquered by Onomarchos (Ephor. fr. 94a; Diod. 16.58.1) and became a Phokian stronghold (Dem. 19.148; Diod. 16.58.1) until 346, when Philip had the city handed over to the Thebans (Dem. 5.22, 6.15), who exposed it to an andrapodismos (Dem. 19.112, 325); but shortly afterwards Koroneia must have been resettled, since in 337/6 one of the Boian tamiai in Delphi was a Koroneian citizen (CID 11.74.50).

Koroneia was a walled city when conquered by the Phokians in 353 (Ephor. fr. 94a; Diod. 16.58.1). There are remains of an undated polygonal circuit around the acropolis, enclosing an area of 38 ha (Fossey 1988 325–26, letter of Jan. 1995); another circuit of unknown date enclosing the lower town could still be seen in the nineteenth century (Frazer 1898 v. 70). The settlement is supposed to have covered 394 ha (Bintliff 1997a 244); it can be traced back to the Neolithic period, and there are remains of the Geometric, Archaic and Classical periods (Fossey 1988 326). The site of a possible theatre and above it remains of a Doric temple were noted by early travellers (Fossey 1988 325).


211. Lebadeia (Lebadeus) Map 55. Lat. 38.25, long. 22.50. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Αἶβάδεια, η (Hdt 8.134.1; IG vii 3083.4–5 (C3s)), denoting either the town (IG iv.2.1 94.4.9; Theophr. Hist. pl. 4.11.8) or the territory (Xen. Mem. 3.5.4). According to Paus. 9.39.1, the original toponym was Μίδεια, mentioned in the Homeric Catalogue of Ships (Hom. Il. 2.507). The city-ethnic is Λεβαδεύς (Hell. Oxy. 19.3; CIDD 102.11.11 (324/3)) or, once, Λεβάδευς (IG xi.5 542.25 (C4m)), but in some Boiotian inscriptions it is Λεβαδεύς (IG vii 3068.1 = Michel 635 (C3)).

Lebadeia is called a polis in the political sense at Hell. Oxy. 19.3 and in a sacred law of C4m (IG vii 3055). The formula [τὰς πόλις τὰς Λεβαδεύς σὲ Αἴβαδειοι] is restored in IG vii 3086 of c.400, but see Schachter (1981–94 iii. 76 n.1.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in a sacred law (IG vii 3055 (C4s); Schachter 1981–94 iii. 86–88) and externally in Hell. Oxy. 19.3. For the individual and external use, see IG xi.5 542.25 (C4m), a Karthaiai proxenos, or CID 11 102.11: Σωκράτειος Λεβαδευος σε, hieromnemon in 324/3.

The territory was called Λεβαδεύς (Cratinus fr. 220; Xen. Mem. 3.5.4; Theophr. Hist. pl. 4.11.8) or η Λεβάδιακή (Arist. Hist. an. 606a1). Together with Koroneia (no. 210) and Haliartos (no. 206), Lebadeia constituted one of the eleven Boian districts (Hell. Oxy. 19.3). A heros of C4–C3 found some 4 km south-east of Lebadeia marks the border between Lebadeia and Koroneia (SEG 23 297). To the north-east Lebadeia bordered on the territory of Orchomenos (no. 213) (Arist. Hist. an. 606a1, a passage which shows that Lake Kopais in C4 was considerably smaller than indicated in Barr.; cf. also Lauffer (1886) 136). The adjoining city to the north was Chaironeia (no. 201) (Plut. Mor. 849A (rC4)). The size of the territory has been assessed at c.95 km² (Fossey 1988 322, 342).

Lebadeia was a member of the First Federation (Hell. Oxy. 19.3), and the principal body of government was a boule, to which only propertied citizens were admitted (Hell. Oxy. 19.2, 3). The city was sacked by Lysandros in 395 (Plut. Lys. 28.2). The city must have been a member of the Second Federation as well, since the panegyris celebrating the Boiotian victory at Leuktra took place in Lebadeia (infra), and the attestation of a hieromnemon in 324/3 testifies to membership of the Third Federation (CID 11 102.11). Theorodokoi were appointed c.400 to host theoroi from Delphi (no. 177) (Syll. 90.14–15), and in 359 to host theoroi from Epidaurus (no. 348) (restored in IG iv.2.1 94.4.9).

Lebadeia was famous for its oracle of Trophonios, with his brother Agamedes the mythical architect of Apollo's temple at Delphi (Hymn. Hom. Ap. 296). In his subterranean cave just outside Lebadeia, Trophonios was consulted
allegedly by Kroisos of Lydia (Hdt. 1.46.2) and Mys of Persia (Hdt. 8.134.1), and certainly in C4m by King Amyntas of Macedon (IG vii 11 3055.7–8). The cult is attested from C6 to the end of Antiquity (IG vii 11 3055: a sacred law of C4m regulating the consultations; Eur. Ion 300–2; Paus. 9.39.2–14; Schachter (1991–94) iii. 66–89.

The protecting god of Lebadeia was probably Zeus Basileus and, allegedly following an oracle of Trophonios given before the battle of Leuktra in 371, a pan-Boiotian festival was set up at Lebadeia in honour of Zeus Basileus (Diod. 15.53.4). The festival was held under Theban sponsorship to celebrate their victory and included gymnastic and hippic competitions (IG vii 11 352, 2532; SEG 23 332 (all C4m); Schachter (1981–94) iii. 109–18).

The city of Lebadeia was situated on the eastern bank of the river Herkyna (Paus. 9.39.2) beneath the modern city. The size of the city is still unknown (Bintliff (1997a) 251), and so far no traces of an ancient defence circuit have been found. Excavations have revealed some remains of C4 monumental buildings including a stoa and a temple of the Zeus of Lindos, and there are remains of the Archaic and Classical periods (Fossey (1988) 249; Turner (1994)). To the west of the river Herkyna were the famous oracle of Trophonios and the sanctuary of Zeus Basileios with a Doric temple, of which there are still some architectural fragments. The settlement can be traced back to EH II and there are remains of the Archaic and Classical periods (Fossey (1988) 20–81). The large cemetery testifies to a peak of population in C6s (Hure (1940); Sparkes (1967) 108–30).

Mykalessos struck silver coins on the Aiginetan standard from c.500 to 480 and from 386 (or earlier) to 374 (or later). (1) c.500–480, denominations: stater, drachm, hemiobol; obv. Boiotian shield; rev. thunderbolt. Legend: ΛΕΒΑ. (2) Bronze: obv. Boiotian shield; rev. legend: ΛΕΒ in concave field (Head, HN² 346).

212. Mykalessos (Mykalessios) Map 55. Lat. 38.25, long. 23.00. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Μυκαλησίας, Ὀρχοµενός, Ὀρχοµένιος (Hom. Il. 2.498; Thuc. 7.29.2–3), denoting either the town (Thuc. 7.29.3–4) or the polity (Thuc. 7.30.3) or the territory (Hom. Il. 2.498). The city-ethnic is Μυκαλήσιος (Thuc. 7.30.3). Neither the toponym nor the city-ethnic is attested in epigraphical sources.

Mykalessos is called a polis both in the urban and in the political sense by Thuc. 7.29–30. According to Strabo it was a kome (9.2.11.14), whereas Paus. 9.19.4, retrospectively, describes Mykalessos as the ruins of a polis.

The collective form of the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form on coins (infra) and externally in Thuc. 7.30.3, paraphrased by Pausanias at 1.23.3.

In the Hellenistic and Roman periods Mykalessos was located in the territory of Tanagra (no. 220) (Strabo 9.2.11, 14; Paus. 9.19.8), and that seems to have been the case already in C3e (Fossey (1988) 83–84, 222–23; Hansen (1995a) 36–37). Within the Tanagraian territory, however, Mykalessos had its own territory, called Μυκαλησίας, which seems to have stretched as far as the Euboian Gulf (Paus. 9.19.5; Bakhuisen (1970) 20–21, 148–49), and so its area must be assessed as at least 50 and perhaps more than 100 km².

In 413 the city was sacked by Thracian mercenaries, and a large part of the population was killed (Thuc. 7.29–30). Mykalessos was walled, but the circuit was not very high, and parts of it had collapsed (Thuc. 7.29.3). The wall reported by Lolling (1989) 508 may have been the remains of a circuit (Fossey (1988) 80–81). Thucydides describes Mykalessos as a small polis, and apart from houses the only buildings mentioned are some sanctuaries and a school (Thuc. 7.29.4–5). At the site are remains of an undated circuit wall in polygonal masonry and considerable architectural fragments. The settlement can be traced back to EH II and there are remains of the Archaic and Classical periods (Fossey (1988) 80–83). The large cemetery testifies to a peak of population in C6s (Hure (1940); Sparkes (1967) 128–30).

Mykalessos struck silver coins on the Aiginetan standard from c.500 to 480 and from 386 (or earlier) to 374 (or later). (1) c.500–480, denominations: stater, drachm, hemiobol; obv. Boiotian shield; rev. letter M in mill-sail or incuse square. (2) C3–C4f, denominations: obol, hemiobol, tetartemorion, 1/8 obol; obv. Boiotian shield; rev. thunderbolt (some). Legend: Μ or ΜΥ (Head (1881) 47, HN² 346; Kraay (1976) 110; Schachter (1989) 85; SNG. Cop. Boeotia 190–91).
Cóm helmet at Olympia commemorating a victory over Koroneia (no. 210) (LSAG 93 and 95 no. 11). For the individual and external use, see Νίκιας Ἱσραήλ Ἐρχομένος (IG 11 10036 (410–390)). See also in the C5 dedication from Delphi: [Ἐ]πίδαλος . . . Βοιώτων Ἐχχ. Ἐρχ[ομένον] (LSAG 93 and 95 no. 17 (c.475–450)).

The territory was called γῆ Ἡ Ὀρχομενίων (Hdt. 8.34) or Ἡ Ὀρχομενία (Theophr. Hist. pl. 9.13.1; Strabo 9.2.19) or Ἡ Ὀρχομενός (Thuc. 1.113.2). (When denoting the city, the gender of the toponym is invariably masculine—the exception is Apol. Rhod. Arg. 4.257—thus Ἡ Ὀρχομενός probably denotes the territory of Orchomenos with either γῆ or χώρα implied.)

To the north, Orchomenos bordered on Phokis and included Aspledon (Paus. 9.38.9), Kyrto and Korseia (Paus. 9.39.1; cf. Etienne and Knoepfler (1976) 196) and Tegyra (Plut. Pele. 16.1–3). To the south Orchomenos bordered on the territory of Lebadeia (no. 211) (Arist. Hist. an. 605–31; Paus. 9.39.1). Down to c.400 the territory of Orchomenos seems to have included Chaironeia (no. 201) (Hdt. 8.34.1; Thuc. 4.76.3; Theopomp. fr. 407), and after 457 Chaironeia and Orchomenos served as a refuge for oligarchs from the other Boiotian poleis (Hellen. fr. 81). But Chaironeia became free of Orchomenos at some time after 424 (Thuc. 4.76.3, 93.4) but before 395 (Hell. Oxy. 19.3). The size of the territory has been assessed at c.105 km² (Fossey (1988) 342); including Kyrto and Korseia it was c.150 km². Together with Hyettos (no. 207), Orchomenos constituted two of the eleven Boiotian districts (Hell. Oxy. 19.3).

In the Catalogue of Ships Orchomenos is called Μυνεύειος and is not a part of Boiotia (Hom. Il. 2.511; cf. Thuc. 4.76.3). According to this tradition, Orchomenos and the Minyans had once ruled Boiotia and received tribute from the Boiotian cities (Isoc. 14.10; Diod. 15.79.5). On the Bronze Age palace and Mycenaean remains in Orchomenos, see Hiller (1989).

Orchomenos was a member of the First Federation, and, together with Hyettos, supplied two of the eleven Boiotarchs (Hell. Oxy. 19.3); but in 395 at the outbreak of the Corinthian War the Orchomenians joined Sparta and defected from the Federation (Xen. Hell. 3.5.6). The city was garrisoned by the Spartans from 395 to 375 or even later (Xen. Hell. 4.3.15, 5.1.29; Diod. 15.37.1), and the war between Thebes and Orchomenos went on until 371 (Xen. Hell. 6.4.10). In 370, however, Orchomenos was forced to rejoin the Boiotian Federation (Diod. 15.57.1), apparently without any representation in the federal government (only seven Boiotarchs in 365: SEG 34 355). An abortive coup d’état planned by the Orchomenian knights in collusion with some Theban exiles resulted in a Theban attack on Orchomenos in 364. The city was conquered, destroyed and exposed to an andrapodismos by which all men were killed while women and children were sold into slavery (Diod. 15.79.3–6; Dem. 16.4, 16.25, 20.109). But the site was not abandoned: and in 359 an Orchomenian theoreodorokos was appointed to host a theoreos from Epidaurus (no. 348) (IG 1v.1 94.4.8). So in 364 Orchomenos must have been given to settlers who were loyal to Thebes. In 354 Orchomenos was conquered by Onomarchos (Diod. 16.33.4; Buckler (1989) 56) and occupied by the Phokians until their capitulation in the summer of 346 (Dem. 19.148; Aesch. 2.141; Diod. 16.58.1). During the Phokian occupation the city was resettled by some Orchomenians, probably those who had escaped the andrapodismos of 364 (Aesch. 2.141; Dem. 16.25; schol. Dem. 6.13, 21, Diltz). After the peace with the Phokians, Philip surrendered Orchomenos to the Thebans (Dem. 5.21–22), and the city seems to have suffered yet another andrapodismos (Dem. 19.112, 141, 325). When the Thebans had been defeated at Chaironeia, however, Orchomenos was refounded, this time with Philip’s support, and the city was given back to the surviving Orchomenians (Paus. 4.27.10, 9.37.8); it joined the Federation again, and in 357/6 one of the Boiotian hieronmnenes at Delphi was an Orchomenian (CID II 74.1.36, 11.27). After the destruction of Thebes in 335, Orchomenos became once again a walled city (Arr. Anab. 1.9.10).

Orchomenos was a member of the Kalaurian Amphiktyony (Strabo 8.6.14; Schachter (1981–94) ii. 213–14; Tausend (1992) 12–13). In 452 Orchomenos may have been a member of the Delian League (IG 1 463.1x.9, as restored by D. Lewis; see CAH v. 50).

The constitution of Orchomenos was oligarchic (Thuc. 4.76.3; Diod. 15.79.3), and we hear about some Orchomenian exiles who in 424 planned to set up democracies in Siphai (no. 218) and Chaironeia (Thuc. 4.76.3; cf. Hansen (1995a) 22). The principal body of government was a boule, to which only propertied citizens were admitted (Hell. Oxy. 19.2, 3). The Aristotelian collection of politeiai included a Constitution of the Orchomenians (Arist. fr. fr. 578–82). Pausanias’ reference at 9.34.10 to two Orchomenian phylai, if trustworthy, must refer to his own day (Jones, POAG 78–79). Orchomenian citizens were appointed proxenoi by Delphi (no. 177) (F.Delphes 111.4 394 (C45, but heavily restored)).

The protecting god of Orchomenos was Zeus with various epithets, of which Karaios (SEG 32 478 (C45)) and Soter (Tod 197 (330/29)) are attested in Classical sources.
(Schachter (1981–94) iii. 120–24). Other major divinities attested in the Archaic and Classical periods are (a) the Charites (Pind. Ol. 14.3–4; Ephor. fr. 152), whose sanctuary according to Paus. 9.38.1 was the oldest of Orchomenos (Schachter (1981–94) i. 140–41); (b) Dionysos, whose sanctuary housed a cult image by Myron (Paus. 9.30.1 (rC5m)); musical contests are attested c.400 (Schachter (1981–94) i. 180 n. 2), and a biennial rite in which the priest of Dionysos pursued women in ritual flight (and if he caught one might kill her) must antedate the Classical period (Plut. Mor. 299F; Schachter (1981–94) i. 179–81). An extra-urban sanctuary of the Classical period c.3.5 km north of Orchomenos has been assigned to Dionysos (Schachter (1981–94) i. 181). Asopichos of Orchomenos is recorded as victor in the Olympic Games of 488 (Pind. Ol. 14; Olympionikai i82).

The only explicit reference in written sources to walls is ἀχρομομένος at Diod. 16.58.1, which shows that Orchomenos was fortified during the Phokian occupation, 353–346. Substantial remains of a polygonal and irregular trapezoidal wall enclose the acropolis and the western part of the town; it is crowned by a keep of ashlar masonry. The existing walls enclose an area of less than 40 ha, but the lower city must have extended further to the south, and the settlement may have covered altogether c.90 ha (Binliff (1997a) 243). The date of the wall is disputed. Fossey (1988) 353 suggests the Archaic period for the polygonal masonry and the Classical for the ashlar; Scranton (1941) prefers C4m, whereas Lauffer (1974) 297–99 prefers to identify the remains with the walls erected in the 330s after the sack of Thebes in 335 (Arr. Anab. 1.9.10). For the Archaic and Classical periods the degree of urbanisation is virtually unknown, partly because the Classical remains were destroyed by the later Byzantine occupation and partly because the relevant material from Bulle’s excavations was never published (Lauffer (1974) 311). Remains have been found of Archaic temples, one of them possibly the shrine of the Charites or of Dionysos (Fossey (1988) 354), and a theatre of C4s (Spyropoulos in AR 20 (1973–74) 20), apparently dedicated to the Charites (BCH 98 (1974) 224; Isler (1994) 268). The settlement can be traced back to the Neolithic period, and there are remains of the Geometric, Archaic and Classical periods (Fossey (1988) 353–59).

Orchomenos struck silver coins on the Aiginetan standard from c.500 to 480 and from c.490 (or earlier, supra 432) to 374 (or later), and bronze coins c.338–315. (1) Silver, c.500–480, denominations: obol, tritartemorion, hemiobol; obv. incuse; rev. sprouting corn-grain. Legend (on obv. or rev.): Ε or EP. (2) Silver, C5–C4F: (a) denominations stater, hemidrachm; obv. Boiotian shield; rev. running horse or amphora. Legend: EP, EPX or EPXO. (b) Denominations tritartemorion, hemiobol, tetartemorion; obv. sprouting grain of corn; rev. horse or wreath or ear of corn. Legend (on obv. or rev.): EP. (3) Bronze, c.338–315, obv. Boiotian shield; rev. legend: OPX in concave field (Head (1881) 18–19, 48–49, 79, HN3 346–47; Kraay (1976) 110; Schachter (1989) 85; SNG Cop. Boeotia192–208).

214. Oropos (Oropios) Map 55. Lat. 38.20, long. 23.45. Size of territory: 3. Type: B. The toponym is Ὄρωπος, ὅ (Hdt. 6.101.1; Dem. 16.11; SEG 19 363 (C48); SEG 3 317.14 (303/2)), or, once, ἗ (Steph. Byz. 601.3) denoting either the town (Thuc. 8.60.1) or the territory (Hyp. 3.16). The city-ethnic is Ὄρωπος (Thuc. 2.23.3; I.Oropos 1–2 = IG vii 4250–51 = RO 75 A–B (338–335); cf. Rhodes, DGS 116).

All attestations of Oropos as a polis are Hellenistic. Oropos is called a polis in the urban sense by Herac. Cret. 7 (GGM 1.100 (C35)) and in the political sense by Diod. 14.17.3 (rC4), and in some citizenship decrees of 322–312 (I.Oropos 4.7–8, 5.8–9, 6.9–10 = IG vii 4256–57 and SEG 15.264 (all C4l)).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in two proxeny decrees of C4m (I.Oropos 1–2) and externally in many literary sources (Thuc. 2.23.3; Isoc. 14.20). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in a sepulchral inscription of C2 (SEG 15 303) and externally in an Attic naval catalogue of C51 (IG1 1032.170) and in a list of aphedriateunos of 312–304: Ἀφηδριατούνοι (IG vii 2724.5 (c.280–270)).

The name of the territory is Ὄρωπια (Thuc. 4.99.1) or Ὄρωπος (Hyp. 3.16), ὅ (Steph. Byz. 711.2) or ἗ (Steph. Byz. 601.3). It is sometimes referred to as being contiguous with Boiotia (SEG 37100.142 (c.330)) and sometimes as being part of Boiotia (Paus. 1.34.1). Thucydides’ account of the aftermath of the battle of Delion shows that Oropos was a border district between Attika and Boiotia (Thuc. 4.99.1). The size of the territory has been assessed at c.110 km² (Fossey (1988) 28). A survey has been conducted in the territory (Cosmopoulos (2001)).

According to the Boiotian historian Nikokrates (FGrHist 376) fr. 1, Oropos was originally a colony of Eretria (no. 370), and this piece of information is supported by a study of the local dialect, which was neither Boiotian nor Attic but a form of Ionic very close to that spoken by the Eretrians (Wilamowitz-Möllendorff (1886) 97–103). Oropos fell to Athens probably after 507/6 (since the settlement did not become an Attic deme), perhaps before 490 (Hdt. 6.101.1),
but perhaps only after the Persian destruction of Eretria (Knoepfler 1985: 52). During most of C5 Oropos was an Athenian dependency (Thuc. 2.23.3), but in 412/11 the city was conquered by the Boiotians, assisted by some Oropians (Thuc. 8.60.1; Gehrke, Stasis 125), and enjoyed a short period of independence (Lys. 31.9) until 402, when the losing side in a civil war appealed to Thebes. The Thebans captured the city and forced its population to leave their settlement on the coast and move 7 stades inland. The Oropians were first allowed to retain their political institutions, probably as a Theban dependency, but after a few years Oropos was annexed to the Boiotian Federation and all Oropians were made citizens of Thebes (Diod. 14.17.1–3; Theopomp. fr. 12). When the Boiotian federation was dissolved in 386 after the King’s Peace, Oropos must have regained its independence, but some time between 375 and 373 the Oropians preferred to join Athens once again rather than be forced by Thebes to join the new Boiotian Federation (Isoc. 14.20.37; Knoepfler 1986b) 90–93; SEG 36 442). Already in 366 (Diod. 15.76.1), however, Oropos was captured by the Eretrian tyrants (Aeschin. 3.85; Dem. 18.99). Faced with the threat of a major Athenian attack, they agreed to hand over Oropos to the Thebans and submit to international arbitration. The Thebans garrisoned the city, but the arbitration came to nothing, and Thebes annexed Oropos once again (Xen. Hell. 7.4.1; Diod. 15.76.1; schol. Dem. 18.99, 176, Dilts; 21.64, 204, Dilts). Two proxeny decrees passed by the Oropians in their ekklesia (RO 75 A–B) in probably 359/8 (Coulton 1968) 182) strongly suggest that Oropos, though depending on Thebes, was still a polis, and not just a municipality (Hansen 1995a 39). After the defeat at Chaireneia, Oropos was transferred to Athens, perhaps already by Philip in 338 (Paus. 1.34.1; schol. Dem. 18.99, 176, Dilts; Robert (1960) 195), perhaps only in 335 after Alexander’s destruction of Thebes (Knoepfler 1993) 295). During this period Oropos was ruled by a demarchos (IGII² 1672.272–3). Oropos regained its independence in 322, had it confirmed in 319 (Diod. 18.56.6), but became a member of the Third Boiotian Federation in the years 312–304 (Diod. 19.78.3; IG vii 272.42.5 (c.280–270)). In C4s Oropos awarded prokexenia to a member of the Macedonian royal family and to a Macedonian nobleman (I. Oropos 1–2).

Remains of an undated fortification wall enclosing the acropolis are still visible along the west side, but only as a fall in the land with some debris. All remains of ancient structures have disappeared (Fossey 1988) 30 and letter of Jan. 1995).

Oropos was famous for its sanctuary of Amphiaraos situated east of the city. The Amphiareion was originally an underground oracle, allegedly consulted by Kroisos of Lydia (Hdt. 1.46.2) and by Mys of Persia (Hdt. 8.134), in C4s by Euxenippus on behalf of the Athenian polis (Hyp. 3.14–17). It was rebuilt and reorganised in C5s as a predominantly iatromantic sanctuary (Ar. fr. 21, PCG) administered by a hierces and a neokoros (I. Oropos 276–77 (C4f); Schachter 1981–94 i. 19–26; Petrakos (1968) 61–129). The visible remains are mostly of C5–C4s, and include a temple, an altar, separate baths for men and women, a small theatre, a Doric stoa and a larger theatre behind the stoa (I. Oropos 290–93 (C4s); Petrakos (1974) 26–57; Travlos (1988) 301–18).

In 329/8 the Athenians instituted the Great Amphiaraia as a Panhellenic quadrennial festival with competitions in athletics and music (I. Oropos 298). A contemporary list of victors records participants from, e.g. Sinope (no. 729), Kolophon (no. 848), Argos (no. 347) and Thebes (no. 221) in addition to numerous Athenians (no. 361) (IG vii 414 = I. Oropos 520; cf. Knoepfler (1993)).

215. Pharai Map 55. Lat. 38.20, long. 23.40. Size of territory: ? Type: B. The toponym is Φαραί, Α', attested in Strabo 9.2.14 and Steph. Byz. 658.5 but not in any other source. The full form of the city-ethnic is unknown since it is attested only in the abbreviated form ΦΑ on the reverse of some coins of C4e (infra). The identification of Pharai with modern Ag. Pandeleimon is uncertain (Fossey 1988) 96; Barr.).

Pharai is not called a polis in any extant source, but the existence of a C4 mint strongly suggests that it must have been a polis, at least in the period after the King’s Peace of 386.

According to Strabo (9.2.14–15), Pharai, Heleon, Harma and Mykalessos (no. 212) formed a τετρακομινία which lay in the territory of Tanagra (no. 220). All sherds and tombs found in the area date from the Archaic and Classical periods (Fossey 1988) 97).

Pharai struck silver obols on the Aiginetan standard between c.386 (or earlier) and 374 (or later): obv. Boiotian shield; rev. amphora. Legend: ΦΑ (Head, HNP 347; SNG Cop. Boeotia 211). On the Archaic issues traditionally assigned to Pharai, see s.v. Thespiai (no. 222).

216. Plateai (Plataieus) Map 55. Lat. 38.15, long. 23.15. Size of territory: 3? Type: A. The toponym is Πλαταιαί, Α' (RO 88.34–35 (C4m); IG iv².1 629 (C2); Hdt. 9.25.2), but some authors use the singular: Πλαταια, η (Hom. Il 2.504; Thuc. 2.2.1 et alibi). The toponym denotes either the town (Thuc. 2.2.1) or the polity (Thuc. 2.2.3) or the territory (Xen. Hell. 5.4.48). The city-ethnic is Πλαταιαίς (ML 27.6 (479); SEG 9 2.44 (C4s); IG vii 1664.2–3 (C3); Hdt. 8.44.1; Thuc.
Archidamos summoned the Plataians to show him the bōrundoubtedly, Hysiai (Erythrai (no. 429) entered into a ship decree of at least from 479, Badian (Thuc. 2.2.2, 3.65.3). At RO 88.34 (C4), polis is used in the urban and political senses simultaneously. The term áστον is used by Hdt. 7.233.2.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form on coins of C4e (infra; cf. also IG vii 1664.2–3 (C3)) and externally on the Serpent Column (ML 27.6 (479)). For the individual and external use, see, e.g. Ἐχιλαος Φιλωνίδου Πλαταιος in a Troizenian citizenship decree of 369 (Syll.3 162.2–3 (369)). Patris is used about the community at Isoc. 14.13.

The name of the territory is γῆ Πλαταιῖς (Thuc. 2.71.4); χώρα Πλαταιῖς (Thuc. 3.58.5); Πλαταιάσων (Thuc. 4.72.1); ἐν τοῖς Πλαταιαῖς (Xen. Hell. 5.4.48). In 506 the river Asopus was made the border between Plataiai and Thebes (Hdt. 6.108.6; Paus. 9.4.4). To the west Plataiai bordered on Thespians (no. 222) (Hdt 8.50.2) and to the east on Hysiai (no. 208) (Hdt. 6.108.6), which was then a part of Attika (Hdt. 5.74.2). The size of the territory has been assessed at c.170 km² (Fossey (1988) 100). It is debated whether Plataiai too was a part of Attika from 519 onwards (for: Badian (1993) 117; against: Hammond (1992) 145). But at least from 479 Plataiai was a part of Boiotia. Plataiai came to constitute two of the eleven Boiotian districts and included the small towns in the Parasopia which by then had entered into a sympoliteia with Plataiai; viz. Skolos (no. 219), Erythrai (no. 203), Eteonos/Skaphiai (no. 204) and, undoubtedly, Hysiai (Hell. Oxy. 19.3). In 429 King Archidamos summoned the Plataians to show him the borders of Plataian territory (Thuc. 2.72.3). In 427 the territory was annexed by Thebes (Thuc. 3.68.2–3, 5.17.2).

Plataiai is described as a small town (Thuc. 2.77.2), and according to Poseidippos (fr. 29, C3e) it deserved to be called a polis only during the celebration of the Eleutheria (infra). Six hundred Plataian hoplites fought at Plataiai in 479 (Hdt. 9.28.6). When the Thebans made their nocturnal attack on Plataiai in 431, the urban population must have totalled at least some 2,000 persons (Thuc. 2.3.2; Hansen (1997) 27–28), and there were 400 to defend the city when the siege began in 429 (Thuc. 2.78.3).

In 519 (Thuc. 3.68.5; Hornblower (1991) 464–65) Plataiai entered into an alliance with Athens (Thuc. 2.73.3, 3.68.5; Hammond (1992) 144) whereby the Plataians were granted Athenian citizenship collectively (Thuc. 3.55.3, 63.2; Amit (1973) 75–78; Hornblower (1991) 449); the grant probably implied that a Plataian who moved to Athens was inscribed as a citizen without an individual decree passed by the people. The Plataians fought side by side with the Athenians at Marathon (Hdt. 6.108.1), and those who died in battle were buried with the Athenian (manumitted) slaves (Paus. 1.32.3; Hammond (1992) 147–50). In 480 the Persians occupied Plataiai, and destroyed the city by fire (Hdt. 8.50.2). Plataians fought in the battle of Plataiai in 479 (Hdt. 9.28.6), and after the battle Pausanias had all the victors take an oath that guaranteed the independence of the Plataian polis (Thuc. 2.71.2). At some time between the Persian and the Peloponnesian Wars, when the First Federation was organised as described by the Oxyrhynchus historian, Plataiai had some kind of sympoliteia with the small towns in the Parasopia, controlled two of the eleven districts of Boiotia, and provided two Boiotarchs (Hell. Oxy. 19.3; Kirsten (1950) 2302–3). It is apparent, however, from Thucydides’ account (Thuc. 2.2.4, 3.65.2; Buck (1979) 153–54) that Plataiai had left the Federation when in the spring of 431 the city was attacked by the Thebans (Thuc. 2.2–6), assisted by some Plataian collaborators (Thuc. 2.2.2–3) of oligarchic convictions (Thuc. 3.65.2; Gehrke, Stasis 132).

During this period Plataiai was a democracy in which major decisions were made by the people in assembly (Thuc. 2.72.2; see Amit (1973) 66–71). In the years 429–427 Plataiai was besieged by the Lakedaimonians and the members of the Peloponnesian League (Thuc. 2.71–78, 3.20–24, 3.52–68). After its capture in 427, the men were killed, while the women were exposed to andrapodismos (Thuc. 3.68.2; Dem. 59.103). In 426 the city was razed to the ground (Thuc. 3.68.3) and settled by some Megarians plus a few Plataians who were loyal to Sparta (Thuc. 3.68.3). Some Plataian evacuees of 431 (Thuc. 2.6.4) and some who in 428 escaped the siege (Thuc. 3.24.2) were all granted Athenian citizenship (Dem. 59.103–4; Isoc. 12.94; Osborne (1982) D 1) and inscribed in the Attic tribes and demes (Lys. 23.2–3). After the destruction of Skione (no. 609) in 421, the Athenians gave the place to the Plataians (Thuc. 5.32.1), but many remained in Athens (Lys. 23.5–7). The Plataians were restored to their native city only after the King’s Peace of 386 (Paus 9.1.4), and perhaps in connection with Sparta’s occupation of the Kadmeia in 382 (Isoc. 14, hypoth.). They remained loyal to the Lakedaimonians after the liberation of Thebes in 379 (Xen. Hell. 5.4.14), and when the Thebans put pressure on the Plataians to join the Second Federation, they refused (Isoc. 14.8–9). As a result, Plataiai was conquered...
and destroyed once again by the Thebans (Xen. Hell. 6.3.1, 3.5; Isoc. 14.1, 5, 7, 19, 35, 46), probably in 373 (Paus. 9.1.5–8; Tuplin (1986) 321 n. 2) rather than in 374 (Diod. 15.46.6). This time the Plataians were allowed to go into exile (Paus. 9.1.7). They found refuge in Athens once again, and had their previous grant of citizenship renewed (Diod. 15.46.6; cf. Isoc. 14.51–52). The town was still deserted and unfortified in 343 (Dem. 19.21, 112, 325), but the Plataians were repatriated by Philip II (Paus. 4.27.10, 9.1.8), undoubtedly in consequence of the peace of 338. They took an active part in the destruction of Thebes in 335 (Arr. Anab. 1.8.8; Diod. 17.13.5), whereupon the members of the Corinthian League decided to rebuild and refortify Plataiai (Arr. Anab. 1.9.10). Yet it may have taken another four years before the town and its walls were re-erected in 331 (Plut. Alex. 34.2, Arist. 11.9). Plataiai provided one of the naopoi of 336/5 and must accordingly have joined the Boiotian Federation already before the destruction of Thebes (CID ii 32.32). Plataiai is attested in 331 as providing one of the hieronmomenes (CID ii 86.13) and in C3e as providing one of the aphedriaeontes; it must accordingly have been a member of the Third Federation (IG vii 2724.5–6 (c.280–270)). Plataian citizens were appointed protexenes by Aigina (no. 358) (Hdt. 9.85.3), Lakedaimon (no. 345) (Thuc. 3.52.5), and Chios (no. 840) (PEP Chios 50 (C4m)).

The protecting god of Plataiai was Hera (Plut. Arist. 18.1 (1479)), whose sanctuary before the destruction of Plataiai in 427 was outside the city (Hdt. 9.52.1), whereas the temple for Hera built by the Thebans in 427/6 was probably inside the walls alongside a new katagogeion measuring 200 × 200 feet (Thuc. 3.68.3). The goddess was worshipped by the Plataians at a festival called the “Little” Daidala. At irregular intervals were held the Greater Daidala, in which several Boiotian poleis participated—in the end perhaps all Boiotian poleis. The key features were a procession carrying a log dressed like a woman and a sacrifice in which the animals were burned up completely, together with the wooden altar on which they were placed (Paus. 9.2.7–3.9; Schachter (1981–94) i. 242–50). The hostel built by the Thebans indicates that the Daidala were an inter-poleis festival already in C5s, and C6 terracotta figurines have been interpreted as evidence of the festival in the Archaic period (Schachter (1981–94) i. 244). What we know about the festival, however, belongs in the Hellenistic period (Knoepfler (2001a)). After the victory in 479 Pausanias made a sacrifice to Zeus Eleutherios in the agora of Plataiai (Thuc. 2.71.2–4), and thereafter the Plataians carried out annual rituals in honour of the fallen (Thuc. 3.58.4; Isoc. 14.61); but a regular cult of Zeus Eleutherios and the associated festival of Eleutheria were not instituted until C3 (Schachter (1981–94) iii. 124–43). The most famous temple in Plataiai was that of Athena Areia, with a cult image by Pheidias and paintings by Polygnotos and Onasias (Paus. 9.4.1–2; Plut. Arist. 20.3).

Plataiai was a fortified city when attacked by Thebes in 431 (Thuc. 2.4.4, 75.4), but in 426 the walls were demolished (Thuc. 6.68.3), and were not re-erected until after the King's Peace of 386, now with Spartan help (Paus. 9.1.6). This circuit, however, was destroyed once again by the Thebans in 373 (Isoc. 14.19, 35; Dem. 6.30), and new walls were built only after the sack of Thebes in 335 (Arr. Anab. 1.9.10). Remains of all three phases are still to be seen: (1) Plataiai had no proper acropolis, but the oldest part of the settlement to the northwest, an area of 10 ha, was enclosed by a wall in Lesbian masonry—probably the one that was demolished in 426. (2) A new and much larger wall in polygonal masonry with interval towers enclosed an area of 80 ha. (3) Refounded in 335, the city was protected by a wall of coursed ashlar blocks enclosing an area of 70 ha (Fossey (1988) 102–7). The settlement can be traced back to the Neolithic period and there are remains of the Geometric, Archaic and Classical periods (Fossey (1988) 109). Traces of a (still undated) orthogonal town plan have been found in recent excavations (AR (1999–2000) 57).

Plataiai struck coins on the Aiginetan standard from c.386 (or earlier) to 374 (or later). Denominations: hemidrachm, diobol, obol; obv. Boiotian shield; rev. head of Hera. Legend: ΠΑΑ (Head, HN 347; SNG Cop. Boeotia 212–14).

217. Potniai (Potnieus) Map 55. Lat. 38.20, long. 23.20. Size of territory: 1. Type: C. The toponym is Ποτνείας, α' (Hell. Oxy. 20.3; Xen. Hell. 5.4.51). The city-ethnic is Ποτνείες (ArchDel 3 (1917) 64 (C6)).

Potniai is called a polis in late sources only (Strabo 9.2.24; schol. Eur. Or. 317–18; Steph. Byz. 533.21), and Paus. 9.8.1 has just ἐπείσια. The reason for including Potniai in this inventory of poleis is the C6 attestation of a city-ethnic inscribed on a poros column drum dedicated to Apollo: [Ἀπα]λαόνι Ποτνείες (ArchDel 3 (1917) 64; cf. Hansen (1995a) 32, 48). The only other attestation of the ethnic is as an epithet to Glaukos, the heroic founder of Anthedon: Ἐλατός Ποτνείες (Aesch. fr. 450–53, Mette; cf. Schachter (1981–94) i. 228).

We have no information about the name of the territory. Potniai was one of the small unwalled settlements whose population was moved to Thebes (Hell. Oxy. 20.3) in connection with the major synoecism at the outbreak of the
Peloponnesian War (Demand (1990) 83–85; Moggi, Sin. 197–204 prefers a date c.426–424). The absence of physical remains of the Hellenistic period (Fossey (1988) 209) may indicate that, unlike the other small towns synoecised with Thebes in 431, Potniai was not resettled. Potniai was famous for its sanctuary of Demeter and Kore (Paus. 9.8.1), which was an ancient one (Schachter (1981–94) i. 159–60). The settlement can be traced back to the Protogeometric period (Fossey (1988) 209), but po-ti-ni-ja on a Theban Linear B tablet suggests that Potniai was inhabited in the Mycenaean period too (Schachter (1981–94) i. 159).

218. Siphai (Siphaius)  Map 55. Lat. 38.10, long. 23.05. Size of territory: 1. Type: A. The toponym is Σίφαι, ai (Thuc. 4.76.2), but the singular form is also attested (Steph. Byz. 573.1), and according to Paus. 9.32.4 the toponym was Τίφα. The toponym denotes either the town (Thuc. 4.76.3) or the territory (Arist. Part. an. 696b5). The only preserved attestation of the city-ethnic is Σιφειεύς (IG vii 207 = Michel 170 (C3s)).

Siphai is called a polis in the political sense by Thuc. 4.76.2–3, 89.2 (cf. Hansen (1995a) 21–23), and in the urban sense implicitly at Ps.-Skylax 38, where Σίφαι καὶ λιµήν is a convincing emendation of MSS Σίφασις καὶ λιµήν. In Ps.-Skylax καὶ λιµήν, an ellipsis of πόλις καὶ λιµήν (Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 142, 145), invariably goes with the preceding and not the following toponym (pace Müller in GGM).

The territory is called Σίφαι (Arist. Part. an. 696b5; Schwandner (1977) 519–20). It constituted the coastal region of the territory of Thespiai (no. 222) (Thuc. 4.76.3), and its size has been assessed at c.25 km² (Fossey (1988) 134). Steph. Byz. 573.1 calls Siphai an ἐπίνειον τῆς Θεσπιακῆς hestiatorion equipment includes some in Siphai (SEG24 361.25), which supports the assumption that Siphai was a dependent polis in Thespian territory.

From the abortive attempt in 424 to introduce a democracy, we can infer that Siphai must have had an oligarchic constitution. The democratic faction was supported by Athens, but the stasis was quelled by armed assistance from the other Boiotians (Thuc. 4.76.2–3, 89.2, 101.3; Hansen (1995a) 21–24).

Siphai was walled in 424 (προδόσασεν: Thuc. 4.76.3). The existing circuit in ashlar masonry with square towers (of which seven are preserved) encloses both the acropolis and the settlement below to the north, east and south. A wall to the south separated the acropolis from the lower city. To the west was the Corinthian Gulf, and no traces of a wall have been found here. The wall is of C4 and, partly for historical reasons, Schwandner suggests a date between 363 and 330, but the nearby tower at Mavrovouni (Ano-Siphai) from c.400 points to earlier fortifications at Siphai as well (Schwandner (1977) 548–51). The circuit encloses an area of c.3 ha, of which only a part was used for settlement. The harbour was presumably to the south of the city. The settlement can be traced back to EH I–II, and there are remains of the Geometric, Archaic and Classical periods (Fossey (1988) 171).

Siphai had no mint, but stray finds on the acropolis of Thespian coins (Schwandner (1977) 547 n. 32) may suggest that such coins were legal tender in Siphai.

219. Skolos  Map 55. Lat. 38.20/38.15, long. 23.25. Size of territory: 1. Type: C. Down to c.404 probably north of the river Asopos, after 404 south of the river, see infra. The toponym is Ἑκόλος, δ (Hom. II.2.497; Eust. II.1.404.24, van der Valk), denoting either the town (Xen. Ages. 2.22) or the polity (Hell. Oxy. 19.3). The toponym may have been derived from σκόλοπτες “palisade” (letter from Schachter). Apart from Steph. Byz. 580.8, there is no attestation of an ethnic.

The only classification of Skolos as a polis is in Steph. Byz. 580.7. According to Strabo 9.2.23 it was a κώµη τῆς Παρασωτίας, and Paus. 9.4.4 has just ἐφείσα. What justifies the inclusion of Skolos in this inventory is only its membership of the sympolitía headed by Plataiai (no. 216) (Hell. Oxy. 19.3; Hansen (1995a) 16).

We have no information about the name of the territory, which must have been very small. Down to 479 Skolos was in Theban territory (Hdt. 9.35.2, 65.1) and probably situated north of the river Asopos, which was the southern border of the territory of Thebes (Hdt. 6.108.6; cf. most recently Munn (1987) 121–24). After the Persian Wars Skolos became part of Plataiai territory and a member of the sympolitía which for some time constituted two of the eleven Boiotian districts (Hell. Oxy. 19.3). But by 431 Skolos must have been annexed by Thebes once again, since it was one of the small unwalled settlements whose population was moved to Thebes (Hell. Oxy. 20.3) in connection with the major synoecism at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War (Demand (1990) 82–85; Moggi, Sin. 197–204). By 395 Skolos had been repopulated. It still belonged to Thebes (Hell. Oxy. 19.3), but since both Strabo 9.2.23 and, more importantly, Paus. 9.4.4 (cf. Wallace (1979) 89) place Skolos south of the river Asopos, the refounded village was probably located south of the Asopos in land that had been Theban territory since the destruction of Plataiai in 426.
Tanagra (Tanagraios)  Map 55. Lat. 38.20, long. 23.35. Size of territory: 5. Type: A. The toponym is Τάναγρα, ἳ (ML 35, 36 = Lazzarini (1976) 998 (c.458); Thuc. 4.97.1), denoting either the town (Heracl. Cret. 8, GGM 1.101) or the polity (Xen. Hell. 5.4.49) or the territory (Thuc. 1.108.1). The city-ethnic is Τάναγραιοι (LSAG 93 and no. 12 (C6); SEG 9 2.32 (C4S); Dem. 25.60) but in Boiotian inscriptions from C4 onwards mostly Ταναγρῖος (IG vii 3055.25 (C4m), 2723.2–3 (C3e)), attested already in C5f (SEG 29 1788.7; for the date, see Votteéro (2001) 183), and sometimes Ταναγρεῖος (IG vii 522.10 (C3S)). Roller (1989a) does not record the city-ethnic.

Tanagra is called a polis in the urban sense (Aristophanes Boeotus (FGrHist 379) fr. 2 bis = P Oxy. 2463.26; cf. Heracl. Cret. 8–10, GGM 1.101 (C3S)) and in the territorial sense (Xen. Hell. 5.4.49), and is listed as a polis in the political sense (Thuc. 4.91.1, 93.4; Hell. Oxy. 19.2–3).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on a stamped tile of C5f (SEG 29 1788.7: δαμοσία Ταναγρίων) and in abbreviated form on coins (infra), and externally on a late C6 shield at Olympia commemorating a victory over an unknown enemy (LSAG 93 and no. 12). For the individual and external use of the city-ethnic, see e.g. Σ[ν];[θριῶν Φορµίδα Ταναγραίων], τάσιοι at Delphi in 335 (CID II 76.11.19–20).

The territory is called Τάναγρα (Thuc. 3.91.3–4) or ἳ Ταναγραία (Thuc. 4.76.4) or (later) Ἤ Ταναγραίικη (Strabo 9.2.11). During the First Federation the territory of Tanagra constituted one of the eleven Boiotian districts (Hell. Oxy. 19.3); it comprised Delion (Thuc. 4.76.4), Aulis (Nicocrates (FGrHist 376) fr. 1; Strabo 9.2.8), Salganeus (Nicocrates (FGrHist 376) fr. 1), and what was later called the Tetrakomia, i.e. Heleon, Harma, Mykalessos (no. 212) and Pharai (no. 215) (Strabo 9.2.14; Fossey (1988) 43–99 and 222–23). Tanagra was bordered on the east by Oropos (no. 214) (Heracl. Cret. 7–8, GGM 1.101), on the west by Skolos (no. 219), belonging to Thebes (Hdt. 9.15.2, 5.79.2; Xen. Hell. 5.4.49) and on the north by Anthedon (no. 200) (Nicocrates (FGrHist 376) fr. 1) and Glisas (Hdt. 9.43.2), belonging to Thebes (Strabo 9.2.31). Inclusive of the small dependent poleis, its size has been assessed at 530 km² (Fossey (1988) 28).

Tanagra was allied with Thebes in 506 and earlier (Hdt. 5.79.2). The city was a member of the First Federation (Hell. Oxy. 19.3), during which the principal body of government was a boule, to which only propertied citizens were admitted (Hell. Oxy. 19.2, 3). It was a member of the Second Federation (Isoc. 14.9), providing one Boiotarch (SEG 25 553 = 32 476.14 (C4f); for the date, see SEG 45 431 and Votteéro (2001) 71), and of the Third Federation (IG vii 2724.7 (c.280–270)). Tanagran citizens were appointed proxenoi by Delphi (no. 177; SGDI 2674 (c.328)) and Eretria (no. 370) (IG xi.9 203 (C43)). The Aristotelian collection of politieia seems to have included a Constitution of Tanagra (Plut. Mor. 299C; Hansen (1995a) 53), which reported a tradition that the territory of Tanagra had once been inhabited κατὰ κώμας (Mogg, Sin. 82–84). During the crisis of 330–326, Tanagra received 10,000 medimnoi of grain from Kyrene (no. 1028) (RO 96.32).

The protecting god of Tanagra seems to have been Hermes, with the epithets Kriphoros and Promachos, each with his own temple—that of Promachos near the theatre (Paus. 9.22.1–2 (rC5m); LSAG 92 and 94 no. 7 (C7–C6e); Schachter (1981–94) ii. 44–50; iii. 50). Other major divinities attested in the Archaic and Classical periods are Artemis Eileithyia (IG vii 546 (C5), 458 (C4–C3); Paus. 9.22.1; Schachter (1981–94) i. 193), Athena Longatias (SEG 31 497 (C4–C3)), Demeter Gephyraia (Hdt. 5.57–61; REG 12 (1899) 53–115; Schachter (1981–94) i. 162–63); Dionysos (IG vii 550 (C5); Paus. 9.20.4 (rC5); Schachter (1981–94) i. 183–85), Herakles (SEG 34 367: khanthoioi inscribed ἰπρας and Ἡρακλεός (C68); Schachter (1981–94) ii. 12; Andriomenou (1983) 113).

According to Thuc. 1.108.2–3, Tanagra was a walled city in 457, but following the battle of Oinophyta the Tanagrans had their walls demolished by the Athenians (cf. Diod. 11.82.5). The existing circuit of 2.2 km with forty-three towers was of mudbrick on a mostly isodomic ashlar sockle; it can be dated to the period c.425–375 and may have been erected after the King’s Peace in 386 (Roller (1974), (1987)). Xenophon’s mention at Hell. 5.4.49 of τὸ τεῖχος, however, must refer to the Theban stockade and not to the walls of Tanagra (Munn (1987) 124–26). The city walls enclose an area of 30 ha (Roller (1987) 223). Except, perhaps, for a temple of Hermes Promachos near the theatre (Paus. 9.22.2), all architectural remains seem to be later than the C4 circuit; and the orthogonal town plan, with insulae of 52 × 102 m, was clearly devised to fit the existing walls. Nothing of Archaic and C5 Tanagra is visible today (Roller (1989b) 157); but a surface survey of the town has been carried out by a team from Leiden, and a geo-prospection team has reconstructed the C4 street and insula plan across the city (Teireias 32 (2002) 1). A depression in the ground is all that is left of a theatre seen by early travellers. It seems to be an integral part of the urban plan of C4 (Roller (1989b) 152–54). Herakleides describes Tanagra as a town inhabited
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by farmers (9, GGM 1.101, 9). Outside the city walls a cemetery has been excavated with some 500 graves, the majority from C6 and C5 (Andriomenou (1985)).


C.560 Tanagra joined Megara (no. 225) in colonising Herakleia Pontike (no. 715) (Paus. 5.26.7; Burstein (1976) 15–18).

221. Thebai (Thebais) Map 55. Lat. 38.20, long. 23.20. Size of territory: 5. Type: A. The toponym is Θηβαια, αι (LSAG 93 and 95 no. 16 (c.470); Hom. Il. 5.804); the singular Θηβη or Θηβα is sometimes found in poetry (Hom. Il. 4.378; IG VII 2470.1 (c.300)). The toponym denotes either the town (Hdt. 1.92.1) or the polity (Dem. 19.325) or the territory (Xen. Hell. 5.2.25). The toponym is attested in linear B tablets. The composite ‘ὙπόΘηβαια (Hom. Il. 2.505) may refer to the early town built at the base of the Kadmeia = Thebai proper (letter from Schachter). The city-ethnic is Θηβαιοι (LSAG 92 and 94 no. 7 (C6f); Hdt. 5.79.2), in the Boiotian dialect often θείδη θείοι (SEG 28 465.4 (C4s)).

Thebes is called a polis in the urban sense (Hes. Phot. 105 (C6); Thgn. 1.1209; Pind. Pyth. 12.26; Bacchyl. 9.54; Hdt. 9.86.1; Dem. 18.216), in the political sense (Hes. Scyt. 105 (C6); Thgn. 1.1209; Pind. Pyth. 12.26; Bacchyl. 9.54; Hdt. 9.86.1; Dem. 18.216), in the political sense (Hes. Phot. 105 (C6); Thgn. 1.1209; Pind. Pyth. 12.26; Bacchyl. 9.54; Hdt. 9.86.1; Dem. 18.216). The size of its territory is called Θηβαιας (Hdt. 9.65.1; Thuc. 3.58.5) or Θηβαι (Xen. Hell. 5.2.25) or in later sources sometimes Θηβαια (Strabo 9.2.26). Before 506 Thebaïs extended south of the Asopos, but in 506 the river was made the border between Thebes and Plataiai (no. 216) (Hdt. 6.108.6; Paus. 9.4.4), and the territory of Thebes may then have comprised both Haliartos (no. 206) (inference from Hdt. 5.79.2) and presumably Akraiphia (no. 198) with Apollo’s sanctuary at Ptoion (Hdt. 8.135.1; Schachter (1981–94) i. 69; cf. also Strabo 9.2.34; Paus. 9.23.5). To the east, Theban territory may have reached the coast and included Delion (Hdt. 6.118.2; Schachter (1981–94) i. 46). After the battle of Plataiai, Thebes was probably deprived of most of its former territory including the Tetrakamia (Hdt. 9.43.2; Fossey (1988) 222–23, probably relating to the period c.450–430; cf. Hansen (1995a) 37 with n. 137) and Delion (Thuc. 4.76.4). But at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War the Thebais must have comprised all the small towns that joined the synoecism and had their populations moved to Thebes (Hell. Oxy. 20.3). The size of its territory c.435 has been assessed at c.650 km² (Bakhuizen (1994) 314). In 427 the territory of Plataiai was incorporated into Thebes (Thuc. 3.68.2–3, 5.17.2). In 395 the Thebais constituted two of the eleven Boiotian districts and controlled the two Plataean districts as well (Hell. Oxy. 19.3) plus Oropos (no. 214) (Diod. 14.17.1–3) and Aulis (Xen. Hell. 3.5.5). Thebes suffered its next major set-back during the Spartan occupation in 382–379 (Xen. Hell. 5.2.25–36, 4.1–12), but when the Boiotian Federation had been re-established in 378–374, Thebes extended its territory to include Plataiai (from 373: Xen. Hell. 6.3.1; Paus. 9.1.5–8), Thespiai (after 377: Xen. Hell. 5.4.46–48, but before the autumn of 371: Xen. Hell. 6.3.5; Isoc. 8.17), Kreusis (Xen. Hell. 6.4.3) and Oropos (from 366: Xen. Hell. 7.4.1). We have no information about Anthedon (no. 200) (Gullath (1989) 164), and we do not know whether Orchomenos (no. 213) was annexed by Thebes after its destruction in 364 (Diod. 15.79.3–6). During the Third Sacred War, Koroneia (no. 210) and Orchomenos were held by the Phokians, but in 346 Philip handed them back to the Thebans (Dem. 5.21–22). Thebais must now have been bordered by Thisbai, Haliartos, Akraiphia, Tanagra (Xen. Hell. 5.4.49) and Athens (πόλις Αθηναίων: Aesch. 3.133; Din. 1.38) and most have covered c.800 km². In 338 Thebes lost Plataiai, Orchomenos (Paus. 4.27.10), Thespiai and Oropos (Paus. 1.34.1), and after the destruction of Thebes in 335, what remained of its territory was given to the neighbouring cities (Hyp. 6.17; Diod. 18.11.3–4; Paus. 1.25.4; Gullath (1982) 77–82).

After the victory at Plataiai in 479, Thebes was besieged by the Greek army until it surrendered the leaders of the
pro-Persian faction (Hdt. 9.86–88). Shortly after the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War many small unfortified Boiotian towns were synoecised with Thebes, which thereby doubled its population. The towns merged with Thebes included Erythrai (no. 203), Eteonos/Skaphai (no. 204), Skolos (no. 219), (Au)lis, Schoinos and Potniai (no. 217) (Hell. Oxy. 20.3; Demand (1990) 83–85; Moggii, Sin. 197–204 prefers a date c.426–424). From 382 to 379 Thebes had to suffer a Spartan occupation (Xen. Hell. 5.2.25–36, 4.1–12); and by the peace of 338 a Macedonian garrison was placed on the Kadmeia (Diod. 16.87.3).

In 335 Thebes was conquered by Alexander and razed to the ground (Din. 1.24; Arr. Anab. 1.7–9; Diod. 17.7–14; Plut. Alex. 11.6–12; Gullath (1982) 60–85). More than 6,000 men were killed, and the remaining population, some 30,000 men, women and children, were exposed to andrapodismos and sold into slavery (Din. 1.24; Arr. Anab. 1.9–9; Diod. 17.13.3, 14.1; Plut. Alex. 11.12).

Thebes was the leading member of the First Federation (Thuc. 4.91.3; Hell. Oxy. 19.3); it re-established the Federation immediately after the liberation of the city in 379 (Plut. Pelop. 13.1) and dominated all the other member states (Isoc. 14.8–10; Aeschin. 3.412); and in spite of the defeat in 338, Thebes was still a member of the Third Federation between 338 and the destruction of the city in 335 (Arr. Anab. 1.7.11; CID 1174.1.72 (3376)).

Membership of the Boiotian Federation did not prevent Thebes from joining one of the major leagues or from entering into alliance with other poleis: during the 370s Thebes was a member of the Second Athenian Naval Confederacy (IG II2 40, 43.24–25, 79; IG II2 1607.155) and in 339 Athens concluded an alliance with Thebes, not with the Boiotian Federation (Aeschin. 3.142; Staatsverträge 345).

Theban laws were traditionally ascribed to Philolao of Corinth (Arist. Pol. 1274a31–32), who probably lived in C75. The Aristotelian collection of politeiai included a Constitution of Thebes (Arist. fr. 506–7). Down to the Spartan occupation of Kadmeia in 382–379 Thebes was an oligarchy, in C6–C5e of the narrow type (dynastia: Thuc. 3.62.3), later a more moderate oligarchy (ibid.; Arist. Pol. 1278b25) ruled by a boule based on a property qualification (Hell. Oxy. 19.2). A bronze phiale of C6e is dedicated by λεκτός Θεβαῖος, perhaps members of the nobility (Lazzarini (1976) no. 920, cf. p. 156), perhaps a body of officials (LSAG 92 and 94 no. 7; cf. Schachter (1987) 79), or, rather, a military elite (Schachter, forthcoming).

The Athenian victory at Oinophyta in 457 (Thuc. 1.108.3; Pl. Menex. 242B) and stasis in Thebes (Thuc. 3.62.5, 4.92.6) were followed by a brief period of democracy (Arist. Pol. 1302b28–9). The Athenians were expelled, autonomia recovered, exiles recalled and oligarchy restored after the Athenian defeat at Koroneia in 447/6 (Thuc. 1.113.2–4, 3.62.3). The principal body of government was a boule, to which only property citizens were admitted (Hell. Oxy. 19.2.3). In 454 the leading oligarchs were divided into a pro-Athenian and a pro-Lakedaimonian faction (Hell. Oxy. 19.1, 20.1), and after a protracted stasis the pro-Lakedaimonians came to power in 382 with the Spartan occupation of Thebes (Xen. Hell. 5.2.25–36). Between 382 and 379 the constitution was again a dynastia (Xen. Hell. 5.4.46). From 379 onwards Thebes was a democracy (Diod. 15.79.3; Polyb. 6.43; Buckler (1980) 20). In collusion with a faction in Thebes, some Theban exiles made an abortive attempt in 364 to reintroduce an aristocratic constitution (Diod. 15.79.3–5).

Thebes had a boule (Xen. Hell. 5.2.29), which prepared the matters to be put to the assembly (Diod. 17.9.1). An oralar response refers to a meeting of the popular assembly in 506 (Hdt. 5.79.1). It is unknown what powers it had during the oligarchy down to 379, but from then on major decisions were made by the people in assembly (Aeschin. 2.105; Dem. 18.233; Ar. Anab. 1.7.2). An eponymous archon is attested in C48 (SEG 28 466 (c.338)) and polemarchs from 382 (Xen. Hell. 5.2.25; Schaefer (1956) 1108–11). Thebes awarded proecinia to citizens from Opous (no. 386) (schol. Pind. Ol. 9.123c (C5f)), from Athens (no. 361) (Demosthenes: Aeschin. 2.141; Thrason: Aeschin. 3.138), and from unknown poleis (IG VII 2409 (Cmph–C3m); cf. Vottéro (2001) 159; SEG 28 465 (C4s)).

Theban citizens were appointed proecinoi by Athens (no. 361) (Pindar, Isoc. 15.166, Delphi (no. 177) (F.Delphes 111.1 356 (327)); and Karthaia (no. 492) (IG XII.5 542.27 (C4m))).

The protective divinities of Thebes were probably Demeter Thesmophoros and Dionysos Kadmeios (Pind. Isthm. 7.1–5; Eur. Bacch. 1–12; Xen. Hell. 5.2.29; Paus. 9.15.5–6; Brackertz (1976) 73–78; Schachter (1981–94 ii. 168, 187), but Athena Onka (Aesch. Sept. 164–65) and Athena Proneia (ArchDelt 3 (1917) 36.2) are also attested as the protectors of Thebes (Soph. OT 18–19; SEG 32 493 (C4l); Schachter (1981–94 i. 129–32). Other major divinities attested in the Archai and Classical periods are Herakles Promachos, whose sanctuary was outside the walls (Pind. Nem. 4.22–24; Isoc. 5.32; Xen. Hell. 6.4.7; Paus. 9.11.4; Schachter (1981–94 ii. 14–30); Aphrodite, the divine patron of the Theban polemarchs, whose sanctuary was on the Kadmeia (Xen. Hell. 5.4.4–7; Schachter (1981–94 i. 38–41); Apollo Ismenios, whose sanctuary was on the Ismenion hill (IG VII 2455 (C6); SEG 22 417 (C6); Pind. Pyth. 11.1–11; Paus. 9.10.2; Schachter
(1981–94) i. 77–85). The major extra-urban cults were Zeus Hypatos (Paus. 9.19.3), in whose sanctuary on Mt. Hypaton some remains of the Classical period have been found (Schachter (1981–94) iii. 102); and the Kabiroi: a mother goddess, her consort and two attending Kabiroi, usually represented as Hermes and Pan. It was a mystery cult reserved for the initiated and situated at the Kabirion, a natural cavity c.5.5 km west of Thebes. Monumental architecture at the sanctuary dates from the Hellenistic and Roman periods. The cult is attested from the Geometric to the Roman imperial period (IG vii 2457 (C–C5), cf. SEG 36 458; Schachter (1986–94) ii. 66–110, (2003)). *Theorodokoi* were appointed in 359 to host *theoroi* from Epidaurus (no. 348) (IG iv² 1946); in 360/59 Thebes was granted *promanteia* by the Delphians (no. 177) (E.Delphes. iii.4 375). The Theban Ismenias was *hieromnemon* in 341 (CID 11 43.229).

Citizens of Thebes are frequently attested as victors at the major Panhellenic festivals, e.g. at the Isthmian Games (Pind. *Isthm. 1. 3–4. 7 (in 474, 458 and 454)), at the Nemean Games (schol. Pind. *Isthm. 223.10, Drachmann (4705)), at the Olympic Games (Paus. 5.8.7 (680); see Olympiaikon 33, 69, 136, 206, 362, 427, 441), at the Pythian Games (Pind. *Pyth. 11 (474); Paus. 10.7.7 (1378), 7.8 (1346)), and at the Amphiareia (IG vii 414.4, 24, = I.Oropos 520 (329/8))). The city dedicated a treasury at Delphi to commemorate the victory at Leuktra (Bommelaer (1991) 129–30).

Thebes is called a fortified city in c.540 (Thgn. 1.1209) and again in 479 (Hdt. 9.41.2, 9.86–88), but it is uncertain whether the references are to the acropolis wall or to a wall enclosing the lower city as well, referred to at Xen. *Hell. 5.4.53*. In C4 the city had two circuits (Arr. *Anab. 1.7.9–10, 8.5–6*): an acropolis wall around the Kadmeia with the seven famous gates (Pind. *Pyth. 11.12; Paus. 9.8.4*) enclosed an area of c.32 ha, and a wall around the lower city enclosed an area of 350 ha (Bintliff (1997a) 243). Only a few traces are left (Symeonoglou (1985) 119). The acropolis wall seems to have followed the line of the late Helladic cyclopean wall, and the surviving traces of polygonal and isodomic masonry may be no more than Archaic and Classical repairs of the late Helladic wall (cf. Hes. *Scut. 105*). The short south side of the acropolis wall seems to have been a part of the city wall as well (Arr. *Anab. 1.7.9–10*). The great city wall was of mud-brick superimposed on a foundation of isodomic masonry and covered with tiles. The masonry suggests a C5 date. The synoecism of 431 must be the *terminus ante quem*, and the most likely *terminus post quem* seems to be the liberation of Boiotia from Athenian domination in 446 (Symeonoglou (1985) 118–22). The city wall was demolished in 335 (Aeschin. 3.157), but the acropolis wall was probably left to protect the Makedonian garrison on the Kadmeia (Hyp. 6.17; Arr. *Anab. 1.9.9*).

In the Archaic period much of the Kadmeia was inhabited (Fossey (1988) 204), but some Thebans, including Pindar, lived in the lower city (Paus. 9.25.3), which became densely populated after the erection of the greater circuit in C5m and the synoecism of 431 (Hell. *Oxy. 20.3*). In the Classical period Thebes had at least twenty-three sanctuaries, twelve on the Kadmeia and eleven in the lower city (Symeonoglou (1985) 123–37). South-east of the Kadmea are remains of the temple of Apollo Ismenias, built in C8s, rebuilt c.700 and again in C4 (Symeonoglou (1985) site 8 pp. 236–8), and in the lower town were found the foundations of a temple of the Classical period (Symeonoglou (1985) site 229 p. 299). The Theban *boule* (Xen. *Hell. 5.2.29*), as well as the federal council (Hell. *Oxy. 19.4*) and the Boiotarchs (Aeschin. 3.145), had their meeting place on the Kadmeia. In lower Thebes was the *polemarcheion* (Xen. *Hell. 5.4.6*), a hippodrome (Paus. 9.23.2; Symeonoglou (1985) 140 and cat. no. 106), a C5 *stadion* and *gymnasium* (Paus. 9.23.1; Symeonoglou (1985) 140 cat. nos. 65, 169); an earlier *stadion* and *gymnasium* (of C6?) was situated outside the walls (Xen. *Hell. 5.2.25*; Symeonoglou (1985) 183–90). The agora in the lower city was flanked with several stoa (Xen. *Hell. 5.2.29; Diod. 12.70.5*). Thebes had a theatre (Paus. 9.16.6), which in C4 was used for meetings of the assembly (Plut. *Mor. 799E–F*); traces have been found in the northern part of the lower city (Symeonoglou (1985) 189–90). The city got most of its water through an impressive system of subterranean aqueducts already famous in antiquity (Herac. Cret. 13, *GGM 1.102* and still partly preserved (Symeonoglou (1985) 141–44).

Thebes struck silver coins on the Aiginetan standard from c.500 to 335. Denominations: stater, drachm, hemidrachm, obol, hemiobol, tetarteromion, in C4 also tritemion; obv. mostly Boiotian shield; rev. down to 479: mill-sail; thereafter Herakles or Dionysos or amphora with symbols relating to Herakles or Dionysos. Legend: first Θ, later various abbreviations of the city-ethnic or occasionally the full form: *ΘEBAION*. An abbreviated personal name, denoting the issuing magistrate, appears on the C4 amphora-type coins, and forty-five separate magistrates can be identified (Hepworth (1986) 35). A series of probably Theban coins struck c.386–379 have a kantharos on the rev. and the legend *BOI* or *BOIΩ*. Some rare gold coins of C5 have obv. head of bearded Dionysos; rev. infant Herakles strangling serpents. Legend: ΘΕ. A small series of C4 bronze obols have obv. head of young Herakles; rev. club and other symbols


222. Thespiai (Thespieus)  Map 55. Lat. 38.15, long. 23.10. Size of territory: 4. Type: A. The toponym is Θησπιαί, α (Xen. Hell. 5.4.10; IG vii 1862 (Roman)), but Θεσπιαί at Hom. II. 2.498 and Hdt. 8.50.2. The toponym denotes either the town (IG iv.2.1 944.6; Dem. 6.30) or the polis (Isoc. 3.17) or the territory (Xen. Hell. 5.4.41). The city-ethnic is Θεσπική (F.Delphes 111.4 148 (C5f); Xen. Hell. 4.2.20).

At Hes. Op. 222, πόλις probably denotes Thespiai. In sources of the Classical period Thespiai is called a polis in the urban sense (Hdt. 8.50.2; Xen. Hell. 6.3.1; Dem. 16.25) and in the political sense (IG vii 72.6, 16 (C5)); Xen. Hell. 5.4.46; Hell. Oxy. 19.2–3; Isoc. 8.17; Dem. 16.25).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in a proxeny decree of C3m (SEG 32 496.2–3) and externally on the Serpent Column (ML 27.6: Θεσπική (479)). The individual and external use of the city-ethnic is attested in an Athenian proxeny decree of C5m for four named Thespians (IG iv.4 23) and in Delphic inscriptions where a Thespian appears as ναόν (Delphi in 334 (CID ii 79A.15). In the feminine, the κτετίκον Θεσπική is sometimes used (IG ii² 8834 (C4)). Patra ( = patris) has been restored in CEG ii 788 (c.350).

The territory is called η Θεσπική γη (Thuc. 4.76.3); η τῶν Θεσπικῶν χώρα (Xen. Hell. 5.4.42) or just η Θεσπική (Xen. Hell. 6.4.4); Anth. Pal. iii.119.2 (1480) has Θεσπικαί. During the First Federation, Thespiai constituted two of the eleven Boeotian districts (Hell. Oxy. 19.3), including Siphaï (no. 218) (Thuc. 4.76.3), Leuktra (Xen. Hell. 6.4.4), Eutresis (no. 205) and Thisbai (no. 223; Hell. Oxy. 19.3), Chorsiai (no. 202) (SEG 24 361, but cf. 47 520), Kreusis (Ps.-Skylax 38, as restored by Roesch (1980); Livy 36.21.5; but Xen. Hell. 6.4.3 shows that in 371 it belonged to Thebes), Askra (Hes. Op. 639–40 with 222; Arist. Fr. 580), Keressos (Paus. 9.14.1–4; Plut. Cam. 19.4; Mor. 866F), Donakon (Paus. 9.31.7) and perhaps Hippotai (Plut. Mor. 775A; Schachter (1996a) 104). Including the dependent poleis of Chorsiai, Thisbai, Siphaï and Eutresis (no. 205), its territory covered 425 km². Excluding these, it came to some 200 km². Thespiai bordered on Haliartos (no. 206) to the north, on Thebes to the east (Hdt. 5.79.2), on Plataiai (no. 216) to the south-east (Hdt. 8.50.2), and on Thisbai to the south-west (Xen. Hell. 6.4.3–4).

Thespiai was allied with Thebes in 506 and earlier (Hdt. 5.79.2). Seven hundred Thespians were killed at Thermopylae in 480 (Hdt. 7.202.1; cf. Anth. Pal. iii.19), and the Thespians fled to the Peloponnese when the Persians attacked Boiotia and burned down the city of Thespiai (Hdt. 8.50.2). A force of 1,800 light-armed Thespians fought in the battle of Plataiai in 479 (Hdt. 9.30.1), and the Thespians are duly recorded on the Serpent Column commemorating the victory (ML 27.6). Thespiai was resettled and the Thespians admitted extra citizens to make up for the losses during the war (Hdt. 8.75.5; Schachter (1996a) 115). The city was a member of the First Federation and provided two Boiotarchs (Hell. Oxy. 19.3–4). The Thespians suffered severe losses in 424 in the battle of Delion (Thuc. 4.96.3, 133.1) and 101 names are recorded in the public funeral monument set up after the battle (IG vii 1888). The Thespians fought in the Boiotian army in the battle of the Nemea in 394 (Xen. Hell. 4.2.20; cf. SEG 2186, 47 519). Thespiai was garrisoned by the Spartans in 379 and 378, under the supremacy of a harmost (Xen. Hell. 5.4.15, 41), but by the mid-370s Thebes had regained control of the neighbouring poleis, probably including Thespiai (Xen. Hell. 5.4.63). By 372 the Thespians had been forced by the Thebans to join the Second Federation (Isoc. 14.9: αὐτολέγον ἔσ τὸς Θησίας), providing one Boiotarch (SEG 25 533.14 (C4f: for the date, see SEG 45 431 and Vottéro (2001) 71)). Before the autumn of 371 (Xen. Hell. 6.3.5, 6.4.10) the city was sacked by the Thebans and depopulated (Diod. 15.46.6; Isoc. 6.27; Dem. 16.4, 25, 28). The Thespians, or some of them, withdrew to nearby Keressos (Paus. 9.14.2), but probably only after the sack of Thespiai (Tuplin (1986) 333–34; Buck (1994) 110 with n. 46). In 359, however, a Thespian theorodokos hosted theoroi sent from Epirauros (no. 348) (IG iv.2.1 944.6), and Aischylos of Thespiai was a victor in the Olympic Games, probably in 348 (IAG 26; Olympionikai 444); so Demosthenes’ contention (19.325) that the city was still not rebuilt in 346 must be taken with a grain of salt. The Thespians took an active part in the destruction of Thebes in 335 (Diod. 17.13.5), and in C3e the city was resettled (Plut. Dem. 39.5; IG vii 1747 and 1751, military catalogues of C3e).

The constitution of Thespiai was oligarchic and based on a property qualification (Hell. Oxy. 19.3; Xen. Hell. 5.4.46). A democratic uprising in 414 was immediately quelled by the Thebans (Thuc. 6.95.2; Gehrke, Stasis 172). In 378 the constitution is classified as a dynastia, and the democratic faction as living in exile in Thebes (Xen. Hell. 5.4.46). The principal body of government was a boule, to which only propertied citizens were admitted (Hell. Oxy. 19.2, 3). An eponymous
archon is attested c.386 (SEG 24 361.3; Sherk (1990) 287). The Aristotelian collection of politeiai included a Constitution of Thespiai (Heraca. Lemb. 76 = no. 59, Gigon). Thespian citizens were appointed procoroi by Athens (no. 361 (IG i² 23) and Delphi (no. 177) (F.Delphes 111.1 96 (318–306), 416 (C41)).

Apollo Archegetas seems to have been the protecting god of Thespiai. His cult was associated with the foundation of the polis, and was performed in a Doric peristyle temple of C5, c.2 km south-west of Thespiai (SEG 2 237 (C5f); Schacht 1981–94) i. 88–89, (1996a) 103). Other major cults attested in the Archaic and Classical periods are the nine Muses, whose sanctuary was in the Valley of the Muses 6 km west of Thespiai (Hes. Op. 654–59; Paus. 9.30.1 (rC4c); Schacht 1981–94 ii. 151–58), Heraclides (BCH 50 (1926) 390.4; SEG 15 224 (C5f); Schacht 1981–94) ii. 34–35), Dionysos (IG vii 1794 (C5); Schacht 1981–94) i. 192–95), Zeus Karaios (SEG 32 505 (C4l)); Zeus Saotes (Anh. Pal. 6.344 (330/29); Schacht 1981–94) iii. 150–53), and the Daimones (Michel 1102 (C.300); Schacht 1981–94) i. 149).

Surveys have shown that “the early city consisted of at least four separate nuclei, spread out over a total area of about 100 ha”. In C5 and C4l they were merged together into one large conurbation (Snodgrass 1987–89) 57). Remains of the Geometric and Archaic periods, however, are scarce, and it has been suggested that the centre of Thespiai before 480 was at the temple of Apollo, and that the settlement was moved to its Classical site only after the Persian destruction in 480 (Schacht 1996a) 103–4).

The walls were demolished by the Thebans in 423 (Thuc. 4.133.1), re-erected with Spartan help in 378 (Xen. Hell. 5.4.41), demolished once more by the Thespians (Dem. 6.30; Isoc. 14.19, 35), probably before 373/2 (the date of Isoc. Plat.) and not yet rebuilt in 343 (Dem. 19.112). Three huge square blocks of the Classical city wall were discovered in 187 (Bintliff and Snodgrass 1988) 67). The settlements covered an area of at least 50 and perhaps more than 100 ha (Bintliff 1997a) 243).

Thespiai struck silver coins on the Aiginetan standard from c.500 to 480 and from 386 (or earlier) to 374 (or later), and bronze coins from c.338 to 315. (1) Silver, c.500–480, denominations: stater, drachm, hemidrachm, obol; obv. Boiotian shield, some with Θ in one of the openings of the shield; rev. the letter Θ in mill-sail incuse square. The epichoric letter (Φ) is interpreted as a Θ and associated with Pharai (no. 215), but now interpreted as a Θ signifying Thespiai (Etienne and Knoepfler 1976) 219). (2) Silver, C5l–C4l, denominations: stater, hemidrachm, obol, hemibol, tetartemorion; rev. Boiotian shield; rev. crescent and (on some) amphora head of Aphrodite. Legend: ΘΕΣΩ or ΘΕΣΠΙΩ or ΘΕΣΠΙΚΩN. Some have the epichoric sigma (ς), pointing to a date earlier than 386. (3) Bronze, c.338–315: obv. Boiotian shield; rev. legend: ΘΕΣΩ in concave field (Head (1881) 15–16, 55–56; HN? 354); Etienne and Knoepfler (1976) 219; Schacht 1996a) 113; SNG Cop. Boeotia 397–405).

223. Thisbai (Thisbeus) Map 55. Lat. 38.15, long. 23.00. Size of territory: 3. Type: B. The toponym is Θισβεύς (Hom. Il. 2.502) or more frequently Θισβαί in the plural (Hell. Oxy. 19.3; F.Delphes 111.3 103 (300–280)), denoting the polity (Hell. Oxy. 19.3) or the territory (Xen. Hell. 6.4.3). The city-ethnic is Θισβαίων (IG vii 2724.b.6 (c.280–270); SEG 15, 282.4 (263–255)).

The earliest attestation of Thisbai as a polis is in a treaty with Chorsiai of C2e (SEG 3 342.4 = Migeotte (1984) no. 11), and the only attestation in a literary source is Paus. 9.32.2. The occurrence in C4l of a Thisban among the aphedriateuontes, however, shows that Thisbai was a polis at least from the beginning of the Third Federation (IG vii 2724.b.6 (c.280–270)), and the reference at Hell. Oxy. 19.3 to what was probably a sympoliteia between Thespiai (no. 222), Eutresis (no. 205) and Thisbai suggests that during the First Federation Thisbai was a dependent polis dominated by Thespiai (Koesch 1965) 37; Siewert (1977) 463; Hansen (1995a) 16); cf. τοι Θισβαίοι καὶ τοιρ αὐτὸς (SEG 31 358.5 (C5f)). The size of its territory has been assessed at just over 100 km² (Fossey (1988) 176). A funeral epigram of c.500 indicates that the population of Thisbai consisted of citizens (aatoi) and foreigners (xenoi) (CEG 112).

The only cults at Thisbai attested in sources of the Archaic and Classical periods are of Athena (IG vii 2230 (C6–C5)); Schacht (1981–94) i. 133) and, perhaps, Demeter Achaia (BCH 50 (1926) 418 n. 4 (C3)); Schacht (1981–94) i. 170; for the date, see Vottéro (2001) 256).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in Thisbai’s copy of a treaty with Chorsiai (SEG 3 342 = Migeotte (1984) no. 11 (C2e)), but externally only in a Roman inscription (IG vii 2870.13 (AD 155)). For the individual and external use, see e.g. Πύρρακος Θισβαίων Θισβαίεσ in a list of aphedriateuontes (IG vii 2724.b.4 (c.280–270)). The territory was called Θισβαί (Xen. Hell. 6.4.3).

Thisbai is attested as a member of the First Federation (Hell. Oxy. 19.3) and of the Third Federation (IG vii 2724.b.4 (c.280–270)).

A circuit of c.2.5 km with interval square towers enclosed the city, which was situated with a rocky hill to the north, the foot of Mt. Helikon to the south, and in the narrow corridor between the two. Most of the wall is of pseudo-isodomic.
trapezoidal or ashlar work, but one round tower on the northern hill (the acropolis) is in Lesbian masonry (Maier (1958)). The circuit enclosed an area of c.48.5 ha (Bintliff (1997a) 244). Maier (1958) 24–25 suggests a date between c.325 and 175, but the tower indicates a date between 375 and 325 (Buckler (1980) 283 n.19) and Camp (2000) 43 suggests a date of 375–60. No remains of buildings have been identified. The settlement can be traced back to the early Helladic period, and there are remains of the Geometric, Archaic and Classical periods (Fossey (1988) 180).
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MEGARIS, CORINTHIA AND SIKYONIA

RONALD P. LEGON

I. The Region

Megaris, Corinthia and Sikyonia constitute the Isthmus of Corinth and the territory immediately south of the Isthmus in the north-eastern Peloponnese. See Maps 57–58. This region has no specific identity in Greek nomenclature. It is set off from the territory of Attika and Boiotia by the mountains of Kithairon, Pateras and Kerata, but, despite these physical barriers, the Athenians regarded Megaris as originally part of Attika (Strabo 8.1.5–7). The region was conquered and settled by the Dorian Greeks between C4 and C9. Although there is no universal agreement regarding early Dorian settlement patterns, it seems most likely that their initial settlements were agricultural communities referred to as komai. By C8, in a process that is little recorded or understood (see Roebuck (1972) and Salmon (1984) 57–58), these komai coalesced into the city-states of Corinth (no. 227), Megara (no. 225) and Sikyon (no. 228), each with one major urban centre. From that point forward, throughout C7–C4, these states were remarkably stable, politically and territorially.

Many of the initial komai survived as towns within the consolidated poleis, and numerous other settlements are known within their territories. There seems to have been at least five second-order settlements in Megaris, eleven in Korinthia and five in the territory of Sikyon. These localities are enumerated in the entries for each of the three major poleis. Pagai (no. 226) and Aigosthena (no. 224), two Corinthian Gulf ports of Megara, were minor poleis by C3, but may have been poleis already in C4; they are described, along with Megara, in the Inventory below. Tenea, in the Corinthia, attained the status of polis only in Hellenistic times (SEG 13 248 (C1); Head, HNP 418).

In addition to controlling territory suitable for agriculture and animal husbandry, the Isthmian states occupied territory of the greatest military and commercial significance in Mainland Greece. Both Corinth and Megara straddled the narrow land bridge joining the Peloponnese to central Greece, and were in a position to interdict land traffic in both directions, although they were seldom powerful enough to accomplish this without the involvement of greater military powers. Equally important, both poleis possessed ports on the Saronic and Corinthian Gulfs, making them crucial transfer points and entrepôts in the trans-Hellenic and trans-Mediterranean sea trade, and contributing greatly to their prosperity, particularly in the case of Corinth, which controlled the shortest route across the Isthmus. The strategic location of the Isthmus states made them frequently the cockpit of power struggles among the Greek poleis, and, at crucial junctures in their history, with the external forces of Persia, Makedon and Rome. These circumstances make all the more remarkable the relative stability of the major poleis of the region.

II. The Poleis

1. Megaris

224. Aigosthena (Aigosthenitis) Map 58. Lat. 38.10, long. 23.15. Size of territory: probably 1. Type: [A]. The toponym is Αἰγοσθένης, τά (Xen. Hell. 5.4.18). The city-ethnic is Αἰγοσθένειτας (IG vii 1.5 (c.300); 43.2 (C3)) or Ηγοσθένειτας (IG vii 207.4 (C3)).

Aigosthena was situated in the territory of Megara (Xen. Hell. 5.4.18: τῆς Μεγαρικῆς ἐν Αἰγοσθένεις; cf. 6.4.26). In a difficult chapter, Ps.-Skylax 39 (on which see Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 142–43) refers to a plurality of poleis in Megaris under the heading πόλεις αἵδε, and the toponym Aigosthena has been plausibly restored from the MS reading λιγόθθειναι which follows this heading: accepting this, Aigosthena is here listed as a polis in the urban sense in a C4 source. C3 sources use polis in the political sense about the city (IG vii 207.4, 10 (C3); 208.19, 21; 213.10, 219.5 (C3s–C3e)) and in C3s a citizen of Aigosthena served as
Delphic therorodokos (BCH 45 (1921) 11.28). This suggests that Aigosthena may in fact have been a polis by C4, as indicated by Ps.-Skylax. However, an inscription of c.300 describes Aigosthena as a kome of Megara (IG vii 1.19), so the city may have had a double status as both a kome and a polis, and in this case a dependent polis within the territory of Megara (Hansen (1995) 74–75); alternatively, the city developed into a polis only in the Hellenistic period.

The date of the impressive fortifications at Aigosthena is uncertain, but probably C4–C3e (PECS s.v.; Winter (1971) 142 n. 56); on the site, see Benson (1895).

225. Megara (Megareus) Map 58. Lat. 38.00, long 23.20. Size of territory: 5. Type: A. The toponym is Μεγαρα, τά (IG i1 1353 (Cs)); Hdt. 9.14). The ethnic is Μεγαρείς (Hdt. 9.21.1; Thuc. 1.103.4; CID i1 4.1.6 (361/60); SGDI 3034 (C4)).

Megara is called a polis in the political sense by the C6m poet Theognis (53–58, etc.), in a late copy of a C5 inscription (IG vii 53 = Tod 20.15) and in CID i1 5.1–4, 6 (360). Thuc. 1.103.4 and Xen. Vinct. 4.46 refer to Megara as a polis in the urban sense. The Aristotelian collection of politeiai included one of the Megarians (fr. 561). Thgn. 219 refers to his fellow Megarians as poligretów, but also as ástóyain (24; cf. Tod 20.13 (c.479)). At Thgn. 788, patre (= patris) is used about Megara, and at Dem. 18.291–92 it is implicitly described as patris.

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found in Tod 20.5, 13 (c.479) and on C4 coins (infra) and in a C41 inscription: ὁ δᾶµος Ἔγαρεων (IG vii 1.12, 17); the external collective use is attested on the Serpent Column (ML 27.4 (479/8)) and in, e.g., Hdt. 9.21.1 and Thuc. 1.103.4.

The internal individual use of the city-ethnic may be found as early as Theognis’ self-description: Θεύγνιδος... τοῦ Μεγαρείου (22–23); the external individual use is attested in Hdt. 3.60.3 (C6s), on a C41 gravestone (Χαῖρες Θεύγνισι Μεγαρῶν (SGDI 3034, from Sparta)) and in CID i1 63.16 (C4m). The territory is called τὰ Μέγαρα (ἐγέ Μεγάρων>; IG i1 1353 (C5m)); Thuc. 2.31.1 or Ἐ Μεγαρῆς (Hdt. 9.14; Thuc. 4.70.1) or Ε Μεγαρῆς (Xen. Hell. 5.4.18). It is called χώρα in Ps.-Skylax 39.

Megara was situated on the Isthmus of Corinuth, bounded by the Corinthian Gulf on the north, Mt. Kithairon, Pateras and Kerata on the east, separating Megaric territory from Attika and Boiotia, the Saronic Gulf on the south, and Mt. Gerania on the west, dividing Megarid and Corinthia. Legon (1981) 59–70 argues that Krommion, Mt. Gerania and the Perachora peninsula were controlled by Megara after the Dorian invasions and were taken by Corinth (no. 227) in the conflicts of C8. Salmon (1984) 46–48 places the transition at least a century earlier. The Dorians seem to have settled the Megarid in five komai: Ἡραείς, Πιλαρείς, Μεγαρείς, Κυνουρείς and Τριποδίσκαρες (Plut. Quaest. Grac. 17; cf. Arist. Poet. 1448a30ff; Legon (1981) 47–55; Jones, POAG 94–96). Another version of the early settlement pattern may be inferred from Strabo (9.1.10), where he reports that the Megarians interpolated a passage in Homer’s Iliad linking Salamis with Polichna, Aigiroussa, Nisia and Tripodes, to prove the pre-Dorian antiquity of their claim to Salamis. The implication is that the latter four places were all within Megarian territory. Rigsby (1987) 98–102 argues that this couplet presents a more accurate picture of the Megarid in the Dark Ages than does Plutarch’s testimony. Synoecism appears to have occurred in C8 through the union of five komai, including the kome of Megara (Plut. Quaest. Grac. 17; cf. Moggi, Sin. 29–34).

Attested place-names in the Megarid include Aigirios, perhaps in the region of Vathikhoria, based on the incident of the “wagon-rollers” (Plut. Quaest. Grac. 59); Aigosthena (no. 224), in C4 a kome of Megara (IG vii 1.19) and possibly a dependent polis of Megara as well (supra); Eirenea, a village (Paus. 7.22.8); Kynosoura, Archaic–Classical evidence is lacking, but a C3 inscription (IG iv3.1 42) refers to the hekatostyes of Kynosoura (see Legon (1981) 53 and nn. 23 and 32); Nisia, the Saronic Gulf port of Megara (Thuc. 4.69; Paus. 1.39.4) associated with the island or promontory of Minoa (Thuc. 4.67; Paus. 1.44.3; Legon (1981) 29–32); Pagai (no. 226) (IG i1 1353.5 (C5m)) was possibly a dependent polis of Megara by C4 (infra); Panormus, a harbour between Pagai and Aigosthena (Paus. 7.22.10); and Tripodiskos, tentatively identified in a central depression of Mt. Gerania, near the western edge of the Megarid plain (Thuc. 4.70.1; Paus. 1.43.8; Plut. Quaest. Grac. 17; Nicopoulou (1969), (1970); and Rigsby (1987)).

Megara’s estimated peak population (C5) was 40,000, including 15,000 slaves and free non-citizens (Legon (1981) 23–24, 167–68, 258–59, 268–71).

Megara is attested as a member of the Peloponnesian League in C5e (e.g. Thuc. 1.103.4), probably having accepted the obligatory bilateral alliance with Sparta (no. 345) in C6l at approximately the same time as Corinth (no. 227) (see Legon (1981) 143–45). Megara broke away from the Peloponnesian League to become an ally of Athens (no. 361) in 461, but returned to the League in 448 (Thuc. 1.103.3–114; cf. Diod. 11.79 and 12.5). In C4 and beyond Megara frequently shifted allegiance and attempted to maintain neutrality among its larger neighbours and more distant powers (Legon (1981) 257–79, 285–95, 299–303).
Megara awarded *proxenia* to citizens of, e.g., Argos (no. 347) *(IG vii 2* C4l)), and Megarian citizens were appointed *proxenoi* by Athens (no. 361) in C4f *(SEG 40* 57) and by Delphi (no. 177) in 320–310 *(F.Delphes iiii.1* 161). A citizen of Megara served as Epidaurian *theorodokos* in 360/59 *(IG iv².1* 94.1a.2).

Megara mustered 3,000 hoplite troops at full mobilisation during the C5e battles of the Persian Wars *(Hdt. 9.28.6, 31.5)*, but less than half this number under similar circumstances in C4e *(Legon (1981) 268–71)*, based on Diod. 15.31 and Xen. *Hell.* 5.2.11–22. Six *strategoi* are attested in C45 *(IG vii 1–7; cf. Heath (1912–13)). Naval power is attested for Megara as early as its C7l sea battle with Samos (no. 864) *(Plut. *Quaest. Graec.* 57)*. Megara contributed twenty triremes to the Greek fleets at Artemision *(Hdt. 8.1.1) and Salamis *(Hdt. 8.4.5).*

The Megarians maintained that citizenship had been granted to only two non-Megarians: the hero Herakles and Alexander the Great *(Plut. *Mor.* 826C)*. The denial of citizenship to Hermon the metic is recorded by Dem. 23.212, but see Paus. 10.9.4. For Athenians living as metics in Megara, see also Dem. 29.3; Lycurg 1.21; Plut. *Mor.* 605D. A casualty list of c.425–400 *(SEG 39.411)* attests to a group of *ἐποικοί* *(I. 22)*, i.e. free non-citizens.

The existence of the three Dorian *phylai* at Classical Megara is attested by SEG 39.411, a casualty list of c.425–400 listing the fallen soldiers under the rubrics *Hυπαλές*, etc. A *hekatostys* is attested in C35 *(IG iv².1* 42.18–21), but evidence from Megarian colonies *(infra)* suggests that such units existed at a much earlier date *(Jones, *POAG* 94).* Plut. *Mor.* 295B reports the early existence of five *komai* *(‘Πηγάς, Πηραῖς, Μεγαραῖς, Κυνοσουρεῖς, Τριποδίσκους’)* in Megaris, and one of these, Tripodiskos, is called a *kome* at Thuc. 4.70.1 as well. There is no compelling evidence that these *komai* functioned as civic subdivisions or as units of public organisation *(Jones, *POAG* 95–96; Hansen (1995) 72–73)*, though it is worth noting that the C6–C5 poet Sousarion refers to himself as a *Μεγαρόφων Τριποδίσκου* *(fr. 1, West).*

The Megarian constitution was oligarchic for most of the period between C7 and C5, briefly interrupted by the tyranny of Theagenes in C7s *(Thuc. 1.126; Arist. *Pol.* 1305*α*; *Rh.* 1357*σ; Plut. *Quaest. Graec.* 18; Paus. 1.40.1, 41.2) and by the “unbridled democracy” in C6e *(Arist. *Pol.* 1306*β–19, 1302*α–31, 1304*β–40; Plut. *Quaest. Graec.* 18 and 59).* Legon (1981) 105–19 argues that much of the *Theognidea*, e.g. 43–48, 43–60 and 182–92, also refers to the latter régime; cf. Robinson (1997) 114–17. A democratic faction seized power in 427 and had the leading oligarchs exiled. Renewed *stasis* in 424, however, resulted in the Athenian conquest of Nisaia and the long walls, whereupon the Megarians opened their gates to the Lakedaimonians under Brasidas. A radical oligarchic constitution was introduced, and, of the leaders of the democratic faction, some went into exile while others were executed *(Thuc. 3.68.3, 4.66–74; Gehrke, *Statis* 106–10).*

This oligarchy was still in power in C4e *(Thuc. 4.74.3, cf. 5.31.6; Dem. 18.96).* Diod. 15.40.4 reports an attempted *coup* that was defeated by the *demos* in 375, though it is more likely to have occurred in 369 after Leuktra *(Legon (1981) 276–78).* C.343 an attempt to introduce a pro-Makedonian faction into power was reported to Athens and thwarted by an Athenian relieving force under Phokion that fortified Nisaia and reconstructed Megara’s long walls from the city to Nisaia *(Dem. 19.294–95; Plut. *Phoc.* 15.1; cf. Legon (1981) 289–94).*

The institution of ostracism is reported by schol. *Ar. Eq.* 855 *(ὡστρακοκόροι ... καὶ Μεγαρεῖς)*, a report now supported by the finding of an inscribed C5l–C4e *ostikon at Megara (Kritzas (1987)). Decrees of C4l show that decisions were made by the *boule* and the *demos* in accordance with a prototheocratic procedure *(IG vii 1–14; Rhodes, *DGS* 109–12)*, but these decrees reflect the constitution after 307. Other institutions known from C4 and later sources include a high court, “the three hundred” *(Dem. 19.295)*, the *aisynetai* *(IG vii 15)*, five *demiourgoi* in C4 *(IG vii 41)* and five *polemarchoi* in C3 *(IG vii 27–28).* A *basileus* is attested as the eponymous official *(IG vii 1–14)*; cf. a *grammataeis boulas kai demou* *(IG vii 1–14)*; a *grammataeis tou damou* *(IG vii 29)*; and a *grammataeis ton synhedron* *(IG vii 31).*

The town centres on the twin hills of Karia and Alkathoa, both under 300 m *(Thriepsiades and Travlos (1934) and (1936), which are encircled by a 3.5 km perimeter wall (of C4?) enclosing an area of 140 ha (Alexandris (1970)). Long walls from the perimeter wall to the port of Nisaia, approximately 1.5 km distant, were built in C5m *(Thuc. 1.110.4), destroyed in 424/3 (Thuc. 4.109.1), and briefly rebuilt in C4m *(Plut. *Phoc.* 15); a section of the long walls has been uncovered; see P. Zoridis in *ArchDelt* 38 Chron. 1983 (1989) 39–40 with plate 22B; cf. *AR* (1990–91) 12.

The site and main physical features of the town of Megara are well known. Excavations have identified the agora, stoas, major arteries and portions of the circuit wall *(Thriepsiades and Travlos (1936)). The fountain house of Theagenes (C6) is Megara’s most famous surviving monument (Gruben (1964)). The divinities honoured include Apollo, Artemis, Athena, Demeter, Dionysos and Zeus *(Paus. 1.39–44; Hanell*
MEGARIS, CORINTHIA, SYKONIA 465

(1934)). The principal divinity was Apollo Pythios (Paus. 1.42.5; Syll. 1.653.22 (C2); Meyer (1931) 201–2). On Alkathoa have been found the remains of a temple of Athena (Lauffer (1989) 415).

Orsippus was victor at Olympia in 720 (IG v11 52; Paus. 1.44.1 = Olympiānikai 16; cf. nos. 23, 48, 49, 468). A Megarian treasury was built at Olympia in C6–C5e (Paus. 6.19.12–14; Bol (1974)) and one at Delphi in C5–C4 (Bommelaer (1991) 126–28). In C4i the trumpeter Herodoros of Megara won the prize in all the four major Panhellenic games, ten times according Ath. 44f–45A, seventeen times according Poll. (1489–90); Ath. probably refers to the Olympia and Pythia, Poll. to the Isthmia and Nemea. From the time of the First Sacred War in C6e, Megara seems to have been frequently at odds with Delphi (no. 177) over the question of tolls levied on pilgrims to the sanctuary, and to have been involved in territorial disputes with its neighbours, Athens (no. 361) and Corinth (no. 227) (see Legon (1981) for details). The Megarians dedicated a statue of Apollo at Delphi in C5m for a victory over the Athenians at Nisaia (Paus. 10.15.1); cf. MEFR (1983) 631, 1.1. In C5m Megara contributed money to the rebuilding of Apollo’s temple at Delphi after its collapse in 369 (CID ii 4.1.6, 11.55 (360)), and Megarians appear among the naapoioi (CID ii 31.34 (354/5, etc.).

Megara may have minted the disputed C6 “wagon wheel” coins (Head, HN² 393), but its first authenticated coinage is dated to C4: obv. head of Apollo; rev. Apollo’s lyre. Legend: ΜΕΓΑΡΕΙΝ on the didrachm, ΜΕΓΑ and ΜΕΓ on smaller coins (Head, HN² 329–30; SNG Cop. Attica-Aegina 459–65).

Megara was an active coloniser from C8s to C7m, founding Megara Hybaia (no. 36), one of the earliest Sicilian colonies C7m (Thuc. 6.2.2; Strabo 5.270–82; Hellan. fr. 82; cf. Vallet and Villard (1952) for discussion of literary and archaeological evidence). Megara also sent the oecist Pammilos for Selinous (no. 44) in Sicily in C7m (Thuc. 6.4.2), but concentrated its further colonising activities in the Hellespontine and Black Sea regions. Megara was principal or sole founder of Kalchedon (no. 743) C6.675 (Thuc. 4.75.2; Strabo 12.4.2; Pompon. 1.101), Selymbria (no. 679) C6.660 (Ps.-Skymnos 715–16), Byzantion (no. 674) C6.658 (Hdt. 4.144.2; Hschr. Patria Constantinoupolos 5.3), Astakos (no. 737) (Memnon (FGrHist 434) fr. 12), Herakleia Pontike (no. 715) in C6m (Paus. 5.26.7) and possibly Olbia (no. 753). Since Megara was not a major factor in later Greek history, many of its early foundations were disputed in later sources. See Hanell (1934), esp. 161–204, for cult and calendar evidence that confirms Megarian influence in the colonies.

226. Pagai (Pagaioi) Map 58. Lat. 38.05, long. 23.10. Size of territory: probably 1. Type: [A]. The toponym is Παγαι, αί (IG i 1353.5 (C5m)) or Παγαι, αί (Thuc. 1.111.2; Ps.-Skylax 39). The city-ethnic is Παγαιοι (C2 coins: Head, HN² 417).

Pagai was situated in Megaris, according to Hellan. fr. 44 and Ps.-Skylax 39. In a difficult chapter (on which see Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 142–43), Ps.-Skylax 39 (C4) refers to a plurality of poleis in Megaris by the heading πόλεις αἰῶνες, and among the toponyms which follow this heading Παγαι is securely preserved; it is thus likely that Pagai is here listed as a polis in the urban sense. Several sources indicate that Pagai was a polis in the political sense in the Hellenistic period: it legislated (IG v11 190), one of its citizens served as Delphic theorodokos (BCH 45 (1921) 11.29 (230–220)), and it was a member of the Achaian Confederacy (Head, HN² 417). That it may already have been a polis by C4 is suggested by Ps.-Skylax 39. An inscription of c.300 refers to a plurality of komai in Megaris (IG VII 1.19); it seems likely that, like Aigosthena (no. 224), Pagai was one of these komai, and so the city may have had a double status as both a kome and a polis and in this case a dependent polis within the territory of Megara (Hansen (1995) 74–75); alternatively, the city developed into a polis only in the Hellenistic period. An Archai inscription suggests a cult of Apollo Lykeios (IG v11 35). On the site are remains of undated walls (Hammond (1973) 438–40). Thuc. 1.103.4 shows that Pagai was fortified in C5m.

2. Corinthia

227. Korinthos (Korinthios) Map 58. Lat. 37.55, long. 23.55. Size of territory: 5. Type: A. The toponym is Kόρινθος, Ἰ (Anac. 195; Gentili; Simon. fr. 40, Page Hdt. 3.50.3), also spelled Γορίνθος (ML 24 = IG i 1143 (480/79)). The city-ethnic is Κόρινθοις (IG iv 355 (C5e); Hdt. 1.23), also spelled Ερινθοὶς (SEG 41 340B1 (C6m); SEG 23 264a.3 (540–525)).

Corinth is called a polis in the urban sense by Hdt. 8.61.2 and Thuc. 1.13.5. The territorial sense is a connotation at Thuc. 1.13.5 (second occurrence). The political sense is attested in C6m (Thgn. 893) and later by Xen. Hell. 4.4.2 and CID ii 4.11.35 and 38. Aristotle also included Corinth in his collection of 158 politieīai (fr. 521–22). The term asty is used for Corinth on a C3e gravestone found on Salamis (ML 24 = IG i 1143) and by Simon. fr. 10, West.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on C4 bronze coinage (infra), and externally in a C6 oracle reported by Hdt. 5.92B3 and on the Serpent Column (ML 27.2 (479/8)). The external individual city-ethnic is attested, e.g. in
The peninsula of Perachora on the Isthmus passed into Corinthian territory in the Archaic and Classical periods. No other Hell alongside the border between Corinth and Argos by Xen. 4.4.66. No other poleis are recorded as having existed within Corinthian territory in the Archaic and Classical periods. Located settlements in the territory of Corinth (see Wiseman (1978)) comprise Boukephalos (Bucephalus: Plin. HN 4.18; Barr., AC); Kromna (Κρόμνα: Lykop. Alex. 522 with schol.; Barr., AC); cf. SEG 22 219 (325–280), a sepulchral inscription over or a dedication by Αὗθος Κρομβύτης; Krommyon (Κρομμύων: Thuc. 4.4.51; Ps.-Skylax 55; Xen. Hell. 4.4.13, 19, τείχοις; Strabo 8.6.22; Barr., AC); Oinoe (Οἶνος: Xen. Hell. 4.5.19; Strabo 8.6.62; Barr. C); Schoinous (Σχοινοῦς: Strabo 8.6.4, 22; λιμένι Αργο, AC); Sidous (Σίδους: Ps.-Skylax 55; Xen. Hell. 4.4.13, 19, τείχοις; Ath. 82A–B, Barr., AC); Solyeia (Σολυγεία: Thuc. 4.4.2–43.5, κώμη; Barr., AC); Tenea (Τενεά: Xen. Hell. 4.4.19; Strabo 8.6.22, κώμης; Paus. 2.5.4; Barr., AC), which developed into a polis in the Hellenistic period (see SEG13 348 (C1) and Head, HN 408); and Therme (Θερμα: Xen. Hell. 4.5.8; Barr., AC); furthermore, Lechaion (Xen. Hell. 4.4.7; Pl. Menex. 245E) and Kenchreai (Κένχρεαι: Thuc. 8.23.1, 5; Xen. Hell. 4.5.1), the two harbours of Corinth (Ps.-Skylax 40, 55; Paus. 2.2.3; Strabo 8.6.62; Barr. AC). Note also that Hdt. 5.92β1 refers to a δήμος called Πέτρη, and that Theopomp. fr. 173 refers to two κόμαι μεγάλαι καὶ πολυάνθρωποι called Asai and Mauos; Asai is unlocated (Barr.), whereas Barr. (following Wiseman (1978) 81) tentatively identifies Mauos with the C site at modern Mapsos.
attributed the Corinthian synoecism to King Aletes at the time of the foundation. Salmon (1984) 57–58 concludes that Corinthia was unified from the time of the Dorian conquest, c. 900 (Phot. Lexicon πάντα δικτω). During the Persian War Corinth mustered 5,000 hoplites at Plataiai in 479 (Hdt. 9.28.3) and forty triremes at Artemision and Salamis (Hdt. 8.1.43). In the Peloponnesian War Corinth sent 3,000 hoplites and thirty triremes to Leukimme (Thuc. 1.27.2), ninety triremes to Sybota (Thuc. 1.46.1), forty triremes and 1,500 hoplites to restore the tyrant of Astakos (no. 116) (Thuc. 2.33.1), and 2,000 hoplites to Boiotia after Delion in 424 (Thuc. 4.100.1). Some 3,000 Corinthian hoplites fought at Nemea in 394 (Xen. Hell. 4.2.17). Corinth appointed eight strategoi to command its forces, one per tribe (Thuc. 1.46.2, 2.33.1, 7.7.1, 19.4.34.2). Salmon (1984) 232–33 suggests that they “acted as a college, without an overall commander”.

Few diplomatic envoy names are found in the sources, but Hdt. 5.93.1 (RCé) describes Sokles as ἄποι Κορίνθου προσβείων, and Aineas, son of Okytos, and Euphamidas, son of Aristonymos, were signers of the Peloponnesian truce with Athens in 423 (Thuc. 4.119.2). Corinth awarded proxenia to citizens of Korkyra (no. 123) (Thuc. 3.70.1), and Corinthian citizens were appointed proxenoi by Karthaia (no. 492) (IG xii 5 542.14 (C4m)) and Delphi (no. 177) (F.Delphes 111.1 178–79 (C4l)). In 356 a theodorokos was appointed to host theoroi from Epidaurus (no. 348) (IG1v2.1 95.2).

Monarchy gave way to the Bacchid aristocracy in C8m (Diod. 7.9; Salmon (1984) 55–56). The tyranny of the Kypselids lasted from C7m to C6e (Arist. Pol. 1315a22–26; Salmon (1984) 186–230). Thereafter, an oligarchic constitution characterised Corinth throughout C6, C5 and C4, interrupted only by a brief period of democracy 392–386 (infra) and the tyranny of Timophasines in 366 (Arist. Pol. 1306a21–24). A Council of Eighty comprised of eight probouloi and seventy-two ordinary members (Nic. Dam. (FGrHist 90) fr. 60.2; cf. Will (1955) 609–15) existed by C4 and probably goes back to the time of the tyranny. This Council is probably the γεροντία mentioned by Diod. (16.65.6, 9) as involved in the dispatch of Timoleon to Sicily in 346/5 (Salmon (1984) 231). Thuc. 5.30.5 mentions a Corinthian ξύλλογος in 421, which must be an assembly.

Isopolitía with Argos (no. 347) in C4e (Xen. Hell. 4.4.6; Diod. 14.92.1) led to joint administration of the Isthmian Games and some reciprocal political rights, but its further significance is disputed. Xen. Hell. 4.4.6 took it as a step toward the merger of the two poleis. Salmon (1984) 357–71 disputes this interpretation. Corinthian exiles are attested at the time of these events: 150 of these exiles fought under the Spartan Praxitas to retake Corinth (Xen. Hell. 4.4.9). The isopolitía was dissolved by the terms of the King’s Peace (Xen. Hell. 5.1.32–34). Salmon (1984) 354–62 argues that even the revolution of 392 (Xen. Hell. 4.4.2–5; Diod. 14.86.1–2) did not overturn the oligarchy, but Xen. Hell. 4.4.6 supports the view of Kagan (1962) 447–53 and Hamilton (1979) 260–78 that a democratic regime came to power briefly.

Corinth suffered threats and outbreaks of stasis during the tyranny of Periander (Hdt. 5.92L–θ; Arist. Pol. 1284a26–33, 1311a20–22, 1313a36–37, b21–23), in connection with the overthrow of the tyranny (Nic. Dam. (FGrHist 90) fr. 60.), and in C4f during and after the Corinthian War: stasis between pro-Lakedaimonian and anti-Lakedaimonian factions broke out in 395 (Hell. Oxy. 10.3), and the core of the pro-Lakedaimonian faction was massacred in 392 (Xen. Hell. 4.4.1–5; cf. Buckler (1999)). Later in 392 the Corinthian exiles and their allies conquered Lecheion and won a battle fought against the Corinthians in the city (Xen. Hell. 4.4.9–11). The anti-Lakedaimonian democrats were expelled in turn after the King’s Peace in 386, when the pro-Spartan oligarchy had been restored (Xen. Hell. 5.1.34). Corinthian exiles are found in Argos (Diod. 15.40.3) and in Athens (Dem. 20.51–57), and an attempted return in 375 ended in bloodshed (Diod. 15.40.3; for the date, see Stylianou (1998) 330–31). Another stasis occurred in 366/5, when Timophasines was appointed commander of a standing force of 400 mercenaries, but then set himself up as tyrant of Corinth, whereupon he was murdered by his brother Timoleon (Plut. Tim. 4.4; Arist. Pol. 1306a22–24; Diod. 16.65.3–8).

The Akrokorinth was a “natural fortress” (Salmon (1984) 220) and traces of what are most likely Archaic fortifications have been found there (Carpenter in Bon et al. (1936) 1ff). Kypselos is credited with building the earliest fortifications around the city (rubble-filled stone with an average width of 2.4 m) and joining it to the Akrokorinth (A. N. Stillwell (1948) 14). Remains are dated to C7f (ibid.; Lang (1996) 171). The Classical city walls of Corinth were approximately 7.5 km in length, enclosing an urban area of 600–700 ha (Carpenter in Bon et al. (1936) 1–83). In C5m, long walls were built between Corinth and the port of Lechaion (Parsons in Bon et al. (1936) 84–125). These were breached by Praxitas in 392 (Xen. Hell. 4.4.13).

Public buildings included the bouleuterion (Diod. 16.65.6 (1346)), the Kyklopeian Springs constructed by the Bacchiads in C8–C7, the Sacred Spring, the springs of...
et al. the north building consisted of a stoa and shops (R. Stillwell 1954). The earliest theatre was built in C5 (R. Stillwell 1952) 131–33; cf. TGR ii. 152–55. Xen. Hell. 4.4.3 mentions a theatre in the context of Corinthian stasis in 392. Among the temples and shrines observed by Pausanias were the shrine of Tyche (2.2.7), the temple of Aphrodite (Strabo 8.6.20), the temple of Athena of the Bride, and the temple of Zeus Supreme (2.4.5). Pausanias omits mention of the temple of Apollo built under the tyranny in C6m, which superseded an earlier temple of Apollo built in C7 by the Bacchiads (Salmon 1984) 78–79, 180. At Isthmia, the Corinthians built a temple of Poseidon and a sanctuary of Kyklopes (Ps.-Skylax 55; Paus. 2.2.2). At Perachora, Kypros built the temple and altar of Hera Akraia in C6.

Among the cults attested in Corinth are those associated with Aphrodite, Hera, Medea, Athena, Bellerophon, Apollo, Poseidon, Ephesian Artemis, Dionysos, Hermes, Zeus of the Underworld, Zeus the All-Highest, Demeter, Kore, the Fates, Necessity and Violence, Pelagian and Egyptian Isis, and Serapis. (See Odelberg (1896) and Will (1955) 81–236.)

Corinth was the sanctuary of Peisistratus and presided over the Isthmian Games (Thuc. 8.9–10.1; Xen. Hell. 4.5.1–2; Paus. 2.2.2).

Consultation of the oracle at Delphi by the Bacchiad regime (C6e) is recorded by Hdt. 5.92β.3. Corinthian victories are reported in the Olympic Games (Olympionikai 13, 14,147, 152, 154, 229, 249–50, 367c), the Pythian Games (Pind. Ol. 13.37; Anth. Pal. 13.19), the Nemean Games (Pind. Ol. 13.44; Anth. Pal. 13.39), the Panathenaic Games (Anth. Pal. 13.19), and, of course, the Isthmian Games (Pind. Ol. 13.41; Anth. Pal. 13.19). The earliest known treasury at Delphi was dedicated by the Corinthian tyrant Kypros (Hdt. 1.14.2; Plut. Mor. 164A, 400D–E). He also dedicated a gold colossus at Olympia in C7m (Pl. Phdr. 236B). The Olympianos of Aelia built by Periander, near Corinth, was destroyed in C4e (Paus. 2.5.5).

Corinth had one of the most prolific mints in ancient Greece (see Kraay (1976) 78–88). C6f and later silver coins bore an image of Pegasos and the letter Ψ on the obv., and a helmeted Athena on the rev., with Aphrodite substituted for Athena on drachms and smaller denominations. The Corinthian weight standard was adopted in much of northwest Greece. Minting ceased during the greater part of the Peloponnesian War in C5f and resumed in C4e (Kraay (1976) 85–86). On C4 bronze coinage we find Κ, ΚΟΠ, and ΚΟΠΙΝΘΙΩΝ (Head, ΧΝ ΧVII and 399ft; SNG Cop. Corinth 1–67).

Corinth was involved in the colonisation of Syracuse (no. 47), oecist Archias (Thuc. 6.3.2); Apollonia (no. 77), which was either a Corinthian foundation (Thuc. 1.26.2; Plin. HN 3.145; Plut. Dio 41.45,1; Steph. Byz. 105.21–22) or a joint foundation with Korkyra (Strabo 7.5.8; Ps.-Skymnos 439–40); Elea (no. 95); possibly Alyzeia (no. 112); Ambrakia (no. 113), oecist Gorgos (Strabo 7.7.6; Ps.-Skymnos 453–55; Thuc. 2.80.3); Anaktorion (no. 114) in C7f–C6e (Nic. Dam. (FGHist 90) fr. 57.7; Strabo 10.2.8); Plut. Mor. 55E2 credits Periander with this foundation, but Anaktorion may have been jointly founded with Korkyra (Thuc. 1.50.1); possibly Astakos (no. 116); Korkyra (no. 123), oecist Chersikrates (Thuc. 1.26; Ap. Rhod. 4.1212 with scholar; Timeaus (FGHist 566) fr. 80); Leukas (no. 126), founded by Kypselos (Hdt. 8.45; Thuc. 1.30.2; Ps.-Sklyax 34); Sollion (no. 137); Chalkis (no. 145); Molykreion (no. 150); and Poteidaia (no. 598) in C6e, said to have been founded by Periander (Nic. Dam. (FGHist 90) fr. 59.1). Corinth maintained active relations with its colonies. Thus, a Corinthian, Phallos, son of Eratokleides, was oecist at the Korkyran colony of Epidamnos in C7lm (Thuc. 1.24.1–2); in C5f, Corinth and Korkyra arbitrated between Syracuse and Hippokrates of Gela (Hdt. 7.154.3); as late as C5s, magistrates called ἐπιδηµιουργοὶ were sent to Poteidaia (Thuc. 1.56.2), and in 346/5 Timoleon was sent to Syracuse on that city’s own request to end the political chaos there (Diod. 16–65; see Talbert (1974)). See further Graham (1964) 118–53.

3. Sikyonia

228. Sikyon (Sikyonios) Map 58. Lat. 38.00, long. 22.45. Size of territory: 4. Type: A. The toponym is Σικύων, o (Pind. Ol. 13.109; Thuc. 1.111.2, Xen. Hell. 4.2.14) or Ό (Pind. Nem. 9,53); in local script up to C4l, it appears as Σικύων (SEG 11 257 (C5f)). The ethnic is Σικύωνος (ML 27,3 (479/8)), Σικύωνος (IG v.1 1565 = Tod 120; Hdt. 5.69,1), or Σικύωνος (SGDI 3162; Griffin (1982) 62); Σικύωνος is found in LSAG 140 and pl. 23 (C7). In Classical sources Sikyos is called a polis in the political sense by Thuc. 8.3.2 and Xen. Hell. 7.1.4;4 the urban sense is found at Ps.-Skylax 41, and asty appears in Xen. Hell. 7.3.4 and Theopomp. fr. 176; polis in the territorial sense is found
in Xen. Hell. 7.3.3 (δοληρ. . . τὴν πόλις). The term asty is used for Sikyon at Xen. Hell. 7.3.4 and Theopomp. fr. 176 and 311. Xenophon refers to the politeia at Hell. 7.1.44 (κατὰ τοὺς ἀρχαῖους νόμους ἡ πολιτεία). The term Aigialeis, established for the pre-Dorian population

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found in IG iv 429.3 (C46); the external collective use is attested in ΙvO 649 (C5f), on a C5m bronze grave dedicated at Olympia (Griffin 1982) 62; cf. SEG 31 369, and on the Serpent Column (ML 27.3 (479/8)); the external individual use is found on a C7 graffito from Delphi: Σεφυννίος (LSAG 140 and pl. 23), in IG i3 741 (C5e), on a C4f limestone base at Delphi: [Κλ]έων επίσης Σικυώνιος (Tod 120), and in the historians (e.g. Hdt. 5.69.1; Thuc. 7.19.4). Sikyon is called patra (= patris) in CEGl 181 356 and is implicitly called patris at Dem. 18.291–92 (cf. IG ii2 484.55–56 (318/7)).

The territory is called Σικυών (Hdt. 1.145, 5.67.1; Thuc. 5.81.2) or Σικυωνία (Thuc. 4.101.3); it is called χώρη at Hdt. 5.67. The size of the territory has been estimated at 360–400 km² (Beloch 1922) 276. Sikyon's eastern boundary was the river Nemea, which divided its territory from Corinthia (Strabo 8.6.25). Sikyon was bounded by the Corinthian Gulf on the north, and by the river Sythas and the territory of Pellene (no. 30) on the west (Paus. 7.27.12). In the south, Sikyon was separated from the territory of Phleious (no. 355) by mountains—Apesas, Spiria and Trikaranon (Skalet 1928) 28. The main area of occupation and the city of Sikyon were located in a triangular coastal plain bounded by the rivers Asopus and Helisson (Skalet 1928) 1–4. Urban sites within Sikyonia included Titane, probably the most important site after Sikyon itself, but with little remaining (Paus. 2.11.3; Barr., AC); Ephrya (Strabo 8.3.4; not in Barr.), Plataiai (Strabo 9.2.31; not in Barr.), Donoussa (Gonoussa; not in Barr.) (Paus. 5.18.7, 7.26.6; Hom. Il. 2.573), and Ptoibia (alias Boupia: Steph. Byz. 184.5 = Ephor. fr. 81; not in Barr.) called a πόλις (town) by Paus. 9.15.2. Forts identified in the sources are Epieikia (Xen. Hell. 4.2.14, 4.13); Derai (Gerali), a stronghold (Xen. Hell. 7.1.12); and Thyamia (Xen. Hell. 7.2.1, 23, 41.11).

The free population in C5 and C4 is estimated at 20,000 (Beloch 1922) 276. The three Dorian phylai—Hyleis, Pamphyloi and Dymanes—are attested, and an additional tribe, Aigialeis, established for the pre-Dorian population (Hdt. 5.68). These were abolished by the tyrant Kleisthenes, but restored after the fall of the tyranny in C6m (Hdt. 5.68).

Sikyon was dominated by Argos (no. 347) until the period of the Sikyonian tyranny, when Kleisthenes (C6e) fought a war with Argos (Hdt. 5.67–68). It was a member of the Peloponnesian League from C6 to 369 (the earliest notice of Sikyon's membership being in 494, when it supplied ships to the Spartan king, Kleomenes: Hdt. 6.92.1). In the reorganisation of the Peloponnesian League in 377, Sikyon was paired with Phleious (no. 355) and the communities of Akte in one of the ten divisions (Diod. 15.31.2). Sikyon was included as a subordinate party in the Athenian/Spartan alliance of 369 (Xen. Hell. 7.11.15–23, 2.2). After Sparta's defeat at Leuktra in the same year, Sikyon was invaded by Epameinondas, conquered and forced to join the Theban alliance (Xen. Hell. 7.1.18, 22, 44; 2.2, 3.2; Diod. 15.69.1). A Theban harmost is attested in Sikyon c.366 (Xen. Hell. 7.2.11 and 3.4, 9). By the time of Alexander's death a Makedonian garrison held Sikyon (IG ii2 448). An inscription from C4l records a treaty between Athens (no. 361) and Sikyon (Staatsverträge no. 445).

In 480, Sikyon sent twelve ships to the Hellenic fleet at Artemision (Hdt. 8.1.2) and, later, fifteen to Salamis (Hdt. 8.43). In 479, Sikyon mustered 3,000 hoplites at Plataiai (Hdt. 9.28.4, 31.3). At Nemea, a century later, Sikyon mustered only 1,500 hoplites (Xen. Hell. 4.2.16). The tyrant Orthagoras was a general (polemarchos) according to P.Oxy. 11, 1365, and Herodotos calls Perileos, the Sikyonian general who died at Mykale in 479, strategos (Hdt. 9.103.1). In C4m Euphron asked the people of Sikyon to choose strategoi, which they did (Xen. Hell. 7.1.45).

Few Sikyonian diplomats are named, but Damotimos, son of Naukrates, and Onesimos, son of Megakles, are recorded as signers of the one-year truce in 423 (Thuc. 4.119.2); cf. Thuc. 1.28.1 for Sikyonian presbeis. Μυγαθοκλέης Μικυώταος was Sikyonian proskenos at Thespiai (no. 222) in Boiotia (IG vii 1724); and three Sikyonian proskenos are noted in Messenia in C4s or later (Paus. 4.14.1). Kleandros and Sokles were proskenos and theorodokoi of the Pisatans (no. 262) c.365–563 (Syll.3 171; Perlman 2000) 64–65, 175). There is no evidence of grants of citizenship by Sikyon, or of free non-citizens. A citizen of Sikyon was granted citizenship by Athens (no. 361) in 323/2 (IG ii2 448), and another by Eretria (no. 370) in C4s (Eretria x1).

probably through Spartan intervention, oligarchy prevailed in Sikyon through most of C6, C5 and C4. Fearing that Sikyon might go over to Argos, the Spartans intervened again in 417 to establish a more extreme oligarchic regime (Thuc. 5.81.2). We do not know how long this regime remained in power, but Sikyon is referred to as supporting Sparta several years later, during the Sicilian campaign, under compulsion (Thuc. 7.58.3). There was an unsuccessful revolution in Sikyon in 375/4 (Diod. 15.40.4; for the date, see Stylianou 1998 330–31), and the oligarchy survived a shift to the Theban alliance in 369 except for the brief democratic/tyrannical coup of Euphoron in 367 (Xen. Hell. 7.1.44–46, 3.4–12; Diod. 15.70.3; Plut. Arat. 53). Outbreaks of stasis occurred in C6m when the tyranny was abolished (Plut. Mor. 859D), in 417 when a more narrow form of oligarchy was established (Thuc. 5.81.2), c.375 when a coup failed, probably planned by a democratic faction (Diod 15.40.4), in 367–366 when Euphoron established a short-lived tyranny (Xen. Hell. 7.1.44–46, 2.11–15, 2–12), and c.340 when a pro-Macedonian group was headed by the “traitors” Aristratos and Ephichares (Dem. 18.48, 295).

Artemis was the chief goddess of Sikyon, and Apollo the most revered god. The presence of Athena Polias or Poliouchos is disputed (for: Odelberg (1896) 31; against: Hitzig-Blümner, Pausanias 1.2, p. 537). SEG 11 257.6 (C5f) attests to athletic games at Sikyon (cf. Pind. Nem. 9).

The Sikyonians consulted the Delphic oracle on several important occasions in rC6m (Parke and Wormell 1956 nos. 23 (cf. Diod. 8.24 and Plut. Mor. 553A) and 28; Pliny, HN 36.9). Sikyonians are listed among the temple-builders (naopoioi) who restored the temple of Apollo at Delphi in C4m, e.g. Ξενότιμος Σικυώνος (CID 11 31.12 (356/5)). A collective donation of money by Sikyon towards this purpose is recorded in CID 11 8.11.9 (C3m).

Tellis won the stadium at Olympia in 708 (Olympionikai 20); Myron, the tyrant, won chariot victory in 648 (Paus. 6.19.2; Olympionikai 52), and Kleisthenes, his descendant, won the chariot race in 576 or 572 (Hdt. 6.126.2; Olympionikai 96). Pythokritos, son of Kallinikos, the flute-player, won six consecutive victories at the Pythian Games in C6, and was honoured with a statue at Olympia (Paus. 6.14.9–10). Boukeles won the boys’ boxing some time between 412 and 360 (Paus. 6.13.7; Hyde (1921) 120; Olympionikai 360). Sostratos was most prolific of all, winning the pancratic contests at Isthmia, Nemea, Olympia (Olympionikai 420, 425, 433) and Delphi (Paus. 6.4.2).

Sikyon built a prominent treasury at Delphi (Paus. 10.11.1). Archaeology has established a C5s building, but older C6f foundations beneath may be remains of a Sikyonian treasury of Kleisthenes’ time, though the traditional attribution of the building to Sikyon is uncertain (Griffin (1982) 106–11). A treasury at Olympia was dedicated by the Sikyonian Olympic victor and tyrant “Myron and the Sikyonian demos” in C7m (Paus. 6.19.1–6), but letter-form dating assigns the archaeological remains to C5f (Jeffery (1990) 143–44). There may have been an earlier C7l structure (Herrman (1972) 99–100).

The town of Sikyon had a two-level acropolis. A C5 wall surrounded the city, and another wall protected the acropolis. The city walls enclosed an area of approximately 175 ha (this wall is mentioned in Xen. Hell. 4.4.14; Aen. Tact. 29.12; Diod. 11.88.2 (1453)). The agora is mentioned at Hdt. 5.67.1. The harbour must have had its own fortifications (see Skaelet (1928) 7). In C4l, the city was relocated by Demetrios Poliorketes: the outer city wall was demolished, the lower acropolis wall was strengthened (2.5 m thickness), and a new wall was built surrounding the upper acropolis. The urban population moved from the old city on the plain below the acropolis to what had been the lower acropolis (Diod. 20.102; Plut. Demetr. 25; Strabo 8.6.25; Paus. 2.7.1; cf. Skaelet (1928) 2–3; Griffin (1982) 23–24, 78).

The remains of public buildings in the city and on the acropolis are surveyed by Griffin (1982) 6–24. Most of the visible ruins date from Hellenistic and Roman times, including a theatre on the slope of the acropolis (TGR ii. 291–92; cf. Paus. 2.7.5; cf. Polyb. 29.24.6 and 25.2); but there is an Archaic temple rebuilt in the Hellenistic period. Paus. 2.9.6 mentions a bouleuterion in the agora and a stoa ascribed to Kleisthenes, the C6 tyrant who also had part of the pyrtaneion turned into a sanctuary for Melanippos (Hdt. 5.67). The C4l remains of a quadrangular hypostyle hall on the east side of the agora are usually identified with the bouleuterion referred to by Pausanias (Gneisz (1990) 351–52). Xen. Hell. 7.1.45 describes a gathering of the demos in the agora in 367–366. Pausanias describes (2.11.1–2) the remains of older temples on the original acropolis, whose precise location is still in dispute (Griffin (1982) 21–24). These sacred buildings include the temple of Athena, the sanctuaries of Artemis and Apollo, Hera, and Demeter, and the shrines of Karneian Apollo and Hera Prodromia.

The earliest Sikyonian coinage dated to C6l. Sikyon used the Aiginetan weight standard (Kraay (1976) 329). C5 silver coinage had types: obv. Chimaera, or Apollo kneeling with his bow and arrows; rev. dove (a symbol of Artemis) and the letter Σ. C4e coinage with legend ΣΕ or ΣΙ. See Head, HN2 409–12 and SNG Cop. Philiasia-Laconia 18–72.
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I. The Region

The name of the region is Ἀχαιῶν (Thuc. 2.83.3, 84.3; Xen. Hell. 3.2.23, 7.1.41). The ethnic is Ἀχαιός (ivO 650.3 (C6–C5); Hdt. 1.145). The collective use of the ethnic is attested externally (Hdt. 1.145; Thuc. 2.9.2; Xen. Hell. 4.6.1; IG ii 112 (362/1)), and internally on federal coins dating to c.370–360 and inscribed AXΑΙΩΝ (Head, HN² 416); cf. SEG14 375 (C4). The external individual use is found in IG 1² 174.5: Αὔκονα τῶν Ἀχαιῶν (425–410), and is frequently combined with an indication of local origin: Ἀχαιός Ὀλένος (SEG 39 370a.A7 (427–414)); Αριστε(ί)αν τῶν Ἀχαιῶν τῶν Ἀλίγια (IG 11² 13 (399/8)); Κλέων Ἀχαιός έχ Φάρας (IG xii.8.637 (C4)); or Μανίδας Ἁθεφές (Ἀ)χαιών ἐξ Αἰγίρας (BCH 22 (1898) 261 n. 1 with BCH 62 (1938) 340–41 (326/5)). The region of Achaia is described as γῆ at Hdt. 8.73.1 and χώρα at Ps.-Skylax 42, while the population is termed ἔθνος τῶ Ἀχαιῶν at Hdt. 8.73.1.

Achaia spans the north coast of the Peloponnese, from the border with Sicyon at the river Sythas in the east to the river Larissos which marked the Eleian frontier in the west (Strabo 9.5). Mt. Skollis served as a common frontier between Elis, Dyme and Tritaia (Strabo 8.3.10) and in the south, Mts. Erymanthos, Aroania and Kyllini in northern Arkadia formed a striking natural barrier dividing Achaia from the central Peloponnese (Paus. 8.15.8–9, 17.5). Geographically and culturally, Achaia may be divided into four sub-regions, which show great variety in the pace and pattern of local development (Morgan and Hall (1996) 166–93). The narrow, alluvial coastal plain that runs from Aigeira to Neos Erineos attains a depth greater than one mile only east of Aigion, and is characterised by a series of headlands punctuated by the outflow of the rivers which originate in the inland mountains (Pellene, further to the east, appears distinct both in its topography and its role in history). The northern escarpments of the inland mountains are abrupt—Mt. Kyllini being a mere 13 miles from the coast—and rivers cut deep valleys which are mainly dry in summer. Routes inland are few—notably along the river Vouraikos towards modern Kalavryta, and the Meganeitas and Selinous valleys inland from Aigion—and the easiest communication in Antiquity was via the coast. To the west of this area lies the chora of Patrai, which in Classical times extended from Drepanon perhaps as far as Tsoukaleika, although the exact boundary of the chora of Olenos is hard to define. The interior is dominated by Mt. Panachaikon, situated 9 miles inland from Drepanon, with uplands—many over 5,000 feet—offering good summer pasture to complement the broad coastal plain. The Gulfs of Corinth and Patras reach their narrowest point at modern Rion, just outside Patras, offering the easiest crossing north to Aitolia. Thirdly, the area of Dyme (modern Kato Achaia) west of the river Peiros has a broad, continuous coastal plain surrounding lower and more undulating hill country (rising to 2,300 feet), which is well watered due to a comparatively high rainfall. It is possible that this area was extensively forested in Antiquity. Finally, the Pharai valley runs inland south of Panachaikon, rising in elevation and growing increasingly narrow towards the east; it is punctuated by small, well-watered plains (Philippson (1959) ch. 1; NID (1945) 162–66, 189–93).

According to literary sources, Achaia was divided into twelve regions. Hdt. 1.145 names these as Pellene, Aigeira, Aigai, Boura, Helleike, Aigion, Rhypes, Patrees (Patrai), Pharees (Pharai), Olenos, Dyme and Tritaiees (Tritaia). Strabo 8.7.4, drawing on Herodotos, gives the same names in the same order. Ps.-Skylax 42 also follows this order, but omits Boura, Helleike, Pharai, Olenos and Tritaia. The absence of inland Pharai and Tritaia is, of course, understandable in a treatise which purports to be a periplous. Helleike had been engulfed by a tidal wave occasioned by an earthquake in 373 (Polyb. 2.41; Strabo 8.7.2; Paus. 7.24.6), while Boura was affected by the same event but was swiftly resettled by survivors who had escaped thanks to their absence on military service (Paus. 7.25.8–9)—an omission that may suggest that this particular section of Ps.-Skylax’s work dates to a period immediately after the earthquake (see Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 137–38). Olenos had been abandoned due to weakness (Paus. 7.18.1), and its
inhabitants incorporated within Dyme (Strabo 8.7.4). Leontion and Keryneia, neither of which is mentioned by Classical sources, may have originally been hill sites (Anderson (1954) 73): Pausanias implies that Keryneia, situated between Helike and Boura, already existed when it received refugees from Mykenai (no. 353) shortly after 468, but that it was this increase in population that guaranteed Keryneia’s future importance. Other late authors reflect these various reversals. Polyb. 2.41.7–8 omits Aigai, Rhypes, Helike and Olenos, but adds Keryneia and Leontion. Pausanias’ list (7.6.1; cf. 7.18.7, 22.1, 22.6) largely accords with that of Herodotos, though he too adds the name of Keryneia and omits that of Patrai—perhaps because by his day it had been refounded as a Roman colony.

For Hdt. 1.114–146.1, the Ionians of Asia Minor had originated from Peloponnesian Achaia; the reason why they were organised into twelve poleis and were reluctant to admit new members was that they had been divided into twelve mere when they had occupied Achaia. At first sight, Herodotos appears to be establishing a direct contrast between the poleis of Ionia and the mere of Achaia, and this has led Sakellariou (1991) 14 to hypothesise that the emergence of poleis in Achaia must postdate the time of Herodotos. Yet if this was Herodotos’ intention, it was misunderstood by later writers. Paus. 7.6.1 says that the Achaians immediately established poleis upon their arrival in Achaia, and Strabo 8.7.4 contrasts the village settlements of the Ionians with the poleis founded by the Achaians (although he had previously (8.7.1) described Achaia as already settled in poleis at the time of the Ionian “occupation”). However, far from being concerned with the political geography of Achaia in historical times, Herodotos’ aim was to provide an aition for the restriction of membership of the Panionion to twelve cities. The mere of Achaia are introduced in the context of the protohistoric period prior to the return of the Herakleidai, whose arrival in Argos and Sparta supposedly forced the Achaians to migrate to the north Peloponnese (Paus. 7.1.5; cf. Hdt. 7.94; Strabo 8.7.1). If Herodotos subscribes to a view of Achaia at this time as relatively unurbanised, he is almost certainly reflecting a commonly held opinion: Homer mentions only Hyperesia (Aigeira), Gonoessa (Donoussia?), Pellene, Aigion, Aigai and Helike, and attaches to none a term such as polis or ptoliethron (Hom. Il. 2.573–75, 8.203; cf. 2.501, 305, 538, 546, 569, 584, 648–49, 677, 739). And since polis would have been an unsuitable term in this period, Herodotos uses the term mereos which, together with its cognate meris, continued to be employed in Achaian contexts as a synonym for chora even after the appearance of urban centres (Strabo 8.7.2, 4, 5; Paus. 7.17.13). In short, the dictates of Herodotos’ argument, together with the fact that mereos could be used to describe a chora with or without an urban centre, makes it difficult to maintain that poleis cannot have existed by Herodotos’ day.

According to Strabo 8.7.5, each of the twelve mere of Achaia was formed from seven or eight demois. While it is possible that the “prehistory” of these demois was invented during the Hellenistic period to bestow a deeper historical pedigree upon the members of the Achaian Confederacy, it is equally likely that they had existed during the Archaic period at least. Unfortunately, there is no epigraphic evidence for their existence in Achaia at any period—indeed, the only testimony for civic subdivisions comes in a C3 law (Syll. 1974 531) which regulates citizenship at Dyme (no. 234) and names three phylai: Stratis (or Spathis), Dymaia and Thesmiaia. Jones, POAG 130–32, argues that the absence of demois in this inscription indicates that they played no role in public administration, although he suggests that the phylai—which in Dyme, at any rate, seem to have had a geographical significance—were modelled on a pre-existing system of demois. Archaeological evidence appears to suggest that the physical existence of the demois continued long after the Archaic period, even if their political identity was lost after synoecism (see generally Rizakis (1995)).

Poleis are certainly attested in Achaia by C4. Xen. Hell. 6.5.29 includes Pellene (no. 240) in a list of poleis that gave aid to the Spartans during the Theban invasion of Lokonia in the winter of 370/69. Cicero says that Dikaierarchos, a pupil of Aristotle, wrote a Constitution of the Pellenians (Cic. ad Att. II 2 = no. 125, Gigon), and IG II² 220 (344/3) refers to presbesis from Pellene being entertained in the prytyaneion at Athens. More explicit evidence is available for 367, when the Thebans decided to send harmostai to the poleis of Achaia (Xen. Hell. 7.1.43), and in a document thought to date to C4 (see supra), Ps.-Skylax 42 refers to the settlements of Achaia as poleis. Nevertheles, we are unable to find any good evidence that would allow us to date the emergence of Achaian poleis much, if at all, before C5 (Morgan and Hall (1996) 193).

Particularly relevant to this question is the issue of synoe- cism, which represents a frequent topos within the literary sources. Koerner (1974) has argued that many of these synoe- cisms should have already taken place by the end of C6, and cites the example of Dyme (no. 234), which is first named as the home city of an Olympic victor in 496 (Olympionikai 171); since the settlement of Palea is named as the home of an earlier local victor (Paus. 7.17.6–7; Olympionikai 6), Koerner (1974) 469 assumes that the
toponym Dyme was adopted after the synoecism of formerly independent demes such as Paleia and Stratos (cf. Strabo 8.7.5; Steph. Byz. s.v. Δυμην). It is unclear whether Strabo 8.3.2 sought to imply a synchronism in juxtaposing the synoecisms of Dyme (no. 234), Aigion (no. 231) and Patrai (no. 239) with those of Mantinea (no. 281), Tegea (no. 297), Heraia (no. 274) and Elis (no. 251)—the last of which is dated to the period after the Persian Wars—but the archaeological record generally argues against C6 synoecisms (see also Moggi, Sin. 93, 124, 126; Demand 1990: 61–64). It is not until the Classical period that there is any discernible emphasis on urban centres at the expense of rural sites in the Dyme region (Lakakis 1991; Lakakis and Rizakis 1992)). At Patrai the establishment of large rural sites some distance from the urban centre may indicate a certain degree of abandonment among intervening settlements (Petropoulos and Rizakis 1994)), while the commencement of urbanisation within the city of Aigion was a phenomenon of C5 (Papakosta 1991)). The process of synoecism was, no doubt, a lengthy one, but there is no evidence that would allow us to place the start of this process before 500—the date at which the issue of coinage, probably at Aigai (no. 229) (Babelon, Traité ii.1. 823–26; Head, HN² 412; Kroll 1996: 52 n. 14; contra Imhoof-Blumer (1885) 157; Jeffery (1999) 222), may provide the first clear indication of a self-conscious political identity (though see Martin (1995)). It is often assumed that even if poleis were a relatively late phenomenon in Achaia, some form of overarching political organisation existed from an early period. Yet, while there is good evidence to indicate that the Achaian Confederacy existed prior to its refoundation in 280, it is difficult to subscribe to the view (e.g. Larsen 1968: 85) that the legend of Achaian colonial foundations in South Italy allows us to trace Achaian political unity back as far as C8 (Hall (forthcoming)). The local traditions recorded by Paus. 7.6.1–2 speak of a plurality of basileis in the early period. After the death of Teisamenos, son of Orestes and reputedly the leader of the Achaian migration to the northern Peloponnese, the rule (κράτος) of the Achaians was distributed among the four sons of Teisamenos—Daimenes, Sparton, Tellis and Leontomenes—as well as being extended to their cousin, Damasias, and the unrelated Preugenés and his son, Patreus. The first explicit reference to a collective boule of the Achaians is found in an inscription (SEG 14 375) dating to C4I, though Hypereides (Dem. 5.18), in describing events of 324, speaks of a syllogos of the Achaians. However, the existence of the double politeia (i.e. citizenship of both an Achaian polis and the Achaian Confederacy) which was so central to the refounded Confederacy can probably be traced back to the first third of C4, since at some point shortly before 389 the Achaians enrolled the Aitolian city of Kalydon (no. 148) in the politeia of the Confederacy (Xen. Hell. 4.6.1; Larsen 1953: 809, 1968: 9; Koerner 1974: 485; cf. Polyb. 2.41.7–8). Xen. Hell. 6.4.18 even appears to regard Achaias itself as a polis in his description of the allies who rallied to the aid of Sparta immediately after the battle of Leuktra. The fact that a shipowner named Lykon is described as Achaias in IG 1² 174 (an Athenian honorific inscription which should predate 413) may—if it is not a simple ethnic (see infra)—testify to the Confederacy’s existence at this date (cf. the grant of Athenian proxenia to Ἀριστέαν τὸν Ἀχαιὸν τὸν Αἰγιᾶ in IG 11² 13 (C4e)), but earlier indications are difficult to substantiate. Patrai (no. 239) seems not to have consulted with other Achaian cities when it responded to Alkibiades’ request to extend its walls to the sea (Thuc. 5.52.2), and Pellene (no. 240) appears to have acted independently in joining the Peloponnesian League in 431 (Thuc. 2.9.2). Nor does Thucydides’ reference (1.111.3) to Perikles taking Achaias with him on his siege of Akarnanian Oiniadai in the 460s necessarily imply the existence of the Achaian Confederacy: they are simply referred to as Ἀχαιοίς without any definite article and could be Achaian mercenaries as much as citizen-soldiers. Indeed, Thucydides refers far more frequently to the region of Achaia as a geographical pawn in Athenian and Spartan attempts to control the Corinthian Gulf than he does to the Achaias as a collective political entity (e.g. Thuc. 1.115.1, 2.86.1, 4, 2.92.5, 4, 2.41.3, 5, 8.21.1).

According to Polyb. 2.39.5–6, in C5m the Italian cities of Kroton (no. 56), Sybaris (no. 70) and Kaulonia (no. 55) met and decided to adopt the politeia of the Achaias. It has generally been assumed from this notice that by this date the Achaias both possessed a common politeia and held regular synodoi in the sanctuary of Zeus (see most recently Walbank (2000)). However, it should be remembered that Polybios’ intention was not to document early Achaian history per se but to establish a historical credential which might prove his contention that the Achaian League of his own day enshrined age-old principles of equality and fairness. To emphasise these qualities, it was necessary to retroject them, and it should be noted that elsewhere (2.41.3–6) he attempts to trace the origins of the Achaian Confederacy back to the time of Teisamenos. Furthermore, it is not at all clear that the sanctuary of Zeus Hamarios/Homarios did act as a centre for the Achaian Confederacy as early as C5 (as argued by Aymard (1935) 454, among others). There is no
doubt that the Confederacy met in the sanctuary after its refoundation. Strabo (8.7.3; cf. Aymard (1935) 454 n. 1) describes how the koinon of the Achaian met in the Homarion from 280; Polyb. 5.93.10 recounts that a stele was erected here in 217 recording a mediation by the federal general, Aratos, to re-establish peace in Megalopolis; and an inscription from Arkadian Orchomenos which dates to 234–224 stipulates that the representatives of the Achaian Federation have to invoke Zeus Amarios and Athena Amaria (Foucart (1876)). This literary terminus ante quem of 280 can be pushed back to the late 370s or 360s—the date of the first stater coined by the Achaian Confederacy and depicting the head of Zeus (Head, HNP 416; cf. Kraay (1976) 101).

The sanctuary of Zeus Homarios belonged to Aigion (no. 231) (Livy 38.30.2), but almost certainly lay outside the city itself (Strabo 8.7.5). Interestingly, Pausanias does not mention the Homarion, which should not be confused with the coastal sanctuary of Zeus Homayryios at Aigion (Paus. 7.24.2; cf. Aymard (1935) 454 n. 1, (1938) 279–80; Rizakis (1995) 200–1). Instead, he mentions (7.24.4) that the synedrion of the Achaian met at Aigion in his own day, but he implies elsewhere (7.7.2) that Aigion assumed a prominent place within Achaian historical consciousness only after the destruction of Helike (no. 235). Aymard (1938) 286–87, 293 therefore hypothesised that the sanctuary lay midway between Helike and Aigion, and that it was originally part of the chora of Helike, but became part of the territory of Aigion after the destruction of Helike and the redistribution of its chora. Yet this forces the meaning of Pausanias’ testimony, which does appear to distinguish between an earlier meeting place at Helike and a later one near Aigion, and is now contradicted by the discovery of Achaian federal inscriptions which indicate that the Homarion lay not between Aigion and Helike but to the north-west of Aigion (see Parker (1998) 31 n. 77; Wallbank (2000) 26). If any location functioned as a place of union for the Achaian in an earlier period, it is more likely to have been the sanctuary of Poseidon Helikonios that of Zeus Homarios. The cult of Poseidon was associated with Helike as early as the Homeric epics (II. 8.205; cf. Rizakis (1995) 101–2), and although it was traditionally treated as the meeting place of the Ionians of Achaia, it clearly retained its importance through to the destruction of Helike in 373 (Hdt. 1.148.1; Paus. 7.24.5, 6; Strabo 8.7.2). Indeed, one might argue that it could not have continued to act as a potent symbol of Ionian ancestral origins in the northern Peloponnese had it not retained its importance throughout the historical period. If so, then one might suppose that the sanctuary of Zeus Homarios became the federal sanctuary of the Achaiai only after the destruction of Helike—the fact that federal coinage bearing the head of Zeus appeared very shortly after this destruction is particularly suggestive. In the absence of archaeological evidence, certainty is impossible, but there are good reasons to doubt the early existence of the Homarion as a federal centre and to view Polybios’ testimony as an attempt to construct a historical legitimation for the Achaian Confederacy of his own day.

Two earlier events sometimes invoked in support of an early Achaian Confederacy command no greater credence. According to Paus. 7.25.6, when the Argives (no. 347) destroyed Mykenai (no. 353) in 468, Mykenian refugees fled to Kleonai (no. 351), Makedon and Keryneia (no. 236) in the vicinity of Aigion and Helike. It has been argued (e.g. Larsen (1968) 81–82; Anderson (1954) 81) that this indicates the existence of a federal government which extended free passage to the foreign refugees through the “string of city-states” that lay to the east of Aigion. However, this argument seems predicated on an anachronistic view of state boundaries and ignores the fact that by tracing descent from the Herakleidae, the Mykenians could claim ethnic ties with the Achaiai (Hall (1997) 94–107). Finally, Anderson (1954) 80 has suggested that the independent stance of the Achaiai during the Persian Wars indicates a common policy decision. Again, however, this is not an inevitable conclusion, especially since Achaia was barely—if at all—aected by the invasion of Xerxes. Collective participation would surely have been much more signiﬁcant than collective non-participation. In short, there is little solid evidence for the existence of an Achaian Confederacy much before the very end of C5. And if the Confederacy postdates the emergence of poleis in Achaia, it becomes easier to explain why in the later period there are clear differences between the constitutions of individual Achaian poleis. Damniourgoi, for example, are not attested in every Achaian polis, and at Dyme (no. 234) an ofﬁcial named the theokolos appears to share equal rank with the damniourgoi (Koerner (1974) 474). Nevertheless, if the Confederacy itself is late, there is some evidence for an earlier, less formal and looser association of Achaian mere based on perceived ethnic aﬃnity.

By C5 at the very latest, the Achaiai were thought to constitute an ethnos. Hdt. 8.73.1 describes them as one of the seven ethne which inhabit the Peloponnese and adds that they have always been indigenous there, even if they had originally occupied another region within the Peloponnese. Thuc. 3.92.5, in describing the foundation of Herakleia Trachinia (no. 430) in 426, reports that the Spartans made a
proclamation to the effect that any Greek could join the new settlement with the exception of ethne such as the Ionians and Achaians. In Greek, the word ethnos carries a far wider semantic scope than its English derivations (Giovannini (1971) 14–16; Donlan (1985) 295), though it can certainly be applied to ethnic groups—that is, those whose common identity is predicated on kinship (however fictive) and an association with a primordial territory (Hall (1997) 25–26). The centrality of descent to notions of Achaian ethnic affinity is demonstrated by Herodotos’ comment (8.47) that the people of Krotos (no. 56) are Achaian “by birth”. A sense of collective identity was engendered among the historical Achaians by their belief that they were descended from heroes who, after being expelled by the Doriens from their original homes in Argos and Sparta, had migrated to Achaia, where they replaced the former Ionian population. Archaeologically, there are few material indications of sharp cultural discontinuity in Achaia, and we prefer to regard Achaian ethnicity as a constructed identity of the Early Iron Age rather than as the hazy memory of genuine migrations (Morgan and Hall (1996) 198, contra Sakellariou (1991)). For the Ionians of Asia Minor, origins in Mainland Greece formed an important aspect of their collective identity; Achaia was an obvious candidate, since the Achaians had to regard themselves as newcomers to the region if they were to substantiate their claim to being the descendants of the Homeric Achaians who had ruled in the Argolid and Lakonia. In fact, with the notable exception of the Athenians and the Arkadians who claimed autochthony, it was generally the rule for Greek populations to regard themselves as immigrants from other regions, and thus to circumvent the problem of ultimate origins. Nevertheless, the inventive character of this Ionian tradition is revealed by the existence of alternative, competing myths of ethnic origins which situated their Urheimat elsewhere in Greece, in Messenia (Mimnermos fr. 9, West; cf. Hom. Il. 11.690–93; Hes. fr. 33a, MW; Hellan. fr. 125; Hdt. 9.97; Pherecydes (PGrHist) fr. 155; Strabo 14.1.3; Paus. 7.2.1–2), or Boiotia (Hellan. fr. 101; Hdt. 1.146.1–2).

Territoriality is an important component of ethnos states, yet, as already noted, Achaia does not form a natural geographical or cultural unity. For this reason, we should perhaps follow Pausanias’ view (7.1.1) that the geographical definition of Achaia was structured around the ethnic definition of its inhabitants, and not vice versa (Gschnitzer (1955); Koerner (1974) 458). The notion of Achaian territoriality was probably a gradual and aggregative creation, which began in the east of the region. It is the northern coastal mere of Pellene, Aigeira, Aigai, Helike and Aigion which are first attested in the literary sources (Hom. Il. 2.573–75, 8.203), and it is here that the earliest evidence for cult is attested. By contrast, references to the western and inland regions of Achaia are scarce in the literary record, although Olenos appears to be listed among the contingent from Eleia in the Catalogue of Ships (Hom. Il. 2.617). Furthermore, a variety of sources (Hom. Il. 2.575; Hdt. 7.94; Strabo 8.7.1; Paus. 7.1.1.) state that the earlier name of Achaia was Aigialos/Aigialeia—a designation more appropriate to the northern coastal area with its settlements of Aigion, Aigai and Aigeira.

The very latest terminus ante quem for the association of ethnic Achaians with the north coast of Achaia is C6m—the date at which the Spartans decided to repatriate the bones of the Achaian king, Teisamenos, which were said to have been discovered in the region of Helike (Paus. 7.1.8). Leahy (1995) dates this transferral between 560 and 555, and while there is no suggestion that the Achaians had been aware of Teisamenos’ tomb prior to the Spartan “discovery”, the connection of Teisamenos with eastern Achaia must have already been established for the Spartans to have made any political capital out of the event. If, on the other hand, Strabo 8.7.5 is right to derive the name of Dyme (no. 234) from the fact that it was the most westerly of the Achaian cities, then this should mark the completion of the territorial construction of Achaia (at least in a westerly direction). Mendone (1991) 68 argues that Dyme is attested in Hymn. Hom. Ap. 416–26, normally dated c.600, though the fact that it is mentioned as part of a sea voyage around the Peloponnesse after Pylos and before Elis, Ithaka, Doulichion and Zakynthos may suggest that this is a different Dyme. In fact, a combination of literary and archaeological evidence suggests a date in C5 (and possibly even late in that century) for the synecicism of Dyme, and thus for the final stage in the territorial construction of Achaia (Lakakis and Rizakis (1992)).

Certainly in C5, Achaios appears to be used as a regional/ethnic designation rather than as a political label in the strict sense. The clearest indication of this is the bronze statue group, seen by Paus. 5.25.8–10 at Olympia, which depicted the Achaian heroes casting lots to see who would meet Hektor in single combat. Jeffery (1990) 221 assumed that this was a dedication by the Achaian Confederacy, but Paus. 5.25.8 simply describes it as the donation ἐν κοινῷ τοῦ Ἱχαιῶν ἐθνοῦς, and the ethnic signification of the γάρχαιος named on the monument is emphasised not only by the subject matter of the statue group but by the self-professed
derivation of descent from Pelops (via Teisamenos, Orestes and Agamemnon). A similar usage of Achaios appears to be indicated on the base of a statue erected at Olympia in 460 for the athlete Oibotas (Paus. 7.17.7). The inscription describes Oibotas as an Achaian, but his patris as Paleia (one of the demes of Dyne). It is possible that the attestation of Paleia is deliberately archaizing, or it may provide evidence for a synoecism of Dyne later than 460 (cf. Demand (1990) 63–64). On another statue base at Olympia (IV O 630–31 (480–475)), the sculptor Athanodoros is described as Achaios: that this is not simply a political label may be suggested by the fact that his collaborator, Asopodoros, is indicated on the base of a statue erected at Olympia in Argeios (Paus. 6.56.7).

Archaic and Classical periods. A similar usage of the shipowner Lykon in suggested by the fact that his collaborator, Asopodoros, is indicated on the base of a statue erected at Olympia in Argeios (Paus. 6.56.7). It is possible that the attestation of Paleia is deliberately archaizing, or it may provide evidence for a synoecism of Dyne later than 460 (cf. Demand (1990) 63–64). On another statue base at Olympia (IV O 630–31 (480–475)), the sculptor Athanodoros is described as Achaios: that this is not simply a political label may be suggested by the fact that his collaborator, Asopodoros, is indicated on the base of a statue erected at Olympia in Argeios (Paus. 6.56.7).

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis

Antheia (Ἀνθέια) Paus. 7.18.6 (πόλις). Antheia, probably to be located at modern Ano Sykaina, was (re)settled after the dioikismos of Patrai (no. 239) in 279 (Paus. 7.18.6). It may have formerly been a demos of Patrai (Curtius (1851) 453; Moggi, Sin. 92–93). Although there is no firm evidence that it was ever a polis in the Archaic or Classical periods, it does refer to the chora of the Antheioi. Archaic sherds and burials on the site of a Classical villa complex at Ano Sykaina suggest settlement in the Late Archaic and Classical periods (Petropoulos and Rizakis (1994) sites 102, 103; AR (1955) 17). See Patrai (no. 239). No date in Barr.

Arba (Ἀρβα) Paus. 7.18.6 (πόλις). Arba, possibly to be located at modern Ano Kastritsi, was (re)settled after the dioikismos of Patrai (no. 239) in 279 (Paus. 7.18.6). It may have formerly been a demos of Patrai (Curtius (1851) 453; Moggi, Sin. 92–93), but there is no evidence that it was ever a polis in the Archaic or Classical periods. Slight indications for pre-Hellenistic settlement may be offered by C8 burial evidence at Ano Kastritsi (ArchDelt 30B (1975) 118; Petropoulos and Rizakis (1994) sites 113–16). See Patrai (no. 239). No date in Barr.

Argyra (Ἀργύρα) Paus. 7.18.6 (πόλις). Argyra, possibly to be located at modern Mavropodia, was (re)settled after the dioikismos of Patrai (no. 239) in 279 (Paus. 7.18.6). It may formerly have been a demos of Patrai (Curtius (1851) 453; Moggi, Sin. 92–93), but there is no evidence that it was ever a polis in the Archaic or Classical periods. Settlement evidence from the Geometric and Classical periods has been reported (Petropoulos (1991) 256). See Patrai (no. 239). No date in Barr.

Boline (Βολίνα) (Paus. 7.23.4), Bόλινη (Paus. 7.18.6; Steph. Byz. 174.14), Bόλινον (Etym. Magn. 204.33–38)). Paus. 7.23.4 (πόλις), 7.2.6, 18.6 (πόλις); Etym. Magn. 204.33 (κώµη). Boline, probably to be located at Drepaneiko (2 km south of modern Drepano), was (re)settled after the dioikismos of Patrai (no. 239) in 279 (Paus. 7.18.6). It may formerly have been a demos of Patrai (Curtius (1851) 453; Moggi, Sin. 92–93), but there is no evidence that it was ever a polis in the Archaic or Classical periods. Surface remains from near Drepano suggest continuous and perhaps extensive settlement from the Protogeometric to Roman periods (Petropoulos (1991) 254; Morgan and Hall (1996) 183–84). See Patrai (no. 239). No date in Barr.

Donoussa (Δονούσσα) Paus. 7.26.13 says that Donoussa, which lay between Aigeira (no. 230) and Pellene (no. 240) and should probably be located at modern Ano Tarates (Rizakis (1995) 223–24), was a πόλις of Sikyon (no. 228). The periegete equates Donoussa with Homeric Τονόσσα (II. 2573), which Eustathios (II. 291.40) describes as an ἀκρωτήριον of Pellene and which Hesychios (4.442.23) classifies as a πόλις of the Peloponnese. Surface remains include sherds that predate the Hellenistic period (Anderson and Anderson (1975)). No date in Barr.

Erineos (Ἐρινεός, Ερινεύς) Paus. 7.22.10 (λιμήν). In C5, Erineos lay within the territory of Rhypes (no. 243) (Thuc. 7.34.1). See Rhypes (no. 243). Barr. AC.
Mesatis (Μεσάτις) Paus. 7.18.6 (πόλις). Mesatis, probably to be located at modern Mygdalia, was (re)settled after the dioikismos of Patrai in 279 (Paus. 7.18.6). It may formerly have been a demos of Patrai (no. 239) (Curtius (1851) 453; Moggi, Sin. 92–93), but there is no evidence that it was ever a polis in the Archaic or Classical periods. Late Geometric and Classical burials at Mygdalia suggest occupation prior to the Hellenistic period (ArchDelt 43 B (1988) 168; Petropoulos (1990) 517 n. 28, (1991) 253; Petropoulos and Rizakis (1994) site 57). See Patrai (no. 239). No date in Barr.

Olouros (Ὀλούρος) Xen. Hell. 7.4.17. Olouros lay within the territory of Pellene (no. 240). See Pellene (no. 240). Barr. C.

Panormos (Πάνορμος) Thuc. 2.86.1; 4, cf. 2.92.1. Panormos’ precise status is not specified by Thucydides, but it is clear that the settlement was a naval station within the territory of Patrai (no. 239). Barr. C.

None of these settlements is likely to have been a polis, although Archaic and Classical sources fail to specify whether they were considered demes or komai. All that can be said on the basis of evidence currently available is that sixteen of twenty-five known Archaic or Classical settlements were considered to be poleis throughout their period of existence or for at least some time within this period.

Almost all the poleis described in the inventory below are known to have been members of the Achaian Confederacy whose development was traced above. The Confederacy was not ethnically exclusive, however, and “at least as early as the beginning of the fourth century, overstepped the ethnic boundary and admitted non-Achaean citizens” (Larsen (1968) 80), when the Kalydonians (no. 148) of Aitolia were made Achaian politai (Xen. Hell. 4.6.1; cf. Diod. 15.75.2 (1367/6) and Dem. 9.34 (suggesting that Lokrian Naupaktos (no. 165) was also a member of the Confederacy)). Its name was presumably τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἀχαιῶν (Diod. 15.49.2; Beck (1997) 63). It seems to have been highly stable: no secessionist movements or internal wars are on record (Beck (1997) 66), though Pellene (no. 240) sometimes acted independently (cf. Thuc. 2.9.2; Beck (1997) 62). The Confederacy struck coins c.370–360 (Head, HN² 416), and its constitution was described in the Aristotelian Αἰγαίοι πολετεία (no. 30, Gigon). It was presumably oligarchic (Beck (1997) 64), but not much is known about it: SEG 14 375 (C41) attests the existence of a βουλὴ[ἀ] τῶν Ἀχαιῶν together with a board of damiorgoi, composed of contingents from individual member cities. The Confederacy conducted the foreign policy of the region, sending out embassies (Xen. Hell. 4.6.1) and concluding treaties (Staatsverträge 283, 290, 337, 343, 452). It was a member of the Peloponnesian League (Xen. Hell. 4.6.2–3; Beck (1997) 59). Federal forces are attested at Xen. Hell. 6.2.3 (naval forces) and 6.4.18 (infantry).

In C4f the constitutions of the Achaian poleis were oligarchic (Xen. Hell. 7.1.43), and had probably been so since 417, when the Lakedaimonians had forced the Achaians to adopt a political system that suited Sparta (no. 345) (Thuc. 5.82.1; Anderson (1954) 83–85). But after Epameinondas’ conquest of Achaia in 366, the Thebans sent harmosts to the Achaian poleis, had the constitutions changed into democracies, and got the new democratic regime to send members of the oligarchic factions into exile. However, the exiles soon returned to their poleis, regained their position, re-established the alliance with Lakedaimon and undoubtedly the oligarchic constitutions as well (Xen. Hell. 7.1.41–43; Buckler (1986) 188–91; Gehrke, Stasis 13–15).

II. The Poleis

229. Aigai (Aigaios) Map 58. Lat. 38.20, long. 22.20. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: [A]. The precise location of Aigai, which Paus. 7.27.12 situates close to the river Krathis, is uncertain, although it should probably be sought at either modern Akrata (Morgan and Hall (1996) 174; Barr.) or Kokinies near the village of Ambelos (Rizakis (1995) 214). The toponym is normally Ἀλγαί (Hom. Il. 8.203; Hdt. 1.145; Ps.-Skylax 42), αἱ (Strabo 8.7.4), though Ἀλγαία, η is also attested (IG II² 8404 (C4–C3); Strabo 8.7.5). The city-ethnic is Ἀλγαίος (Classical coins (infra); Strabo 8.7.4).

The only Classical source to call Aigai a polis is Ps.-Skylax at 42, where Ἀλγαία is the third toponym listed after the heading πόλεις . . . αἰδοῖ, where polis is used in the urban sense. However, the appearance of coinage c.500 should probably be seen as a strong indication that Aigai was already a polis in the political sense by this date (Morgan and Hall (1996) 174, though see Martin (1995)). The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is attested on coins from c.500 onwards.

The toponym is already attested in Hom. Il. 8.203, and Hdt. 1.145 (C55) records Aigai as one of the original twelve Achaian mere—a term that is often used synonymously with chorai in Achaian contexts, but need not necessarily imply the existence of an urban centre (Morgan and Hall (1996) 168–69).
According to Paus. 7.25.12 and 8.15.9, Aigai was abandoned due to "weakness", and its inhabitants incorporated within the polis of Aigeira (no. 230), where they were nevertheless permitted to retain their own ethnic (Strabo 8.7.4). The date at which this happened is not easy to determine: a terminus post quem may be provided by Aigai's inclusion in Ps.-Skylax's list of Achaian poleis (42)—a section which should probably be dated to the years around 370 (Morgan and Hall (1996) 167), and it may not be coincidental that coinage issues cease at about the same time (Head, HN2 412). Aigai is omitted from Polybios' list of Achaian poleis (2.41.7–8), which purports to describe the Achaian Confederacy prior to the time of Philip II and Alexander. On the other hand, IG II² 8404 (C4–C3e) commemorates a man who is described as an Ἀχαιός ἐξ Αἰγής, which might suggest that Aigai had not yet been abandoned by the beginning of C3 if indeed the inscription is C3e.

There is no explicit literary testimony for any colonial foundations originating from Aigai, but the homonymy between the river Krathis near Aigai and the river Krathis in the territory of Sybaris (no. 70) in South Italy has sometimes been taken to imply that some of the founders of Sybaris originated from the region of Aigai (Dunbabin (1948) 24; Bérard (1957) 141; Koerner (1974) 464; Giangiulio (1989) 166–67).

Aigai struck silver coins from c.500 to c.370 (Head, HN2 412). Minted on the Aiginaan standard and including tribols and obols, this coinage had previously been assigned to Aigion (no. 231) by both Imhoof-Blumer (1883) 157 and Jeffery (1990) 222, though the original attribution to Aigai has recently been defended by Rizakis (1995) no. 530 and Kroll (1996) 52 n.14. The obv. is a punning type depicting the forepart of a goat and accompanied by the legend ΑΙΓΑΙΟΝ; the rev. depicts the ivy-crowned head of a bearded Dionysos and has the legend ΑΙΤΑΙΩΝ or ΑΙΤΑΙΩΝ (Rizakis (1995) no. 530; SNG Cop. Phliaia-Laconia 125–26).

230. Aigeira (Aigeirai) Map 58. Lat. 38.10, long. 22.20. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A. Aigeira, which ancient authors situated on a steep hill (Polyb. 4.57.5; Strabo 8.7.5), is located east of modern Krathio (Rizakis (1995) 215–16; Barr.) The toponym is Ἀίγειρα, Ἰ (Hdt. 1.145; Ps.-Skylax 42; Polyb. 2.41.8; Paus. 7.26.4), though Ἀίγηρα is attested in BCH 32 (1898) 261 n. 1 (325 (cf. BCH 62 (1938) 340–41)) and IG XI.9 1187.34 (C3). The city-ethnic is regularly Ἀίγειράτης from C4 onwards (infra).

Classified by Hdt 1.145 as one of the original twelve Achaian mere, it is listed by Ps.-Skylax 42 as the second toponym after the heading πόλεις . . . αὖθε, where polis is used in the urban sense; Theophr. Phys. op. 12.122 also uses polis in the urban sense, and the internal use of the collective city-ethnic on coinage from c.330 (infra) would indicate that Aigeira was by this period also a polis in the political sense; Polyb. 2.41.7–8 (rC4) calls it a polis in the political sense and attests to its membership of the Achaian Confederacy prior to the time of Philip II and Alexander. A citizen of Aigeira was appointed proxenos by Delphi (no. 177) in 325 (Ἀχαιός ἐξ Ἀίγας: BCH 22 (1898) 261 n. 1 with BCH 62 (1938) 340–41).

Paus. 7.26.2 says that Aigeira was formerly called Υπερηφαία—a name known from Hom. II. 2.573—though it seems to date this shift in nomenclature to the period of the Ionian settlement of Achaia (i.e. the Heroic Age). It is therefore surprising that he should attach the ethnic Hyperesieus to an athlete from Aigeira named Ikaros who won the stade in 688 (Paus. 4.15.1; Olimpionikai 28). The term could be archaising, or it could indicate a period prior to the synoecism of Aigeira (Morgan and Hall (1996) 173). Such a synoecism is not explicitly attested by any source, though is perhaps suggested by the existence of a homonymous port (ἐπινευος) of Aigeira some two and a half miles from the acropolis (Paus. 7.26.1). It may be that the name Hyperesia was originally applied to the acropolis area—known in later periods as the ἅρα (Polyb. 4.58.4) or the ἀνεό πόλιν (Paus. 7.26.1) and almost certainly to be associated with the plateau excavated since 1972 by the Austrian Archaeological Institute (see Alzinger (1972–73), (1976–77), (1981–82), (1983), (1985), (1986); Bammer (forthcoming))—but that after synoecism the ἐπινευος of Aigeira gave its name to the whole polis (Morgan and Hall (1996) 173). The population of Aigeira expanded again when the polis incorporated the inhabitants of Aigai (Strabo 8.7.4). The date at which this happened is not easy to determine (cf. Aigai (no. 229)).

The archaeological evidence from the acropolis shows settlement dating back more or less continuously to the Neolithic period. Reappraisal of evidence from the acropolis has cast doubt upon the interpretation of foundations dating to C75 as those of a temple which Paus. 7.26.5 assigns to Artemis and Iphigenia, and also upon the identification of an earlier C8 structure as a temple (Bammer (forthcoming), contra Gogos (1986); Alzinger (1982) 13–18, (1985) 426–30, 449–50). This evidence is more likely to relate to continuous settlement. Walls are certainly attested at Aigeira by C2 (Polyb. 4.57.3, 58.7), and their circuit—encompassing a separately acropolis wall enclosing 3.5 ha—has been traced
on the ground (Alzinger (1985) 392); recent investigations suggest that city walls existed prior to Hellenistic times (AR (2001–2) 36).

Aigeira began minting bronze coins c.434/3: obv. helmeted Athena or veiled female head; rev. forepart of a goat or standing goat in a wreath. Legends: ΑΙΤΙ or ΑΙΤΙΠΑΤΑΝ
(Head, HNB 412; SNG Cop. Phliasia-Laconia 127).

231. Aigion (Aigieus) Map 58. Lat. 38.15, long. 22.05. Size of territory: 2 or 3. Type: [A]. The toponym is Αἰγιεύς, τό (Hom. II. 2.574; Hdt. 1.145; Ps.-Skylax 42). The city-ethnic is usually Αἰγιεύς (SEG 40 54 (399/8); Diod. 19.66.3; Strabo 8.7.5) but IG II² 7946 (c.400) has Αἰγεύς.

Located at modern Egio (Barr), Aigion was one of the original twelve Achaian mere (Hdt. 1.145). It is first described as a polis in the urban sense in Ps.-Skylax 42, where it is listed as the fourth toponym after the heading πόλεις . . τὰ ἄθικα; Polyb. 2.41.7–8 (rC4) calls it a polis in the political sense, and attests to its membership of the Achaean Confederacy prior to the time of Philip II and Alexander. The external collective use of the city-ethnic (Αἰγιεύες) is attested in a supposedly C7 Delphic oracle cited by Ion of Chios (apud Anth. Pal. 14.73; Zenob. 1.57), but it is debatable whether Aigion's status as a polis in the political sense can really be retrojected as far back as C7—the date supposedly attributed to this apocryphal and much-cited Delphic consultation. The external collective use of the city-ethnic is attested in Diod. 19.66.3 (1313). The external individual use of the city-ethnic is found in an Athenian proxeny decree of 399/8 for Ἀριστέας ὁ Ἀχαιός ὁ Αἰγιεύς (SEG 40 54); cf. IG II² 7946 (c.400, epитет).

Strabo says that Aigion was synoecised from seven or eight δημοὶ (8.3.2; Moggi, Sin. 125–27), but although a number of rural sites appear in the archaeological record (see Morgan and Hall (1996) 177), we are poorly informed as to their ancient names.

Rescue excavations are beginning to yield a clearer picture of the urbanisation of Aigion (Papakosta (1991)). The evidence of Polyb. 11.9.8 reveals that a bouleuterion—probably housing meetings of the Achaean Confederacy (Walbank (1967) 280; Hansen and Fischer-Hansen (1994) 38)—was in existence by C3 at least, while Pausanias' description (3.12.7, 7.24.1) of the mnema of Talthybios in the agora of Aigion ought to suggest that the agora already existed by the late Classical period. Diod. 19.66.3 suggests that the city was fortified by C4 and mentions private houses within the circuit.

The sanctuary of Zeus Homarios, which belonged to Aigion, although it lay outside the city (Aymard (1935)), was certainly in existence by 280, when the koinon of the Achaian met there (Strabo 8.7.3). It is not entirely certain, however, that it had always served as a common meeting place for the Achaian. The fact that the issue of the earliest Achaean federal coinage, depicting the head of Zeus, cannot be pushed back further than the 360s may suggest that the sanctuary of Poseidon at Helike (no. 235) had formerly been a place of union for the Achaian and that this function was transferred to the Homarion after the destruction of Helike in 373 (Morgan and Hall (1996) 196, but see Walbank (2000)). From C5, an inscribed bronze oinochoe provides evidence for a sanctuary of Aigeus, although it is not known whether this signifies the hero or is a cult epithet for Poseidon (Robinson (1942); Morgan and Hall (1996) 177).

Xenophon of Aigion was victorious in the pankration at the Olympic Games of 380 (Paus. 6.3.13; Olympionikai 400).

A series of silver triobols, struck on the Aiginetan standard, was formerly assigned to Aigion (Imhoof-Blumer (1883) 157; Jeffery (1990) 222), but is now attributed to Aigai (no. 229) (Rizakis (1995) no. 530; Kroll (1996) 52 n. 14).

According to Paus. 6.3.12, Kaulonia (no. 55) in South Italy was colonised by Typhon of Aigion, though this receives no other literary support (Anderson (1954) 78; Koerner (1974) 464; Morgan and Hall (1996) 208–9).

232. Ascheion (Ascheieus) Unlocated. Type: B. The toponym is Ἀσχεύς, τό (CID 11 51.8 (339/8)) or Ἀσχεύς (BCH 45 (1921) 11.63 (230–220)). The city-ethnic is Ἀσχεύες (F.Delphes 111.1 413 (C45)) or Ἀσχεύς (SEG 1 74 (229/8)).

Ascheion is never identified explicitly as a polis, though a Delphic decree granting proxenia to two of its citizens (F.Delphes 111.1 413 (C45)) suggests that it was a polis in C4; there may also be some retrospective value in the fact that two men of Ascheion are listed as Delphic theodorokoi in BCH 45 (1921) 11.63 (230–220).

233. Boura (Bourios) Map 58. Lat. 38.10, long. 22.15. Size of territory: 2 or 3. Type: A. Situated near Keryneia (no. 236) by Paus. 7.25.8 and 40 stades from the sea by Strabo 8.7.5, Boura should probably be located either near Ano Diakophto (Morgan and Hall (1996) 175; Barr.) or on the left bank of the river Bouraikos near Ag. Stephanos (Rizakis (1995) 209–10). The toponym is Βούρα, ἦ (Aesch. fr. 754A, Mette; Hdt. 1.145; Polyb. 2.41.8). The city-ethnic is usually Βούριος (Polyb. 2.41.13; SEG 1 74 (229/8), 12 1122 (C3)), though Βουράιος (Tzet. Chil. 37.179 (rC48)) and Βουρεύς (Paus. 7.25.8–9 (1373)) are also found.
Achaia (Rizakis 1995: 156; Barr.) The toponym is normally Δυμή, ἐν (Hdt. 1.145; Thuc. 2.84.5; Ephor. fr. 84; Ps.-Skylax 42), though Δύμη (IdiCos ED 232.14 (C2), Δύμαι (Plut. Cleom. 14.4) and Δυμαίαι (Etym. Magn. 291.12–16) are also attested. The city-ethnic is Δυμαιός (Ephor. fr. 84; SEG 14 375 (C4)).

Hdt. 1.145 lists it among the original twelve mere of Achaia, but the only Classical source to call it a polis in the urban sense is Ps.-Skylax 42, where it is listed as the seventh toponym after the heading παλαιές ... αἰωνεῖ; Polyb. 2.41.7–8 (rC4) calls it a polis in the political sense, and attests to its membership of the Achaian Confederacy prior to the time of Philip II and Alexander (cf. SEG 14 375 (C4)). The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found abbreviated on C4m coins (infra); the external collective use is found in Ephor. fr. 84; the external individual use is found in Theopomp. fr. 194 and probably in SEG 14 375 (C4l).

Strabo says that Dyme was synoecised from eight demoi (8.3.2; Moggi, Sin. 121–25), and there are other indications in generally late sources that the toponym was adopted relatively late. Thus Paus. 7.17.5 says that Dyme’s original name was Paleia, while Steph. Byz. (s.v. Δύμη) says that its original name was Stratos; Strabo 8.7.5 compromises by hypothesising that Dyme was originally called Paleia and then Stratos. It is possible that Paleia and Stratos were the names of two of the demoi that were synoecised, along with the πολίς ην ην ην of Teuthea (Strabo 8.3.11; Morgan and Hall (1996) 186–87). Determining the date of this synoecism is not easy: the toponym Paleia is attested as the πατρίς of an athlete named Oibotas on the base of a dedication referring to an Olympic victory in 756 but erected in 460 (Paus. 7.17.7, cf. 6.3.8; Olympikonai 6), though the name of Dyme appears to be familiar already to Hecat. fr. 121 (c500). Koerner (1974) 469 argues that Dyme must have been synoecised prior to 496, the year in which Pataikos of Dyme won the trotting race at Olympia (Paus. 5.9.1; Olympikonai 171), though Pausanias does not attach the city-ethnic to Pataikos’ name but merely says that he was an Achaian from Dyme. Demand (1990) 61–64 suggests that the synoecism that Strabo imagines must have involved the incorporation of Olenos (no. 238)—an event that would have to postdate Hdt. 1.145. On the other hand, the city-ethnic, which is certainly used on coinage dating to C4m (infra), is already attached to Oibotas’ name on the retrospective victory dedication mentioned above. This should indicate that Dyme was a synoecised polis by 460. At this point, the demoi may have been reorganised within the three phylai of Stratis (or Spatis), Dymaia and Thesmiaia, which are attested in C3 (Syll. 3 531, with Jones, POAG 130–32). By C3, an eponymous magistrate named the theokolos is attested (Sherk (1990) 288), though there is no way of determining the antiquity of this office.

2 The phrase καὶ ἐν πρώτον Πάλι(Σ)ις, ἄρι ἐν ἑνικῷ πολιτείᾳ τοῦ Παλι(Σ)ιστέατος does not appear in all manuscripts. It is included in the Budé edition but omitted from the Loeb.
A late tradition told of a war between Dyme and Elis (no. 251) in 668 (Euseb. Chron. 1.28; Philostr. Gymn. 7), though this provides no explicit indications of Dyem's status in the Archaic period. In 367, it was "liberated" along with Naupaktos (no. 165) and Kalydon (no. 148) by Epameinondas of Thebes (Diod. 15.75.2).

According to Steph. Byz. s.v. *Δύμη*, the original name of the *chora* was *Δυμαία*, while for Polyb. 7.17.3 and Paus. 7.17.3 it was *Δυμαία*. The *chora* included the *polichne* of Teuthea (Strabo 8.3.11) and the *phrourion* of Teichos (Polyb. 4.59.4). The archaeological evidence suggests a dispersed settlement pattern until well into the Classical period (Morgan and Hall (1996) 189), with the foundations of a small Archaic temple being found at Santameri, in the south of the territory of Dyme (ArchDelt 22 B (1967) 216), and Classical elements—possibly to be associated with the temple of Athena Larisaia (Paus. 7.17)—being found to the south-west, at Katarchia. An urban centre is attested c.400 by Antimachos of Kolophon (apud Steph. Byz. s.v. *Δυμαία*), who refers to *Δυμιὸν ἄστυ*, though archaeological evidence suggests the existence of settlement in the area of the later centre already from the Archaic period (Morgan and Hall (1996) 187).

In 496, Pataikos of Dyme won the trotting race at Olympia (Olympionikai 171). On Oibotas of Paleia, see supra 473–74.

Dyme minted in both silver (obols) and bronze by C4m; the standard employed was the Aiginetan. Types: obv. female head. Legend: *ΔΥ* Rev. amphora or broad fish. Legend: *ΔΥΜΑ* (Head, HN2 414; SNG Cop. Philasia-Laconia 143–46).

235. Helike (Heliqueus) Map 58. Lat. 38.15, long. 22.10. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A. Paus. 7.24.5 locates Helike 40 stades from Aigion (no. 231), while Strabo 8.7.2 (following Herakleides) places it 12 stades from the sea. This should put it between the rivers Selinous and Kerynitis (Morgan and Hall (1996) 175; Barr.). The city, which was overwhelmed by a tidal wave occasioned by an earthquake in 373 (Diod. 15.48.1–49.4; Polyb. 2.41.7; Strabo 8.7.2; Paus. 7.24.6; Ael. NA 11.19), was normally supposed to lie under water (cf. Ov. Met. 15.293–95), but sonar investigation suggests that it may actually lie inland under massive sedimentary deposits in the vicinity of Nea Kerynnea (Petropoulos (1983); cf. Ptol. Geog. 3.14.36, who lists Helike among the inland cities of Achaia). However, Rizakis (1995) 203–4 finds all candidates for ancient Helike unconvinving. The toponym is usually *Ελίκεια*; *Η* (Hom. II. 2.575; SEG 36 718 (C5e); Hdt. 1.145) or *Ελίκεα* (Syll. 3 90.12), though Theophr. Phys. Op. 12.122 cites a verse which gives the toponym as *Ελίκεια*. The city-ethnic is *Ελίκειος* (Diod. 15.49.3).

Helike is called a *polis* in the urban sense in Heraclid. Pont. fr. 460a (1373) and Theophr. Phys. Op. 12.122 (1373), but is absent from Ps.-Skylax’s list of Achaian *poeis* (42), which may suggest that this chapter was composed after 373. Retrospective evidence is provided by Polyb. 2.41.7 (rC4), who calls it a *polis* in the political sense, and by Diod. 15.48.3 (1373), who describes it as a *polis* in the urban sense. The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is probably found (abbreviated) on C4 coins (infra), and the external collective use is found in Diod. 15.49.3 (r ante 373). A citizen of Helike served as Delphic *theorodokos* in C5l (Syll. 3 90.12). According to Polyb. 2.41.6–7 (rC4), Helike had been a member of the Achaian Confederacy.

The early physical existence of Helike is attested in Hom. Il. 2.575 and in a C5e inscription (SEG 36 718; see also Soter and Katsonopoulou (1999)). Archaeological investigations have revealed the foundations of two small temples, one Archaic, the other Classical, at Nea Kerynnea, which may possibly be associated with the acropolis of ancient Helike (Petropoulos (1990)). The most important sanctuary at Helike was, however, that of Poseidon Helikonios (Hom. Il. 8.203; Diod. 15.49.2–3; Strabo 8.7.2; Paus. 7.24.5–6), and it is quite likely that this sanctuary acted as a common place of union for the Achaians prior to the destruction of Helike, when that function was assumed by the sanctuary of Zeus Homarios near Aigion (Morgan and Hall (1996) 195–96, contra Aymard (1938) 286–87, 293; Walbank (2000)).

According to Strabo 6.1.13, Is of Helike was the founder of Sybaris (no. 70) in South Italy. The reading (οὐκιοστίγης δι᾽ αὐτὶς Οἰς...δὲ Ἐλίκειος) is, however, unsure, and Béard (1957) 141 n. 2 proposed either <Σύηρ> or <Σάγερ>.

A series of bronze coins, dating to C4f, depicts obv. head of Poseidon. Legend: *ΕΛΙΚ* (retr.). Rev. trident between dolphins in wreath (Head, HN2 414).

236. Keryneia (Keryneus) Map 58. Lat. 38.10, long. 22.10. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: C. Paus. 7.25.5 situates Keryneia above the road in an elevated position, and it is almost certain to be located just south of the modern village of Mamousia, near Derveni (Rizakis (1995) 206; Barr.). The toponym is *Κέρυνεια*, *Η* (Paus. 7.25.5); epichoric form: *Καρόνεια* (Polyb. 2.41.8). However, *Κέρυνια* (Ael. VH 13.6) and *Καρνια* (schol. Soph. OC 42) are also attested. The
epichoric city-ethnic is Ῥανυβέως (SEG 15 113.34 (C3l), 254 (C2s); Polyb. 2.41.14 (rC4s)). Ῥανυβέως is also attested (I.Magnesia 38 (C2l)).

Keryneia is not described as a polis in any Archaic or Classical source, but Polyb. 2.41.7–8 states that it was one of the poleis (in a political sense) that formed the Achaian Confederacy prior to the time of Philip II and Alexander. It was certainly a polis by C3, when it began to strike Achaian Confederate coinage (Head, HNp 417; SNG Cap. Phliasiana-Laconia 236–38). Its precise status in earlier times is unsure, though Paus. 7.25.3–5 describes it as a πόλις and describes how it owed its strength to taking in refugees after the destruction of Mykenai (no. 353) in C5m (see also Anderson (1954) 73). Sculptural fragments appear to testify to the existence of an Archaic temple (ArchDelt 39 B (1984) 99).

237. Leontion (Leontesios) Map 58. Lat. 38.00, long. 21.55. Size of territory: ? Type: C. Leontion is probably to be located 3 km north of Kastritsi (Lauffer (1989) 380; Barr.). The toponym is Λεόντιος (Polyb. 2.41). The city-ethnic is Λεοντήσιος (IvO 300 (C2f); SEG 15 254 (C2s)).

No Archaic or Classical source calls Leontion a polis, but Polyb. 2.41.7–8 records it as one of the poleis (in the political sense) that constituted the Achaian Confederacy in the period prior to Philip II and Alexander. The external use of individual (SEG 26 530 (200); IvO 300 (C2f)) and collective (SEG 15 254 (120)) city-ethnics suggests strongly that it was a polis in the political sense by the end of C3, though this dates to after its refounding by Antigonus Gonatas (Strabo 8.7.5; cf. Baladié ad loc.; Lauffer (1989) 380; Rizakis (1995) 308). The walls date back only as far as the Hellenistic period, though a theatre appears to belong to C4 (Lauffer (1989) 380; TGR ii. 251). By the Roman period, the territory was called Λεοντήσια (Strabo 8.7.5).³

238. Olenos (Olenios) Map 58. Lat. 38.10, long. 21.40. Size of territory: ? Type: B. Paus. 7.18.1–2 and Strabo 8.7.4 situate Olenos between Dyne (no. 234) and Patrai (no. 239), and it is probably to be located west of modern Tsoukaleika (Rizakis (1995) 159–60; Morgan and Hall (1996) 181; Barr.). The toponym is Ολένιος, ἡ/δ (Aesch. fr. 745b, Mette; Hdt. 1.145; Polyb. 2.41.7). The city-ethnic is Ολένιος (IG v.1 1 (C5s)), Ολένιος (SEG 14 375.10 (C4l)).

No Archaic or Classical source calls Olenos a polis, but Polyb. 2.41.7 (rC4) calls it a polis in the political sense and attests to its membership of the Achaian Confederacy in the

³ The phrase Ἡ δὲ Τριταία τῆς Φαραϊκῆς ἐφάπτεται κατὶ Λεοντήσιας καὶ Λασιωνίας does not appear in all manuscripts. It is included in the Bude edition but omitted from the Loeb.

time prior to Philip II and Alexander (cf. SEG 14 375 (C4l)). Furthermore, a citizen of Olenos who made contributions to Sparta (no. 345) in the middle phase of the Peloponnesian War is described as Ἡχαῖος Ολένιος (IG v.1.1; cf. IG II² 62.6 where the restoration τὸν Ὀλένιος προδίδεται produces a pre-378 honorary decree for an Olenian) and this, together with the external application of the individual city-ethnic in a C4l inscription (SEG 14 375.10), ought to suggest that Olenos was a Classical polis in the political sense. The external collective use of the ethnic is found in Aesch. fr. 745c, Mette, and—referring to exiles—Ael. NA 5.29 (citing TheoPhr. fr. 109). Olenos is called a πόλις by the C3e poet Hermesianax (Paus. 7.18.1).

Olenos was abandoned due to “weakness” (Paus. 7.18.1), and its inhabitants were incorporated within Dyne (no. 234) (Strabo 8.7.1). Demand (1990) 61–64 argues that this must have taken place after the time at which Herodotos was writing, though Strabo 8.7.1 seems to imply that Olenos still existed by 280; it had certainly been abandoned by C2 (Polyb. 2.41.7). The territory (called “Ολένιος γῆ” by Soph. fr. 300, Radt) probably included the settlements of Peirai and Euryteiai (Paus. 7.18.2). According to an ancient commentator (schol. vet. Pind. Ol. 1.37α), Pelops is supposed to have originated from the polis of Olenos.

239. Patrai (Patreus) Map 58. Lat. 38.15, long. 21.45. Size of territory: ? Type: [A]. The toponym is Πάτραι, αἱ (Thuc. 2.83.3; Ps.-Skylax 42). The city-ethnic is Πάτρας (Hdt. 1.145; Thuc. 5.52.2; SEG 14 375 (C4l)), though Πάτρας appears to be attested in Polyb. 5.30.3, 95.7.

Underlying the modern coastal city of Patras (Barr.), Patrai is listed by Hdt. 1.145 as one of the original twelve mere of Achaia and is described as a polis (in the urban sense) by Ps.-Skylax 42 (C4f), where it is listed as the sixth toponym after the heading πόλεις . . . αἰδ. That it was considered to be a polis in the urban sense during C5 is rendered likely by Thucydides’ notice (5.52.2) that in 419 the citizens of Patrai were persuaded by Alkibiades to extend their walls down to the sea; traces of these long walls have recently been found (ArchDelt 52 (1997) Chron. 273–75). Polyb. 2.41.7–8 (rC4) calls it a polis in the political sense, and attests to its membership of the Achaian Confederacy prior to the time of Philip II and Alexander (cf. SEG 14 375.9 (C4l)). The external collective use of the city-ethnic is found in Hdt. 1.145 and Thuc. 5.52.2, the external individual use in SEG 14 375.9 (C4l) and Paus. 6.4.6 (rC4s).

According to tradition, Patrai was originally formed by the synoecism of Aroe, Anthia and Mesatis (Paus. 7.18.2–6),
three communities which shared the common cult of Artemis Trikaria (Paus. 7.19.1). In 279, Patrai underwent a dioikismos, and its inhabitants settled in the polis mata of Mesatis, Antheia, Boline, Argyra and Arba as well as Patrai (Paus. 7.18.6). This suggested to Curtius ((1851) 437, 453) that these polis mata had formerly been denoi, which had earlier been incorporated through a second process of synoecism. Moggi, Sin. 89–95 dates this latter synoecism to C6 or C5e, though it is worth noting that Herodotos’ use in his list of Achaian mere (1.145) of the plural city-ethnic rather than the toponym may suggest that a multifocal settlement pattern still existed in C5m (Nilsson (1951) 22–23). In 429, the Peloponnesian fleet used Patrai, Panormos and Rhion as naval bases (Thuc. 2.83.3, 86.1–2, 92.5), and this has suggested to Larsen (1953) 802–3 that Patrai was by this time part of the Peloponnesian League.

The territory was called Πατραϊκή (Theophr. Hist. pl. 9.15.8, 20.2) and included the naval station of Panormos—modern Golimi—(Thuc. 2.86.1, 4, cf. 2.92.1) together with the settlements which were later to be resettled after dioikismos.

In C4m, Cheilon of Patrai won a string of wrestling victories in the Isthmian, Nemean, Olympic (Olympionikat 461, 465) and Pythian Games (Paus 6.4.6–7).

4.20. Pellene (Pellenes) Map 58. Lat. 38.05, long. 22.35. Size of territory: 3 or 4. Type: A. The Attic–Ionic form of the toponym is regularly Πελλήνη, Ἡ (Hom. Il. 2.574; Hdt. 1.145; Xen. Hell. 7.2.18; Ps.-Skylax 42); the epichoric form is Πελλήνα (SEG 11 1227 (C6); IG IV 510 (C6); Pind. Ol. 9.98), though Πελλήνα is also attested (Steph. Byz. 515.12). The city-ethnic is Πελλῆνες in Attic–Ionic (Thuc. 2.9.2; IG II 12 1388A.34 (3987)) and Πελληνείς in the epichoric dialect (SEG 3 83 (365–335); IG II 220 (344/3)); later sources retrospectively use Πελληναῖος (Cic. ad Att. 11 2; Plut. Mor. 399B). Πελλήνης is also attested (Lycoph. Alex. 922).

Almost certainly to be located on the Tserkova hill near the modern village of Pellini (Rizakis (1995) 225; Barr.), Pellene is the best-documented polis of Achaia. It is called a polis in the urban sense by Xen. Hell. 7.4.18 and Ps.-Skylax 42, where it is listed as the first toponym after the heading πόλεις ... αὖδε, and in the political sense by Thuc. 8.3.2 and Xen. Hell. 6.5.29. In an honorific decree for some Pellenian presbeis passed by the Athenians in C4m (IG II 220), [ἡ πόλις τῶν ΠΕΛΛΗΝΕΩΝ] πολιτεία is restored in 15–16. Polyb. 2.41.7–8 attests to its membership of the Achaian Confederacy in the time prior to Philip II and Alexander. There was a ΠΕΛΛΗΝΕΩΝ πολιτεία among the 158 constitutions collected by Aristotle (frs. 583–84), and Dikaiarchos (fr. 69, Wehrli) wrote a similar work (Cic. ad Att. 11 2). Polites and demos are found in [Dem.] 17.10.

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found (abbreviated) on C4s coins (infra); the external collective use is attested in Thuc. 2.9.2, 8.3.2; Xen. Hell. 6.5.29; and IG II 220.8 (344/3). The external individual use is attested in Xen. Hell. 3.2.11 and IG II 1388A.34 (3987/4) and SEG 3 83 (365–335).

The fact that a homonymous kome of Pellene existed between Pellene and Aigion (no. 231) (Strabo 8.7.5) may suggest that the polis of Pellene was the result of a series of synoecisms to which one of its constituents gave its name (Koerner (1974) 468; Morgan and Hall (1996) 171). Other possible participants in this synoecism are Mysoi (Paus. 7.27.9), Kyros (Paus. 7.27.31), the harbour of Ariontauai (Paus. 7.26.14, cf. 2.12.2), Poseidion—which is explicitly called a δῆμος (Paus. 7.27.8)—and Olouras, which Xen. Hell. 7.4.17 describes as being besieged by the Pelleneis after its capture by the Arkadians (thus implying some form of urban settlement).

According to tradition, Pellene was exposed to andrapodismos and destroyed by Sikyon (no. 228) in C6e, but refounded shortly afterwards (Zenob. 1.57, citing Anaxandridas (FGrHist 404) fr. 1; P. Oxy. 1241.111.2–12, citing Aristotle (not in Gigon), 1365.28–45). This is not definitive proof of Pellene’s status as a polis in the Archaic period (contra Koerner (1974) 469), and it may be that the settlement that was destroyed was the kome of Pellene (Haussoullier (1917) 165–66). At the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War in 431, Pellene was the first Achaian city to join the Peloponnesian League (Thuc. 2.9.2–3; cf. Ar. Lys. 996); it was still allied with Sparta (no. 345) shortly after the battle of Leuktra (Xen. Hell. 7.2.2); action by its naval forces is attested at the battle of Abydos in 411 (Thuc. 8.106.3; Diod. 13.40.5; cf. Thuc. 2.9.3, 8.3.2; attesting to naval forces); infantry forces are attested at Thuc. 5.60.3, at the battle of the Nemea in 395 (Xen. Hell. 4.2.20), at Oineon in 369 (Xen. Hell. 7.11.15–16) and at Lechaion in 369 (Paus. 9.15.4). In 367, following the expulsion of oligarchs from the polis of Achaia, Pellene allied herself with Thebes (no. 221) (Xen. Hell. 7.2.11), though the oligarchs swiftly resumed power and forged new alliances with both Sparta and Elis (no. 251) (Xen. Hell. 7.4.16–18). In the 330s, the Makedonians installed the tyrant Chaireon ([Dem.] 17.10; Paus. 7.27.7; Ath. 905B) and Pellene was the only Achaian city and not to join King Agis’ anti-Makedonian league (Aeschin. 3.165; Curt. 6.1). By and large, the constitution of Pellene was normally oligarchic, and according to Harp, s.v. Μαστήρες, the Aristotelian ΠΕΛΛΗΝΕΩΝ πολιτεία attested the existence
of magistrates named mastroi (fr. 583). A period of democracy is implied by [Dem.] 17.10.

C4 sees a number of citizens of Pellene appointed to diplomatic offices: apart from the hospitality afforded to presbeis of Pellene by Athens (IG ιΙ 220 (344)), a similar invitation to dine in the Athenian prytyanesis is proffered to Andrion, son of Pausanias (SEG 3 83 (365–335)); Xen. Hell. 7.2.16 refers to a pro xenos of the Phliasians (no. 355); in 340/39, Ekephylus, son of Charmides, was granted proxenia, politeia, promanteia and prodikia by Delphi (no. 177) (BCH 23 (1899) 349); and shortly after 338, Oikles was granted proxenia by the Boiotians (SEG 25 553).

Pellene’s renown in the Panhellenic athletic circuit dates back as far as 542, when Phanas won victories in the stade, the diaulos and the hoplitodromos at the Olympic Games (Euseb. Chron. 1.67; Olym Dionikai 142–44). Sostratos won a victory in the boys’ foot-race at Olympia in 460 (Paus. 6.8.1; Olym Dionikai 263), Promachos won the Olympic pankration in 404 (Paus. 7.27.5; Olym Dionikai 355) and in the third quarter of C4 the tyrant Chaireon won two wrestling victories at Isthmia and four at Olympia (Paus. 7.27.5; Olym Dionikai 432, 437, 443, 447). A victory in boys’ boxing by Philip, described as Πέλλανας, is recorded by Paus. 6.8.5 and dated to 436 in Olym Dionikai 319 (see Nielsen and Roy (1998) 36–39). Pellene even hosted her own prize games, known variously as the Heraia (schol. Ar. Av. 1421), the Hermaia (schol. Ar. Av. 1421; schol. Pind. Ol. 9.116C) or the Theoxenia (Paus. 7.27.4; schol. Pind. Ol. 7.156A). The games are already attested by C6 (IG 1v 510; Anth. Pal. 13.19; cf. Bacchyl. 9.33, Jebb).

A cult to (Zeus) Mellichios is known in C6 (SEG 11 1272), but Apollo’s importance at Pellene is suggested by the depiction of his head on silver and bronze coins dating to the period 370–322 (Head, HNP 415).

Pellene struck coins in both silver (triobols) and bronze, and dated to 370 (SEG 11 1272); Ekephylus, son of Charmides, was granted proxenia, politeia, promanteia and prodikia by Delphi (no. 177) (BCH 23 (1899) 349); and shortly after 338, Oikles was granted proxenia by the Boiotians (SEG 25 553).

Designated by Hdt. 1.145 as one of the original twelve mere of Achaia, Pharai is absent from Ps.-Skylax’s list of Achaian poleis (42), though in this case the negative evidence should not be overstressed, since we would not expect to find an inland settlement recorded in a treatise composed as a periplous (Morgan and Hall (1996) 167). Polyb. 2.41.8–9 states that Pharai was one of the Achaian poleis (in the political sense) that constituted the Achaian Confederacy prior to the time of Philip II and Alexander. The external collective use of the city-ethnic is found in Hdt. 1.145 and Polyb. 2.41.12 (980); the external individual use is found in IG v.2 392 (C4–C3).

A man of Φάρα (Polyb. 2.41.6) is recorded in a C3 inscription listing Delphic theorodokoi (Syll. 90, 3), and if this is a reference to a citizen of Achaian Pharai, then it might indicate polis status before 400. It is possible, however, that the reference is to Arkadian Pharai (no. 290). A citizen of Pharai was appointed proxenos and theorodokos by Arkadian Lousoi (no. 279) in C4–C3 (IG v.2 392). The territory was called Φάρα (Strabo 8.7.5; cf. Baladié ad loc.

242. Phelloe Map 58. Lat. 38.05, long. 22.25. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: B. Paus. 7.26.10 locates Phelloe on the mountain road from Aigeira (no. 230), and it may possibly be situated at Zachali/Seliana (Morgan and Hall (1996) 174; Barr.). The toponym is Φελλίδα (BCH 70 (1946) 39B; Paus. 7.26.10).

Paus. 7.26.10 calls Phelloe a πόλις (BCH 70 (1946) 39B) and claims that it had been settled ever since the Ionian occupation of Achaia. A C4 decree granting Delphic proxenia to an Αχαιος in Φελλίδα (BCH 70 (1946) 39B) indicates that Phelloe was a polis in the political sense by C4. If an eponymous mythical hero named Phellos, mentioned in Hes. fr. 167 (MW), is to be associated with Achaian Phelloe (see West (1985) 91), this might suggest the existence of a political community in the Archaic period. Certainly, surface exploration and limited excavation in the area have revealed settlement evidence and burials dating from C8 and continuing into the Archaic and Classical periods (Alzinger (1986) 319–26; Morgan and Hall (1996) 174).

243. Rhypes (Rhyps) Map 58. Lat. 38.15, long. 22.00. Size of territory: Type: [A]. Paus. 7.23.4 situates Rhypes a little above the Aigion–Patrai road, some 50 stades from Aigion (no. 231). The identification is not certain, but it is often located on the Trapeza hill, 7 km west of Aigion (Rizakis (1995) 193; Morgan and Hall (1996) 179; Barr.). The toponym is Ρύπαι (Ps.-Skylax 42), Ρύπαι (Strabo 8.7.5; Paus. 7.18.7) or Ρύπη (Diod. 8.17.1). Steph. Byz. 548.4 also attests Ρύπαι. The city-ethnic is Ρύπαι (SGDI 1644 (C6); Hdt.
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Rhyppa is designated variously (ἐν τ/etas-ΧιΞταῆ 'Ρυπικ/etas-ΧιΞταῆ (Strabo 7.346.12); Vindonissa (forthcoming)), and it would appear that it per-dence (Rizakis (1995), though this does not accord with the archaeological ev-
however, since according to Phot. Lex. p. 492.10, Aischylus (fr. 394, Nauck) had described Rhyppa as a πόλις τών 'Ωλενίων Ἀχαιῶν. An even earlier attestation of what appears to be the external individual city-ethnic 'Πούσ(ὁ)ς in an Archaic inscription (SGDI 1644) may just possibly indicate that Rhyppa was a polis in the political sense during C.6. In C.4, the external application of the individual city-ethnic is attested in SEG 14 375. The external collective use of the city-ethnic is found in Hdt. 1.145 (cf. Pherecydes (FGrHist 3) fr. 163). C.4 membership of the Achaeian Confederacy is suggested by SEG 14 375.8.

Anderson (1995) 73 suggests that Rhyppa was abandoned in C.4, though this does not accord with the archaeological evidence (Rizakis (1995) 193–94; Morgan and Hall (1996) 216 n. 19; Vardos (forthcoming)), and it would appear that it persisted until its destruction by Augustus, when its territory was distributed between Aigion (no. 231) and Pharae (no. 241) (Strabo 8.7.5), as well as Patrai (no. 239) (Paus. 7.18.7). The territory of Rhyppa is designated variously (ἐν τ/etas-ΧιΞταῆ 'Ρυπικ/etas-ΧιΞταῆ (Thuc. 7.34.1); τῆν δὲ χώραν 'Ρυπίδα (Strabo 8.7.5)), and it seems to have included Erineos, in the vicinity of the modern Lambiri (Thuc. 7.34.1), and Leuktron (Strabo 8.7.5).

Kronion (no. 56) in South Italy was reputedly founded by Myskellos of Rhyppa (FGrHist 555) fr. 10; Hippos of Rhegion (FGrHist 554) fr. 1; Ps.-Skymnos 325; Diod. 8.17; Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 2.59.3; Strabo 6.11.12, 8.7.5; Solin. 2.10; Zenob. 3.42). However, Paus. 3.3.1 attributes Kronion’s foundation to the Spartans (no. 345) (see further Giannelli (1963) 148–51; Koerner (1974) 403; Malkin (1987) 44–46, (1994) 62–64; Leschhorn (1984) 30; Giangiuilo (1989) 136–39, 183–84).

244. Tritaia (Tritaeus) Map 58. Lat. 37.55, long. 21.40. Size of territory: ? Type: B. Paus. 7.22.6, 10 describes Tritaia as an inland city 120 stades from Pharae (no. 241), and it should probably be located on the Voundouklia plateau near the modern village of Hagia Marina (Rizakis (1995) 189; Barr.). The toponym is Τρίταια (Polyb. 2.41.8; Strabo 8.3.10), though Τρίτεια is also attested (Paus. 6.12.9, 7.22.6). The city-ethnic is Τριταιεύς (Hdt. 1.145; SEG 1 74 (C38); Polyb. 2.41.12).

Tritaia is described as one of the original twelve mere of Achaea by Hdt 1.145. It is absent from Ps.-Skylax’s list (42), though—as in the case of Pharae (no. 241)—negative evidence is not conclusive, since one would normally not expect to find an inland polis listed in a treatise composed as a periplous (Morgan and Hall (1996) 167). Polyb. 2.41.7–8 (ctC4) calls it a polis in the political sense, and attests its membership of the Achaeian Confederacy in the period prior to Philip II and Alexander. The external collective use of the city-ethnic appears in Hdt. 1.145 and Polyb. 2.41.12. In C.3, the city-ethnic is used externally and individually (SEG 1 74; IG v.2 368.77ff (ante 280)). Citizens of Tritaia are listed as proxenoi of Arkadian Kleitor (no. 276) in IG v.2 368.77ff (ante 280).

Cicero (ad Att. 6.2.2) implies that Tritaia was attached to Arkadia after the foundation of Megalopolis (no. 282), but this is contradicted by Paus. 6.12.8–9, who appears to attest Tritaia’s independence in Camb (cf. Nielsen and Roy (1998) 38). Tritaia was eventually annexed by Augustus, and its territory assigned to Patrai (Paus. 7.22.6). An eponymous damiorgos is attested in C3 (Sherk (1990) 258–59).
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I. The Region

The region of Elis was bordered by Achaia to the north and north-east, by Arkadia to the east and south-east, and by Messenia to the south. The boundaries changed with time, especially that with Arkadia (Roy (2000)). The Eleians’ original home appears to have been in the valley of the river Peneios in κοίλη ῥῆλας (a name first found in Thuc. 2.25.3). In Homer they are usually called Ἐπειοῖοι (e.g. Il. 4.537), but also Ἡλεῖοι (Il. 11.671); their home was ῥῆλας (Il. 2.615, etc.). From their homeland they eventually expanded their power over the entire area later known as Elis (or Eleia, e.g. Thuc. 5.34.1), incorporating some territory directly into the Eleian state while imposing perioikic status on other communities.

Early Eleian expansion, and in particular the struggle with Pisa for control of Olympia, is obscure (RE v. 2373—91, xx. 1747–53). Surviving accounts are distorted by a desire to identify people and places mentioned by Homer (see especially the material from Apollodoros in Strabo book 8), and by the influence of later political interests (see Sordi (1994); Ulf (1997); Bilk (1998–99); and Nafissi (2001) on the historiography of Olympia and Elis). By C6, however, Elis (no. 251) dominated Pisa, and with it Olympia, and probably also Akroreia to the east and some territory south of the river Alpheios, and in C5 Elis extended its power to the Messenian border. Pisatis was incorporated directly into the Eleian state proper, as was territory down the coast at least as far as the harbour Pheia, while other areas (Akroreia, Lasion (no. 256) on the Arkadian border, Letrinoi (no. 258), Marganeis (no. 259) and Amphidolia (no. 247) near Pisatis, and all Triphylia) became perioikic (Roy (1997), (1999)). Elis then lost all perioikic territory after a war with Sparta c.400, but made considerable efforts—with varying success—to win it back. A notable, but brief, set-back was the breakaway of Pisa as an independent state from 365 until c.362. Elis ultimately achieved lasting control of the entire area, probably in 146 (Roy (1999); RE v. 2391–2416). The region of Elis from C6 onwards can therefore be divided into two categories:

(1) the territory of the Eleian state proper, all north of the river Alpheios, and including Pisatis except during its brief independence, 365–c.362; and

(2) the remaining territory, which was perioikic when under Eleian control, and otherwise independent or associated with states other than Elis.

The second category includes Triphylia, but in this Inventory the communities of Triphylia are treated in a separate chapter by Nielsen (540–46). The present chapter therefore deals with the Eleian state proper and with other Eleian territory north of the Alpheios. The total area of Eleian and perioikic territory north of the Alpheios was 2,120 km² according to Yalouris (1972a) 96.

There was considerable settlement within the region of Elis as a whole. Yalouris reported (PECS 299–300, in 1976) that 120 settlements have been found by excavation, and a further 160 by surface finds, adding that these settlements range from Paleolithic to Byzantine, and must mainly be small villages, hamlets and isolated farms. Cf. Yalouris (1972a), with the same figures, and also the statement that forty-nine towns—not identified—are recorded in the area by literary sources, twenty-seven north of the river Alpheios and twenty-two south of it; and see also Roy (1999).

Few known urban sites north of the river Alpheios have benefited from intensive archaeological investigation: apart from the town of Elis, Pylos (no. 263) has been thoroughly excavated (and Olympia, not a town), and Kyllene (no. 254) and Pheia have been examined. There remain, however, sites with archaeological material which may have been urban settlements but need further exploration, particularly at Elaionas (formerly Malapasi) (Sperling (1942) 83 no. 22); Goumero (Bon (1946) 29–30); Korifi (formerly Koukovitsa) (Sperling (1942) 82 no. 13); and Vartholomio.

I wish to thank the British Academy, the Fondation Hardt and the University of Nottingham Research Committee for support during the preparation of this chapter. I am grateful to Dr. S. Minon for permission to cite her unpublished doctoral thesis (which she is revising for publication) and to Drs. B. Eder, P. Flensted-Jensen, M. H. Hansen, Professor S. Hornblower, Drs. C. Morgan, T. H. Nielsen, and Professor P. Siewert for information and advice. Responsibility for the text remains entirely my own.
It is also the case that north of the river Alpheios very few ancient towns known from literary or epigraphical evidence have been precisely located: Elis, Pheia, Kyllene and Lasion have been identified with certainty, and Pylos very plausibly, while sites have been suggested for other communities (e.g. Gartsiko for Opous (no. 261)) but lack proof, and yet other ancient settlements can be located only approximately, or not at all.

Besides towns, Classical Elis had many villages and scattered farmsteads. Polyb. 4.73.5–9 described considerable settlement in C3i in villages, places of refuge and open countryside, which offered protection against attack, and clearly believed that this pattern of settlement was old. Much evidence for settlements in Classical Elis comes, however, from sources even later than Polybios, notably Strabo and Pausanias, and even Stephanos of Byzantium. Such evidence mentions numerous nucleated settlements, but its value varies.

Concerning the perioikic communities north of the river Alpheios there is less difficulty. Available evidence suggests that all such communities were poleis in the Classical period, and they are described below in the Inventory of poleis. In addition to evidence on particular communities, both Xen. Hell. 3.2.23 and Diod. 14.17.5 use the term polis for the perioikic communities of Elis generally at the time of the Eleian–Spartan War c.400. Moreover, the relationship between Elis and the perioikic communities was structured as a military alliance (symmachia) by Cēl (Siewert (1994a); Ebert and Siewert (1999); Roy (1997)). The internal structure of the Eleian state is sometimes described as federal, but the limited evidence for the relationship between the Eleian state and settlements within that state’s territory does not show a federal structure.¹ There may have been an amphiktyony of states connected with Olympia, though there is little evidence for it (Roy (1997) 296; cf. Taita (1999)): if it existed, it lost importance by 500 to the hegemonial alliance by which Elis structured its relations with its perioikai. As subordinate allies, the perioikic poleis were enrolled by Elis in Elis’ alliance of 420 with Athens (no. 361), Argos (no. 347) and Mantinea (no. 281) (Thuc. 5.47.8–9), and while of perioikic status they presumably contributed to the Peloponnesian League during Elis’ own membership, though no such effort is directly recorded for perioikoi north of the river Alpheios (as it is implicitly for Lepreon (no. 306) in Triphylia, Thuc. 5.31.2–3). The perioikic communities in question are Letrinoi (no. 258), Marganeis (no. 259) and Amphidolia (no. 247), all fairly near Olympia; the four poleis of Akroreia (Alion (no. 246), Eupagion (no. 252), Opous (no. 261) and Thraistos (no. 264)), and Lasion (no. 256) east of Akroreia. (Both Xen. Hell. 3.2.30, 4.2.16, and Diod. 14.17.8 distinguish Lasion from Akroreia.) The four Akroreian communities (on which see Siewert (1987–88)) at least occasionally acted collectively. Once free from Eleian control c.400 (Xen. Hell. 3.2.30), the Akroreians sent a collective military contingent to support Sparta (no. 345) in 394 (Xen. Hell. 4.2.16), and may have formed a federal state. Their collective dedication at Olympia, made jointly with the Alases, may be dated either in C5i, when Akroreia was perioikic, or during independence in C4e (Siewert (1987–88) 8 n. 3). The Akroreians were again under Eleian control by 365, when Arkadia captured all the Akroreian poleis except Thraistos (no. 264) (Xen. Hell. 7.4.14). The Akroreians then again formed a state, possibly federal, since they and Pisa (no. 262) allied with Arkadia (Ringel et al. (1999)). This Akroreian state is not heard of again after the battle of Mantinea in 362, and Akroreia presumably reverted to Eleian control.

Four other communities which are each attested only by a single epigraphic reference—the Anaitoi (no. 248), the Metapioi (no. 260), the Chaladrioi (no. 249) and the Ewaoioi (no. 253)—were evidently poleis. They used the Eleian dialect and presumably belonged to the region of Elis in the widest sense, but it is impossible to determine whether they fell within the Eleian state proper or lay in perioikic territory (either north or south of the river Alpheios). They are included in the Inventory of Eleian poleis (though they may in fact have been Triphylian).

Within the Eleian state proper there were certainly towns other than Elis itself, but there is only limited Classical evidence that any of these settlements were considered to be poleis. Ps.-Skylax 43 calls Kyllene a polis, and for the inhabitants of Eleian Pylos Xenophon uses an ethnic (Hell. 7.4.26), which may be a sign of polis status (Hansen (1996)): Kyllene and Pylos are included, as possible cases, in the Inventory of poleis. There is, however, much later evidence of varying value. Strabo 8.3.31 reports a tradition that there were eight poleis in Pisatis: the report is probably taken from Apollodoros, and is antiquarian rather than contemporary (RE xx.1737–39; Roy (2002a)). (No Classical source refers to any Pisatan community as a polis cf. in Xen. Hell. 3.2.31 the

¹ Walter (1993) 118–21 considers seriously the possibility that there were subordinate poleis within the Eleian state, and suggests that it may have been federal. Van Effenterre and Ruizé (1994–95) write without comment about “la Confédération des Éléens” (e.g. i no. 21). Siewert (1994b) 30 argues against the suggestion that Elis was a “Stammstaat”.
term “rustics” (χωριτάς) referring to the Pisatans. The obscure Pisatan community of the Alaseis (no. 245) is included in the Inventory because, using its ethnic, it made a joint dedication at Olympia with the Akreonites in C52 or C4e (Siewert (1991)). (Pisa itself, because it briefly operated as an independent state 365–c.362, is also included in the Inventory.) For Elis apart from Pisatis there is also evidence of nucleated settlements, sometimes described as poleis. Paus. 5.16.2–8 states that the Sixteen Women, responsible for an important cult, were originally chosen from sixteen poleis which once existed in Elis (Bultrighini (1990) 165–73). Reports of the synoecism of Elis in 471 mention other settlements, called poleis by Diod. 11.54.1 (cf. Strabo 8.3.2). Ps.-Skylax 43, after calling Kyllene a polis, speaks of a synoikía of poleis farther inland in Elis (possibly a reflection of the synoecism). The archaeological evidence on Kyllene, Pheia and Pylos does not help to determine their formal status (though in the case of Pylos it does not suggest a highly developed community). Finally there are scattered post-Classical reports, often from Stephanos, describing individual settlements as poleis. This range of evidence raises problems.

First, there is the difficulty of deciding whether any individual subordinate settlement within the Eleian state proper was considered to be a polis in the Classical period. (It is unlikely that there would be only one single subordinate polis within the Eleian state: if any single subordinate settlement can be shown to have been a polis, that increases the likelihood that others were too.) The Anaitoi (no. 248), Metapioi (no. 260), Chaladrioi (no. 249) and Ewaoioi (no. 253) were probably poleis, but may not have lain within the Eleian state in the narrow sense. Dyspontion (no. 250) and Lenos (no. 257) produced Olympic victors, but are otherwise little known. Of communities that can be securely located within the Eleian state proper there is Classical evidence (however limited) for polis status only for Kyllene (no. 254), Pylos (no. 263) and the Alaseis (no. 245). For other communities there is only later evidence, of varying value. It is thus possible that there were a number of subordinate poleis within the Eleian state, but the evidence to support this view is limited. Since there is, however, no direct evidence of a federal structure, Elis probably functioned as a unitary state, with internal subdivisions of a kind normal in a unitary polis (and possibly with dependent poleis within its territory).

The Inventory below describes twenty certain, probable, or possible poleis certainly or probably located in Elis as defined here. The following Archaic and Classical settle-

ments have not been included in the Inventory. They are grouped in three categories: (1) settlements in Pisatis; (2) settlements within the Eleian state proper but not described as Pisatan; and (3) a settlement which might be located anywhere within the region of Elis (including Triphylia). 2

2 Other settlements in Pisatis may have existed in the Classical period, but evidence is lacking. Kikyson (Κικύσιον) was the biggest of the eight poleis of Pisatis (Strabo 8.3.31, 32), but its existence is not attested before the Hellenistic period. Pharaia/Pheria (Φηραία, Φηροι) is mentioned only by Polybios 4.77.5 and Strabo 8.3.32, both identifying a road by it: Strabo puts it in Arkadia, but his text is corrupt when giving the location, and if it is correctly located at modern Nemeta (Pritchett (1986) 35–37), it was in territory considered Eleian in Pausanias’ day (Paus. 8.26.3–41 and could have been part of Pisatis. However, the existence of Pharea is not attested before the Hellenistic period, though it is dated C by the Princeton Classical Atlas.

3 Other settlements are reported in Elis north of the river Alpheios, but their existence in the A or C periods is not attested. Oinoe (Οἰνόη, Οινοί) is known only from Strabo 8.3.5 as a place 120 stades from Elis on the road to Lasion (MSS emended: a different emendation would put Oinoe on the road to the sea). A location at ruins near modern Koulogi (officially Oinoe) has been suggested, but questioned (RE xvii. 2240–44 no. 10): Sperling (1942) 8 n. 14 found no remains there earlier than Roman. Ancient attempts were made (RE xvii. 2240–44 no. 10) to identify Oinoe with a probably non-existent polis Ephyra (on which see below) related to Homerick Ephyra. Orthia (Οθρία) was a demos of Koile Elis, home of Physkoa, who bore Narkaios to Dionysos (Paus. 5.16.6), but is not otherwise attested. Petra (Πέτρα): Paus. 6.24.5 reports the tomb of the sophist Pyrrhon (c.360–271) at Petra, near the town of Elis, and says that in ancient times Petra was a demos, without mentioning other remains: Petra presumably existed at the time of Pyrrhon’s death, but is not attested earlier. Phyteion (Φύτειον) was referred to in C3 by Istros (FGrHist 334) fr. 40, but is not attested earlier: Step. Byz. 675.17–19 calls it a polis of Koile Elis, with ethnic. Pyrgus is mentioned only by Livy 27.32.7 (2029) as a castellum not far from the town of Elis, apparently capable of sheltering 4,000 people and 20,000 animals (which must be exaggerated, but suggests a settlement larger than a simple fort). It is not identical with Pyrgos or Pyrgoi in Triphylia (Pritchett (1986) 73), and, though some MSS have Phyrcom vel sim. for the name, it is most unlikely to be identical with Phyrkon near Lepreon mentioned by Thuc. 5.49.1. Thalaima (Θαλαίμα) was a C locality in Koile Elis: a location near Mt. Skollis has been suggested (KIlPauv. 642 no. 2). Polyb. 4.75.2 (cf. 4.84.2) “the chorion which they call Thalaima” shows that it was not a polis in his day, and Xen. Hell. 7.4.26 might refer to a fortress or a natural stronghold rather than a settlement: there is therefore no good evidence that Thalaima was ever a settlement. Thirious (Θηρίους) was a polis of Achaia, and later of Elis, bordering on Patrai (Steph. Byz. 318.7–10; cf. Pliny HN 4.22). Clearly a real community, as an inscription of C2 or C1 shows (SEG 15 524, Θηρινάος: cf. SEG 4.490), it is an unknown earlier. Bon (1946) 20–23 proposed for Thirious a location at Aspra Litharia near Sartamier where he found C material; but Thirious is likely to have been Eleian—if it ever was—after boundary changes in the Roman period (KIlPauv. iv. 549–551 on Patrai).

4 Asiane (Ασιάνη) is known only from Steph. Byz. 131.4–5 as a polis of Elis. Mention of Bouprasion (Βούπραισιον) in Homer (Il. 2.6.15, etc.) caused a clear ancient desire to identify it as a town (Strabo 8.3.8), but there is no evidence that it was a polis (RE iii. 1058). Brysiai (Βρύσιαι) is known only from Step. Byz. 188.2–3 as a polis of Elis: this is possibly a mistake for Lakonian Bryseiai (RE iii. 927). Mention of Ephyra (Εφύρα, Εφρα) in Homer II. 2.659, etc. provoked later attempts to locate it in Elis (Strabo 8.3.3), but there are no good grounds for believing in an Eleian Ephyra (KIlPauv. ii. 301 no. 41; cf. Oinoe (above)). Kyme (Κύμη) is known only from Steph. Byz. 392.22 as a polis of Elis. Pind. Ol. 6.34 said that Aiptos ruled Arkadians at Phaisana (Φαισάνα) on the Alpheios, but Istros (FGrHist 334) fr. 41 (C3) said Phaisana was in Elis: if indeed in Elis, it could be north or south of the Alpheios, though it has been suggested that it should be identified with Phrixia in Triphylia (KIlPauv. iv. 695). Phaisana could in any case be purely mythical.
1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis

A. Settlements of Pisatis


Herakleia (Ἡράκλεια) An ethnic is not attested, save for the forms given by Steph. Byz. 304,3–5, cf. 303,21, after a list of communities of this name. Strabo 8,3,2 calls it one of the eight poleis of Pisatis, and Paus. 6.22,7 a kome of Elis (no. 251): both mention a shrine of the nymphs Ioni(a)des, with healing waters. On a likely location beside medicinal springs near modern Pournari, see Panayotopoulos (1991). Barr. dates Herakleia AC; there is, however, no evidence attesting its existence in the Archaic period, and the only evidence of its existence in the Classical period is surface finds at the site proposed by Panayotopoulos. Identifying Herakleia in Pisatis with the Herakleia of the Archaic Kypselid dedication at Olympia (see SEG 45,404) is purely speculative, and implausible. Roy (2002a) 232–33, 235–39, 242–43.

Salmone (Σαλμώνη, also Σαλμώνα and Σαλμωνία) Ethnic only in Steph. Byz. Salmone is one of the eight poleis of Pisatis, near the source of the river Enipeus (modern Lestenitsa) (Strabo 8,3,31–32). Salmoneus, son of Aiolos, founded the polis Salmonia in Elis beside the Alpheios (Diod. 4,68,1). Steph. Byz. 552,5–7: a polis of Pisatis. IvO 18 (c.425,LSAG no. 20) is an agreement between two individuals for one to rent to the other 18 plethra of “the land in Salamona”. On a likely location, see Panayotopoulos (1991). Roy (2002a) 232–33, 235, 237–42. Barr. C.

B. Settlements of Elis Proper

<Λ>griades (Ἀγριάδες) Apparently one of the communities from which Elis was synoecised in 471 (Strabo 8,3,2), but there is manuscript corruption, and the name—if indeed truly a name—is uncertain. Not attested elsewhere. Roy (2002b) 254. Not in Barr., but C would be attested by acceptance of its inclusion in the synoecism.

Hyrmne (Ἡρμίς, also Ἡρμίνα and Ὀρμνα) In Hom. Il. 2,616 one of the limits of the land of the Epeioi. Paus. 5,1,11 gives Akrot as the (mythical) founder of the polis Hymena in Eleia: Strabo 8,3,10 says that Hymne was a poleichnion, but no longer exists. Mentioned also by Echephylidas (FGrHist 409) fr. 3 (probably C4), Menelaos (FGrHist 384) fr. 2 and Pliny, HN 4,13. It has not been certainly located, but the name apparently survived for a hill near Kyllene (no. 254) (Servais (1964)). To be dated AC (so Barr. with a query) if it existed from Homeric times.

Myrtountion (Μύρτωντιον) Steph. Byz. 464,14–16 s.v. Μύρσινος: a polis of Elis, later called Myrtountion, with ethnic. Strabo 8,3,10: Myrsinos (Hom. Il. 2,616) is the present-day Myrtountion, a katoikia by the sea on the road from Dyme (no. 234) to Elis (no. 251). On a suggested site near the lagoon of Kotiki, see Servais (1964) 37. To be dated AC (so Barr.) if it existed from Homeric times.

Pheia (Φεία, and several variant forms, KLPauly iv. 721) An important harbour town (e.g. Thuc. 2,25,3–5), with fortifications (Xen. Hell. 3,2,30; Roy (1999) 162–63). Diod. 12,43,4 (1430) describes it as a chorion, Strabo 8,3,12 calls it a poleichne; cf. Paus. 5,18,6, referring to Hom. Il. 7,132–35. The site has been explored archaeologically, including examination of remains now under the sea (Yalouris (1957); Themelis (1968)); there was settlement from prehistoric times, and in particular a flourishing town from the Archaic period to later Roman times (though oddly not dated A in Barr.). Yalouris did not report traces of a city wall round the settlement as a whole, but did record ancient fortification of the hill Pontikokastro, which he identified as the ancient acropolis.

C. Settlement within the Entire Region of Elis

Andria (Ἀνδρία) Known as a polis of Elis with ethnic Ἀνδρίας only from Steph. Byz. 94,15–17 (citing Teupalos (FGrHist 408) fr. 1 (probably C4)). The ethnic may have been in Teupalos’ text. Unlocated. No date in Barr., but C if Teupalos (supra) is C4.

There are also archaeological remains of Classical (or Archaic–Classical) settlements, not yet identified with
known ancient communities, at the following sites in Elis north of the Alpheios.⁵

2. Unidentified Settlements


Thus, we know of thirty-two settlements in Archaic and Classical Elis as defined here. As already stated, twenty of these were poleis throughout the Archaic and Classical periods or at least for some time during these periods. About the status of the remaining twelve settlements we are too poorly informed to allow any inference. It should, however, be stressed here that Andria may possibly have been located outside Elis as defined here (and the same is true of four of the settlements described in the Inventory: the Anaitoi (no. 248), Metapioi (no. 260), Chaladrioi (no. 249) and Ewaoioi (no. 253)).

The poleis structure of Archaic and Classical Elis as defined here depends of course on the evidence currently available. It should be noted that, given the large area concerned and the often lacunose evidence, it is possible, even likely, that other settlements, though not at present explicitly attested for the Archaic and Classical periods, did in fact exist then, and it is also possible that some settlements (especially within the Eleian state proper) for which there is currently no clear evidence of poleis status in the Archaic and Classical periods were in fact poleis. These, however, are mere possibilities which could be tested only if new evidence appears. On present evidence the pattern is as follows. Throughout the perioikic areas the poleis was the universal form of political organisation at least by C6th; in most cases we have little evidence about earlier circumstances. The very large territory of the Eleian state proper was organised as a poleis by C6th; but there is evidence that Alasyaion (no. 245), Kyllene (no. 254) and Pylos (no. 265) also had the status of poleis, and they were therefore presumably subordinate poleis within the territory of Elis. It follows that at least from the Classical period the entire area was organised in poleis, much of it admittedly in the exceptionally large poleis of Elis.

II. The Poleis

245. Alasyaion (Alaseus) Map 58. Unlocated. Type: C. The toponym is Ἀλασαίων (MSS at Strabo 8.3.10, usually amended); the city-ethnic is Ἀλασεύς (>Ἀλασσίες (nom. pl.) in Sievert (1991) no. 3 = ἸΩ (Csm–C4e); Steph. Byz. 72.17–20 s.v. Ἀλασαίων suggests Ἀλασεύς. Ale(is)ion, a Homeric place in Elis (II. 2.617) with a hill or mound (Il. 11.757), was later (Strabo 8.3.10) identified with Alasyaion, described by Strabo as a chora around Amphidolia (no. 247) with a monthly market and previously a poleis of Pisatis. In C5th or C4e the Alaseis and the Akroreioi made a joint inscribed dedication at Olympia (Sievert (1991) no. 3); the dedication with collective ethnics suggests that Alasyaion may at the time have been a dependent poleis of Elis (no. 251). It was presumably situated at the border of Pisatis and Amphidolia, and therefore probably not adjacent to Akroreia. According to Steph. Byz. 72.17–20 its founder was Alesios, son of Skillous or of Gargettos.

246. Alion Map 58. Unlocated. Type: B. The toponym Ἀλιόν (or Ἀλια) occurs only in Diod. 14.17.8 (following MS P, most editors print Ἀλιον). It was a perioikic community. It is described retrospectively as a poleis (in the political
sense) of the Akreoreians c.400 (Diod. 14.17.8); Xen. Hell. 7.4.14 refers collectively to the poleis of the Akreoreians in 365, without naming Alion (supra, on Akreorea).

247. Amphidolia (Amphidolos) Map 58. Unlocated. Type: A. The toponym is Ἀμφιδολία, ἦ (Strabo 8.3.24) and Ἀμφιδολίας, -ίδος, ἦ (Strabo 8.3.10). The city-ethnic is Ἀμφιδολος (Siewert (1991) no. 2 (C5–C4e)) or Ἀμφιδολος (Xen. Hell. 3.2.25). Though not precisely located, Amphidolia lay in hilly territory west of Olympia; Meyer (RE xx. 1739) suggests that it did not extend into the upper valley of the river Lesteniatsa, leaving a route on purely Eleian territory between Elis (no. 251) and Pisatis. In Strabo’s day Margalai (presumably = Marganeis) was in Amphidolia (8.3.24), and Alasyaion (no. 245) near it (8.3.10).

In the years following c.400 it is seen to function as a polis: it is described as a (periokic) polis in the political sense at Xen. Hell. 3.2.23 and 30, and the Amphidoloi made a dedication at Olympia in C5 or C4e (Siewert (1991) no. 2), which provides an instance of the external collective use of the city-ethnic, as does Xen. Hell. 3.2.26 (cf. 4.2.16, where it is used to name a military contingent). It is not known when Amphidolia became subordinate to Elis, but presumably no later than adjacent Pisatis. Like all Eleian periokoi, it was freed at the end of the Eleian–Spartan war c.400 (Xen. Hell. 3.2.25, 30; Roy (1997) 299–304). It probably then joined the Peloponnesian League, and in 394 sent troops (sphendonetai) to fight with Sparta (Xen. Hell. 4.2.16). Its later history is unknown; it was presumably regained by Elis c.362 if not before (cf. Xen. Hell. 6.5.2 with Tuplin (1993) 183–85).

248. (Anaitoi) Map 58. Unlocated. Type: B. The toponym is not attested. The city-ethnic is Αναίτοι, known only from ΙvO 10 (c.475–450), where the collective and external use is attested in a 50-year treaty of friendship with the equally unknown Metapioi (no. 260) (Minon (1994) no. 10; Staatsverträge 111). Since the treaty is in Eleian dialect, both the Anaitoi and the Metapioi presumably belong to the region of Elis, but may have been located anywhere in the region, either within the Eleian state proper or in periokic territory north or south of the river Alpheios. The existence of an ethnic and the capacity to enter into a treaty with another community strongly suggest that the Anaitoi were a polis. Failure to observe the treaty is to be sanctioned by the proxenoi and the manteis (in Eleian mantier), and ultimately by the iaromai: these are all known as Eleian officials at Olympia, but do not necessarily implicate direct subordination to Elis (251). Cf. Metapioi (no. 260).

249. (Chaladrioi) Map 58. Unlocated. Type: B. The toponym is not attested. The city-ethnic is Χαλάδριοι known only from ΙvO 11 = Minon (1994) no. 9, an agreement of C5e in which the internal and collective use is attested: hereditary Chaladian citizenship is granted to a man called Deukalion, together with status equal to a proxenos and to a damiorgos (Gauthier (1972) 42–44) and possession of “the land in Pisa”. The community evidently had officials with the titles proxenos and damiorgos. The damos had considerable authority: the final clause in the decree is to apply “unless the damos decides otherwise”. There seems no doubt that the Chaladrioi formed a polis. The text is in Eleian dialect, but the community is otherwise entirely unknown, and could belong anywhere in the region, either within the Eleian state proper or in periokic territory north or south of the river Alpheios. For the suggestion that the land which the Chaladrioi evidently controlled in Pisa was land for camping during Olympic festivals, available for use at other times, see Roy (1997) 333 n. 31: control of such a plot need not mean that the territory of the Chaladrioi was in or even very close to Pisatis.

250. Dyspontion (Dyspontios) Map 58. Unlocated. Type: C. The toponym is Δυσπόντιον, τό (Strabo 8.3.32; Tryphon fr. 15.5). The city-ethnic is Δυσπόντιος (Tryphon fr. 15.5) or Δυσπόντιος (Paus. 6.22.4 (rC6f)).

It is called a polis in the urban sense in Tryphon fr. 15.5 = Steph. Byz. 245.19; Paus. 6.22.4 provides an instance of the external collective use of the city-ethnic in reference to C6f.

Strabo 8.3.32 puts it in Pisatis on the mountain road from Olympia to Elis (no. 251) (RE xx. 1737; contra Baladié (1978) 114), but does not call it one of the eight poleis of Pisatis. It produced one or two early Olympic victors (Phlegeton (FGrHist) 257 fr. 4 (1772) and possibly fr. 6 (1672), where the text is disturbed), described as “Eleian(s) from Dyspontion”. Paus. 6.22.4 reports that it was a periokic community, though presumably not Pisatan since it joined Pisa in revolt against Elis c.570, and was destroyed. Strabo 8.3.32 says that Dyspontion was destroyed and that most of its inhabitants emigrated to Epidamnos (no. 79) and Apollonia (no. 77). There is no evidence of its later existence. Because of the Olympic victors, it may have been a polis. Dysponteus (or Dyspontos, Tryphon fr. 15.5), son of Oinomaos, was the oecist of Dyspontion (Paus. 6.22.4).

251. Elis (Eleios) Map 58. Lat. 21.20, long. 37.55. Size of territory: 5 (not precisely known, but in excess of 1,000 km²). Type: A. The toponym is in local dialect Ἄλας (SEG 12
The city-ethnic is in local dialect ('αλείος (IvO 2) or rarely on coins ΑΛΕΙΟΝ (Selman (1921) 30.120), elsewhere Αλείος (Pind. Isthm. 2.24) or Ήλείος (Hom. Il. 11.671; Xen. Hell. 3.2.25). The city-ethnic is used of the citizens by Hdt.

Elis is attested as a polis both in the urban sense (Xen. Hell. 3.2.27, 7.4.14; Ps.-Skylax 43) and in the political sense (Hdt. 8.73.2; Thuc. 5.47.3 (cf. IG i 2183; Gorgias fr. 10 (= Arist. Rh. 1416a1–4); Pl. H. maj. 281C; Xen. Hell. 3.2.27, 7.4.17). Politai is used of the citizens by Hdt. 2.160 and Pl. H. maj. 282E and Xen. Hell. 7.4.16. There was an Aristotelian politeia of the Eleians (Heracl. Lemb. 21; Arist. fr. 499–500); cf. Plut. Adv. Col. 1126C (reform of the politeia of the Eleians by Plato’s pupil Phormio) and Arist. Pol. 1306b16–19 (politeia as conduct of state business among the Eleians). Aστυ is used of the town Elis by Xen. Hell. 3.2.26, 7.4.32 (cf. 3.2.27: τά πατράστια).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is found internally in Siewert (1991) no. 4 (Cel) and on Cel–C5 coins (infra) and externally in ML 27.9 (479–478); Hecat. fr. 25.2; Hdt. 4.148.4; Thuc. 1.27.2. The individual use is found internally in IvO 271 = LSAG no. 19 (c.450–425?) and externally in Hdt. 5.45.2; Pl. Ap. 19E; Dem. 18.295; IG II 2 8528 (C4e); IG VIII 1 414.22–23, 25–26 (C4m); and IG II 2 3827 (C4m). Elis is implicitly described as patris at Dem. 18.291–92 (cf. Hdt. 6.127.1–4 implicitly describing it as patre).

The territory was called ΤΗΛΙΣ (already in Hom. Il. 2.615; also Hdt. 6.70.2; Thuc. 2.66.1), and also ΉΛεια (Hdt. 4.30.1; Thuc. 2.25.3). Καλάτ ΤΗΛΙΣ was used for the area of the valley of the river Peneios (first by Thuc. 2.25.3), believed to be the area originally controlled by the Eleians (cf. Arist. fr. 500). The territory was at least sometimes understood as including periokic areas: Thuc. 5.34.1, putting Lepreon (no. 306) on the border of Lakonike and Elea, must include in Elea at least Triphylia north of Lepreon, if not Lepreon itself; and Diod. 14.17.8 (1400) apparently includes Lasion (no. 256) in Elis. There is, however, no reason to suppose that periokic territory was formally incorporated into the Eleian state proper in the Classical period (Roy (1997) 297–98; cf. Roy (1999)).

Apart from the town of Elis, there were numerous other settlements in Eleia, including urban sites, though their status is often not clear. Within the Eleian state proper Alasiaon (no. 245), Kyllene (no. 254) and Pylos (no. 263) may have been (dependent) poleis, while other settlements are reliably or plausibly reported especially at Harpina, Herakleia and Salome (all in Pisatis), and at Hyrmone, Myrtountion and Theia. There was also the sanctuary at Olympia, run by Elis at least from C6. Elis also controlled periokic communities north of the river Alpheios at Amphidolia (no. 247), Letroinoi (no. 258), Marganeis (no. 259), Lasion (no. 256) and (in Akroreia) Alion (no. 246), Eupagion (no. 252), Opous (no. 261) and Thraistos (no. 264), besides numerous periokic communities in Triphylia south of the Alpheios (on which see Nielsen, in this volume 540–46).

There is very limited evidence on population size: 3,000 hoplites from Elis are recorded in 418 (Thuc. 5.58.1, 75.5) and 3,000 jointly from Elis, Triphylia, Akroreia and Lasion in 394 (Xen. Hell. 4.2.16).

Though there is no hard evidence of a Spartan–Eleian alliance before the Persian Wars (Hdt. 8.72, 9.77.3; Paus. 5.4.7), Elis may have been among the earliest members of the Peloponnesian League (Tausend (1992) 167); membership lasted till Elis quarrelled with Sparta (no. 345) over Lepreon in 420 (Thuc. 5.31.1–5, 34.1). War between Sparta and Elis c.400 (Roy (1997) 283–84, 299–304) was ended by a treaty under which Elis evidently rejoined the Peloponnesian League, since it is seen as Sparta’s ally in 394 (Xen. Hell. 4.2.16), 382 (Diod. 15.31.2) and 374 (Xen. Hell. 6.2.3). Elis’ membership of the League finally ended in the aftermath of Leuktra (Roy (1994)). C.500 Elis made a treaty, for 100 years and agreeing inter alia mutual military support, with the otherwise unknown Ewaoii (no. 253) (IvO 9), in which Elis was the superior partner (Roy (1998) 367–68; Roy and Schofield (1999)). Treaties of symmachia with Corinth (no. 257), Argos (no. 347) and Lepreon (no. 306) are mentioned at Thuc. 5.31.1; Elis formed a major alliance in 420–418 with Athens (no. 361), Argos (no. 347) and Mantinea (no. 281) (Thuc. 5.47; IG III 83), and in 370 an alliance with Arkadia, Argos (no. 347) and Thebes (no. 221) (Diod. 15.62.3; Dem. 16.12, 19–20; see Roy (1994) 190), which broke down when Elis and Arkadia went to war in 365 (Xen. Hell. 7.4.12; Diod. 15.77.1–2). IG II 2 112 (362/1) records a treaty of symmachia between Elis and Athens (no. 361), Arkadia, Achaia and Phleious (no. 355). Elis was a member of the League of Corinth set up by Philip II in 338–337 (cf. RO 76; Hammond and Griffith (1979) 632–46).

A supposed early synoecism of Elis (Paus. 5.4.3) by Oxylos seems unhistorical (so rightly Moggi, Sin. 160). In 471 (Diod. 11.54.1), “after the Persian Wars” (Strabo 8.3.2), the Eleians were synoecised (συνοξύκθησαι, both authors). Diodorus says the Eleians were synoecised from numerous small poleis into one; Strabo that they had previously lived κοινωνίζοντες.
and then came together into the polis Elis from many demoi. Strabo also says that the Eleians were synoecised from the periokides, a term presumably used in a purely local sense, not suggesting that subordinate periokic communities were incorporated (Roy (1997) 285–89). There may be other references to this synoecism in Ps.-Skylax 43 (a συνοικία πόλεων in Elis) and in Leandr(i)os (FGrHist 492) fr. 13 (Eleians lived in komai and were then gathered into one polis). The ancient sources do not clarify the nature of the synoecism (Moggi, Sin. 157–66; Roy (1997) 286–89, (2002b)). A unitary Eleian state certainly existed before 471, as did the town Elis (Eder and Mitsopoulos (1999); see also Yalouris (1994) on the town in the Archaic period and later). Political restructuring within in Elis may have accompanied the synoecism: see Gehrke, Stassis 55, 36–67; but note the scepticism of Walter (1993) 118 and n. 19, 124 and n. 55. Strabo’s report (8,3.15) that Hypana in Triphylia was synoecised into Elis must—if accurate—refer to a period after C3 (Moggi, Sin. 164 n. 18).

The following Eleian refugees are attested: commanders exiled during the Persian Wars (Hdt. 9,77,3); oligarchs, after a failed oligarchic coup c.400 (Xen. Hell. 3,2.27–29; cf. Paus. 3,8,4–5); democrats driven out of the town of Elis in 365 (Xen. Hell. 7,4,16, 26); Eleians exiled by oligarchs in 343 (Dem. 19,260, 294; Paus. 4,28,4, 5,4,9; Diod. 16,63,4–5; cf. Dem. 9,27 and 18,295) and pro-Makedonian exiles restored after Alexander overcame Thebes in 335 (Arr. Anab. 11,10,1: presumably exiled when Elis tried to leave the League of Corinth on the death of Philip (Diod. 17,3,5, cf. 17,8,5)). C.350(?), a law was passed (supplementing an earlier text) about the return of exiles and the treatment of their relatives and property (DGE 424). In 365 there were Arkadian exiles in Elis (Diod. 15,7,7,1).

Elis took part in the Persian Wars (ML 27,9; cf. Hdt. 8,72,3, 9,77,3). Eleian hoplite contingents are recorded in 418 (Thuc. 5,58,1) and 394 (Xen. Hell. 4,2,16); 300 logades are mentioned by Thuc. 2,25,4; 300 was also the number of the special guard which is attested in C4 (Xen. Hell. 7,4,13, 16, 31) and whose commander is mentioned at Xen. Hell. 7,4,31 (Pritchett 1974) 223). Commanders (hegemones) are mentioned at Hdt. 9,77. A hippocarchos is attested at Xen. Hell. 7,4,19, and hippies are mentioned at Hell. 7,4,16, 26. An Eleian navy is mentioned or implied by Thuc. 1,27,2, 46,1, 2,9,3 (cf. Diod. 14,34,1); it was presumably served by the harbours at Pheia (Thuc. 2,25,4) and Kyllene (2,8,4,5). The Eleian Teutiaios was evidently a commander in the Peloponnesian fleet in 427 (Thuc. 3,29,2).

An Eleian embassy went to Corinth (no. 227) and then Argos (no. 347) in 421 (Thuc. 5,31,1, cf. 5,44,2); for Eleian diplomatic activity cf. Hippias’ claims to be preferred as ambassador (Pl. Hp. mai. 281A) and Hdt. 2,160,1 and Xen. Hell. 7,1,38. A quarrel between Eleis and Leprone (no. 306) was arbitrated by Sparta (no. 345), but Elis refused to accept the verdict (Thuc. 5,31,3; Roy (1998)). In C5f, Elis itself passed a verdict in a case of unknown nature, involving Athens (no. 361), Thespiai (no. 222), the Boiotians and the Thessaliens (SEG 26 475, 31 358).

The earliest award of proxeny by Elis (with a guarantor) is recorded by an unpublished inscription of c.550–500 (Marek (1984) 23; Taeuber (1991) 112). An inscription of C5m records an award of citizenship and the- orodokia (Taeuber (1991) 112). The Tenedian honorand of Ivo 39 (C3 or C2e) was hereditary theorodokos of Elis, and entertained theoroi. It may have been Elis which developed the system of theorodokia (Perlman (2000) 18–20), naturally in order to facilitate the epangelia for the Olympics. Hippias of Elis dated the first Olympic Games to 776, but archaeological evidence suggests that the Games gained major popularity only from C8l (Morgan (1990) 26–56). Besides that of Zeus, numerous other cults developed at the sanctuary of Olympia (Paus. 5,15,3–10). There was also an important oracle of Zeus (Jacquemin (1999–2002), hereafter J.) on Paus. 5,13,11). The first temple at Olympia was that of Hera (c.600) (J. on Paus. 5,16,1), followed by the temple of Zeus in the second quarter of C5 (J. on Paus. 5,10,2–12,8). No earlier than C5 the shrine of Pelops (Pelopion) was surrounded by a hexagonal enclosure, and a monumental porch was added in C4 (J. on Paus. 5,13,1). The last temple built in the Altis was the Metrōn (C5l) (J. on Paus. 5,20,9). All these buildings stood within the defined sacred area, the Altis (see J. on Paus. 5,10,1). On a terrace north of the Altis twelve (!?) treasuries were built by different Greek poleis to store offerings: the earliest was that of Gela (no. 17) (c.600), while others belonged to Megara (no. 225), Metapontion (no. 61), Selinous (no. 44), Kyrene (no. 194), Sybaris (no. 70), Byzantium (no. 74), Epidamnos (no. 79), Syracuse (no. 47), Sikyon (no. 228) and an unknown state (J. on Paus. 6,19,1–15; there are difficulties reconciling Pausanias and the archaeological findings). Two buildings were built close to each
other south of the Altis, the older c.550–500 and the other C5e, and they were joined by further construction in C4; they have been identified as the bouleuterion, though it has been doubted whether that was their original function (Gneisz (1990) 340–41; J. on Paus. 5.23.1; note the reservations of Morgan and Coulton (1997) 112–13). North of the Altis a prytaneion was constructed in C5e (Miller (1978) 86–91, 235–239). The original stadion was moved east out of the Altis by C6m, and developed and extended later (Mallwitz (1988)). Classical Greeks believed in early conflict between Elis and Pisatis for control of Olympia by some time in C6. Both the town of Elis and the Olympic sanctuary served as political centres for the polis Elis from the C6 onwards. Various Elean officials (e.g. the hellanodikai) carried out duties at both places, and their duties concerning the sanctuaries to the Greek world. The sanctuary’s Panhellenic were an occasion for political speeches and pronouncements in war. Texts of documents such as inter-state treaties (described by Paus.) from both individuals and in large numbers, and received a multitude of dedications though under Elean control and sometimes exploited by polis (Arist.).

The use of both Elis and Olympia for political purposes made the Elean polis remarkably bicentral. The sanctuary, though under Elean control and sometimes exploited by Elis (Roy (1998)), attracted Greeks from other communities in large numbers, and received a multitude of dedications (described by Paus.) from both individuals and poleis, including armour and weapons dedicated to celebrate victory in war. Texts of documents such as inter-state treaties were displayed there, and the large gatherings at the Games were an occasion for political speeches and pronouncements to the Greek world. The sanctuary’s Panhellenic character of course made control all the more valuable to Elis.

As civic subdivisions, twelve phylai are attested in 368. The number was reduced to eight in 364 because of territory lost in war with Arkadia (Paus. 5.9.4–6), and apparently remained at eight (Paus. 5.16.7). See Jones, POAG 142–45, and Roy (1997) 297–98.

The form of constitution changed several times in Elis (Gehrke, Stasis 52–57, 365–67; cf. Bultrighini (1990)). In C6 an extreme oligarchy was largely controlled by a few families (Arist. Pol. 1306*13–19), though probably later became more moderate (but, pace Gehrke, the Chaladrion decree IvO 11 may not be directly relevant). Elis then became democratic, possibly in the synoecism of 471 (Diod. 11.54.1; Strabo 8.3.2), and—despite an attempted oligarchic coup d’état c.400 (Xen. Hell. 3.2.27–29; cf. Paus. 3.8.4–5)—retained democratic constitutional forms until 365, when oligarchs took control (Xen. Hell. 7.4.15–16). Reconciliation between oligarchs and democrats (DGE 24) may be dated c.350, and may have been followed by constitutional reform by Plato’s pupil Phormio (Plut. Adv. Col. 1206C). Probably in 343 there was an oligarchic coup d’état (Dem. 19.260, 294; Paus. 4.28.4, 5.4.9; Diod. 16.63.4–5; cf. Dem. 9.27 and 18.295). After Philip’s death Elis tried to break away from the League of Corinth (Diod. 17.3.5, cf. 17.8.5), apparently exiling pro-Makedonians; after Alexander overcame Thebes, Elis took back these exile (Arr. Anab. 1.10.1).

On public enactments, see Minon (1994) ii. 514–16. Examples of laws are IvO 4 (Minon (1994) no. 6 (c.500–480), law concerning the theokolos); IvO 2 (Minon (1994) no. 14 (c.475–450), decree concerning Patrias); DGE 424 (c.350(?), law concerning exiles). Lawcourts are attested in an inscription of C6 found at the town of Elis (Siewert (1994b) and (2001)). It is notable that Olympian Zeus was often involved in sanctions for offences (e.g. IvO 2, 3; Minon (1994) ii. 516–26; this involvement extended to the treaty with the Ewaioi (no. 253) (IvO 9; Roy and Schofield (1999)), and to the penalty imposed on Sparta (no. 345) for alleged breach of the Olympic truce in 420 (Thuc. 5.49.1–50.4; Roy (1998)). Elis also held Olympic tribunals, delivering judgments and penalties (Thuc. 5.49.1–50.4 (cf. Hyp. frr. 111–12; Siewert (1981); Minon (1994) ii. 490–95; Roy (1998)).

As eponymous officials (Sherk (1990b) 233–34), damiorgoi are attested in IvO 17 (C5l–C4e, number unknown), SEG 15 241 (C4, two damiorgoi), DGE 424 (C4m, one damiorgos). Cf. IvO 39 (C3 or C2e), with eponymous hellanodikai.

On the boule, see Minon (1994) ii. 509–11. There was an early oligarchic council of ninety gerontes, in which membership was for life, and election was dominated by a few families so that, even among the oligarchs, few gained members (Arist. Pol. 1306*13–19). By c.525–500 there was a council of 500 (IvO7 = Minon (1994) no. 1; cf. reference to a council in IvO 3 = Minon (1994) no. 5 (c.500–475)), presumably later replaced by the council of 600 found in 420 (Thuc. 5.47.9).

On other officials, see e.g. Thuc. 5.47.9 (damiourgoi and thesmophylakes) and Minon (1994) ii. 473–509. In IvO 9 (c.500) τελεστά appears as a generic term for an official, as opposed to an ordinary citizen (Φέρας). Officials called mastroi had powers to review actions of other magistrates (IvO 2 (c.475–450)) and judicial decisions (SEG 31 358 (c.475–470)). Among other officials the hellanodikai were important, but the development of the office is not clear (Jones, POAG 142–45 with nn. at 152–53; Bultrighini (1990) 146–65); the original title was possibly diaitater (Ebert and Siewert (1999)). The administration of Olympic affairs
overlapped considerably with other functions of Eleian officials (Minon (1994) ii. 508–9; Roy (1999) 159).

On the assembly, see Minon (1994) ii. 511–13. There are references to meetings of an assembly as *damos plethyon* in *IvO* 7 (= Minon (1994) no. 1 (c. 525–500)) and 3 (= Minon (1994) no. 5 (c. 500–475)). There is a reference to a decision of the *damos* in *IvO* 13 (= Minon (1994) no. 12 (c. 475–450)), and in *IvO* 7 the *damos* has power to take a definitive decision in jurisdiction.

For the public architecture of Elis, see the description of the town Elis by Paus. 6.23.1–26.3. Architectural fragments suggest that there were several monumental structures already in the Archaic period (Yalouris, *PECS* 299–300 ("Elis"); Eder and Mitsopoulos (1999) 25–35). While at least some functions of the state took place at the town by C6 (Siewert (1994b)), there were also buildings for such purposes at Olympia, which may have been the major seat of Eleian government in C6 (Hansen and Fischer-Hansen (1994) 86–89).

There was a *bouleuterion* at Olympia (see Gneisz (1990) 340–41, dating its first phase to C6s). On the *C6e prytaeion* at Olympia, see Miller (1978) 86–91, 235–39. There was an agora at Elis (Xen. *Hell* 3.2.28 (c. 400); Martin (1951) 31–13, cf. 241–44 on two areas at Olympia which he saw as agoras). On the south stoa (c. 450–425) and the west stoa (C5 or early C4) at Elis, see Coulton (1976) 237; at Olympia there were the Echo Stoa of c.340–330 (Jacquemin (1999–2002) on Paus. 5.21.17), and others. At Elis the temple of Athena on the acropolis was probably erected in the Archaic period (Yalouris, *PECS*). The cult site at Olympia was already well established in the Archaic period (Morgan (1990) 26–56; Sinn (1994) on early developments); see also Yalouris, *PECS* 646–650. The theatre at Elis was first built c.300 (Glaser (2001); TGR ii. 207). On *gymnasia* at Elis, see Xen. *Hell* 3.2.27 (c.400); on the *gymnasion* at Olympia, see Wacker (1996), dating the first phase (p. 24) to C4 or C3.

On a plan of settlement in the town of Elis from the Classical to the Roman periods the area of settlement is shown as between 4 and 5 km², extending north of the river Peneios (Yalouris (1972b) 141; see also Yalouris (1994)). Xen. *Hell* 3.2.27 says that c.400 the *gymnasia* were near the suburbs (*proasia*), but on Yalouris’ plan they are shown near the centre of the area of settlement, which may have grown after c.400. The hill Kaloskopi became the acropolis of Elis (Yalouris, *PECS*; cf. Xen. *Hell* 7.4.15 (1656) and Paus. 6.2.63), but was apparently not fortified until 312 (note the wording of Diod. 19.87.2–3). The town of Elis was unwalled c.400 according to Xen. *Hell* 3.2.27 (Roy (1997) 299–304). No walls are shown on Yalouris’ plan, and no remains of walls have been reported from subsequent archaeological investigation.

The most important cult at Elis was that of Zeus Olympios, under Eleian control at least from C6 (Siewert (1987–88) 7), and Elis organised the Olympic festival and the Heraia at Olympia (KIPaulv. 286–88, ii. 1031–32). On Eleian victors at Olympia, Delphi and Nemea, see Crowther (1988). Eleians did not participate in the Isthmian Games (e.g. Paus. 5.2.2). Communal dedications by the Eleians at Olympia are attested in C6 (Siewert (1991b) nos. 4–8) and C4 (*DGE* 423); on the surprising rarity of Eleian dedications at Olympia, see Taeuber (1991) 113.

Elis had its own calendar, with some month names not known from elsewhere (Samuel (1972) 95–97, 284, 288, 294; Trümpy, *Monat*. 199–201).

From C6/E Elis struck silver coinage on the Aiginetan standard, mainly staters but also smaller denominations. From C5/E bronze coins were also struck. Most coins carried the Eleian city-ethnic (or an abbreviation), but from C5/E coins were also struck with the legend ΟΛΥΜΠΙΚΟΝ (spelt with kappa or koppa), clearly in connection with Olympic festivals. Frequent types were Olympian Zeus and his attributes (thunderbolt, eagle), and also Hera (Head, *HN* 294, 295; Seltman (1921) on silver coinage only; Kraay (1976) 103–7; Franke (1984); *SNG* *C. Phlias-Laconia* 352–418). There is no reason to accept Seltman’s view that Eleian coinage was essentially a “temple coinage” (Warren (1962); Nicolet-Pierre (1975)).

Elis established four colonies in southern Epeiros: Boucheta (no. 90), Elateia (no. 94), Pandosia (no. 104) and Batiai (no. 88) (Theopomp. fr. 206; Dem. 7.32; Strabo 7.7.5). Though not precisely dated, the foundations are assigned to C8–C6 (Hammond (1967) 427, 478; Dakaris (1971) 16, 30–33).

Varying legendary accounts of the foundation of Elis existed in the Classical period, giving prominence to the role of Oxylos, but also reflecting in one way or another Elis’ relations with Aitolia (cf. Hdt. 8.73), Elis’ relations with Sparta, and Elis’ struggle with Pisa for control of Olympia. The accounts are heavily affected by political considerations of the Classical period. See Sordi (1994).

252. Eupagion Map 58. Unlocated. Type: B. The toponym Ἐυπάγιον occurs only in Diod. 14.17.8 (all modern editors wrongly accept Wesseling’s emendation: Ἐπιτάλιον, impossible because it lay south of the Alpheios). A city-ethnic is not attested. It was a perioikic community. It is
described as a *polis* (in the political sense) of the Akroaians *c*.400 (Diod. 14.17.8); Xen. *Hell*. 7.4.14 refers collectively to the *polis* of the Akroaians in 365, without naming Eupagion (*supra*, on Akroia).

253. (Ewaoioi) Map 58. Unlocated. Type: B. The toponym is not attested. The city-ethnic is *’Εϝαοιοί* (*IvO*; Roy and Schofield (1999)); the ethnic had previously been read as *’Εϝραοιοί* and referred to Heraia (no. 274) in Arkadia, or as *’Εϝςαοίος* and referred to an unknown Eleian community; but see Roy and Schofield (1999). The inscription attests the collective and external use of the city-ethnic.

The community is known only from *IvO* 9 of c.500, a 100-year alliance with Elis (no. 251). The alliance may well be an example of the hegemonial alliance by which Elis structured its relations with its external and individual use of the city-ethnic.

254. Kyllene (Kyllenios) Map 58. Lat. 21.05, long. 37.55. Size of territory: unknown, presumably 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is Κυλλήνη, ἦ (Thuc. 1.30.2; Ps.-Sklax 43). The external and individual use of the city-ethnic Κυλλήνιος occurs in Hom. II. 15.518, but is not found in Classical sources. Called a *polis* (and *limen*) only by Ps.-Sklax 43 (Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 148), Kyllene is often called *epineion* as a base for the Eleian fleet (e.g. Thuc. 1.30.2). By c.400 it was fortified (Xen. *Hell*. 3.2.30; Roy (1997) 299–304; cf. Diod. 19.66.2 (r314); Polyb. 5.3.1 (r218)). Strabo 8.3.4 calls it a *kome metria*, with a remarkable ivory statue of Asklepios; Paus. 6.26.4 mentions sanctuaries of Asklepios and Aphrodite and a popular cult of Hermes. On its location and archaeological remains, see Servais (1961), who makes a convincing case for identifying it with the physical remains immediately adjacent to modern Killini (despite the lack of conclusive documentary evidence). There was a town on that site at least from C5 to the Roman imperial period; there is no direct evidence of ancient fortifications in place, but Servais (1961) 140 found numerous large blocks of stone which he identified as having once belonged to ancient fortifications. Kyllene had cults of Asklepios (Strabo 8.3.4; Paus. 6.26.4), Aphrodite (Paus. 6.26.4) and Hermes (Paus. 6.26.4). Only the reference in Ps.-Sklax 43 suggests that Kyllene had the status of a *polis*.

255. Laris(s)a Map 58. Unlocated, not in Barr. Type: A. Larisa was situated in the borderland between Elis (no. 251) and Achaian Dyme (no. 234) according to Theopomp. fr. 386, who calls it a *polis* in the urban sense. The location may be confirmed by a reference in the MSS of Xen. *Hell*. 3.2.23 (κατά Λάρισαν) to a toponym “Larissa” on a route through Achaia into Elis, though modern editors generally follow Portus’ emendation to κατά Λάρισαν, referring to the river between Achaia and Elis (Strabo 8.7.5). Nothing else is known about this Laris(s)a (cf. Hansen (2000) 193), and, according to the references in Theopompos and Xenophon, it could have been in either Achaia or Elis.

256. Lasion (Lasionios) Map 58. Lat. 21.45, long. 37.50. Size of territory: unknown but probably 2. Type: A. The toponym is Λασιών, ὁ (Xen. *Hell*. 3.2.30). The city-ethnic is Λασιώνιος (Xen. *Hell*. 4.2.16). Lasion is described by Polyb. 4.73.1 (r219/18) as a *polis* in the urban sense; Xen. *Hell*. 3.2.23, 30 describes it as a (periöikik) *polis* in the political sense. The external collective city-ethnic is used by Xen. *Hell*. 4.2.16 (r394) for a military contingent; the external individual use is attested in the Hellenistic period (Euphorion of Chalkis fr. 47, de Cuenca, *apud* Ath. 4.4 F).

It is not known when Lasion became periöikik: it certainly was by the Eleian–Spartan war of c.400, after which it became independent (Xen. *Hell*. 3.2.30) and probably joined the Peloponnesian League, sending troops (hoplites) to support Sparta (no. 256) in 394 (Xen. *Hell*. 4.2.16). It was claimed as Arkadian c.400 (Xen. *Hell*. 3.2.30), and joined the Arkadian League in the 360s (Xen. *Hell*. 7.1.26, where “the others” must refer to Lasion). In 365 it was captured by Elis (no. 251), or Arkadian exiles backed by Elis, but was soon recaptured by Arkadia (Xen. *Hell*. 7.4.12–13; Diod. 15.77.1). The site has been identified (though without documentary proof) and examined but not excavated (Pritchett (1989) 28–30).

257. Lenos Map 58. Unlocated. Type: C. The community is known only from Phlegon (*FGHist* 257) fr. 7, quoted by Steph. *Byz*. 413.17–18 for the toponym Λήνος and the city-ethnic Ληναίος.

A Ληναίος was Olympic victor in 588 (Phlegon (*FGHist* 257) fr. 7 = Steph. *Byz*. 413.17–18). Steph. *Byz*. 413.17 describes it as a *chora* of Pisatis, but it may have been a *polis* because of the Olympic victor, whose ethnic was presumably given by Phlegon.

258. Letrinoi (Letrinos) Map 58. Probably lat. 21.25, long. 37.40. Size of territory: unknown, presumably 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is Λετρίνοι, οἳ (Paus. 6.22.8) or Λετρίνων, ἦ (Lyc. Alex. 54). The city-ethnic is Λετρίνοι (Xen. *Hell*. 3.2.25), or Λετρίνων (Siewert (1991b) no. 9 (C6s)).

Letrinoi lay 120 stades from Olympia and 180 from Elis (no. 251) on the Olympia–Elis road through the plain (Paus.
6.22.8); locations near modern Ag. Ioannis (RE xii. 2148, xx. 1732–55) and near Pirgos (Sperling (1942) 85) have been suggested: Pirgos is more likely because Classical remains have been found there but not at Ag. Ioannis (Pirgos: BCH 108 (1984) Chron. 770 and McDonald and Hope Simpson (1972) 320–21 no. 717; Ag. Ioannis: ibid. 302–3 no. 306).

It is described as a (perioikic) polis in the political sense at Xen. Hell. 3.2.23, 30. The external collective city-ethnic is used on a Češ dedication at Olympia (Siewert (1991) no. 9), and by Xen. Hell. 3.2.25 and 4.2.16 ((1394) for a military contingent). When Letrinoi became perioikic is not known: it was certainly perioikic by the Eleian–Spartan war of c.400. It then became independent (Xen. Hell. 3.2.25, 30) and probably joined the Peloponnesian League, sending troops (spendentetai) to support Sparta (no. 345) in 394 (Xen. Hell. 4.2.16). Elis probably recovered it by c.362 (cf. Xen. Hell. 6.5.2 with Tuplin (1993) 183–85). Paus. 6.22.8 says that it was originally a polis, but in his day had only a few buildings with a temple and statue of Artemis Alpheiaia. According to Lyc. Alex. 53–55, the bones of Pelops were at Letrina. Letreus, son of Pelops, was oecis of Letrinoi (Paus. 6.22.8).

259. Marganeis (Marganeus) Map 58. At or near lat. 21.30, long. 37.40. Size of territory: unknown, presumably 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is Μαργάνεις (Xen. Hell. 7.4.14) or Μάργανα (Diod. 15.77.4), and the same site is probably meant by Μαργάλαι (MS at Strabo 8.3.24) and Μάργανα (Steph. Byz. 432.11–12). The city-ethnic is Μαργανείς (Xen. Hell. 3.2.25).

It was apparently near Olympia (Xen. Hell. 7.4.14). A location between modern Flora and Strefi west of Olympia has been suggested (KIPauly iii. 1020), but the site with Classical material at Salmoni (formerly Koukoura) (McDonald and Hope Simpson (1972) 304–5 no. 308: see also ibid. 320–21 no. 722) would suit well.

It is called a (perioikic) polis in the political sense at Xen. Hell. 3.2.23–25, 30. The external collective use of the city-ethnic is found in Xen. Hell. 3.2.25, 4.2.16.

When Marganeis became perioikic is not known: it was certainly perioikic by the Eleian–Spartan war of c.400, after which it became independent (Xen. Hell. 3.2.25, 30). It then probably joined the Peloponnesian League. It sent troops to support Sparta (no. 345) in 394 (Xen. Hell. 4.2.16). In 371/0 Elis (no. 251) claimed that Marganeis should belong to Elis (Xen. Hell. 6.5.2); it was Eleian by 365, when it was captured by Arkadia (Xen. Hell. 7.4.14; Diod. 15.77.4), but was soon recaptured by Elis (Xen. Hell. 7.4.26). It was probably fortified; Xen. Hell. 7.4.14 notes that it was captured because of treachery, and Strabo 8.3.24 says that it was not a natural stronghold, implying man-made defences. In Strabo’s day (ibid.) it was part of Amphidolia (no. 247).

260. (Metapioi) Map 58. Unlocated, not in Barr. Type: B. The toponym is not attested. The city-ethnic is Μετάπιος, known only from Ivo 10 (c.475–450), where the collective and external use is attested in a 50-year treaty of friendship with the equally unknown Anaitoi (no. 248) (cf. Minon (1994) no. 10; Staatsverträge 111). Since the treaty is in Eleian dialect, both Anaitoi and Metapioi presumably belong to the region of Elis, but may have been located anywhere in the region, either within the Eleian state proper or in perioikic territory north or south of the river Alpheios. The collective use of the city-ethnic and the capacity to enter into a treaty with another community strongly suggest that the Metapioi were a polis. On the difficulty of identifying the Classical community with the Mycenaean Me-ta-pa, see Roy (1997) 313–14. Cf. Anaitoi (no. 248).

261. Opous (Opountios) Map 58. Unlocated. Type: B. The toponym is Οπούς (Diod. 14.17.8), also Οφούς (BCH 45 (1921) 11.128). The city-ethnic is Οφούντιος (IG v.2 368.135–7 (C3)). It was a perioikic community, perhaps to be identified with the ruins of an ancient acropolis at Gartsiko (KIPauly iv. 323 no. 2). It is described as a polis (in a political sense) of the Akroreians c.400 (Diod. 14.17.8); Xen. Hell. 7.4.14 refers collectively to the poleis of the Akroreians in 365, without naming Opous. There were two Opountian proxenoi at Kleitor in Arkadia at a date before 221 (IG v.2 368.135–37). Strabo 9.4.2 regarded Opous as insignificant, but noted that it renewed its kinship with the Opountian Lokrians (supra, on Akrorea).


It seems clear that in the Archaic period Elis struggled with an independent community Pisa; the ethnic Πυσαίοι is often used of it (e.g. Paus. 6.22.4), and Stesichoros (fr. 86, Page = Strabo 8.3.31, on which see Hansen (1998) 124–32) called it a polis; in its territory lay Olympia (where one of its own citizens was victorious in 724, according to Paus. 5.8.6 = Olymptionikai 15), and it struggled with Elis for control of Olympia and of Pisatan territory generally. Elis eventually prevailed—perhaps c.570—and incorporated Pisatan territory into the Eleian state. Because reports of these events are distorted by later interests (Sordi (1994)), little is
known about the Archaic Pisatan state save that its rulers were remembered as kings or tyrants (on early Pisatan history, see RE xx. 1746–53). Pisa later broke away from Eleian control, and again formed an independent, or at least self-governing, state 365–c.362, but was then reabsorbed into the Eleian state. It merits inclusion in this Inventory primarily because it was quite possibly a polis in 365–c.362. No source explicitly calls it a polis, but the internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found in IvO 36 = DGE 422 (365–362) and the external collective use in Xen. Hell. 7.4.28; it issued coins and conducted a foreign policy (infra). However, several points should be borne in mind when assessing the form taken by the independent Pisatan state of 365–c.362. First, there is no reason to believe in the existence of a town Pisa (infra). Secondly, there were other towns in Classical Pisatis: Alasyaion (no. 245) is included in this Inventory, and Harpina, Herakleia and Salmone are listed above among the settlements not included, but a strong case can be made that yet other towns also existed in Classical Pisatis (Roy (2002a)). According to the criteria used in the present work to determine whether a community should be included, only Alasyaion merits inclusion: but the evidence on towns in Pisatis is such that there is a real possibility that several Pisatan towns were poleis in the Classical period (Roy (2002a)). If there were such poleis, then presumably during the Classical period, except for the period 365–c.362, they were subordinate poleis within the territory of Elis (cf. the cases of Kyllene (no. 254) and Pylos (no. 263), both within Elis but not in Pisatis). In that case the towns could have been subordinate poleis of Pisatis in 365–c.362. Alternatively, the independent state of Pisatis may have been not a polis, but a confederacy of several small poleis: in the limited surviving evidence there is no indication of a federal structure, but equally nothing to exclude it. Thus Pisatis in 365–c.362 may have been (1) a polis with no central town Pisa but with several towns not of polis status within its territory; or (2) a polis with no central town Pisa but with several subordinate poleis within its territory; or (3) not a polis but a confederacy uniting several small poleis. Despite this last possibility, Pisa is here included in the Inventory of poleis because its status as a polis is likely; but, if in fact a polis, it may have had a somewhat anomalous composition.

The extent of the territory of the independent Pisatan state is unknown, but presumably included some or all of the supposed eight poleis of Pisatis (see the Introduction and Alasyaion (no. 245) in this Inventory). Despite ancient attempts to argue for a town Pisa ( countered by Apollodoros in Strabo 8.3.31), there is no reliable evidence, literary or archaeological, for a town of that name, and no reason to believe in it (KlPauly iv. 866–67).

Pisa’s claim to Olympia was still remembered c.400 (Xen. Hell. 3.2.31, where the other claimants, besides the Eleians, must be Pisatan). When war broke out between Arkadia and Elis (no. 251) in 365, the Arkadians occupied various pieces of Eleian territory (Xen. Hell. 7.4.14), including Pisa, which became an independent state. It was probably a puppet-state of the Arkadians: the Arkadians were able to draw on Olympic treasures (Xen. Hell. 7.4.33–34; Diod. 15.82.1), as the Pisatans themselves may have done for their gold coinage, and it was often said that the Olympic Games of 364, regarded as a non-Olympiad by the Eleians (Diod. 15.78.3), were held by the Pisatans and the Arkadians (Xen. Hell. 7.4.28–29; Diod. 15.82.1; Paus. 6.4.2) or even by the Arkadians alone (Paus. 6.8.3, 6.22.3; cf. Xen. Hell. 7.4.35). The Pisatan state none the less appears to have had the forms of an independent state. It is not heard of again after the battle of Mantinea in 362, and presumably rapidly returned to Elis, which had regained control of Olympia before the Olympic Games of 360.

Pisa made treaties with Arkadia and Akroiaria and with Messenia and Sikyon (no. 228) (Ringel et al. (1999)). A Pisatan decree (IvO 36 = DGE 422) appointed two Sikyonians proxenoi and theoerodokoi: the decree was dated by three eponymous Pisatan hellanodikai (not noted in Sherk (1990b)).

Pisa minted gold coins bearing the head of Zeus and with the legend ΠΙΣΑ (Head, HNη 426). Pisa held the Olympic Games of 364 (Diod. 15.78.2–3), though (as noted supra) Arkadia was often said to have been involved in organising the games. It is clear that for a brief period Pisa discharged typical functions of an independent Greek state, and can be regarded as such, even if it was probably in fact a puppet-state of the Arkadian federation.

Pisos was founder of Pisa (RE xx. 1806 no. 1). The genealogical claim that Olympia, consort of Pisos, was a daughter of Arkas (Etym. Magn. s.v. Olympia) may be an attempt, from the period of Pisatan independence, to connect Pisa and Arkadia.

263. Pylos (Pylos) Map 58. Lat. 21.30, long. 37.55. Size of territory: unknown, presumably 1 or 2. Type: C. The toponym is Πύλος, δ (Xen. Hell. 7.4.16; Strabo 8.3.7). The city-ethnic is Πύλιος (Xen. Hell. 7.4.26).

The only evidence which suggests that Pylos may have been a polis is the use of a collective ethnic twice in a single passage by Xenophon (Hell. 7.4.26), but it is notable that
Xenophon appears to include in the “Pylians” both Eleian exiles and non-Eleian foreigners, though possibly through imprecision in the narrative.

There was ancient confusion about the location because of the desire to identify Homeric Pylos, and the existence of other sites called Pylos in the western Peloponnes (RE xxi. 2131–33 no. 3). The site at modern Armata near Agrapidokhori, which has been thoroughly excavated (Coleman 1986), is very probably Pylos. Xen. Hell. 7.4.16 (365) says that Eleian exiles seized Pylos and were joined by many of the Eleian demos because it was a chorion kalon; the Eleians captured the Pylians and their chorion (ibid. 26). The excavation has shown a significant Classical nucleated settlement from c.425, but without monumental architecture of any kind: communal buildings, if any, must have been of the same character as the houses (Coleman 1986 67). The archaeological findings are compatible with destruction in the 360s. Pylos was reputedly founded by the Megarian Pylon, then destroyed by Herakles, and refounded by the Eleians (Paus. 6.22.5).
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I. The Region

The name of the region is Ἀρκαδία, ἣ (IvO 266 (C6–C5e); Thuc. 1.2.3), or Ἀρκαδίη in the Ionic dialect (Hom. Il. 2.603; Hdt. 1.66.2). The ethnic proper is invariably Ἀρκαδός (Hom. Il. 2.611; IvO 147,148 (C5f)), but the etic Ἀρκαδικόν sometimes serves as the plural (infra). The collective use of the ethnic proper is attested externally in Hom. Il. 2.611 and often in literature, whereas it does not occur in inscriptions before the foundation of the Confederacy in 370 (CEG 11 824.10 (369)); IG II² 112.15 (362)); internally it is attested (in the form ἈΡΚΑΔΙΚΟΝ or different abbreviations there- of (cf. Xen. Hell. 6.5.6) on C5 coins (for which see R. T. Williams (1965) and SNG Cap. Argolis 164–90) and in the C4 federal decree IG v.2 1.3 (360s). The individual use is found externally in IvO 147,148 (C5f) and Thuc. 5.49.1, and internally in IGv.2 549.550 (C4l). The region Arkadia is described as χώρα (Hdt. 1.66.1; Xen. Hell. 6.5.21), and from C5 onwards the people are described by such terms as ἔθνος (Hdt. 8.73.1), φυλή (Xen. Hell. 7.1.23) and λαός (CEG 11 824.2 (369)); see further Nielsen (1999).

The earliest source for the extent of Arkadia is probably the Homeric Catalogue of Ships (Il. 2.603–14), which describes the eastern plain and Parrhasia as Arkadian, in addition to Rhipe, Stratie and Enispe, communities that are otherwise unknown. The northern border with Achaia is not very well attested in Archaic and Classical sources, but Herodotos includes Nonakris (no. 285) and Pheneos (no. 291) in Arkadia (Hdt. 6.74.2). The border with Achaia ran north of Kynaitha (no. 278), always described as Arkadian (e.g. by Polyb. 4.20–21), but exactly where it ran in the earlier period is uncertain, since it is possible that the northern district Azania once included territory later considered to be Achaian (Nielsen and Roy (1998) 36–39); in the present Inventory, however, Kynaitha is considered to be the northernmost Arkadian community. The western border with Elis (no. 251) and Triphylia was particularly unstable. The city of Lasi (no. 256) must have been right in the border zone between Elis and Arkadia, since it was the object of dispute between Eleians and Arkadians for long periods in Antiquity (cf. Xen. Hell. 3.2.30, 7.4.12; Diod. 14.17.8, 15.77.1; Polyb. 4.73.1, 74.1); in the present context the border is considered to run slightly to the east of Lasi, which is therefore not included here but treated by Roy in the Eleian Inventory (no. 256). The border with Triphylia is a problem in itself: though the area was under Eleian control during C5 (Roy (1997)), some of the communities in Triphylia were sometimes considered to be Arkadian; Phrixai(ι) (no. 309), for example, was described as Arkadian by Pherekydes (FGrHist) fr. 161, and Triphylia as such ended up being considered a part of Arkadia (cf. Ps.-Skylax 44; Nielsen (1997) 131, 155–56). In the present work, however, Triphylia is treated as an individual region (next chapter). For a full discussion of the western border of Arkadia, see Roy (2000a). The southern border with Lakonike ran from Phigaleia (no. 292) in south-western Arkadia (Hdt. 6.81.2) to Parrhasia, which bordered on Lakonike (Thuc. 5.33.2), to Eutaia (no. 270), south of Tegea (no. 297), which was on the Lakonian border (Xen. Hell. 6.5.12). The western border with Thyreatis and Argolis was quite stable, but it is possible, it should be noted, that the Arkadian Eua mentioned by Theopomp. fr. 60 was the one in the Thyreatis (no. 331) (for which see Christien and Spyropoulos (1985)), and that the Hysia mentioned as Arkadian by Pherekydes (FGrHist 3) fr. 5 was Hysiai in the Argolid (so Bölte in RE ix (1916) 540 and Shaw (1999) 284–85). If so, the border here may also have fluctuated a
little, but in the present Inventory neither Eua nor Hysia(i) is considered to be Arkadian.

Our written sources provide us with information about seventy named settlements of the Archaic and Classical periods in Arkadia as thus delimited. Of these, fifty-three have been located, with certainty or with varying degrees of probability. Fifteen ancient toponyms, however, remain unlocated; there is no example of a major urban settlement that cannot be matched with a toponym attested in the written sources (but see, e.g., Dipoina(i) and Kallia(i) in the following list for identifications that remain hypothetical).

Thirty-nine settlements are described in the Inventory of poleis below. The other thirty-one settlements in alphabetical order are as follows. ²

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis

Basilis (Βάσιλις) Paus. 8.29.1, without indication of type of site, but presumably a settlement, since a mythical oikistes is mentioned (so Barr.). Barr. dates it AC with reference to Paus. 8.29.5, which, however, gives no indication of the date of its existence (it was in ruins in Pausanias’ day). ³ But Basilis is possibly to be located near modern Kyparissia, c.20 km north-west of Megalopolis (no. 282): here recent rescue excavations by A. V. Karapanagiotou have brought to light a candidate for Basilis: a city with a rectangular street plan and a fortification wall with rectangular towers, of considerable size (18 ha) though not excavated in its entirety, and dated by the excavator to 5th c.; the earliest material is C6 ceramic material; a C6–C4 sanctuary is located 1.5 km from the city (information derived from public lecture by A. V. Karapanagiotou in Athens, May 2002; for earlier finds at the site, see Bather and Yorke (1892–93) 229–30; Jost (1985) 170). If not to be equated with Basilis, the site may be ancient Trapezos (no. 303) (Paus. 8.29.5).

Bathos (Βάθος) Paus. 8.29.1. Regarded as a settlement by Barr., but perhaps rather a sanctuary (Paus. 8.29.1: Βάθος ἐστιν ὀνομαζόμενον, ἐνθύμου τῆς σκηνῆς ἔντον τριτον θεᾶς <ταίς> Μεγάλαις). Bather and Yorke (1892–93) 229: “The site excavated appears to be that of a small shrine”. No date in Barr., but AC is attested (Bather and Yorke (1892–93) 228–29; Jost (1985) 170).

Charisia(i) (Χαρισία(ι)) Unlocated. Paus. 8.3.4. 27.3 (1371/70, πόλις). No date in Barr., but C is indicated by Paus. 8.27.3.

Dasea(i) (Δασέα(ι)) Paus. 8.27.4 (1371/70, πόλις), 8.36.9 (ἐρείπια). Steph. Byz. 220.7 (πόλις). Barr. AC (but the reference is to Paus. 8.36.3; C is indicated, however, by Paus. 8.27.4.).

Dipoina(i) (Δίπωνα(ι); but cf. Jost (1986a) 152 n. 69 Unlocated (but see infra). Paus. 8.27.4 (1371/0, πόλις). With Kallia and Nonakris (for both of which see the present list) it formed a Tripolis, reportedly synoecised into Megalopolis (no. 282) (Paus. 8.27.3). No date in Barr., but C is indicated by Paus. 8.27.3. Meyer (1939a) 50–58 briefly describes two ancient settlements (not in Barr.) at Kastro Galatas/Kastro tis Monovizas and Kerpini (both on the map in Jost (1985)), which should probably be identified with two of the three

² For some toponyms which may or may not be names of settlements, see the preceding note; they are disregarded in the following.

³ The following list diverges from the Barr. directory of Map 58 by excluding the following settlements from consideration as not demonstrably Archaic or Classical or not demonstrably settlements vel sim.: Aphroditai: an urban deme of Tegea; Boukolion: a mere toponym, cf. n. 45; Eues: a mere toponym; cf. n. 41; Euryale: a mere toponym (cf. Jost, Comm. 1985); Ilona (Ποιηλα): a mere toponym (cf. Jost, Comm. 371); Myndus: a mere toponym (cf. Jost, Comm. 371). But Tenea (Paus. 12.1.8), which should probably be identified with two of the three

⁴ Τοι δὲ χωρίον τού ὀνομαζόμενον Βάθος σταδίους ὡς δέκα ἀφέστηκε καλουµένη Βάσιλις· ταύτης ἐγένετο οἰκίστης Κύψελος ὁ Ἀριστοµάχου τὴν θυγατέρα ἐκδούς· ἐπ’ ἐµοῦ δὲ ἀφέστηκε καλουµένη Βάσιλις· ταύτης ἐγένετο οἰκίστης Κύψελος ὁ
communities constituting the Tripolis (Dipoina(i) and Kallia(i), according to Meyer).

**Haimoniai** (Ἀιμονιαὶ) Paus. 8.44.1 (Ἀιμονιαὶ πόλις ἦσαν τοὺς δραχίον; Steph. Byz. 50.4 (πόλις). *Barr. AC* (cf. Roy et al. (1992)).

**Iasaia** (Ἰασαία) Paus. 8.27.3 (1371/70, πόλις). Not in *Barr.; C* indicated by Paus. 8.27.3.

**Kallia(i)** (Καλλία(ι)) Unlocated (but see *infra*). Paus. 8.27.4 (1371/70, πόλις), 27.7 (κώμη). With Dipoina(i) and Nonakris (for both of which see the present list) it formed a Tripolis, reportedly synoecised into Megalopolis (no. 282; Paus. 8.27.3). No date in *Barr., but C* is indicated by Paus. 8.27.3. Meyer (1939a) 50–58 briefly describes two ancient settlements (not in *Barr.*) at Kastro Galatas/Kastro tis Monovizas and Kerpini (both on the map in Jost (1985)), which should probably be identified with two of the three communities constituting the Tripolis (Dipoina(i) and Kallia(i), according to Meyer).


**Knauson** (Κναῦσον) Unlocated. Paus. 8.27.3 (1371/70, πόλις). No date in *Barr., but C* is indicated by Paus. 8.27.3.

**Lykoo, Lykaia** (Λυκόα, Λύκαια) Paus. 8.27.3 (1371/70, πόλις). *Barr. AC*, but the reference is to Paus. 8.36.7; Paus. 8.27.3 indicates *C*, and there are remains of a late Archaic–Classical temple (Voyatzis (1999) 154 (Mainalon); Pikoulas (1999c) 126–27).

**Lykotai, Lykoia** (Λυκοῦτας, Λυκόα) Unlocated. Polyb. 16.17; Paus. 8.27.4 (1371/70, πόλις). Listed in *Barr.* (as “Lykaia”) as unlocated and not given a date; but Paus. 8.27.4–5 indicates *C*.

**Lykouria** (Λυκουρία) Paus. 8.19.4 (χωρίων). *Barr. AC*, but the reference is to Paus. 8.19.4; however, AC is archaeologically attested; cf. Erath (1999a) 223–25.

**Mainalos** (Μαίναλος) Paus. 8.2.3 (πόλις “in ancient times”). Located by *Barr.* near Daria, but the location is uncertain (Jost, *Comm.* 36.8); cf., however, Pikoulas (1999c) 120–21, 127–28. *Barr. AC*, but the reference is to Paus. 8.36.8; *C* existence is indicated by its Olympic victors (Olympionikai 362, 377); cf. Jost, *Comm.* 36.8.

**Makaria** (Μακαρία, Μακαρέας) Paus. 8.27.4 (1371/70, πόλις). *Barr. puts it on the map near the river Alpheios, but its ruins have disappeared (Jost, *Comm.* 36.9). *Barr. AC*, but the reference is to Paus. 8.36.9; Paus. 8.27.4 indicates *C* existence.

**Melainai** (Μελαιαὶ) Paus. 8.26.8. Listed in the *Barr. directory as unlocated and with no date attached; however, Pikoulas (1999a) 304–5 suggests that it should be located at Helliniko of Paloumba, an “important archaeological site . . . unquestionably occupied by a settlement”, which is proved by pottery to have been Archaic and Classical.

**Nonakris** (Νόνακρις) Unlocated. Paus. 8.27.4 (1371/70, πόλις). With Dipoina(i) and Kallia(i) (for both of which see the present list) it formed a Tripolis, reportedly synoecised into Megalopolis (no. 282) (Paus. 8.27.3). No in *Barr.*, but *C* is indicated by Paus. 8.27.3. Not to be confused with the polis of Nonakris (no. 285). Meyer (1939a) 50–58 briefly describes two ancient settlements (not in *Barr.*) at Kastro Galatas/Kastro tis Monovizas and Kerpini (both on the map in Jost (1985)), which should probably be identified with two of the three communities constituting the Tripolis (Dipoina(i) and Kallia(i), according to Meyer).

**Onkeion** (Ονκειόν) Paus. 8.25.4. Listed as unlocated by *Barr. and with no date attached, but see Meyer (1957b) 13ff for a possible location with AC remains.

**Paroeriia** (Παρωρεία) Paus. 8.27.3 (1371/70, πόλις), 8.35.6–7. No date is attached in *Barr., but Paus. 8.27.3 indicates *C*.

**Peraiteis** (Περαιτεῖς) Paus. 8.27.3 (1371/70, πόλις), 8.36.7. *Barr. AC*, though the reference is to Paus. 8.3.4; Paus. 8.27.3 indicates *C*, and there are some *A* archaeological remains (Pikoulas (1999a) 276).

**Proseis** (Προσεῖς) Unlocated. Paus. 8.27.4 (1371/70, πόλις). No date is attached in *Barr., but C* is indicated by Paus. 8.27.4.

**Ptolederma** (Πτολέδερμα) Unlocated. Paus. 8.27.3 (1371/70, πόλις). No date is attached in *Barr., but Paus. 8.27.3 indicates *C*.

**Sounateion** (Σουμάτειον) Unlocated in *Barr., but see Pikoulas (1999c) 127. Paus. 8.27.3 (1371/70, πόλις). No date is attached in *Barr., but Paus. 8.27.3 indicates *C*, and so the site proposed by Pikoulas (1999c) 116.

**Thisa** (Θισά) Paus. 8.27.4 (1371/70, πόλις); *Barr. gives HR, but Paus. 8.27.4 indicates *C*. Cf. *Pharos* 2 (1994) 39–89.
Thoknia (Θωκνία, Θωκνεῖς) Paus. 8.27.4 (τριτή/70, πόλεις), 8.29.5. Barr. AC, but the reference is to Paus. 8.29.5; Paus. 8.27.4 indicates C.

Trikolonoi (Τρικόλωνοι) Paus. 8.27.3 (τριτή/70, πόλεις). Barr. AC, but the reference is to Paus. 8.35.6; Paus. 8.27.3 indicates C. Jost, Comm. 35.6.

Zoiteion (Ζοιτείων) Paus. 8.27.3 (τριτή/70, πόλεις). Barr. AC, but the reference is to Paus. 8.35.6–7; Paus. 8.27.3 indicates C.

Some of these settlements may have been poleis. Mainalos, for example, probably produced an Olympic victor in 400 (Olympionikai 362, 377; cf. Roy (1972b) 49) and was presumably a Mainalian community (Nielsen (1996a) 148); so it may have been a polis by analogy with Mainalian communities such as Pallantion (no. 289) and Helisson (no. 273). Conversely, communities such as, e.g., Pylai (no. 295) and Phorieia (no. 293) which have been included in the Inventory might perhaps be omitted. But even allowing for a margin of uncertainty, the Inventory points to the conclusion that c.60 per cent of all Arkadian settlements were considered to be poleis at some time or throughout the Archaic and Classical periods.

A distinctive feature of the Arkadian polis structure was the existence of the so-called tribal states, states based on populations living settled in several minor communities (Roy (1972b), (1996); Nielsen (1996a) 132–43). In the Classical period there existed four such tribal states: the Eutresians, the Kynourians, the Mainalians and the Parrhasians. In the Archaic period a fifth tribe, the Azanians, existed, but if they ever formed a tribal state, this had disintegrated before C5, and during the Classical period the former Azanian communities appear as individual poleis and are described as such below in the Inventory (Nielsen (1996a) 139; Nielsen and Roy (1998)). We know next to nothing about the internal political structure of the Eutresians; the Mainalians, on the other hand, are quite well documented (Nielsen (1996a) 134–38): their state was composed of a number of local communities which were organised as poleis, and six such Mainalian poleis are described in the Inventory below. It is very likely that both the Parrhasians and the Kynourians were subdivided into poleis as well, but the evidence is less substantial in these cases, and only two communities of each of these two tribal states are described in the Inventory.

Besides the tribal poleis there were in Arkadia a number of more conventional poleis. Some of the larger poleis developed local dominions. Mantinea (no. 281), for example, created a hegemonic league in C5s (Nielsen (1996c) 79–84), and so did Orchomenos (no. 286) in C4f (Nielsen (1996c) 84–86). However, the small communities subjugated by Mantinea and Orchomenos continued to function as poleis; they became dependent poleis and are duly described as such in the Inventory.

There is hardly any contemporary evidence for the status of those settlements which were not poleis. It is clear, however, from Xen. Hell. 5.2.6–7 and IPArk no. 9.7–8 that Mantinea possessed a number of komai, which played a role in the organisation of the polis. In his description of the synoecism of Megalopolis (no. 282), Diod. 15.72.4 refers to twenty unnamed Mainalian and Parrhasian communities as komai, but this classification runs counter to contemporary sources which regularly describe, e.g., Mainalian communities as poleis; it is probably prompted by the context of synoecism, for according to C4 theory poleis arose through synoecisms of komai (Arist. Pol. 1252c–27 with Demand (1990) 14–27 and Hansen (1995b) 52–61). But apart from Helisson (no. 273) (which became a Mantinean kome by the conclusion of the C4f treaty IPArk no. 9), no individual community is classified as a kome or by Archaic or Classical sources. So although we have evidence for second-order settlements in several Arkadian poleis, we do not know what status they enjoyed, since we do not know whether the evidence pertaining to Mantinea can be generalised.

Even though the existence of a C5 Arkadian Confederacy has been argued by, for instance, Wallace (1954), there is very little evidence for such an organisation (Roy (1972d); Nielsen (1996d)), and the only attested political unification of the region remains the short-lived C4 Confederacy (for which see Larsen (1968) 180–95; Dušančić (1970); Nielsen (1996c) 93–100; Roy (2000b)) that united Arkadia from 370 to 363. At the latter date it split into two factions, which seem never to have been reunited (Nielsen (1996b) 356–59), although some kind of Confederacy still existed in C4l (Piérart (1982)).

II. The Poleis

26. Alea (Ales) Map 58. Lat. 37.50, long. 22.25. Size of territory: 3. Type: B. The toponym is Αλέα, Αἶα (IGiv.1² 103,45 (C4m); SEG 23 189 (c.330)). The city-ethnic is Αλεῶς (IGiv.1² 80 (421); IVΟ 30 (C5s–C4f) has Αλεῖος (cf. Nielsen (1996a) 118); Classical coins use the form Αλεύς (often abbreviated-ed) in the legends (infra; cf. Roy (1972a) 331).
There is no certain attestation of *polis* in references to Alea, but Theopomp. fr. 242 (= Steph. Byz. 69.20) may have classed Alea as a *polis* (cf. Whitehead (1994) 119), and the *πόλις τῶν Ἀλειῶν* of *IvO* 295 (c.275–250) is probably our city (cf. Nielsen (1996a) 118).

The collective use of the ethnic is attested internally in Classical coin legends (*infra*, cf. Roy (1972a) 331) and externally in *IvO* 30 (C5s–C4f), for which see Nielsen (1996a) 118. The individual use is found externally on *IG* I 80 (421).

The territory occupied c.110 km².⁵ There is a temple (?) at Anemomilo, in the pass leading to Orchomenos (no. 286); with it are associated Classical sherds (Meyer (1939a) 29; Jost (1985) 108).

It may be assumed that Alea was a member both of the Peloponnesian League (Nielsen (1996a) 87) and the Arkadian Confederacy (ibid. 94–95). *IG* iv.² 103.45 (C4m) records a payment of ἐφόδια to two people ἐς Ἀλέαν, and the presumption is that Alea received an embassy from Epidaurus (no. 348). *IvO* 30 (C5s–C4f) is a grant of *proxenia* by Alea to an Athenian (cf. Nielsen (1996a) 118), and *IG* i 80 (421) is a grant by Athens (no. 361) of *proxenia* to a man of Alea; *SEG* 23 189.25 (c.330) records an Argive *theorodokos* in Alea.

*IvO* 30 (C5s–C4f), a grant of *proxenia*, is the oldest known public enactment of Alea; from its enactment formula (*ἐδοξε Ἀλειείσ*) the existence of an assembly may be inferred, but otherwise the political institutions of the city are unknown.

The well-preserved walls of Alea are probably C3 (Meyer (1939a) 26). The acropolis measured 14.3 ha, and on it was a building which Meyer identified as a military barracks. The city below the “Stadtberg” occupied 14.6 ha; no substantial remains are extant, but scattered remains seem to be of houses. See Meyer (1939a) 19–29; Papachatzis (1994) 265–66.

Head, *HN* 446 dates the first coinage of Alea to c.430; Babelon, *Traité* ii.3, 630 proposes 421. The legend abbreviates the ethnic *Ἀλεάτας* (Roy (1972a) 331) to ΑΛ, ΑΛΕ, ΑΛΕΑ; Lacroix (1968) 325 n. 4 cites the legend ΑΛΕΑ[Α]ΤΑΝ (C4 according to Jost (1985) 526). The types show Artemis (Babelon, *Traité* ii.3 nos. 946–49), Athena (ibid. no. 950), Herakles (ibid. no. 951) and Helios (Lacroix (1968) 325 n. 4). Both bronze and silver coins are known. Denominations are triobol (Babelon, *Traité* ii.3 no. 951), obol (ibid. no. 946), and tritartemorion (ibid. no. 947). *SNG Cap.* Argolis 213–14.

Aleean coins seem to indicate cults of Athena Alea and Artemis (Jost (1985) 107–9). Alea may have consulted the oracle at Delphi before 300 (cf. Paus. 8.23.1 with Fontenrose (1978) 353); *IvO* 295 (c.275–250) is probably an Aleean dedication, and *IvO* 30 (C5s–C4f), although an Aleean document (cf. Nielsen (1996a) 118), was put up at Olympia.

266. *Alipheira* (Alipheireus) Map 58. Lat. 37.35, long. 21.50. Size of territory: 2–3. Type: C. The toponym is Ἀλιφειρεύς, ἦ (Polyb. 4.78.3; SEG 25 448.15 (C5s)), or Ἀλιφήρα (Paus. 8.27.4). The city-ethnic is Ἀλιφειρείς (Polyb. 4.77.10; SEG 25 449.2 (C2)) or Ἀλιφειρεύς (CIG 1936 (Hell.); Paus. 8.27.7; see Orlando (1967–68) 9–10.

Alipheira is well attested only in Hellenistic sources, where it is called a *polis* both in the urban sense (Polyb. 4.78.11 (2119)) and in the political sense (SEG 25 447.9 (C3)). Since Alipheira certainly existed before C3 (*infra*), the city may possibly have been a *polis*.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in SEG 25 449 (C2f) and externally in Polyb. 4.77.10 and *IvO* 48 (C2); the external individual use is found in CIG 1936 (Hell.).

The territory covered c.100 km²; SEG 25 449 (C2f) has been interpreted as a demarcation of the border of Alipheira.

According to Paus. 8.27.4, Alipheira was in 371 a part of the tribal state of the Kynourians (Nielsen (1996a) 132–34, 140–41), and it can be inferred from a combination of *IG* v.2 1.40 (3605) and Paus. 8.27.4 (3771) (with Nielsen (1996d) 132–34) that the city was a member of the Arkadian Confederacy. Membership of the Peloponnesian League may also be assumed (Nielsen (1996c) 87).

According to Paus. 8.27.4, Alipheira was one of the cities that the Arkadian Confederacy had voted to incorporate into Megalopolis (no. 282); whether this decision was implemented is not certain. According to Paus. 8.26.5, a part of the population actually relocated to Megalopolis, but the city was not abandoned. In C3 Alipheira was, at least sometimes, controlled by Megalopolis (Polyb. 4.77.10); but it also appears as a *polis* (SEG 25 447).

Alipheira was centred on a hill rising to 686 m above sea level. The hill measures 800 × 65 m and was fortified before 370 (Orlando (1967–68) 32). The city proper seems to have lain outside these walls and to have occupied the area

---

⁵ Most of the territorial sizes given in this Inventory are based on the map in Jost (1985); on this map Jost has indicated the probable borders of the major *poleis*. She comments: “Il va de soi que les limites . . . sont approximatives: elles marquent la zone frontalière dont seuls quelques points . . . sont assurés.” It may be added that these points are most often known from Pausanias, and so the borders indicated reflect the Roman period. In general, there is no way of knowing whether this corresponds to Archaic and Classical conditions, a problem further complicated by the fact that we do have information which indicates that borders could fluctuate even within the Archaic and Classical periods (Nielsen (1996b) 181). So the territorial sizes given here are merely educated guesses.
north-east of the acropolis (ibid. 41). The lower city too was fortified (Pritchett (1989) 44, no dates). In the eastern part of the acropolis was the sanctuary of Athena, with a temple constructed c.500–490; votives go back to C6th (lost (1985) 80). In addition to the temple, the sanctuary included a colossal statue of Athena dating to C5 (ibid. 81). In the north-western part of the hill was a sanctuary of Asklepios with a C4th temple (ibid. 81).

267. Asea (Aseates) Map 58. Lat. 37.25, long. 22.20. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Ἀσεά, Ἱ (Xen. Hell. 6.5.15); in the great Delphic catalogue of theorodokoi (c.230–210) we find the entry ἐν Ἀσέωι, but this form is unique (BCH 45 (1921) 111.9). The city-ethnic is ἈΣΕΑΤΑΝ on the Achaian federal bronze coinage of the city (Head, HN² 418 (c.1905)); this enables us to emend the ἀθεᾶται/ἀσθεᾶται of the MSS at Xen. Hell. 7.5.5 to Ἀσάεται.

Asea is classified as a polis in the territorial sense (with the political sense as a possible connotation) at Xen. Hell. 7.5.5, a passage that also provides an instance of the external collective use of the city-ethnic. Strabo 8.3.12 classifies Asea as a κώμη 7ής Μεγαλοπολιτίδος, but the reference is to C1.

The territory is implicitly referred to at Xen. Hell. 7.5.5 as polis (Nielsen (1996c) 72–73). The size of the territory has been estimated at c.60 km² by Forsén and Forsén (1997) 175. The city of Asea was not the only place of habitation: Forsén and Forsén (1997) 173 report that they have found between twenty and thirty sites dating from the Archaic to the Hellenistic periods in the chora. Some of these were presumably isolated farmsteads, but at least four seem to have been small villages connected with sanctuaries: one is situated only 1.5 km from the Vigla temple, while another was probably situated close to a temple of Athena of which Forsén and Forsén have found scattered architectural remains dating to C4; in addition, two other sites may have been villages and one of these was possibly also connected with a sanctuary (Forsén and Forsén (1997) 172–74).

Two important temples have been excavated in the territory of Asea. (a) At Vigla, on the border with Pallantion (no. 289) (Forsén and Forsén (1997) 170), is a temple dedicated to Athena and Poseidon; it is dated to C6 (Østby (1995b) 348–50). This temple was preceded by a smaller temple built of wood and clay c.630–620 (Voyatzis (1990) 34). (b) At Ag. Elias, on the border with (presumably) Peraithae, a large temple dates from c.500 (Forsén et al. (1999)).

Forsén and Forsén (1997) 176 estimate that the urban population could have been max. 2,000–3,000. The total population of the polis is estimated at 2,500–3,500 at the most. It is impossible to give any estimate of the number of adult male citizens.

Asea was a Mainalian city (Paus. 8.27.3; Nielsen (1996a) 132–34). Membership of the Arkadian Confederacy can be assumed, both on the basis of Xen. Hell. 6.5.11, where the city is described as the rallying place of the federal army in 370, and because the Mainalians as such were members of the Confederacy (IG v.2 1.16 (360s)); membership of the Peloponnesian League may also be assumed, probably mediated by the Mainalian tribal state (Nielsen (1996c) 87, 100).

According to Paus. 8.27.3, Asea was among the communities that the Arkadian Confederacy voted to relocate to Megalopolis (no. 282); however, it is not known whether this relocation was ever wholly or partly carried out (Moggi (1974) 87–88).

Asea was centred on a fortified acropolis rising to 54 m and measuring 240 × 120 m. The fortification may be C4th (Forsén and Forsén (1997) 169; Forsén et al. (2002) 96); Forsén et al. (2002) 100 suggest that a temple was erected on the acropolis during the late Archaic–Classical (?) period. The lower city was fortified too, but the wall here seems to be later than the acropolis wall, probably C3 (Forsén et al. (2002) 96; Forsén and Forsén (1997) 167–68; Holmberg (1944) 132–42); it probably enclosed all of the lower city. Forsén and Forsén (1997) 166–67 and Forsén et al. (2002) 100–2 report that they found Archaic and Classical pottery around the acropolis, and that the area yielding finds was at least 13 ha, but perhaps twice as large (the eastern area of the site having been covered with alluvium brought down by the river Alpheios). The area inside the lower wall was built up for habitation; some of the houses contained Hellenistic finds, but others contained nothing and may possibly be older (Forsén and Forsén (1997) 169).

268. Dipaia (Dipaeus) Map 58. Not securely located, but it is clear from Paus. 8.30.1 that Dipaia must have been situated in the upper Helisson valley; it is probably to be identified with the ancient remains near Davia (Jost (1973) pl. 9.1–3; Pikoulas (1992–93) 204; Pikoulas (1999c) 126); lat. 37.20, long. 22.15. Size of territory: ? Type: B. The toponym is the plural of the ethnic at Hdt. 9.35.2 (ἐν Δίσπασεύς; cf. the comment by Steph. Byz. 23.14–15), but at Isoc. 6.99 we find Δίπαια, Ἱ. The city-ethnic is ΔΙΣΠΑΣΕΥΣ in SEG 23 179 (C4th); at Paus. 6.7.9 ΔΙΣΠΑΣΕΥΣ is an emendation of ΔΙΣΠΑΣΕΥŚ; Paus. 8.30.1 has ΔΙΣΠΑΣΕΥΣ, and the C2 coinage of the city uses the legend ΔΙΠΑΙΑΙΩΝ (Head, HN² 418).

At 8.27.3 (1371) Pausanias retrospectively lists Dipaia as a polis, and at 3.11.7 (rC5f) it is classified as a polisma. The
collective use of the ethnic is attested externally in Hdt. 9.35.2 and on SEG 23.179 (C4f); the individual use of the ethnic is attested externally at Paus. 6.7.9 (1440) (Olympionikai 314).

The name of the territory is unknown; Paus. 8.30.1 refers to it, contemporaneously, as ἦ Διασπεέων χώρα. In the 460s an apparently major battle was fought near Dipaia between Sparta (no. 345) and an Arkadian alliance (Hdt. 9.35.2; Isoc. 6.99).

A C4f inscription (SEG 23.179) mentions the Διασπεές; the nature of the inscription is not clear, but Braden (1966) 321 thinks that it is a fragment of a record of a judgment by a foreign board of arbitration in a dispute involving the city of Dipaia. Dipaia was a Mainalian city (Paus. 3.11.7, 6.7.9, 8.27.3; for the last passage, see Nielsen (1996a) 132–34), but this is the only explicitly attested membership of a larger organisation; however, membership of the Arkadian Confederacy can be inferred from a combination of Paus. 8.27.3 (1271) and IG V2.1.16 (360; see further Nielsen (1996c) 95–96, 100–1), and membership of the Peloponnesian League may be assumed (ibid. 87). According to Paus. 8.27.3 (1371), Dipaia was among the communities that the Arkadian Confederacy voted to relocate to Megalopolis (no. 282); however, it is unknown whether this decision was implemented (Moggi (1974) 83–84).

If Dipaia is to be identified with the remains at Davia (supra), then the city was centred on a fortified acropolis.

In C5m, c.440 according to Olympionikai 314, Dipaia produced an Olympic victor.

269. Euaimon (Euaimnios) Unlocated (but see Howell (1970) 82). Size of territory: ? Type: B. The toponym is Εὐαίμων (IG V2.343 = IPArk no. 15.7, 49–50 (C4m); Steph. Byz. 283.14). The city-ethnic is Εὐαίμινος (IG V2.343 = IPArk no. 15.3 (C4m)).

No Archaic or Classical source describes Euaimon as a polis, though Theopomp. fr. 61 (= Steph. Byz. 283.14–15) may have done so (Whitehead (1994) 119; Nielsen (1996c) 71); IG V2.343 = IPArk no. 15 is a treaty between Euaimon and Orchomenos (no. 286), concluded ἐπὶ τοῖς ἹσαΦοῖς καὶ τοῖς Ἰμοῖοις (II. 4–6), and the nature of the document thus suggests that Euaimon was a polis; Dubois (1986) 148, 159 proposes to restore ἰν πόλι τῇ κατέραι in II. 56–57. The same treaty uses the collective ethnic to refer to the community of Euaimon (2–3, 53–54, 75–76, 83).

The treaty IPArk no. 15.2 describes itself as an agreement of συνφοικία and provides for the inclusion of the Euaiminians into the Orchomenian citizen body (IPArk p. 135); however, Euaimon probably continued to exist (cf. Steph. Byz. 283.14–15; Dušanić (1978) 338; Nielsen (1996c) 71), and may thereafter have been a dependent polis of Orchomenos.

In IPArk no. 15.6–7, τὰ δὲ ιερὰ τὰ ἐν Εὐαίμονι is presumably a reference to communal cults in Euaimon which were to be preserved after the agreement, but the local pantheon is otherwise unknown (Jost (1985) 115, 120).

270. Eutaia Map 58. Lat. 37.20, long. 22.20. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A. The MSS of Xen. Hell. (at 6.5.12, 21) vary between Εὐταία, Εὐγαία and Εὐγύεα, ἦ (Tuplin (1986) 27–28); since later sources such as Paus. 8.27.3 and Steph. Byz. 287.19 use the τ- form, this form has become customary in scholarly literature.

At Hell. 6.5.12 Xenophon uses polis three times about Eutaia, presumably primarily in the sense of town, although the meaning “territory” may be a connotation in the phrase πόλιν ὅµορον οὖσαν and “political community” in ὥς ἡδίκησε τὴν πόλιν.

The name of the territory is unknown, but the territory is probably referred to as polis by Xen. Hell. 6.5.12. To the south Eutaia bordered on Lakonia (Xen. Hell. 6.5.12).

Eutaia was a Mainalian city (Paus. 8.27.3; Nielsen (1996a) 132–34). Membership of the Arkadian Confederacy is proved by Xen. Hell. 6.5.12; membership was probably mediated by the tribal state of the Mainalians (Nielsen (1996c) 95). Membership of the Peloponnesian League may be assumed (ibid. 87).

According to Paus. 8.27.3, Eutaia was among the communities that the Arkadian Confederacy voted to relocate to Megalopolis (no. 282). It is unknown whether the relocation was ever carried out: the site seems not to have been excavated. Xen. Hell. 6.5.12 mentions οἰκίαι, and Loring (1895) 50 as well as Pikoulas (1988) report numerous antiquities at Lianos; Pikoulas (1988) reports an abundance of sherds and minor architectural fragments in the fields.

At Hell. 6.5.12 Xenophon mentions a τείχος. The reference may be to the poor fortification found on the hill of Agios Konstantinos which overlooks the site (Pikoulas (1988) 75). If so, the lower city proper was possibly unfortified.
271. Gortys (Kortynios)  Map 58. Lat. 37.30, long. 22.20. Size of territory: probably 2 or 3. Type: B. The toponym is Κόρτυς, Ἰ (Hsch. s.v Κορτύνιος) or Γόρτυς, -ους, Ἰ (Pl. Leg. 708A); Paus. 5.7.1 and Hsch. s.v. Ἐκαστομβαίος have Γόρτυνα, -ης, Ἰ. The city-ethnic is Κορτύνιος (Syll. 49 (C5f)); KΟΡΤΥΝΕΩΝ from Ἀρχαιότερα πόλις is Paus. 282). It is unknown whether this decision was implemented, and the site seems a C5f dedication to Asklepios and contains a stoa of, possibly, C5l–C5e (Dubois (1986) 287).

The only source that classifies Gortys as a polis is Paus. 8.27.4 (1371) and 281. (κόμη τά ἐπ’ ἐμοῦ, τά δὲ ἐτι ἀρχαιότερα πόλις), but the external collective use of the city-ethnic is found on a C5f dedication of spoils at Delphi (Syll. 49). The ethnic is attested as a personal name already in C6 (Nielsen (1996a) 122).

Gortys was a Kynourian community (Paus. 8.27.4; Nielsen (1996a) 132–34). Membership of the Peloponnesian League can be assumed (Nielsen (1996e) 87); membership of the Arkadian Confederacy is proved by a combination of IG v.2.1.40 (360s) and Paus. 8.27.4 (Nielsen (1996a) 132–34). According to Paus. 8.27.4, Gortys was among the communities that the Arkadian Confederacy voted to relocate to Megalopolis (no. 282). It is, however, unknown whether this decision was implemented, and the site seems not to have been abandoned (Moggi (1974) 91–92).

C5f military activity by Gortys can be inferred from Syll. 49 (Κορτύνιοι δεκάταν πολέµιον), a dedication of spoils set up at Delphi.

The site of Gortys is situated on the western bank of the river Lousios/Gortynios near the modern village of Atsicholo. It is dominated by two sanctuaries: an upper sanctuary with a fortified “acropolis” and a lower sanctuary. The upper sanctuary was dedicated to Asklepios and contains a C4e stoa (Jost (1985) 204), a C5l–C4e gateway (ibid.), and a C5l–C4e stoa of Asklepios (ibid.). The acropolis measures 425 × 160/100 m. The fortifications were constructed entirely in local stone, at least some of which was quarried on the acropolis itself (Martin (1947–48) 112). In general, archaeology points to a date after 370 for the fortifications. Martin (1947–48) 139 believes that the fortifications were erected by Megalopolis/the Arkadian Confederacy as a military outpost protecting Megalopolitan territory; a large number of C4 Arkadian federal coins have been found on the acropolis (ibid.), pointing to a C4m date for the fortifications. Furthermore, there are no remains on the acropolis linking the fortifications to the city of Gortys (Martin (1947–48) 142). If Martin is right, this is not really the acropolis of Gortys, but a military fort; this interpretation is accepted by Jost (1999) 197, but the fortification may also have served the local population, turning Gortys into a settlement of the ville acropole type described by Jost (1999) 193–98. The lower sanctuary lay 500 m north of the acropolis, and the residential area was presumably situated between the two sanctuaries (BCH 79 (1955) 33); at least one house excavated there dates to C4 (BCH 80 (1956) 402), but in contrast to the sanctuaries, the city proper is not well known, and no sketch of it can be given (for a plan, see Papachatzis (1994) 298). The lower sanctuary was likewise dedicated to Asklepios and contains a stoa of, possibly, C4 (BCH 79 (1955) 340), a C4s bath (Jost (1985) 205) and a large temple, laid out c.370 but apparently never finished (ibid. 206–7). There is no obvious explanation for the existence of two Asklepieia, and apart from Asklepios the local pantheon is not well known (ibid. 202–3, 205).

272. Halous  Map 58. Lat. 37.45, long. 22.00. Size of territory: probably 2 or 3. Type: C. The toponym is Ἀλοῦς (‐οῦσος), ὄ (Paus. 8.25.2; the entry ἔν ἥλιος in the Delphic catalogue of theorodokoi of C5l–C4e (ed. by Daux in REG 62 (1949) p. 6 l. 10) may refer to this site, using an older form of the toponym (Daux ad loc. and Meyer (1957a) 86).

The city desires inclusion in this Inventory only because it may have had a Delphic theorodokos in C5l–C4e (supra), and thus was possibly a polis (Perlman (1995) 116, 121, 135). Meyer (1939a) 78–83 identified Halous with the Palaiokastro at Syriamou, south-west of Thaliades (no. 299). The site consists of a small walled hill with the habitation area, unwatched, below. The wall runs for 0.640 m and encloses an area of 1.7 ha; it dates from C4, according to Meyer; sherds and tiles from the walled area date to the Classical and Hellenistic periods. In the habitation area outside the wall Meyer made “massenhaften Ziegel- und Scherbefunde”. The inhabited area was considerable, according to Meyer, but he does not estimate the size of the city proper.

273. Helisson (Heliswasiou)  Map 58 (not precisely located; cf. Bölte (1931a); Pikoulas (1992–93) 204, (1999c) 125–26). Lat. 37.35, long. 22.15. Size of territory: probably 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is Ἑλισσόντι in SEG 37 340.9–10 (C4f), which points to the nominative Ἑλισσ(α)οῦς or Ἑλίσσ(α)οῦς (< Ἑλίσσας>), ὄ, for which see te Riele (1987) 171–72 and Dubois (1988) 289; Paus. 8.27.3 (1371) has Ἑλισσόνων and Diod. 16.39.5 (1352) Ἑλίσσ(α)οῦς. The city-ethnic is Ἑλισσάσιος in SEG 37 340; it is later written Ἑλαισάσιος (IG I3.42.2, 16–17 (c.300); Polyb. 11.11.6); see Dubois (1988) 288.

Helisson is called polis in the urban sense by SEG 37 340.6–7 (C4f) and Diod. 16.39.5 (1352), and in the political
The territory referred to as χώρα by SEG 37 340.5 (C4f) and Polyb. 11.11.6

The city was a Mainalian city (Paus. 8.27.3 (1371); Nielsen (1996a) 132–34), and it can be inferred from a combination of IG v.2 1.16 (3608) and Paus. 8.27.3 (1371) (cf. Nielsen (1996a) 132–34) that the city was a member of the Arkadian Confederacy. Membership of the Peloponnesian League may be assumed (Nielsen (1996c) 87).

In C4f, Helisson concluded a treaty with Mantinea (no. 281) (SEG 37 340), whereby all citizens of Helisson became Mantinean citizens; the city of Helisson was left in existence as a κώµη of Mantinea, but continued to be a polis none the less (SEG 37 340.6–7); it is debatable whether Helisson was to survive as a polis merely in the urban sense (so Rhodes (1995) 97), or whether the city was constituted as a dependent polis within the Mantinike (so Hansen (1995a) 39, (1995b) 73–74; Nielsen (1996c) 67–70). The treaty does not call itself a sympoliteia, but simply a σύνθεσις (SEG 37 340.2); it has, however, become customary to refer to the agreement as a sympoliteia, for which concept see Hansen (1995b) 56. After the treaty, Helisson—like the other dependencies of Mantinea—was entitled to send a thearos to the Mantinian board of thearoi (8–9: thearón ὡναι εξ’Ελισόν/τι γεγονέται κατάπερ ες ταῖς ἄλλαις πόλισις.

According to Paus. 8.27.3 (1371), Helisson was among the communities that the Arkadian Confederacy voted to relocate to Megalopolis (no. 282); it is not known, however, whether this decision was implemented, and the city still existed in 352, when it was captured and pillaged by the Spartans (Diod. 16.69.5).

No theorodokos is attested for Helisson, but SEG 37 340.9–10: τὰς θεαρίας δέκα τὰ πάσαρα suggests that the city was connected to some system of theorodokia. By the treaty SEG 37 340 (C4f), Helisson adopted the Mantinean constitution and thus became a democracy (Nielsen (1996c) 69–70); it is, however, clear from the inscription (which among other things mentions a body of local laws, νοµοί (l. 15)) that Helisson had its own constitution before the agreement, although what form it took is unknown. The treaty is the only surviving public enactment of Helisson; at l. 17 it refers to a local board of ἐπιµεληταί (te Riele (1987) 180; Nielsen (1996a) 160 n. 56).

The local pantheon is unknown, but in SEG 37 340.9–10 τὰς θυσίας . . . τὰς ἐν Ἑλισόν/τι is presumably a reference to local communal cults which were to be preserved after the unification of Helisson and Mantinea. For a C4 hero relief from Helisson, see Damaskos (1990–91).

274. Heraia (Heraeus) — Map 58. Lat. 37.35, long. 21.50. Size of territory: 4. Type: A. The toponym is Ηερησία in REG 62 (1949) p. 6 ll. 11–12 (C3f–C4f); 'Ἡραία, η is first mentioned in Xen. Hell. 2.30.9, 6.5.22; Ps.-Skylax 44; and IPArk no. 23.7 (C3). The city-ethnic is Έρησεις in SEG 11 1045 (c.500); IPArk no. 15.19 (C4m) and Xen. Hell. 6.5.11 have 'Ἡραίες; Thuc. 5.67.1 and Xen. Hell. 6.5.22 have 'Ἡραίες; coins have ΗΡΑΕΩΝ (Babelon, Traité ii.3 no. 1015).

Heraia is listed as the third toponym after the heading πόλεις αἱ μεγάλαι αἵδε (where polis is used in the urban sense) in Ps.-Skylax 44; at Xen. Hell. 3.2.30 it is implicitly described as a polis in the urban and territorial senses combined (for the idiom, cf. Diod. 2.43.6 and see Smyth, Greek Grammar §1096); at Arist. Pol. 1303a15–16 there is a reference to a change of politeia in Heraia, in a passage (1302a40, 1303a15) where Heraia is listed as the fourth of six examples of the observation that a polis (in the political sense) consists of sometimes disproportionate parts. At Paus. 8.26.1 there is a reference to a temple of Dionysos Polites, but its date is unknown.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is found internally on coins (Babelon, Traité ii.3 no. 1015), and externally in SEG 11 1045 (c.500); Thuc. 5.67.1, IPArk no. 15.19 (C4m); and Xen. Hell. 6.5.11. The individual use is found externally on IG 11 ii 2327 (lC6) and IG iv.2.1 96.35 (C3f).

Xen. Hell. 6.5.22 (αὐτάλαπτονται (sc. the Arkadian federal troops) ἐκ τῆς 'Ἡραίες) suggests that the toponym could designate the territory as well as the city, since it is a reasonable inference from the context that the federal troops were operating not in the city, but in the territory of Heraia (so Bölte (1913b) 415). Its size was c.265 km². Bölte (1913b) estimated the citizen population at min. 2,000.

According to Strabo 8.3.2, Heraia was synoecised (at an unknown date: Bergese (1985)) from nine δήµιοι. These demes were perhaps minor settlements in the territory. Their identity is unknown, but Bölte (1913b) 412 counted Melainai and Boughagion among them. A site which he identified with Boughagion is described by Meyer (1939a) 103–6, but Jost (1985) 76–77 rejects the identification of this site with Boughagion. The impressive fortifications of the site and its acropolis are Hellenistic (Meyer (1939a) 106; Jost (1985) 76 states that they are Classical), but large quantities of Archaic and Classical sherds were found at the site (Meyer (1939a) 102), which perhaps had a temple on the acropolis.
(ibid. 106). Meyer (1957b) 20 identified another site, Loutra Ireas, near Betsi as another Heraian “Dorf”.

A number of fortresses in the territory are known; one at Ochthia on the border with Thelphousa (no. 300) is described by Meyer (1939a) 100–1: sherds at the site go back to the Archaic period. Near Paloumba is another fortified site (including a temple) with sherds going back to the Archaic period, for which see Meyer (1939a) 102 and Pikoulas (1999a) 304–5 (suggesting that this may be Melainai).

The symmachy treaty ML 17 (c.500) was traditionally thought of as concluded between Elis (no. 251) and Heraia; however, Dubois (1985) correctly pointed out that the form 'Εραίοι, which should probably be thought of as an otherwise unknown minor community in Eleia (see Ewaoioi (no. 253)).

Heraea fought with Sparta (no. 345) at Mantinea in 418 (Thuc. 5.67.1), and was thus a member of the Peloponnesian League. The city was loyal to Sparta even after Leuktra (Xen. Hell. 6.5.11), although it eventually joined the Arkadian Confederacy (IG v.2.1.58 (360s)). Heraean military activity is attested, in addition to Thuc. 5.67.1, by Xen. Hell. 6.5.11 and SEG 11 1045 (c.500), a dedication of spoils taken from the Heraeans and set up by an unknown Arkadian community.

IPArk no. 15.19 (a treaty of sympoliteia between Euaimon (no. 269) and Orchomenos (no. 286)) stipulates that the Heraeans are to act as arbiters in case of conflicts over property rights. A Delphic theorodokos resided in Heraea in C51–C46 (REG 62 (1949) p. 6 ll. 11–12). Nothing is known about the form of constitution at Heraea, but from the passage at Arist. Pol. 1303v15–16 it can be inferred that at some point there was a constitutional reform there whereby the procedure for the appointment of magistrates was changed from election to sortition. Bölte (1913b) 415 dates the reform to 370.

At Diod. 15.40.2 (1375) a Heraea is described as a χώριον δοξαρός; if this is a reference to this city (which has been disputed; cf. Stylianou (1998) ad loc.), it may mean that the city was fortified (Bölte (1913b) 414): early travellers saw the remains of well-built walls, but these may have been Hellenistic (ibid. 408 and 415). The city of Heraea seems to have occupied a large area (Jost (1985) 73), but since the site has not been systematically investigated, no description of the urban layout is possible (Philadelphus (1931–32) reviews the remains at Heraea).

Heraean coinage began c.510; the earliest coins are hemidrachms and obols: obv. head of Hera; rev. E, EP, EPA or EPAI; see R. T. Williams (1970) and SNG Cop. Argolis 231–33. By C51–C4 the city struck in silver (SNG Cop. Argolis 234–36) and possibly even in iron (for which see Köhler (1882a)), and by C4 in bronze (SNG Cop. Argolis 236–41). Attested denominations are triobol, diobol, trihemibol, obol and hemiobol. The legends are E, EP, EPA, EPAI, H, HP, ΗΡΑΕΩΝ (Head, HN2 448; Babelon, Traité ii.1 nos. 1211–23 and ii.3 nos. 1000–15). The most common types depict female deities (Artemis and Athena), but Pan is found too (Imhoof-Blumer and Gardner (1964) 103).

The pantheon of Heraea is discussed by Jost (1985) 70–77. Heraeans achieved two Olympic victories in C6 (Olympionikai 132, 138) and six in C5 (Olympionikai 189, 200, 205, 313, 317, 344).

275. Kaphy(i)a (Kaphyieus) Map 58. Lat. 37.45, long. 22.15. Size of territory: 4. Type: B. The toponym is Καφύαι, ai in IG iv2.1.122 (C4); it is Καφήαι in Michel 489 (C4) and Theophr. Hist. pl. 4.132. The city-ethnic is Καφύεις in F.Delphes 111.4 191 (C5f) and CID 11 12.1.2 (341/40); Καφύεις is found in IG 11 66c (c.400); cf. Roy (1972a) 333–34.

There is no certain attestation of polis in any Archaic or Classical source: in Theopomp. fr. 77.3 πόλις probably does not stem from Theopompos. The earliest source that classifies Kaphy(i)a as a polis is Staatsverträge 476.25, 92 (c.265).

The city-ethnic is found externally in the collective use in F.Delphes 111.4 191 (C5f), and in the individual use in IG 11 66c (c.400) and CID 11 12.1.2 (341/40).


Kaphy(i)a was a member of the revived Peloponnesian League of King Areus of Sparta (no. 345) for the Chremonidean War (Staatsverträge 476.25), but membership of the early Peloponnesian League may be assumed as well (Nielsen (1996c) 87). Membership of the Arkadian Confederacy is not explicitly attested, but may be assumed (ibid. 95).

Kaphy(i)an military activity can be inferred from F.Delphes 111.4 191 (C5f), a dedication of spoils taken TON [ΠΟI]ΑΕΜΙΟΝ and set up at Delphi. A citizen of Kaphyiai was Athenian proxenos in C51 and had the grant renewed after the fall of the Thirty (IG 11 66c with Walbank (1978) 151–53).

The city of Kaphy(i)a was, like Mantinea (no. 281), situated in a plain and not centred on an acropolis (Pritchett
Kleitor (Kleitorios) Map 58. Lat. 37.55, long. 22.05. Size of territory: 5. Type: A. The toponym is found as [Kleito] in IG IV 510 (C5), as Kleitωρ, cf in Pind. Nem. 10.47; SEG 20 716 (C4), and as Kleitōros in SEG 23 189 (c.330). The city-ethnic is Kleitōριος (Paus. 5.23.7; rC6s; Maddoli 1992 260; Syll.3 291 (332)) or Kleitōριος (Xen. Hell. 5.4.36; IG v.2.1.52 (360s)), abbreviated to KAETO on C5 coins (Head, HN2 446).

No Archaic or Classical source explicitly calls Kleitor a polis, but at Xen. Hell. 5.4.37 the city is referred to as a polis in the political sense.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on C5 coins (Head, HN2 446) and externally in Paus. 5.23.7 (rC6s) (cf. Maddoli 1992 260); IG v.2.1.52 (360s); and Xen. Hell. 5.4.36. The individual use is attested externally in IV O 167 (C4f) and CID 11 51.7 (C4m).

The name of the territory was Kleitoria (Theophr. Hist. pl. 9.15.6; Polyb. 4.11.2). Pausanias mentions a number of sites inside the territory: Leukasion, Mesoboa, Nasoi, Oryx, Halous (no. 272), Thaliades (no. 299) (8.23.8–24.3), Soron, Paion (no. 288), Seirai, Argeath, Lykountes and Skotane (cf. Jost 1985 42–46). Of these, Paion and Thaliades were probably, and Halous possibly, poleis at some time (see the respective entries); but whether they were dependent poleis within Kleitorian territory in the Archaic and Classical periods is unknown, though not impossible. About the other toponyms, nothing is known. On the basis of the map in Jost (1985), the size of the territory can be estimated at c.625 km², but this includes Lousoi (no. 279), Paion, Thaliades and Halous: it is unknown whether all of these ever formed part of Kleitor prior to the Roman era. For two C4s fortresses, see Pikoulas (1999b) 144–53.

Kleitor was almost certainly an Azanian community (K. Tausend 1993) 15); however, if the Azanians ever formed a political unit, this had broken up before C5 (Roy 1972b) 44, (1996) 110; Nielsen (1996a) 139). Kleitor may just possibly have headed a small hegemonic league in northern Arkadia (Nielsen 1996c) 86–87). The city was a member of the Peloponnesian League (Xen. Hell. 5.4.36–37) before the foundation of the Arkadian Confederacy of which it was a member (IG v.2.1.52 (360s)), and probably a leading one since it, like Mantinea (no. 281) and Tegea (no. 297), provided two of the ten oecists who founded Megalopolis (no. 282) (Paus. 8.27.2 (1371)).

C6s military activity can be inferred from Paus. 5.23.2 (Maddoli 1992 260), referring to spoils dedicated at Olympia and, according to the accompanying epigram, taken by the Kleitorians πολλὰν ἐκ πολίων χερτὶ βιασσάµενοι. At Hell. 5.4.36 Xenophon has a brief reference to a war in 379 between Kleitor and Orchomenos (no. 286) (cf. Roy 1972c); for this war the Kleitorians had hired mercenaries (ibid.), but it is not clear whether they conducted the war exclusively with mercenaries. Xen. Hell. 5.4.37 refers to the ἄρχων τῶν παρὰ τοῖς Κλητόριοις ἥλιοι, but it is not clear whether he was a citizen or a mercenary as well.

Xen. Hell. 5.4.36 mentions negotiations between Sparta (no. 345) and Kleitor, and SEG 20 716.14–15 refers to an embassy which travelled from Kyrene (no. 1028) to Kleitor; a Kleitorian was appointed Delphic proxoς in 332 (Syll.3 291), and IG v.2.368 is a long C3e catalogue of proxoς of Kleitor. IPArk no. 30, a sacred law of c.525, may belong to Kleitor. C.330 an Argive theorodokos resided at Kleitor (SEG 23 189) 11.22). In C4f the constitution was presumably democratic (Roy 1972e 79). SEG 20 716.18–19 (C4m) mentions a sentence of exile passed by the Kleitorians.

Like Mantinea, Kleitor was situated in a plain and had no acropolis (Jost 1985 40; Winter 1989) 198 with fig. 3). The Hellenistic fortification wall is 2,500 m long and encloses an area of 58 ha (Petritaki 1996 83–84). It is built of stone throughout (Winter 1989) 198); it is “among the most advanced anywhere in the Peloponnes”, and so Winter (1989) 199 dates it to c.300. Inside the walled area are numerous ancient remains, and a theatre is discernible (Petritaki 1996 85; cf. TGR ii. 237); ceramic evidence suggests that the earliest phases of the construction may go back to C4 (Petritaki 2001). Outside the wall are late Archaic and Classical graves (Petritaki 1996) 84).

According to Head, HN2 446, minting at Kleitor began c.C5m; Babelon, Traité ii.1. 877–88 dates its start somewhat earlier. The city struck in both silver (SNG Cop. Argolis 217–25) and bronze (from C4, SNG Cop. Argolis 226–30). Known denominations are triobol, obol, hemiobol and possibly tetartemorion (SNG Cop. Argolis 218). Recurrent
types show Athena, horses and Helios (cf. Lacroix (1968)). Legends are ΚΑ, ΚΛΗ, ΚΑΕΤΟ.

The Kleitorian pantheon is imperfectly known; Athena Koria was probably the most important divinity (Jost (1985) 41–42). Prestigious games were celebrated at Kleitor (Pind. Nem. 10.47; Lazzarini (1976) no. 865 (C5f)).

Delphic promanteia is granted to a Kleitorian by Syll.3 291 (332). Two Olympic victors from the city are on record, in 384 (Olympionikai 395) and in 376 (Olympionikai 406). In C6s (Paus. 5.23.7; for which see Maddoli (1992) 260), the city set up a dedication of spoils at Olympia.

277. Koila Unlocated (Meyer (1957a) 86). Size of territory: ? Type: C. The toponym is Koila in REG 62 (1949) p. 6 ll. 4–5 (C5l–Cae); an ethnic is not attested. Koila deserves inclusion in this Inventory solely because it may have had a Delphic thevordokos in C5l–Cae (REG 62 (1949) p. 6 ll. 4–5), and thus was possibly a polis (Perlman (1995) 116, 121, 135).

278. Kynaitha (Kynaithaia) Map. 58. Lat. 38.00, long. 22.05. Size of territory: 3. Type: C. The toponym is Kynaitha, -yi, ἕ (Polyb. 4.17.3, 9.17.1). The city-ethnic is Kynaithes (Aristox. fr. 135, Wehrli; Polyb. 4.16.11); Paus. 5.22.1 has Kynaithaëus, and Steph. Byz. 393.4 cites Kynaithaev in addition to the two forms listed here.

No Archaic or Classical source mentions Kynaitha, but Polybios at 4.16.11 calls it a polis in the political sense, and at 9.17.1 in the urban sense; at 4.17.10 he uses πατρίς, and at 17.11 πολιτεία. However, since there is a C4 occurrence of the city-ethnic in the external individual use (Aristox. fr. 135, Wehrli), the city must have existed in the Classical period and was possibly a polis (Nielsen (1996a) 131–32), as it certainly was in C3 (see, e.g., the description of a stasis given by Polyb. 4.17–18 and 9.17).

The name of the territory is unknown; at 4.17.5, Polybios terms it γῆ. It occupied c.125 km². There are no important remains in the territory (Jost (1985) 53), and the major part of the city itself is probably hidden beneath modern Kalavryta (Meyer (1939a) 107 and Howell (1970) 96; but see Petropoulos (1985) 65–66).

279. Lousoi (Louciatius) Map. 58. Lat. 38.00, long. 22.05. Size of territory: ? Type: B. The toponym is Lousoi in IG v.2 399 (C5e); Bacchyl. Ep. 11.96 has Λούσος, but this refers to a spring at the sanctuary of Artemis Hemera, and need not be the form behind the locative Lousoi found in IG v.2 394.132 (c.200); see Bölte (1927) 1891. Arist. Mir. ausc. 842a4 and IG v.1 1387.2 (C3) have Λουσοὶ, oí. Theophr. Hist. pl. 9.15.8, 16.8 has Σοῦσα, commonly taken to be a corruption of Λούσα, τά, see Bölte (1927) 1891. In C5, the ethnic is found both as Λουσαίτας (IG v.2 387.8 (C5s)) and as Λουσαίας (IG v.2 387.2 (C5s)); later only Λουσαίας is found, e.g. Xen. An. 7.6.40; Xen. An. 4.2.21, 7.11–12 has Λουσαεις (cf. Philostr. De gymnastica 12 (1708)); Paus. 8.18.8 uses Λουσαεις retrospectively (I6c).

Lousoi may be called a polis in a treaty dating to 500–475 (Nomima 1 no. 57, but cf. Dubois (1986) 220); a series of decrees dating to C4l onwards (IG v.2 388–96) frequently refers to the city as a polis in the political sense. The collective use of the city-ethnic is found internally in IG v.2 387 (C5s) and externally in IG v.2 358 (C3B) and Polyb. 4.18.11. The external individual use is found in Xen. An. 7.6.40 (cf. Philostr. De gymnastica 12 (1708) and Paus. 8.18.8 (1546)).

The name and size of the territory are unknown; IPArk no. 22 (C3) may be a delimitation of the border between Lousoi and Achaia Boula (no. 233). Stangl (1999b) estimates that the territory could support max. 1,000 individuals. For a Classical watch-tower in the territory, see K. Tausend (1999b) 306–7.

Lousoi was probably an Azanian community (K. Tausend (1993) 15); however, if the Azanians ever formed a political unit, this had broken up before C5 (Roy (1972b) 44, (1996) 110; Nielsen (1996a) 138). The city may have been party to a treaty as early as 500–475 (Nomima 1 no. 57, but cf. Dubois (1986) 220). A C6(?!) treaty with Stymphalos (no. 296) is preserved as IG v.2 358 (= Staatsverträge 560).

The earliest public enactment of Lousoi is a C3s list of proxenoi (IG v.2 387); IPArk no. 20, a sacred law of c.525, may belong to Lousoi. The decrees IG v.2 388–96 (C4l onwards) attest to an eponymous damiorgoi, a board of damiorgoi and an oikonomos. From the enactment formulas (e.g. ἐδοξεῖ ὁῖ ἥ ἀνεφέρει τῷ πατρὶ τῷ ὁμολογιατῷ (IG v.2 389), ἐδοξεῖ ὁῖ τοὶ δίκαιος (IG v.2 390)), the existence of an assembly may be inferred. An enktesis grant is found in IG v.2 394 (C3l). According to Paus. 8.18.8, Agesilas of Lousoi was victorious in the Pythian Games in 546; Eurybates of Lousoi is recorded as Olympic victor as early as 708 (Olympionikai 22); cf. S. Tausend (1999).

The acropolis of Lousoi is crowned by a C4 fortification wall, possibly of mudbrick on a polygonal stone foundation, and encloses an area of 0.3 ha (Petropoulos (1985) 67–73). South of the acropolis is the most important feature of the community of Lousoi: the sanctuary of Artemis Hemera (Jost (1985) 47), the pre-eminent divinity of the city. The temple is Hellenistic, but an older structure probably existed (Jost (1985) 49; Voyatzis (1990) 36). For a plan of the sanctuary, see Jost (1985) pl. 5.1. K. Tausend (1993) suggests
that the sanctuary at Lousoi was originally the cultic centre of the Azanian tribe, and owed its continual importance to this fact. The city lay c.1 km west of the sanctuary, at Phournoi, where there are numerous ancient remains (Jost (1985) 48). Private houses of C4–C3 have been found; see AR (1984–85) 23, (1985–86) 28, (1988–89) 33–34, and Mitsopoulos-Leon (1985) 96.

Apart from Artemis, no other divinities are securely attested at Lousoi (Jost (1985) 50) unless IPARk no. 20, mentioning Demeter, belongs to Lousoi. The city certainly celebrated games in honour of Artemis by C3 (IG v.1 1387) but may already have done so in C4 when the series of decrees granting theoedokia commences (IG v.2 388–96); cf. S. Tausend (1999) 372–73.

280. Lykosoura (Lykourasios) Map 58. Lat. 37.25, long. 22.00. Size of territory: ? Type: C. The toponym is Λυκόσουρα, ἦ (SEG 41 332.45 (c.230–190)); the MSS of Pausanias have different variants of this form (Meyer (1927) 2417–18). The city-ethnic is Λυκουράσιος in SEG 41 332.1 (c.230–190); Pausanias (e.g. 8.27.6 (rC371/70)) uses Λυκουράσιος (Meyer (1927) 2417).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is found internally in SEG 41 332.22–23 (c.230–190) and externally in Paus. 8.27.5 (rC371) (probably taken over from a historiographic source, see Nielsen (1996b) 296). No Archaic or Classical source mentions Lykosoura. At 8.27.4 (rC371), Pausanias states that Lykosoura was among the communities that the Arkadian Confederacy voted to relocate to Megalopolis (no. 282); however, he goes on to explain that this decision was not implemented (8.27.6), because the city resisted the relocation. Since the very first source that mentions Lykosoura (SEG 41 332 (c.230–190)) describes it as a polis (in the political sense, e.g. l. 3) and refers to the politai (II.7–8), it is possible that at the foundation of Megalopolis the city was left as a dependent polis inside Megalopolitan territory. Three other cities that resisted the synoecism (Lykaia, Trikolonoi and Trapezous (no. 303)) were either forced to relocate (Lykaia and Trikolonoi) or annihilated (Trapezous). It is thus rather remarkable that Lykosoura was spared, and we should look for an explanation. According to Paus. 8.27.6, the inhabitants of the city took shelter in the sanctuary of Despoina and were spared “Δήμητρος τε ἑνεκα καὶ Δεσποίνης”. The best explanation, then, seems to be that the city was allowed to exist in order to look after the important sanctuary at which it was situated (see also the judicious remarks by Meyer (1927) 2431 on the importance of the sanctuary in comparison with the city). And in fact, the decree SEG 41 332 (c.223–190) that shows Lykosoura acting as a polis concerns business related to the sanctuary. This points to the conclusion that after the synoecism Lykosoura was a dependent polis in charge of an important sanctuary inside the polis of Megalopolis (see Meyer (1927) 2431–32, suggesting that citizens of Lykosoura were also citizens of Megalopolis; cf. Jost (1999) 194).

Before the synoecism of Megalopolis, Lykosoura belonged to the Parrhasian tribe (Paus. 8.27.4; Nielsen (1996a) 132–34). In C5 the Parrhasians, and thus probably Lykosoura, were members of a local hegemonic league led by Mantinea (no. 281), for which see Nielsen (1996c) 79–86. Membership of the Peloponnesian League may be assumed; it was probably mediated by the Parrhasian tribe (Nielsen (1996c) 97, 89, 100–1). Membership of the Arkadian Confederacy through the Parrhasian tribe can be inferred from Paus. 8.27.4 (cf. Nielsen (1996c) 87, 89, 100–1).

The date at which the monumental buildings in the sanctuary at Lykosoura were erected is not certain, but may be C4 (Jost (1985) 178). Above the sanctuary is the walled acropolis of the city; Meyer (1927) 2426 dates the wall to C5–C4 (so PECS). Ancient temple remains were reused in a chapel (Meyer (1927) 2426). The city proper (termed ἄστυ by Paus. 8.27.5) was on the northern slope of the acropolis, west of the sanctuary; Meyer (1927) 2426 reports that “der ganze Nord- und Ostabhang ist mit antiken Trümmern übersät”.

281. Mantinea (Mantineus) Map 58. Lat. 37.35, long. 22.25. Size of territory: 4. Type: A. The epichoric and Doric form of the toponym is Μαντινέα, ἦ (SEG 37 340.6 (C4f); IG v.1 11124 (C5)); the regular Ionic form is Μαντίνη (Hom. Il. 2.607; Hdt. 4.161.2), but Hecat. fr. 123 (= Steph. Byz. 13.8) apparently used the synaloiphic form Μαντίνη. The Attic form is Μαντίνεια (Eupolis fr. 99.30, K&A; Thuc. 5.55.1). The city-ethnic is invariably Μαντινεύς (Hdt. 4.162.2; CId 11.11.24 (360)). For ethnic and toponym, see further Bölte (1930) 1290–92.

Mantinea is called polis in the urban sense at Thuc. 5.33.2, Ephor. fr. 79, Ps.-Skylax 44 (who lists it as the second toponym after the heading πόλεις αἱ μεγάλαι αἱδε, where polis is used in the urban sense), and at Isoc. Paneg. 126; in the territorial sense at Xen. Hell. 5.2.6; and in the political sense at Hdt. 7.202 and 204, Thuc. 5.47.3, and IG 12 835–17 (420). Hermippos apud Ath. 4.41 (rC6) uses πολιται (Hdt. 4.161.2 (rC6m) has ἄστοι); Isoc. Paneg. 125 uses πολιτεία (opposed to μοναρχίαι); Ael. VH 2.23 (rC58) uses πολιτείασθαι; and Polyb. 6.43.1 πολίτευμα (achronic
The territory occupied c.295 km² (cf. Hodkinson and Hodkinson 1981 275 n. 128), and its name was Ἔδρα τῆς Μαντινικῆς (Thuc. 5.64.5; Xen. Hell. 6.5.15). However, the passage at Thuc. 5.64.4 (βοηθεῖν δὲ καὶ Ἀθηναίους ἐς...Μαντινικήν) suggests that the toponym could also designate the territory. The territory is termed γῆς by Hdt. 9.77.3, Thuc. 5.64.5 and Xen. Hell. 5.2.4, and χώρα at Xen. Hell. 6.5.15; for the territory, see Hodkinson and Hodkinson (1981) 242–46. The neighbours were, to the north, Orchomenos (no. 286); to the east, Argos (no. 347); to the south, Tegea (no. 297); and to the west, Mainalia. Extra-urban sanctuaries are known, e.g. one of Herakles mentioned at Thuc. 5.64.5 (for which see Pritchett (1969) 46–49); see also Jost (1985) 132–41. The important sanctuary of Poseidon Hippios, the tutelary god of the city (Brackertz 1976 68–71), was situated 1.3 km south of the city; it has been located, but no substantial finds have been published (Jost 1985 136); however, the web site of the Hellenic Ministry of Culture (www.culture.gr s.v. ‘The Sanctuary of Hippios Poseidon’ as assessed 21 January 2003) reports: “The excavations of Th. Spyropoulos in 1985–95 revealed remains of the Archaic temple and important objects of the same period (clay akroterion of Lakonion type bearing Gorgoneion, pottery of Archaic and Classical date, idols, etc.). The excavations also uncovered later buildings and tombs preserving ancient liberative inscriptions dedicated to Hippios Poseidon.” For a group of four C4 fortified watch-towers in the territory, see Pikoulas (1995) cat. nos. 38–41; see also Jost (2001–2) esp. fig. 1, noting a new tower at Simiadas.

The town of Mantinea (the date of whose foundation is uncertain; see Hodkinson and Hodkinson 1981 256–61) was not the only settlement in Mantinean territory. A number of sources state that at the dioikismos in 385 (infra) the Mantinians were dispersed to the old villages, komai, which was their old pre-synoecistic way of life. It seems likely that these villages were the ones from which the city was originally synoecised (infra); but it is unknown whether they were inhabited between the original synoecism and the dioikismos (Hodkinson and Hodkinson 1981 261–65), although it seems probable (Bölte 1930 1318; Hodkinson and Hodkinson 1981 264; Jost (1986a) 155). The identity of these komai is not clear from Classical sources, but Pausanias mentions a number of sites that are possibly to be identified with at least some of them (Jost 1986a 155–56). Hodkinson and Hodkinson (1981) 262 have identified two of the villages with surviving remains: (a) Nestane (no. 284), c.7.5 km west of Mantinea town. The site occupies the hill of Nestani, measures 160 × 40 m, and was fortified c.370 (Hodkinson and Hodkinson 1981 247). There are some foundations on the summit, and a few Classical and Hellenistic sherds were found there (Howell (1970) 87). A lower ridge runs east–west for 350 m and is probably the site of the village (Hodkinson and Hodkinson 1981 246–48); (b) Maira, c.5.7 km north of Mantinea town (ibid. 248–50). At modern Gourtsouli, probably ancient Ptolis, just north of the town, there is evidence of cult and habitation down to C6, thereafter of cult only (ibid. 252–56); see, however, AR (1990–91) 26 reporting early Hellenistic habitation on the eastern slope.

It seems reasonably certain that at least in some periods the Mantinike included a number of settlements which were themselves organised as polis. Thus, Nestane had its own ethnic in C4, which indicates that the city was organised as a polis (and thus as a dependent polis within Mantinean territory) since no Arkadian sub-ethnics are known (Nielsen 1996a 117–32); it is likely that during the dioikismos Nestane and (some of) the other individual komai rose to polis status (Polyb. 4.27.6 (r385)), and that this was recognised at the new synoecism in 370 (Xen. Hell. 6.5.3). However, even prior to the dioikismos the Mantinike included other polis besides Mantinea. Thus, it is clear from the treaty SEG 37 340 (C4f) that by this treaty the Mantinike was enlarged to cover the territory of Helisson (no. 273), and that Helisson persisted as a (dependent) polis within Mantinean territory; the text furthermore shows that Helisson was not the only polis in this position; others may have been some of the original komai or other Mainalian communities such as Dipaia (no. 268), etc.; cf. Nielsen 1996c 66–70.

At Thermopylae Mantinea contributed 500 hoplites (Hdt. 7.202), and in 420, 1,000 soldiers helped to protect the Olympic Games against an anticipated Spartan attack. According to Lys. 34.7, the Mantinians did not number 3,000; it is not possible to give any exact estimate of the size of population on this basis (cf. Forsén (2000) 36–39); Xen. Hell. 5.2.7 implies that in 385 residence in the town was the norm in Mantinea.

Mantinea was a member of the Hellenic League against Persia (Hdt. 7.202) and of the Peloponnesian League (Thuc. 5.29.2; Xen. Hell. 5.2.3; cf. Tuplin (1977)), but relations with
Sparta (no. 345) were very varied and seldom easy (Nielsen (1996c) 90–91). In 421 Mantinea defected from the League and concluded an alliance with Argos (Thuc. 5.29.1), which was followed the next year by the conclusion of a quadruple alliance of Argos (no. 347), Athens (no. 361), Elis (no. 251) and Mantinea (Thuc. 5.47 = IG v.80). However, after the defeat at Mantinea in 418 (exactly when is unknown), Mantinea came to terms with Sparta again (Thuc. 5.81.1); and it remained an ally of Sparta (Xen. Hell. 5.2.1) down to the foundation of the Arkadian Confederacy after Leuktra.

Inside Arkadia, Mantinea was a major power, and in C5 it led a league that included all the Parrhasians and some of the Mainalians (see Nielsen (1996c) 79–84 for details), who were reduced to dependencies. In C4f Helisson was reduced to dependent status through a treaty of what amounts to sympolitía (SEG 37 340). The city was also a leading member of the Arkadian Confederacy (IG v.2.1.34 (360s)); the move towards the foundation of the Confederacy probably began in Mantinea (Larsen (1968) 183; Dušanić (1970) 285), and it was the home town of the important federal leader Lykomes (for whom see Xen. Hell. 7.1.23–24, 1.39, 4.2–3), who was one of the two oecists that the city supplied for the foundation of Megalopolis (no. 282) (Paus. 8.27.2). Mantinea was likewise a chief actor in the crisis that led to the dismemberment of the Confederacy in 363 (Xen. Hell. 7.4.33ff; Larsen (1968) 189; Roy (1971a) 588). After the Confederacy split up, Mantinea seems, like Megalopolis, to have been the leading city of a continued but smaller Confederacy (Staatsverträge 290; Diod. 15.94.1–3 (1361), 16.39.1–3 (1352); Staatsverträge 337, 342; cf. Nielsen (1996b) 356–59).

According to Strabo 8.3.2, Mantinea was originally synoecised from five demoi (termed komai at Diod. 15.5.4; cf. Ephor. fr. 79). At Xen. Hell. 5.2.7, it is stated that settlement in (four) komai was the old way of the Mantineans, given up by 385; but the dioikismos that year meant a return to this settlement pattern, and the implication is that the original synoecism was the reverse process. The synoecism cannot be dated (Hodkinson and Hodkinson (1981) 257–61). In 385, the Spartans undid the synoecism by dioikismos, described in our sources by the terms διοικητέους (Xen. Hell. 5.2.7; Isoc. De Pace 100; Ephor. fr. 79.2; Polyb. 4.27.6), μετοικεῖν (Diod. 15.12.2) and ἀνάστασιν ποιεῖν (Isoc. Paneg. 126). However, in 370 the city was synoecised again (Xen. Hell. 6.5.3–5).

Mantinean military activity is attested by, e.g., Hdt. 7.202 and Thuc. 5.69.1; commanders are mentioned at Hdt. 7.203 and Thuc. 5.69.1. Ephor. fr. 54 implies that public instruction in fighting under arms was given at Mantinea from an early date; Bölte (1930) 1317 assumes that this institution was inspired by Sparta. Bacchyl. Ep. fr. 1.2–3 with schol. Pind. Ol. 10.834 suggest that Mantinean hoplites carried the trident of Poseidon as a blazon (Anderson (1970) 18).

The military leaders who were late for Plataiai were exiled (Hdt. 9.77.2); in IG v.2.261.18 = IP Ark no. 7 (C5m) there is a reference to φεύγοντες, and in connection with the dioikismos 60 προστάται, τοῦ δήμου went into exile (Xen. Hell. 5.2.6). Reception of an embassy is implied by Hdt. 4.161.2 (rC6m), and Thuc. 5.44.2 mentions the sending of an embassy.

According to Thuc. 5.29.1 and Xen. Hell. 5.2.7, Mantinea was a democracy, and according to Arist. Pol. 1318b27 it had been a democracy of the old, moderate type in which officials were appointed by electors chosen by election from all citizens and serving in rotation (Larsen (1950)). Political decision making, on the other hand, was left to the demos in assembly (cf. Xen. Hell. 6.5.4–5). This old type of democracy corresponds to a C4 politia (Arist. Pol. 1297b24–5) in the sense of “citizen constitution”, and Mantinea is in fact described as a πολιτεία in this sense by Isoc. Paneg. 4.125–26 (r385). Robinson (1997) 113–14 believes that Mantinea was a democracy already by C6, and Waiglas (1956) argues for the C6m existence at Mantinea of an elective office of βασιλεύς. During the dioikismos, the constitution was aristocratic (Xen. Hell. 5.2.7). In connection with the dioikismos there is evidence of a sharp divide within the citizenry between on the one side οἱ ἀργολίζοντες and οἱ τοῦ δήμου προστάται and on the other οἱ βέλτιστοι (Xen. Hell. 5.2.6).

The earliest surviving public enactingments are a fragmentary law (IG v.2.261 = IP Ark no. 7 (C5m)) and the treaties recorded at Thuc. 5.47 and SEG 37 340 (C4f). IG v.2.262 = IP Ark no. 8 (C5m) records a verdict and refers to δικασταί at 1. 19. Ael. VH 2.23 (rC5s) mentions a νομοθήτης, and in SEG 37 340.6 (C4f) there is a general reference to νόμοι τῶν Μαντινεῶν as well as a reference to procedural laws (ll. 11–12).

A council is attested by Thuc. 5.47.9 (cf. IG v.2.289 (C4), for Ζεύς Εὐβωλής); it possibly had 300 members (SEG 37 340.24 (C4f)). The eponymous official was a δαµιοργός (SEG 37 340.20 (C4f)) who probably headed a board (Thuc. 5.47.9). Boards of ταµίαι (IG v.2.261.7 (C5m)), θεωροί (Thuc. 5.47.9), πολεμάρχοι (Thuc. 5.47.9), σταλογράφοι (SEG 37 340.18 (C4f)) and θεσμοτάρωι (SEG 37 340.20) are attested as well. For the assembly, see Xen. Hell. 6.5.4–5. A system of five phylai is attested, but its function is unknown (IG v.2.271 (C4m); Jones, POAG 132–35).
The city of Mantinea was situated on level ground and had no acropolis. The town had two periods of existence: down to the dioikismos in 385, and from the new synoecism in 370. The first town was fortified (Xen. Hell. 5.2.1), but the wall was pulled down at the dioikismos when the site was abandoned (Xen. Hell. 5.2.7). In 370 it was decided to refortify (and obviously reoccupy) the town (Xen. Hell. 6.5.3). The preserved wall, though probably following the course of the pre-385 wall (Hodkinson and Hodkinson (1981) 257–58), is the one built in 370 (though it has been thought to incorporate parts of the earlier wall (Scranton (1941) 57ff)). It encloses an area of 124 ha (Hodkinson and Hodkinson (1981) 256) and runs for 3,942 m with ten gates and 126 towers; it was constructed in mudbrick on a stone foundation (Winter (1989) 191). Not much is known about the degree of urbanisation reached by the pre-385 city; archaeology does not reveal much, and the best information comes, in fact, from the written sources. From Thuc. 5.47.11 it appears that it had an agora with a sanctuary of Zeus; from SEG 37 340 it appears that there was a boleion (for which see Winter (1987) 240–41), and Xen. Hell. 5.2.1–7 refers to houses. But even the post-370 city is imperfectly known, since the excavations have been directed primarily towards the area of the agora, which was laid out on the site of the old agora (Winter (1987) 240). Here several stoas have been found, one of which may be a relic of the first town (ibid. 239–40). West of the agora is a C4 theatre (ibid. 240; cf. TGR ii. 313) with an artificial embankment (Dilke (1950) 45–46). Near the theatre are several Classical temples (Jost (1985) 130–31). The “vast private sector” of the city is completely unknown (Hodkinson and Hodkinson (1981) 259), but at Hell. 7.5.15 Xenophon refers to houses in the second city too.

The rich pantheon of Mantinea is discussed by Jost (1985) 124–42. The patron divinity was Poseidon Hippios, in whose honour festivals were celebrated (Jost (1985) 133, 290). According to Xen. Hell. 5.2.1, the Spartans in 386/5 accused the Mantineans of manipulating ἐκκεχειρία to avoid campaigning. C5 communal consultation of the Delphic oracle is suggested by Paus. 8.36.8 (Hejnic (1961) 29).

Several C5 Olympic victors are on record (Olympionikai 163, 193, 202, 254, 256, 265): spoils were dedicated at Delphi c.423 (Thuc. 4.134.2), and a C5 dedication in Olympia is mentioned at Paus. 5.26.6 (a wingless Nike by Kalamis, for whom see Pollitt (1990) 46).

Mantinea struck silver coins from c.500 to 385, and silver and bronze from 370 onwards. Denominations: tritetartemorion, hemiobol, obol, trihemiobol, triobol and drachm. (1) Silver, 500–385. Types: obv. bear or acorn; rev. acorn(s); legend (sometimes on obv.): M or MA or MAN or MANT. (2) Silver, 370 onwards. Types: obv. Odysseus or Athena; rev. altar of Poseidon or trident; legend (sometimes on obv.): M or MANTI or MANTIN. (3) Bronze, 370 onwards. Types: obv. Athena; rev. Poseidon or trident; legend: MAN. (4) A particularly interesting C4 issue showing a dancing hoplite has been studied by Lacroix (1967). Head, HN² 449–50; SNG Cop. Argolis 242–54.

282. Megale polis (Megalopolites) Map. 58. Lat. 37.25, long. 22.05. Size of territory: 4–5. Type: A. The toponym is Μεγάλα πόλις, ἡ (CID ii 5.1.24 (358)), or Μεγάλη πόλις in Attic (Dem. 16.4); the form Μεγαλόπολις is late but occurs, e.g., at Strabo 8.4.5. The city-ethnic is Μεγαλοπολίταις (CID ii 4.111.50 (360)) or in Attic Μεγαλοπολίτης (IG ii² 161.2 (C4m)).

Megalopolis is called a polis in the urban sense at Dem. 16.25 and Syll.3 559.29 (1371–368), and it is listed (as Μεγαλοπολίται) as a polis in the political sense in the accounts of the Delphic nauroi at CID ii 4.111.1, 50 (360) under the heading τάδε πόλεις καὶ ἰδιώται ἐπάρχοντο; Diod. 18.70.1 (1318) refers to the πολίται. The territorial sense of polis (with the political sense as a possible connotation) occurs in Xen. Hell. 7.5.5 (for which see Nielsen (1996c) 72–73). The collective use of the ethnic is attested externally in, e.g., CID ii 4.111.50 (360) and Isoc. 5.97; the individual use is attested externally in CID ii 4.111.55–56 (360).

Megalopolis was a creation of the Arkadian Confederacy and was synoecised by a board of ten oikistai, two each from Mantinea (no. 281), Tegea (no. 297), Kleitor (no. 276), the Mainalians and the Parrhasians (Paus. 8.27.2). The synoecism is known principally from Diod. 15.72.4, who gives a compressed account of an event and dates the synoecism to 368; and from Paus. 8.27.1–8, who gives a detailed account of the original plan for the foundation as well as an account of the implementation of this plan, and dates the synoecism to shortly after Leuktra. The two accounts are, apparently, irreconcilable, and it has been customary to follow one and reject the other; however, the differences concern chiefly the date and the extent of the synoecism, and the difficulties may be at least partly removed by the realisation that Pausanias’ account is primarily prescriptive, whereas that of Diodoros is descriptive: thus, the decision to synoecise may have been taken shortly after Leuktra (Paus.) but the implementation may have been postponed to 368 (Diod.). The real problem, however, is the extent of the synoecism. According to Diod. 15.72.4, the city was created by a synoecism whereby twenty komai belonging to the Parrhasians
and Mainalians were relocated to a new site (accepted by, e.g., Moggi (1974) and Demand (1990) 113); according to Paus. 8.27.3–4, the synoecism was planned as much a larger enterprise, which was to absorb thirty-nine different poleis, among them some former Lakedaimonian periokic communities. However, Pausanias himself goes on to explain that the decision was not implemented exactly as planned (8.27.5–8). So, although by the Roman period Megalopolis seems to have controlled all the sites listed by Pausanias (Roy et al. (1988) 186), it is not safe to assume that the synoecism originally had the extent implied by his list. What happened in 368 was thus a synoecism of smaller dimensions than originally envisaged, and the synoecism may primarily have involved Parrhasian and Mainalian communities (Diod.), though Eutresian communities are likely to have been involved as well (cf. Paus. 8.27.5, stating that Eutresian Trikolonoi unsuccessfully resisted incorporation). As in many other cases, the synoecism was probably planned, and certainly carried out, as a relocation of only a part of the population of the settlements concerned (Roy (1968) 159). Among the communities situated in Megalopolitan territory, at least Lykosoura (no. 280) seems to have survived as a dependent polis, and there may have been some others (Roy (2000a) 139).

The ancient sources (Paus. 8.27; Diod. 15.72.4) agree that Megalopolis was intended to serve as protection against Sparta (no. 345). For a modern but highly speculative discussion of the ideology behind the foundation, see Braunert and Petersen (1972). In 361 the city suffered a serious crisis as some of the relocated populations left for their old settlements and called upon Mantinea for support; the rebellion was, however, overcome with Theban assistance (Diod. 15.94.1); nor did the Spartans succeed in a dioikismos of the city in 352 (Dem. 16.30; Diod. 16.39).

If the territory comprised all the communities listed at Paus. 8.27.3–4, it would have occupied 1,500 km² (Roy et al. (1988) 179). If, however, the reconstruction of Moggi (1974), based on Diodorus, is preferred, the territory will have measured c.400 km², somewhat larger than that of Tegea but smaller than that of Kleitor. A survey has been carried out in the territory; from the preliminary reports it appears that even after the synoecism there was considerable habitation in the rural areas, both in dispersed farmsteads and in nucleated settlements (Roy et al. (1992)). Almost all other information about the territory comes from the late account of Pausanias, which is discussed in detail by Jost (1973).

There is no good evidence relating to the size of the population; for what it is worth, Diod. 18.70.1 states that in 318 the city managed to put 15,000 men under arms, but this figure includes metics and slaves (Bury (1898) 16); Gardner et al. (1893) 3 supposes a total population of 65,000.

Megalopolis was a federal foundation, and the city was, of course, a member of the Arkadian Confederacy (IG v.2.1.23 (360s)). It is often believed that the city was intended to serve as the capital of the Confederacy (Bury (1898); Braunert and Petersen (1972) 81ff). Certainly, the fact that the city provided ten damiorgoi for the Confederacy, whereas Tegea (no. 297) and Mantinea provided only five each (IG v.2.1.1, 23, 34 (360s)), suggests that the city did somehow enjoy a favoured position within the Confederacy, but greater precision on this point is impossible (Roy (2000b); Tsiosis (1995) 51, 54). When the Confederacy split in 363, Megalopolis sided with Tegea and Boiotia against Mantinea, Athens (no. 361) and Sparta. According to Polyb. 4.33.9, after the battle of Mantinea in 362, Megalopolis was the centre of an Arkadian alliance: Μεγαλοπόλιται καὶ πάντες οἱ κοινωνώντες Αρκάδων τῆς αὐτῶν συµµαχίας κτλ. This presumably means that the city posed as the leader of one faction of the Confederacy; at least, we know that the federal assembly, Myrioi, held a session in Megalopolis in 348/7 (Dem. 19.10; Aeschin. 2.157); since there is no reason to believe that the Confederacy had reunited by this date (cf. Staatsverträge 337 (342)), this probably means that Megalopolis claimed to represent the Arkadian Confederacy; but Mantinea probably did so as well; see Nielsen (1996b) 356–59 for further discussion.

From Dem. 16.28 it appears that in the 350s Megalopolis was allied to Thebes (no. 221); from Diod. 16.39 it is clear that the city had alliances with Argos (no. 347), Sikyon (no. 228), Messene (no. 318) and Orneai (no. 354) as well. Staatsverträge 337 attests to an alliance with Athens in 342.

Xen. Hell. 7.5.5 refers to Megalopolitan troops. Diod. 18.56.5 (1318) refers to exiles from the city. Dem. 16.1 refers to the sending of an embassy, and Dem. 19.10; Aeschin. 2.157 and SEG 20 716.20 (C4) to reception of embassies. Two citizens were appointed Athenian proxenoi in C4m (IG II² 161), and another received Delphic proxenia in the 330s (I.Delphes III.4 380–81). An Epidaurian theorodokos resided in the city in C4l–C3e (IAEpid 42.3).

Being a federal foundation, Megalopolis was probably originally a democracy, since the Confederacy was democratic (Larsen (1968) 180). The earliest reference to a public enactment is Diod. 18.70.1 (1318): οἱ Μεγαλοπόλιται . . . ἐψηφίσαντο; IG v.2.431.3 (C4) has been restored to refer to a council. A board of damiorgoi is referred to in IG v.2.431.2; the office of agonothetes is attested by IGV.2 450 (C48). It is
as good as certain that a system of six phylai was created at the foundation of the city, but on its functions we have no information (IG v.2 451 (C3l–C2e) and 468 (C4–C3) with Jones, POAG153–358).

The public architecture included a bouleuterion (Paus. 8.30.9, without indication of its date; cf. Hansen and Fischer-Hansen (1994) 40), a stoa erected by Philip II of Makedon (Paus. 8.30.6; cf. Gardner et al. (1893) 59–66 and AR (1993–94) 17–18, (1994–95) 13); in addition, Paus. 8.30.7 has a reference to unspecified ἀρχεία. In the agora (for which see Gardner et al. (1893) 101–6) there was a sanctuary with a temple of Zeus Soter (C4) (cf. AR (1993–94) 17). The theatre had a seating capacity of 20,000 (Gardner et al. (1893) 42; TGR ii. 262–63) and was built when the city was founded (Gardner et al. (1893) 69, 75; cf. AR (2001–2) 28).

Finally, the city housed a C4m assembly hall which served the Confederacy (Paus. 8.32.1; cf. Gardner et al. (1893) 17–23) as well as the city itself (Tsosil (1995) 51–54). So the city was able to house federal institutions, and a federal assembly met in the city in 348/7 (Dem. 19.10; Aeschin. 2.165); it is unknown, however, whether the assembly met in the city in the 360s; Harp. s.v. Μυριοί ἐν Μεγάλαις πόλεις ... πολλὰκις µνηµονεύουσι οἱ ἱστορικοί, but this need not refer to meetings in the 360s (cf. Dem. 19.10; Aeschin. 2.165).

None the less, Braunert and Petersen (1972) 81 believe that the city was planned as the capital of the Confederacy.

The city wall of Megalopolis was erected when the city was founded and was 99 km long (Loring in Gardner et al. (1893) 115); it withstood a siege during the revolt of Agis (Aeschin. 3.165) in 331, but in 318 certain sections had to be repaired (Diod. 18.70.2). It was a mudbrick wall on a stone foundation (ibid.). The area enclosed by walls measured c.350 ha; this area, however, includes the river Helisson, which divided the city in two. Since the excavations have been directed exclusively at the agora and the theatre, there is no way of knowing how densely populated this large area was; it is usually assumed that the city was much too large for its population (Gardner et al. (1893) 116). This was certainly the case in C3l (Polyb. 2.55.2, 5.93.5); however, as Moggi (1974) 105–7 has argued, the extreme lack of population in C3l was probably due to exceptional circumstances. In any case, a drop in population is normally assumed for C3 Arkadia in general (Sallares (1991) 106), and so it is problematical to use the evidence about the C3 level of population retrospectively for C4. Even on the most cautious estimate—that only 100 ha was occupied by habitation and that each ha accommodated only 100 people—the urban population of the city would have been 10,000.

Free non-citizens, ξένοι, are referred to by Diod. 18.70.1 (318). The patron deity was either Athena Polias (Paus. 8.31.9; Jost (1985) 230) or Zeus Lykaios (Brackertz (1976) 85–87). In general, the Megalopolitan pantheon reflects the fact that the city was founded by synoecism of pre-existing states: in the city are found several doublets of cults that belonged to the communities from which the city was synoecised (Nilsson (1951) 18–22; Jost (1985) 221–33, (1994) 225–28). Most importantly, there was a peribolos of Zeus Lykaios in the agora. Cf. Jost (1996).

In C4m Megalopolis applied to the Amphiktyonic League for membership (Syll.2 224).

During the 360s and later, Megalopolis struck staters with obv. Pan; rev. Zeus Lykaios; legend: APK in monogram (Head, HN² 445). A series of triobols and obols with similar types and legends may belong to C4l (Head, HN² 445; Warren (1969) 39; SNG Cop. Argolis 191–200). In addition, bronze coins with similar types and legends were struck (Head, HN² 445; SNG Cop. Argolis 201–10); SNG Cop. Argolis 208 shows Athena and Pan.

283. Methydrion (Methydricus) Map 58. Lat. 37.40, long. 22.10. Size of territory: probably 2. Type: B. The toponym is Μεθύδριον, τό (Thuc. 5.58.2; REG 62 (1949) p. 6 l. 6 (C3l–C4e); Paus. 8.12.2). The city-ethnic is Μεθύδριος at Xen. An. 4.1.27; IPArk no. 14.6–7 (360s, from Orchomenos) has Μεθύδραμον, which points to an epichoric toponym *Μεθυδριον.

The only Classical source that possibly classified Methydrion as a polis is Theopomp. fr. 344.18 (= Porph. Abst. 2.16); at Paus. 8.27.4 (1371) the city is listed as a polis. The collective use of the city-ethnic is found internally on coin legends (Head, HN² 451) and externally in IPArk no. 14.6–7; the individual use is found externally at Xen. An. 4.6.20.

Thuc. 5.58.2 (προίντες ἀπαντώσα τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίωις ἐν Μεθυδρίῳ) suggests that the toponym could designate the territory as well. An inscription from Orchomenos refers to a point where the borders of Methydrion met those of Orchomenos (no. 286) and Torthyneion (no. 302) (IPArk no. 14.4–6); this allows the conclusion that C4m Methydrion had a well-defined territory and that it abutted those of Torthyneion and Orchomenos; in the fragmentary C3l–C4e Delphic list of theorodokoi, the city is listed just before Torthyneion (REG 62 (1949) p. 6 ll. 6–9).

According to Paus. 8.27.4, Methydrion was in 371 one of a number of communities whose relationship to Orchomenos could be described by the phrase συντελεῖν ές. It is unclear exactly what this means, but Methydrion was presumably in
one way or another a dependency of Orchomenos (cf. Hejnic (1961) 37–38; Roy (1972c) 78; Nielsen (1966b) 231–36; (1996c) 84–86).

At Petrovouni, 3 km west of the city, a sanctuary has been found; the temple is Hellenistic, but architectural fragments and votives go back to C7 (Jost (1985) 215).

Membership of the Peloponnesian League may be assumed; in 418, a League army camped in the territory of the city (Thuc. 5.58.2). Membership of the Arkadian Confederacy can be inferred from Paus. 8.27.4 (1971). It is furthermore not impossible that the synteleia of Orchomenos mentioned at Paus. 8.27.4, and of which Methydrion was a part, was an organisation based on formal treaties (Nielsen (1996b) 234).

According to Paus. 8.27.4, Methydrion was among the communities that the Arkadian Confederacy voted to relocate to Megalopolis (no. 282). IPArk no. 14 (360s) seems to demarcate the border with Orchomenos and may be taken to indicate that steps were taken to implement this decision (cf. IPArk on no. 14; Nielsen (1996c) 84). However, it is uncertain whether Megalopolis in the Classical period effectively controlled the city, which was clearly not abandoned (Moggi (1974) 93–94; Nielsen (1996b) 316–19).

In C5–C4 a Delphic theoreodokos resides in the city (REG 62 (1949) p. 6 l. 6). The earliest surviving reference to a public enactment by Methydrion is I.Magnesia 38.61, which attests to a C3l asylia decree for Magnesia.

The preserved fortification wall at Methydrion is Classical, C5 according to von Gaertringen and Lattermann (1911) 31, C4 according to Jost (1985) 213 n. 8. The wall encloses an area of 11 ha (von Gaertringen and Lattermann (1911) 31). They noted some foundations, sherds and tiles inside the wall, and suggested the existence of a large temple (but gave no date, ibid. 23, 31). The oldest find at the site is an Archaic statuette of Zeus (Jost (1985) 214–15). According to Theopomp. fr. 344.27–8 (= Porph. Abst. 2.16), Methydrion was a small, poor place (μικρόου καὶ ταπεινοῦ ὄντος τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ χωρίου). Several Arkadian towns, such as Halous (no. 272) and Pallanton (no. 289), consist of a fortified acropolis with the residential area unfortified below. It is not clear whether Methydrion was such a city; if it was, the fortified area can be equated with the acropolis.

Cults of Zeus Hoplosmios and Poseidon are attested (Jost (1985) 214), and Theopomp. fr. 344 mentions θυσίαι δηµοτελεῖς and public ἐστρατ. According to Paus. 8.36.2, citizens of Methydrion achieved Olympic victories before 371 (Olympionikai 410–11).

From Methydrion comes a bronze coinage of, presumably, C4 (Meyer (1932) 1389–90), though other dates have been proposed, see ibid. and Moggi (1974) 93 n. 72. The legend is ΜΕΘΥΔΡΙΕΩΝ; the types show rev. Zeus; obv. Kallisto in the shape of a woman, falling back pierced by an arrow with Arkas on the ground beside her: this type is “aus Orchomenos entlehnt” (Meyer (1932) 1389); on the significance of this, see Nielsen (1996b) 234–36.

284. Nestane (Nestanios) Map 58. Lat. 37.35, long. 22.30. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: C. Steph. Byz. 478.7 uses the toponym Νοστία and cites Theopomp. fr. 175; Paus. 8.7.4 has Νεστάνιος, η. An ethnic derived from the latter toponym, Νεστάνιος, was used by Ephor. fr. 234 (= Steph. Byz. 478.8).

In C4m, Nestane may have been a dependent polis inside Mantinean territory; see above Mantinea (no. 281) and Hansen (1995b) 74, Nielsen (1996a) 131–32, (1996c) 66–67. For the site, see above Mantinea (no. 281).

285. Nonakris (Nonakrieus) Map 58. Lat. 38.00, long. 22.15; for the location, see Pikoulas (1986a). Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is Νόνακρις, η (Hdt. 6.74.2). The ethnic is Νόνακριείς (Steph. Byz. 480.3–4, citing Aristophanes = Ar. fr. 861 (PCG)).

Nonakris is called polis three times at Hdt. 6.74.1–2, in the territorial sense. Name and size of the territory are unknown. In Theophrastos’ day Nonakris was presumably situated inside the territory of Pheneos (no. 291) (Theophr. fr. 160; Meyer (1937a) 860); if the city was still in existence, the presumption is that it was a dependent polis within the territory of Pheneos. But it may already have been so in C5, since Herodotos (6.74.2) describes it as a πόλις . . . Ἀρκαδίας πρὸς Φενεὸς.

Nonakris was probably an Azanian community (K. Tausend (1993) 15); however, if the Azanians ever formed a political unit, this had broken up before C5 (Roy (1972b) 44, (1996) 110; Nielsen (1996a) 138). At the presumed site of Nonakris, Archaiac and Classical pottery has been found, together with some poor architectural fragments (Pikoulas (1986a)).

286. Orchomenos (Orchomenios) Map 58. Lat. 37.45, long. 22.20. Size of territory: 3. Type: A. The literary form of the toponym is Ὀρχομενός, δ (Hom. Il. 2.605; Thuc. 5.61.4; Xen. Hell. 6.5.15), and the corresponding city-ethnic Ὀρχομένιος. In the epigraphical record we find the toponym Ἐρχομενός (BCH 45 (1921) 11.14 (c.230–210)) with the ethnic Ἐρχομένιος (ML 27.4 (479)); the epichoric ethnic Ἐρχομένιος is found in IPark no. 15.3–4 (360–350) and the toponym is restored Ἐρχομένιος in l. 51 (for Arkadian i for ε before nasal, see Buck (1955) 145).
Orchomenos is classified as a polis in the political sense at Hdt. 7.202, 204, and called polis in the urban sense at Xen. 

Orchomenos was, presumably, the centre of an organisation whether these minor organisation functioned is unclear, and it is also unclear the territory occupied c.145 km² or, according to Meyer (1939b) 890, c.230 km². For a short description of the territory, see Jost (1985) 113–14. It was divided into two sub-plains: the southern was the smaller and higher (630 m); the northern was larger and lower (620 m), but suffered from drainage problems (Jost (1985) 114). The city itself was centred on a hill rising to 929 m and situated in a dominating position between the two plains. A number of sanctuaries in the border zones of the territory are attested by written sources, but none has been securely identified (cf. Jost (1985) 1987–1989). Prior to the foundation of Megalopolis (no. 282), Orchomenos was, presumably, the centre of an organisation comprising a number of minor poleis dependent on it, among which were Methydriion (no. 283), Thisoa (no. 301) and Teuthis (no. 298) (Paus. 8.27.4 (1371)); exactly how this organisation functioned is unclear, and it is also unclear whether these minor poleis were conceived of as situated within Orchomenian territory. Cf. Nielsen (1996b) 231–36, (1996c) 84–86.

The only indication we have of the order of size of the Orchomenian population is the fact that the city fielded 600 hoplites at Plataiai in 479 (cf. Forsén (2000) 36–39).

C4 membership of the Peloponnesian League is proved by Xen. 

The city proper seems to have been situated at the foot of the Kalpaki hill, which rises to 939 m. The hill was enclosed with a circuit wall c.350–325 (Winter (1989) 195). It has been suggested that there was no proper urban site within the fortifications (Osborne (1987) 118), and certainly no substantial residential area has yet come to light, which, however, may not be very significant since the archaeological investigations have been directed primarily towards the agora, the theatre and the temple of Artemis. Furthermore, it should be noted that von Gaertringen and Lattermann (1911) 20 concluded that there was habitation within the circuit “bis tief in die Hellenistische Zeit”. Cf. Jost (1999) 240 n. 51.

The city proper seems to have been situated at the foot of the southern slope of the Kalpaki hill (Meyer (1939b) 890) both before the construction of the circuit wall and after its abandonment; here Geometric and Archaic material has come to light (Blum and Plassart (1914) 81–88), as well as Roman material (Meyer (1939b) 893). Attention has been directed primarily at sacred buildings. At least one and perhaps two temples were built in the Archaic period in the lower city; the building which was definitely a temple measured 31.3 × 13.3 m with six times thirteen columns; it is unknown to which divinity it was dedicated (Jost (1985) 118–19; Voyatzis (1990) 32–33).

Pausanias at 8.13.2 explicitly states that the προτέρα πόλεως was on the Kalpaki hill, but that in his day habitation was under (υπό) the circuit wall, and so far the archaeological material supports this. We may then believe him when he implies that in the Classical period habitation was within the circuit wall. The inference is that in C4 the city was moved from the southern slope to the hill when the wall was constructed (so Winter (1989) 194–95), although habitation in the former town seems not to have ceased (cf. PECS s.v.
Orchomenos, p. 654). But the urban history of Orchomenos is by no means entirely clear.

The fortification wall encloses the upper part of the Kalpaki hill; it was 2,300 m long and enclosed an area of 2.0 ha. It was constructed c.350–325 (Winter (1989) 195); however, Thuc. 5.61.5, Diod. 12.79.2 (1418) and Xen. Hell. 6.5.13 mention a τεῖχος, but where this ran is unknown.

The agora was laid out in a single building programme in C48 (Winter (1987) 235–39). The northern and eastern edges of the agora were flanked by stoas of C48; the eastern stoa is sometimes thought to have been a bouleuterion (e.g. Blum and Plassart (1914) 73); but Winter (1987) 238–39 thinks that it was simply a stoa. West of the agora is a C41 theatre (Winter (1987) 235; TGR ii. 229), and south of the agora, on a terrace supported by a retaining wall is a poros temple of Artemis Mesopolitis (Jost (1985) 117–18); the preserved remains are probably C4, but Winter (1991) 213 suggests that it had an Archaic predecessor.

The patron divinity was presumably Artemis Mesopolitis (Meyer (1939b) 904); on the basis of the theatre and a C41–3e dedication describing a man as δυναμωθητήρας Διονύσωι and found in the theatre (SEG 11 1104) we may assume the existence of a festival of Dionysos.

The Orchomenian mint was late; according to Head, HN No 451 it began to function immediately after 370; according to Babelon, Traité ii.3, 624 it began after 362. The legend is EP (SNG Cap. Argolis 267), or EPXOMENION (SNG Cop. Argolis 265–66). All known coins are of bronze. Some interesting coin types show obv. Artemis kneeling, sometimes with a dog behind her, shooting an arrow; rev. Kallisto falling back pierced by an arrow, on the ground beside her her child Arkas, sometimes with his name in monogram (SNG Cop. Argolis 265–66); these types are found copied at Methydrion, one of the cities thought to have been a dependency of Orchomenos (see Methydrion (no. 283)).

287. Oresthasia (Oresthasion) Map 58, probably at modern Anemodhouri (see Pikoulas (1988) 102ff); lat. 37.25, long. 22.10. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is Ὀρεσθάσιος, τό (Pherekydes (FGHist 3) fr. 153a; Thuc. 5.64.2); at Paus. 8.27.3 (1371) the toponym is Ὀρεσθάσιος. The city-ethnic is Ὀρεσθάσιος (IvO 147.148). For a discussion of onomastics, see Meyer (1939c) 1014–15.

Oresthasia is called a polis by Pherekydes (FGHist 3) fr. 135a and by Eur. El. 1273–75, in both cases presumably in the urban sense; Paus. 8.27.3 (1371) retrospectively lists it as a polis. The external individual use of the city-ethnic is found in IvO 147.148 (C5f) and SEG 20 716.23 (C4m).

The name of the territory was Ὀρεσθίς (Thuc. 4.134.1); its size is unknown. In 423 a battle was fought in the territory between the Tegean and Mantinean Leagues (for which see Nielsen (1996c) 79–86) at a place called Λαοδικεῖον (Thuc. 4.134.1).

Oresthasia was a Mainalian city (Paus. 8.27.3; Nielsen (1996a) 332–34). The city seems to have been an important centre for assembling Peloponnesian League troops (Hdt. 9.11.2; Thuc. 5.64.3; Pikoulas (1988) 109–10, 205–11; membership of the League may thus be assumed, but it was probably via the Mainalian tribal state (Nielsen (1996c) 100–1). Membership of the Arkadian Confederacy can be inferred from Paus. 8.27.3, and was probably again via the Mainalian tribe.

According to Paus. 8.27.3, Oresthasia was one of the communities that the Arkadian Confederacy voted to relocate to Megalopolis (no. 282). It is likely that the city came under Megalopolitan control, but it was probably not abandoned since a surface survey has brought to light numerous Hellenistic sherds at the probable site of the city, see Pikoulas (1988) 102–4.

According to Pikoulas (1988) 102, the hill of Groumourou at Anemodhouri, rising to 70 m, was an ideal acropolis for the site at Anemodhouri (= Oresthasia). The hill-top measures 44 × 30 m; it has yielded sherds and remains of a pre-Classical fortification wall (Pikoulas (1988) 104). According to Pikoulas (1988) 102, the megalos arhaios oikismos of Oresthasia covered an area of 450 × 200 m. The area is filled with sherds spanning the Archaic to Hellenistic periods, and column drums lie exposed (ibid.). No remains of fortifications of the lower city are visible.

In C5f, in 472 according to Olympnikai 231, a citizen of Oresthasia won an Olympic victory (IvO 147.148).


The city is called polis at Hdt. 6.127.3, and in the same passage πάρηγη is implicitly used about it (cf. Hdt. 6.126.3, 127.3). C.320–210 a Delphic theorodokos resided in the city (BCH 45 (1921) 11.72).

Paion was an Azanian community (Hdt. 6.127.3); however, if the Azanians ever formed a political unit, this had broken up before C5 (Roy (1972b) 44, (1996) 110; Nielsen (1996a) 138).

Paion was situated at modern Skoupi. The acropolis was constituted by a small, separately fortified plateau measuring 34 × 65 m (Meyer (1942) 2399). Here Papandreou
believed he saw the foundations of a temple and another building (Prakt (1920) 125).

The city wall did not enclose the whole city, but just the upper city (Meyer (1942) 2399). It was 516 m long and possibly dates to C4 (ibid.). A large cistern (11 x 8 m) was built into the city wall (ibid.).

The extent of the city is not stated by any authority, but there was probably occupation both inside and outside the wall (ibid.). Papandreou seems to believe that the site was of considerable size (Prakt (1920) 128–29). Inside the wall there are remains of foundations, and tiles and sherds cover the ground. A plan of the site is found in Papachatzis (1994) 269.

For a possible suburban temple (undated), see Prakt (1920) 128; a passage in Herodotos connects the Dioskouroi with Paion (Hdt. 6.127.3), but that is all we know about the pantheon of the city.

289. Pallantion (Pallanteus) Map 58. Lat. 37.30, long. 22.20. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Παλλάντιον in a Delphic catalogue of C5L–C4e (Daux (1949) 6–8) and Παλλαντίον, τό in Xen. Hell. 6.5.9 and SEG 11 1084.21–22 (c.318–316); the toponym was possibly used by Stesichoros; cf. Paus. 8.3.2 = Stesichoros; fr. 85, Davies = fr. 5, Page. SEG 11 1084.6 (c.318–316) gives the ethnic as τοι Παλλαντείες; the singular is found as Παλλαντίες in CID 11 5.21 (358); the MSS of Xen. Hell. have Παλλαντεία at 7.5.5, but editors often print Παλλαντείας. At Diod. 15.59.3 the MSS have οἱ Παλλαντίοι οἱ Παλλαντίνοι, but this form is unique (cf., however, the entry in Steph. Byz. with Meyer (1949) 231). According to Meyer (1949) 231, the genuine form of the toponym (coined on the basis of the ethnic Παλλαντείας) is Παλλαντείον; this form is found only once, in the great Delphic catalogue of theorodokos dating to c.230–210 (BCH 45 (1921) iii.7). For a discussion of name and ethnic, see Meyer (1949) 231–32.

Pallantion is described as a polis in the political sense in SEG 11 1084.10 (cf. SEG 25 442 and 33 276 (c.318–316)), and in the territorial sense (with the political sense as a possible connotation) at Xen. Hell. 7.5.5 (for which see Nielsen (1996c) 72–73). The collective use of the city-ethnic is found internally on Classical coins (infra) and in SEG 11 1084.6 (c.318–316), and externally in Xen. Hell. 7.5.5 and SEG 33 276.9 (c.318–316).

The name of the territory is unknown; Paus. 8.44.5 terms it Παλλαντείκων πεδίον, and it is referred to as polis by Xen. Hell. 7.5.5 (for which see Nielsen (1996c) 72–73). Meyer (1949) 233 estimates its size at c.30 km², but Jost (1985) at c.55 km². The Suda s.v. Stesichoros states that this poet was an exile from Pallantion (= Stesichoros Test. A19 and 35, Davies).

Pallantion was a Mainalian city (Paus. 8.27.3; Nielsen (1996a) 132–34). Membership of the Peloponnesian League is not explicitly attested, but may be assumed (Nielsen (1996c) 87, 101) and it was probably via the Mainalian tribe. Membership of the Arkadian Confederacy may be inferred from Diod. 15.59.3 (r370) and Paus. 8.27.3 (r371). In c.318–316, Pallantion concluded a treaty of friendship with Argos (no. 347) (SEG 11 1084).

According to Paus. 8.27.3, Pallantion was among the communities that the Arkadian Confederacy voted to relocate to Megalopolis (no. 282); but, for whatever reason, the decision seems not to have been implemented (Moggi (1974) 85–87, and the city was not under Megalopolitan control in 318: in this year the city was captured by Polyperchon, and some citizens were taken captives, but Pallantion negotiated for their release via Argos (no. 347), not Megalopolis (SEG 11 1084).

According to Xen. Hell. 7.5.5, Epameinondas counted on Pallantion as an ally for the battle of Mantinea in 362, but it is unknown whether Pallantian troops actually fought in the battle. In c.318–316, Pallantion sent an embassy to Argos, and the envoys were all granted Argive proxenia (SEG 11 1084.27). In C5L–C4e a Delphic theorodokos resided in Pallantion (Daux (1949) 6–8).

Pallantion was centred on a hill of moderate height; the city proper was situated in the plain at the northern and eastern foot of the hill; it appears to have occupied a considerable area (Frazer (1898) iv. 421). The lower town has not been excavated, but remains of Classical buildings have been found reused, and Classical sherds have also come to light (Jost (1985) 199). A Classical cemetery has also been identified (ibid.).

The acropolis of Pallantion was fortified, but the date of the wall has not been established. Inside the wall, on the top of the acropolis and on its southern slope, are no fewer than four modest temple buildings (for which see Østby (1995a)); all the buildings seem to belong to a single programme of construction dating to c.600–550, and later modifications are discernible (ibid. 54).

According to Head, HN² 451, Pallantion began to strike coins c.400; Babelon, Traité ii.3. 665–68 dates the coinage to 421–371; it is a silver coinage on the Aiginetan standard; all known coins have a young beardless male (= Apollo or the eponymous hero Pallas) on the obv. and the legend ΠΑΛΛΑΝ in the rev. Known denominations are the obol and the hemiobol. SNG Cap. Argolis 270.
290. Phara
Unlocated, but presumably in western Arkadia, see Meyer (1957a) 82–86 and Pritchett (1989) 36–37. Size of territory: 291 (23 189) no. 6. Type: C. The toponym is Φάρα, ἦν in REG 62 (1949) p. 6 l. 3. An ethnic is not attested. Phara deserves inclusion in this Inventory solely because it may have had a Delphic theorodokos in C3–C4e (REG 62 (1949) p. 6 l. 4–5), and thus was possibly a polis (Perlman (1995) 116, 121, 135). But the Phara in question may well be that in Achaia (Rizakis (1995) no. 689; cf. Pharai (no. 241) in the Achaian Inventory).

291. Pheneos (Pheneaeus)
Map 58. Lat. 37.55, long. 22.20. Size of territory: 4. Type: B. The toponym is Φενεός (ὁ/l; cf. Steph. Byz. 662,5) in Hom. II. 2.605; IG v.2 360 (C5–C4); SEG 23 189,23 (c.330). The ethnic is Φενεῖεως in SEG 39 1365 (470–450). Other forms are Φινεικός and Φινεατής; the former may lie behind the Classical coin legend ΦΕΝΙΚΟΝ (Head, HN² 432; Roy (1972a) 334–36), whereas the latter seems to make its appearance only in C3 (ibid. 335–36).

No Archaic or Classical source describes Pheneos as a polis, but Hejnic (1961) 42 has pointed out that it follows a fortiiori from Hdt. 6.75.1: Νόωναίρες . . . πόλεις ἐστι τίς Αρκαδίας πρὸς Φενεώ, that Herodotos considered Pheneos to be a polis; Polyb. 2.52.2 (1225) calls it a polis in the political sense, and Eratostenes fr. miB 105, Berger (= Strabo 8.8.4) in the urban sense.

The collective use of city-ethnic is attested internally on C4 coin legends (Head, HN² 452) and externally in SEG 39 1365 (470–450); the individual use is found in IG iv.2.1 96.48 (C3f).

The territory occupied c.345 km²; this, however, includes Nonakris (no. 285), which perhaps as early as C5 was a dependent polis inside the territory of Pheneos (see supra s.v. Nonakris). Its name was Φενεϊκή (Polyb. 4.68.1) or ἦν Φενεατική χώρα (Paus. 8.14.5); Theophr. fr. 160, Wimmer, suggests that the toponym could designate the territory as well. The territory is termed πεδιόν by Theophr. Hist. pl. 3.1.2, 5.4.6. It must have suffered from severe problems of drainage (Strabo 8.8.4; Baker-Penoyre (1902); Knauss (1990)). Stangl (1999a), (1999b), estimates that the territory could support max. 5,000 individuals. In addition to Nonakris and Pheneos itself, the territory included Lykouria c.4 km south-west of Pheneos, a site that seems to have been a substantial village (Knauss (1990) 50–51; cf. K. Tausend (1999c)). For Classical watch-towers, see K. Tausend and Erath (1997) 2; K. Tausend (1999b) 308–12. Three extrurban sanctuaries are archaeologically attested (K. Tausend and Erath (1997); Erath (1999b)).

Pheneos was an Azanian community (Steph. Byz. 662.6); however, if the Azanians ever formed a political unit, this had broken up before C5 (Roy (1972b) 44, (1996) 110; Nielsen (1996a) 138).

C.330 an Argive theorodokos resided in Pheneos, and c.300 (SEG 23 189,23) one of its citizens was granted Argive proyeinia (SEG 30 356).

In Pheneos only the sanctuary of Asklepios in the lower city has been excavated (Jost (1985) 29–30). It was a city with a habitation area beneath a fortified acropolis. The earliest part of the acropolis wall dates to C4 (Bölte (1938) 1970; Jost (1985) 31); good C5 sherds have been found at the site (Simpson and Lazenby (1970) 91). A recent survey suggests that the urban centre occupied c.20 ha (Stangl (1999b) 178).

The principal deity of Pheneos was Hermes (Paus. 8.14.10; Bölte (1938) 1972–73; cf. Jost (1985) 27–37), in whose honour games were celebrated (schol. Pind. Ol. 7.153a). A festival with games in honour of the Dioskouroi is attested by SEG 39 1365 (470–450). Before 460, Pheneos set up a statue of Hermes in Olympia (Paus. 5.27.8); it was made by Onatas (for whom see Pollitt (1990) 36–39). Neolaidas of Pheneos won the boys’ boxing contest at Olympia c.392 (Olympionikai 380).

The coinage of Pheneos begins C5 (421, according to both Head, HN² 452 and Babelon, Traité ii.3. 598). The legends are: ΦΕ, ΦΕΝΙΚΟΝ, ΦΕΝΕΩΝ. The city struck in both silver (SNG Cap. Argolis 271–73) and bronze (SNG Cap. Argolis 274–77). Known denominations are hemiobol, obol, triobol, drachm and stater. The most commonly depicted divinities are Demeter and Hermes. The magnificent C4 staters depict Demeter (Maia?) on the obv.; rev. Hermes running with the infant Arkas, to which is sometimes added the legend AΡΚΑΣ. The staters are collected and described by Schultz (1991), who dates them to 360–340.

292. Phigaleia (Phigaleus)
Map 58. Lat. 37.25, long. 21.20. Size of territory: 3. Type: [A]. The city-ethnic is Φιγαλεύς (Hdt. 6.83.2; ΙvO 161 (C4e)). The toponym is not attested in Archaic or Classical sources; Rhianos apud Steph. Byz. 664,10 and Polyb. 4.3.8 have Φιγαλέα, ἦν, but IG v.2 419,6 (c.430) and Diod. 15.40.2 (1374) have Φιγαλέα, ἦν; see further Meyer (1938) 2065–67, who argues for the forms Φιγαλέα and Φιγαλία.

Phigaleia is listed (as Φιγαλεύς Αρκάδες) as a polis in the political sense in the accounts of the Delphic παροιοί at CID II 4.111, 45 (c.360) under the heading τάδε πόλεις καὶ ἰδιώται ἐπάρχαντο and in Diod. 15.40.1, 40.2 (1374), and in the urban sense at Polyb. 4.3.7. ΙvO 161 (C4e) uses παρτέρες about the city. The collective use of the city-ethnic is
attested externally in CID ii 4.111.45 (c.360); the individual use is found externally at Hdt. 6.83.2 and in IvO161 (C4e).

The territory occupied c.125 km²; its mountainous character is well brought out by Jost (1985) 82–83. It is termed χώρα by IG v.2 419 (c.240) and Polyb. 4.3.7. A possible inland port on the river Neda is described by Cooper (1972) 359–62. On a promontory overlooking the Neda valley and with city and port within sight is a free-standing C4 watch-tower (ibid.). Phigaleia probably had a number of second-order settlements; one such, c1 km west of the city, is briefly noticed by Cooper and Myers (1981) 133, who hypothesise “a number of satellite villages” (ibid.); one such was associated with the sanctuary at Bassai (Yalouris (1979) 90). At Bassai, on the southern slope of Mt. Kotilion, the sanctuary of Apollo Bassitas or Epikourios (cf. Cooper (1968) 103 n. 5) can be traced back to C8s or C700 (Jost (1985) 93; Voyatzis (1990) 43). C.620–580 a monumental temple was built (for a plan, see Jost (1985) pl. 22.2; Kelly (1995) fig. 1) which was oriented north–south. It is possible that the construction of a new temple was begun c.500 (Yalouris (1979) 94–96; Jost (1985) 94); however, the famous Classical temple was built in C5s (Jost (1985) 95). It is a Doric peripteral temple measuring 16.13 × 38.87 m and oriented north–south, with six times fifteen columns, and is built of local limestone (for a plan, see Cooper (1968) 104). A large number of other Archaic and Classical buildings stood within the sanctuary (Yalouris (1979) 90). Just above Bassai, on Mt. Kotilion, two simple temples without peristasis have been excavated (see Jost (1985) pl. 22.3 for a plan). They were presumably parts of a single sanctuary (Jost (1985) 97) that can be traced back to C8–C7 (ibid.). The temples were erected contemporaneously with the first temple at Bassai, i.e. c.625–600 (Cooper (1968) 103 n. 7). For other extra-urban sanctuaries, see Cooper (1972) 363–67 and AR (1995–96) 12.

K. Tausend (1991) 16 argues that Phigaleia was an Azanian city, but this is highly unlikely (Roy (1972b) 44 n. 6; Nielsen (1996a) 160 n. 61; Nielsen and Roy (1998) 33–36); in any case, if the Azanians ever formed a political unit, this had broken up before C5 (Roy (1972b) 44, (1996) 110; Nielsen (1996a) 138). Membership of the Peloponnesian League is not explicitly attested, but can be assumed (Nielsen (1996c) 87, 92); the same is true of membership of the Arcadian Confederacy (ibid. 94–95). According to Polyain. 6.27.2, Phigaleia sent an embassy to Argos (no. 347) to conclude a symmachia; Meyer (1938) 2070, 2082, believes that the passage refers to C5; see, however, Robertson (1992) 234–35, 240, 243–44 and esp. 250–52, arguing that this passage simply reflects an aetiological mythic complex. The earliest attested treaty to which Phigaleia was a party is Staatsverträge 476 of c.267–265, a treaty between Athens (no. 361) and Sparta (no. 345) with allies. A citizen of Phigaleia was appointed proxenos by the Aitolian Confederacy c.270 (IG 1x.1 13.19).

Phigaleian exiles are mentioned by Diod. 15.40.2 (1374). From the same passage it can be inferred that Phigaleia was a democracy in 374 (Roy (1973) 138). A system of phylai is attested in IG v.2.421 (undated); damiorgoi are mentioned in IG v.2.423 (undated).

The agora is mentioned in IG v.2.421.7 (undated); Polyb. 4.79.5 refers to a polemarchion; Diod. 15.40.2 (1374) mentions a theatre. A C4–C3 fountain is found too (Papachatzis (1994) 352–53). The acropolis was separately fortified (Cooper and Myers (1981) fig. 4); there are no remains on the acropolis (Jost (1985) 86). “Fortifications embrace a large area, approximately 1.5 km north–south and 1.3 km east–west” (Cooper and Myers (1981) 124: a plan is found as fig. 4); “Stretches of the circuit may date as early as the 5th c. B.C. but in the mid 4th c. B.C. portions were rebuilt” (Cooper in PECS s.v. Phigalia). Meyer (1938) 2069 supposes that not all the area of the city was actually occupied by habitation, but that the city was built to give shelter to herds of cattle; on the other hand, Cooper and Myers (1981) 133 note that roof-tiles, some Classical, are scattered across most of the site, indicating habitation and/or other roofed buildings. According to Cooper in PECS s.v. Phigalia, “considerable remains of the Archaic, Classical, and Roman periods lie exposed”. For a C4 intra-mural temple of Zeus Soter and Athena, see AR (1996–97) 47.

A Polias divinity is attested by IG v.2.421 (undated). The principal deity of the city was Dionysos (Meyer (1938) 2083–84), in whose honour festivals (Diod. 15.40.2 (1374)) and mysteries (Jost (1985) 85 with refs.) were celebrated; recently, a C4 intramural temple dedicated to Athena and Zeus Soter has been excavated; at the temple a number of inscriptions were found, among which grants of proxenia to citizens of Megalopolis (no. 282) and Byzantium (no. 674), etc., and an Archaic votive inscription to Athena (Ergon (1996) 41–47). SEG 23 240 is a C4 dedication to Hygieia.

Citizens of Phigaleia achieved Olympic victories in C6 (Olympionikai 95, 99, 102) and C4 (Olympionikai 392); the latter athlete won three Isthmian victories as well (CEG 11 826). The city as such donated money for the construction of the new temple at Delphi in the 360s (CID ii 4.111.45).

293. Phorieia (Phoriaeus) Unlocated. Type: C. The toponym is Φοριεία in Steph. Byz. 670.7, who cites Ephor. fr. 55 for the ethnic Φοριαεύς. The city’s only claim to
inclusion in this Inventory is the fact that it had its own ethnic; since sub-ethnics are practically unknown in Arkadia, the ethnic may be a city-ethnic; cf. Nielsen (1996a) 117–32.

294. Psophis (Psophidios) Map 58. Lat. 37.50, long. 21.55. Size of territory: 4. Type: A. The toponym is Ὠφης, η (Theopr. Hist. pl. 9.15.2; Polyb. 4.70.3). The city-ethnic is invariably Ὠφιδίας (Hecat. fr. 6). Psophis is called polis in the political sense in IoV 294 (C45; see comm. IoV and Meyer (1959) 1426), and in the urban sense at Polyb. 4.70.4 (r219). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on C5 coins (Head, HN² 453) and externally in SEG 24 299 (C68) and at Hecat. fr. 6.

The territory occupied c.280 km². No second-order settlements are known. The mountains Malea and Lampia were sacred to Pan (Jost (1985) 57). On Mt. Aphrodision was a sanctuary with several buildings, among which a C5 temple (9.9 × 7.4 m) and a C5 stoa stand out; the votives date back to the Archaic period (Jost (1985) 58–59). According to Paus. 8.25.1, the border with Thelphousa (no. 300) was marked by a stele with ἀρχαία γράμματα.

Psophis is not attested as having been a member of any larger organisation during our period, but according to Polyb. 4.70.3, it was an Azanian community; however, if the Azanians ever formed a political unit, this had broken up before C5 (Roy (1972b) 44, (1996) 110; Nielsen (1996a) 138). Paus. 5.24.2 refers to undatable military activities by Psophis; however, SEG 24 299 is a C6s dedication of a shield by the city at Olympia, indicating that it was conducting military campaigns by that time.

No Psophidian proxenoi are known, but at 616.7 Pausanias refers to an (undatable) sculptural group at Olympia which he thought represented Eleian proxenoi of Psophis.

Psophis was situated in a remarkable, almost peninsular position between the rivers Erymanthos and Aroanios (see Jost (1985) pl. 10.1), a position commented upon by Polyb. 4.70.7–10 and well brought out by Pritchett (1989) 23–24. For what it is worth, Polybios at 4.70.3 calls the city a πολεῖς Αὐκάδων κτίσμα. For Archaic stray finds from the site, see Jost (1985) 57. Several sections of retaining walls can be found inside the circuit (Papandreou (1920) 138). Within the circuit are numerous ancient remains and sherds (ibid. 138–41); some of the larger foundations may be of temples (cf. Jost (1985) 55–57), and there are traces of a proasteion as well (Papandreou (1920) 142). The circuit wall enclosed an area of 80 ha (Meyer (1959) 1424). It is of Scranton's class C5 (isodomic trapezoidal: quarry face, p. 170), which he dates 425–375 (Scranton (1941) 85). Polybios refers to private houses in Psophis three times (4.72.1 twice (οἰκίων), 8 (οἰκήσεις)). The acropolis, too, is mentioned by Polyb. 4.71.11, 72.1 (r219). An acropolis wall is not visible (Pritchett (1989) 28) and there are no ancient remains on the acropolis (Papandreou (1920) 138).

Athena Polias is presumably attested on coin types (Jost (1985) 55), and Papandreou (1920) 139 assumes that Artemis Erykene was the patron divinity of the city.

The coinage of Psophis began in C5 (Head, HN² 453). The Classical coinage was in silver only. Known denominations are tritemorion, hemiobol, obol, trihemiobol and tetrobol. The legend is ὨΦΙΔΙΩΝ or abbreviations thereof. Frequent types are obv. Keryneian stag; rev. fish (with acorn) in incuse square, and obv. head of Athena; rev. club (of Herakles). In C4 the city began to strike in bronze. SNG Cop. Argolis 280–82.

295. Pylai (Paryplaios) Unlocated, but presumably in western Arkadia (Meyer (1957a) 81). Type: C. Steph. Byz. 538.19 mentions a Πυλαι as a τόπος Αὐκάδιας; Meyer (1957a) 81 connects this place with the ethnic Παρπυλαίοι (SEG 18 157 (C5)). If accepted, Pylai may claim inclusion in this Inventory because it had its own ethnic; since sub-ethnics are practically unknown in Arkadia, the ethnic may be a city-ethnic; cf. further Nielsen (1996a) 117–32.

296. Stymphalos (Stymphalios) Map 58. Lat. 37.50, long. 22.30. Size of territory: 3. Type: A. The toponym is Στύφαλος (SEG 35 371 (C5f); Ps.-Skylax 44, SEG 36 147.B fr. d.7 (c.368) and Polyb. 4.68.6 have Στύφαλος, ο (cf. η at Paus. 8.22.2.), and Hom. Il. 2.608 has Στύφιθαλος. The city-ethnic is Στυμφάλοι (Pind. Ol. 6.99; SEG 20 716.20 (C4m)).

Stymphalos is listed as the fifth toponym after the headling πόλεις αἱ μεγάλαι αἵδε (where polis is used in the urban sense) at Ps.-Skylax 44. In the political sense polis is used about the city in, e.g., IG v.2 352 (C48) and SEG 32 370 quater (c.315); πολίτης is found in IG v.2 351.3 (C4l), πολίτεια in IG v.2 358 (C5f), and πολιτεύειν in IPArk no. 17.176 (C4l). The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found in IG v.2 352.1–2 (C4l) and on C4 coins (Head, HN² 454); externally, the individual use is found at Xen. An. 1.1.11 and in IG iv² 102 Α23 (C4), and the collective use in Pind. Ol. 6.99 and SEG 20 716.20 (C4m).

The lake near the city was called ἡ Στυμφηλίς λίμνη (Hdt. 6.76.3); the size of this lake varied, and it sometimes extended to the southern part of the city, which itself occupied the lacustrine plain. The size of the territory was c.180
km². Near Lafka, c.6 km south-west of the city, is a late Classical/Hellenistic cemetery, and Doric architectural fragments.

Stymphalian membership of the Peloponnesian League may be assumed (Nielsen (1996c) 87). Membership of the Arkadian Confederacy is proved by Xen. Hell. 7.3.1 (Bötte (1931) 447). A treaty of symbola was concluded with Athens (no. 361) in C4m (cf. Staatsverträge 279; SEG 36 147), and one with Demetrias = Sikyon (no. 228) in C4l (IPArk no. 17); in C3f a treaty of sympolitieia vel sim. was concluded with Lousoi (no. 279) (IGV.2 358).

In SEG 36 147 fr. 4.4 (c.368) occurs the expression προξενία προξενῶν, which may indicate the exchange of envoys and the existence of prokxia relations between Athens and Stymphalos before the final conclusion of the treaty (of symbola); see Wallbank (1986) 333 note ad fr. a.4 and 350–51; Stymphalos granted prokxia to an unknown man in C4s (IG v.2 352), and had one of its own citizens appointed Delphic prokxenos and theorodorokos c.360 (Syll.1 189); an Argive theorodorokos resided in the city c.330 (SEG 23 189.24).

The earliest surviving public enactments are a series of C4s decrees (IG v.2 351–56), for which see Tauerber (1981). A death sentence is recorded at SEG 20 716.20 (C4m). A boule is attested at IG v.2 351 and 356 (C4s), and a board of prostatai bolas at IG v.2 351; a board of damiorgoi at IG v.2 351 too. An assembly (ἐκκλησία) is attested at IPark no. 17.194; its ordinary name was probably polis (IG v.2 352 (C4s)).

The public architecture of Stymphalos is still imperfectly known; the agora has not been located with certainty (H. Williams (1984) 186; but see Bötte (1931) 443 and Jost (1985) 104–5). An area of seating cut in the bare rock south of the acropolis suggests the existence of a theatre (H. Williams (1983) 200, (1984) 176–77; cf. Frederiksen (2002) 67). The acropolis is included within the circuit; here three temples are known, not all of them firmly dated, but one possibly dedicated to Athena Polias is C4m (H. Williams, pers. comm.) and has yielded late Archaic and Classical sculpture (H. Williams et al. (1997) 44, pers. comm.).

Pind. Ol. 6.99 uses the phrase ἀπὸ Στυµφαλίων περὶχείων, thus suggesting the existence of a C3f fortification; at 8.8.4, Strabo mentions a siege of Stymphalos by Lphikrates, which probably occurred in 369 (Dušaníć (1970) 332 n. 9). The preserved wall is C4m or C4l, and is constructed in mudbrick on a stone foundation (H. Williams and Price (1995) 8; Williams et al. (1997) 66). It was 2,300 m long and is described by H. Williams (1985), (1984); it seems to have enclosed an area of at least 40 ha (calculated on the basis of H. Williams (1983) fig. 1).

According to Paus. 8.22.1–2, old Stymphalos was not in the same place as the known city, but we have no idea about where this can have been (Jost (1985) 101, 105); however, at the village of Lafka, part of a well-preserved polygonal circuit wall has been found, thus providing a possible candidate for early Stymphalos (H. Williams, pers. comm.). The later city was “laid out as an orthogonally planned town some time in the fourth century (= 375–350, p. 8); it had a sophisticated grid of streets and blocks apparently laid out on a module of 110 Doric feet, or 36 m, for width of street and block, inside a well-built circuit of stone and mud brick walls that encompassed a relatively low acropolis near the lake as well as the flat terrain to the north and east of it” (H. Williams and Price (1995) 1). So far, the earliest pottery from the site is Late Archaic (ibid. 8); sufficient Classical pottery has now been found to push the existence of the town back into C5 (H. Williams et al. (1997) 41, 43; part of the road system may also predate C4; ibid. 42). There is evidence for several late Archaic or early Classical peri-urban Doric temples (H. Williams and Price (1995) 20; H. Williams et al. (1997) 67).

Athena Polias is attested by SEG 11 1111 (C4), but the patron deity of the city was probably Artemis: she is depicted on coins, and her sanctuary was used for publication of decrees (IG v.2 351.9–10 (C4l)). In C5, Dromeus of Stymphalos was periodonikes (Knab (1934) no. 3).

According to Head, HN, the coinage of Stymphalos began c.400; according to Babelon, Traité ii.3, 593–94 it began c.420. The city struck in both silver and bronze. The legend is ΣΤΥΜΦΑΛΙΩΝ, ΣΤΥΜΦΑΛΙΩΝ, ΣΤΥΜΦΑΛΙΩΝ (silver coins). Known denominations are obol, triobol and stater. The types depict Artemis, Herakles and the Stymphalian birds. The rev. type of the staters (Herakles with club) is discussed by Schefold (1963–64). SNG Cop. Argolis 283–87.

297. Tegea (Τεγέατας) Map 58. Lat. 37.30, long. 22.25. Size of territory: 4. Type: A. The toponym is Τεγέα, Ἱ (IG iv 510 (C5f); Pind. Ol. 10.66), or in Ionic Τεγεύ (Hom. Il. 2.607; IVo 268 (c.460)); Dion. 11.66.3 (x467/6) has Τεγεύα. The city—ethnic is invariably Τεγεύατας (IG v.2 159 (C5); SEG 37 676 (C4f)), of which the Ionic form is Τεγεύητης (Hdt. 1.65.1).

Tegea is called a polis in the political sense at Simon. 122, Diehl = Anth. Pal. 7.512, possibly C5f (Molyneux (1992) 201), or c.369 (Pritchett (1985) 217–19), Hdt. 7.202, 204, and SEG 11 1051 (C4e); in the urban sense polis is used about it at Thuc.
5.62.2, Xen. Hell. 7.5.8 and Ps.-Skylax 44, who lists it as the first toponym after the heading πόλεις αἱ μεγάλαι αἰδε, where polis is used in the urban sense. The territorial sense of polis (with the political sense as a possible connotation) occurs in Xen. Hell. 7.5.5 (for which see Nielsen (1996c) 72–73). Xen. Hell. 6.5.7 and IG v.2 39 (C4) use πολιτεία, whereas IG v.2 3.11 (C5–C4) makes a distinction between ἰαστὸς and ἥνως. There was an Aristotelian Τεγεάτων πολιτεία (frt. 668–9). IPArk. no. 5 (C324) uses πολιτεύειν at l. 21, and at l. 28 it uses πολιτικός to distinguish the ordinary lawcourt of the city from an ad hoc court, called τὸ δικαστήριον τὸ ξενικόν and presumably composed of citizens from a foreign polis (IPArk p. 65), established to adjudicate the claims of returning exiles. SEG 22 287 (C3) uses πατρίς about the city and the poetess Anyte πάτρα (Anth. Pal. 6.153 = Gow and Page 11). A C4 tile is stamped ΔΑΜΟΣΙΟΣ (IG v.2 170.1).

The collective use of the city–ethnic is found internally in IG v.2 159 (C5), and externally in ML 27.3, Hdt. 1.65.1 and Thuc. 4.143.1. The individual use is found externally in Hdt. 9.9.1, Thuc. 2.67.1, IG i3 1371 bis (c.410) and SEG 37 676 (C4f).

The territory occupied c.385 km². It is described as a καλὸν πεδίον in a C6 oracle reported at Hdt. 1.66.2. Its name was (ἡ) Τεγεάτις (χώρα) (Thuc. 5.64.4; Xen. Hell. 6.5.15). Hdt. 1.66.4 calls the territory τὸ πεδίον τὸ τῶν Τεγεάτων, and it is termed χώρα at Xen. Hell. 6.5.6. The border with Lakonia is referred to at Hdt. 8.124.3 (οὗτοι οἱ Τεγεάτεωι). Near this border, at Analipsis, was a Classical sanctuary which seems to have been associated with a small settlement (Jost (1985) 161). At Mavriki south-east of the city was a C6 Doric marble temple (Voyatzis (1990) 29–30). Just north of the city, on Ag. Sostis, is an Archaic sanctuary which perhaps included a C5 temple (Jost (1985) 155). For two C4 fortified watch-towers in the territory, see Pikoulas (1995) cat. nos. 42–43. According to Strabo 8.3.2, Tegea was (at an uncertain date) synoecised from nine demes, whose names are given at Paus. 8.45.1. The nature of the settlement pattern and the political organisation before the synoecism are completely unknown, but the areas of the demes can be roughly located (cf. Voyatzis (1990) 10–11 with fig. 2); two of the demes, those of the Karyatai and the Oiatai, seem to have been annexed by the Spartans at an early date and to have alternated between inclusion in Tegea and Sparta (no. 334) (cf. Shipley (1997) 233–34, 238–39; Nielsen (1999) 49).

Tegea fielded 500 hoplites for Thermopylae (Hdt. 7.202), but at Plataiai the city provided 1,500 (Hdt. 9.27.3) in addition to 1,500 psiloi (Hdt. 9.61.2); at the battle of Nemea in 394 the city may have fielded upwards of 2,400 hoplites (Roy (1971b) 440). Finally, the stasis of 370 sent 800 oligarchs into exile at Sparta (Xen. Hell. 6.5.10). These figures suggest a substantial population, but its exact size cannot be estimated (cf. Forsén (2000) 36–39), and it is, furthermore, not known how large a fraction of the population resided in the town.

According to Hdt. 1.66.3, the Spartans in C6f planned to subject Tegea to an exandrapodismos, but were unsuccessful. It is often believed that it was this conflict that led, around C6m, to the conclusion of the treaty Staatsverträge 112 (cf. p. 11); an alliance between Tegea and Sparta antedating the Persian Wars is certainly implied by Hdt. 9.26.2, but the treaty Staatsverträge 112 is now thought to belong to C5f (Cawkwell (1993) 368–70; Braun (1994) 42–45; cf. Osborne (1996) 287–89). C5 membership of the Peloponnesian League can be inferred from numerous passages in Thucydides (2.67.1, 5.32.3, 5.72.6, 67.1), and C4 membership is proved by, e.g., Xen. Hell. 4.2.13. A C5f alliance with Argos (no. 347) can be inferred from Hdt. 9.35.2 (cf. Strabo 8.6.19, who gives a vague chronological reference: μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐν Σαλαμῖνι ναυµαχίαν: Argos assisted Tegea in a battle against Sparta (Hdt.), and Tegea assisted Argos against Mykenai (no. 355) (Strabo)). The same Herodotean passage allows the inference that Tegea at one point in C5f was the leader of an anti-Spartan alliance comprising all Arkadia except Mantinea (no. 281); cf. Nielsen (1996b) 218–20. From Thuc. 4.134.1 it appears that Tegea, like Mantinea, was the leader of a local alliance; cf. Nielsen (1996c) 79–86.

In 370, Tegea joined the Arkadian Confederacy, but only after a bloody civil war which sent 800 oligarchs into exile (Xen. Hell. 6.5.6–9). Tegea became a leading member providing oecists for the foundation of Megalopolis (no. 282) (Paus. 8.27.2). When the Confederacy split in two in 363, Tegea with Megalopolis remained loyal to Boiotia (Xen. Hell. 7.5.5), whereas Mantinea joined Sparta; Diod. 15.82.2 refers to Tegea as the leader of the faction opposing Mantinea.

Tegean military commanders are referred to at Hdt. 7.202 and 204, and στραταγοι are mentioned in a C4m law (IPArk. no. 3.9). Five hundred Tegean hoplites were present at Thermopylae (Hdt. 7.202); 1,500 hoplites and 1,500 other troops fought at Plataiai (Hdt. 9.28.3, 61.2), and Tegean troops fought at Mantinea in 418 (Thuc. 5.67.1) and at Nemea in 394 (Xen. Hell. 4.2.20).

A Tegean envoy to the Persian king is mentioned at Thuc. 2.67.1, and according to Diod. 15.82.3 Tegea in 362 sent an embassy to Boiotia; Tegea received envoys from Corinth (no. 227) and Argos (no. 347) in 421 (Thuc. 5.32.3) and from
Epidaurus (no. 348) in C4f (IG IV2 102.A.11.102). In C4e, the city granted proxenia to a man from Orchomenos (no. 286) (SEG 11 1051), and in C4m two Tegeans were granted Delphic proxenia (SEG 31 560); in C4–C3 an Argive theorodokos resided in Tegea (SEG 33 283).

A system of four, presumably territorial, phylai is attested, but its functions are unknown; Paus. 8.53.6 names them Κλαρεώτις, Ἰπποθότις, Ἀπολλωνιάτις and Αθανατίς, and these names occur on a C3 inscription (IG v.2 36) as Ἰπποθότις, Ἀπολλωνιάτις, etc.; Jones, POAG 139–42. There was an Aristotelian Τεγειατῶν πολιτεία (fr. 608), but there is no direct evidence about the form of constitution; however, a stasis is described at Xen. Hell. 6.5.7; this stasis brought the demos to power, and it can be inferred that prior to the stasis Tegea was an oligarchy governed in accordance with οἱ πάτριοι νόμοι; a thesµός is referred to in IPArk no. 1.8, 19–20 (C5). The earliest surviving public enactment is SEG 11 1051 of C4e (ἐδοξε τὰι πόλι τῷ Τεγεατᾶ). The eponymous official was presumably the priest of Athena Alea (IPArk no. 4 n. 1 (C4)); a board called οἱ Τριακάσιοι (IPArk nos. 2.20–21, 3.8 (C5–C4e)) was presumably a council, and one called οἱ πεντέκοντα possibly its executive committee (IPArk no. 1.20 with n. 7 (C5–C4e)). In addition, there is evidence of boards of theaµοι (Xen. Hell. 6.5.7); διµοργοι (IPArk no. 2.28 (C5–C4e)); ἐσδοτήρες (= pole-tai) (IPArk no. 3.48 (C4m)); and ιεροθύται (IPArk no. 2.22–23 (C5–C4e)). In addition, IPArk no. 2.5 attests to a ιεροθύτας, and SEG 11 1070 (C4l) to an agonothetes. The existence of an assembly can be inferred from SEG 11 1051 (C4e): ἐδοξε τὰι πόλι, for which formula see Rhodes (1995) 95–96. A local calendar is attested by IPArk no. 2.29–30 (C5l–C4e).

The layout of the city of Tegea is not well known, though there are indications that by the end of the Archaic period the sanctuary of Athena Alea was at the heart of a well-developed site (Morgan (1999) 396–97); Òdegàrd (AR 2000–1 32) refers to various C6s and C5 finds from the city area. A circuit wall and two gates are mentioned at Xen. Hell. 6.5.8–9 in reference to 370; however, Diod. 12.79.3 (1418) mentions a poliarkia of Tegea, thus suggesting that the city was walled at this date. Furthermore, at 5.6.2.2 Thucydides states that in 418 some people in Tegea were willing to betray the city to the democratic quadruple alliance (καὶ τινες αὐτοῖς καὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει [sc. of Tegea] ἐνεδίδοσαν τὰ πράγµατα); if insiders were necessary to conquer the city, we may assume that it was fortified. The preserved remains of the C4e wall show it to have been constructed in mudbrick on a stone foundation (Bérard (1892) 548; cf. Voyatzis (1990) 12); traces of the wall were reportedly found in four places, thus giving a very rough indication of its course (Bérard (1892) 547; cf. Voyatzis (1990) fig. 3), and this course has now been confirmed in its basic assumptions (AR 2000–1 32) except for the fact that the sanctuary of Athena Alea seems to have been outside the wall. The area enclosed by the wall seems to have had the shape of “an irregular ellipse, with the long axis measuring 2,000 metres and the short axis 1,400 metres” (Voyatzis (1990) 12; cf. Bérard (1892) 547). It measured max. c.190 ha. IPArk no. 5 (324) refers to oikiai, but there is, unfortunately, no way of knowing how densely populated the large area inside the wall was. At 5.17.2 Polybios refers to the acropolis, but this has so far escaped identification (Voyatzis (1990) 16–17; cf. Bérard (1892) 541–42).

Little is known about public architecture. Xen. Hell. 7.4.36 refers to a desnoterion and to a demosia oikia. There are remains of a C4 theatre (Callmer (1943) 121; TGR ii. 270). A C3 inscription refers to the agora (SEG 22 280.24). But the most famous Tegean structure was, of course, the temple of Athena Alea; the first monumental temple was constructed C5l (Voyatzis (1990) 11); the Classical temple was constructed c.345–335 (Norman (1984) 191–93).

An Athena Poliatis is attested by Paus. 8.47.5 and IG v.2.77 (Roman, but the divinity is presumably much earlier; see Burkert (1995) 208), but the real patron divinity of Tegea was Athena Alea (Voyatzis (1990) 14; cf. Jost (1985) 142–65). Festivals are attested by IPArk no. 2.26 (C5l–C4e) and IPArk no. 5.21–22 (324); games in honour of Athena Alea are attested as early as Pind. Ol. 7.83 (cf. IG v.2 75 (C6l), 113 (C5e); Jost (1985) 374); a στάδιον χῶµα γῆς is mentioned by Paus. 8.47.4; a starting line block of uncertain but possibly late Classical date is published by Pakkonen, Τεγεα Stadium. A Pythian victor is attested for 554 (Paus. 10.7.7), a Nemean for C5 (Dubois (1986) TE 1), and an Olympic for 308 (Diod. 20.37.1). Dedications of Spartan and Persian spoils were set up in the temple of Athena Alea (Hdt. 1.66.4, 9.70.3), and in 423 the city sent Mantinean spoils to Delphi (Thuc. 4.134.1); in Delphi, too, the city dedicated Spartan spoils and erected a stoa in c.369 (cf. SEG 31 558–59; Vatin (1988) 453–59).

According to Head, HN® 454, the mint at Tegea began to strike c.420; hoard evidence, however, may point to the Archaic period for the first coinage (cf. IGCH 11, buried c.480; Hesperia 24 (1955) 135–36). The city struck on the Aiginetan standard and minted in silver, bronze and iron; the single surviving iron coin (C5a) is discussed by Köhler (1882b) (cf. also MacIsaac (1988) 48–49); obv. Gorgoneion; rev. owl + ΤΗΕ. Known denominations are hemiobol, trihemiobol, obol and triobol; in addition, a single
diodrachm is known, for which see Schwabacher (1939) 15–18. The most common types are Gorgoneion, head of Athena Alea and owl. Legends: Τ, ΤΕ, ΤΕΓ, ΤΕΓΕ, ΤΕΓΕΑ, ΤΕΓΕΛΑΣΤΑΝ (ΘΩΝ) or ΑΘΑΝΑΣ ΑΛΕΑΣ, SNG Cop., Argolis 288–313.

298. Teuthis (Teuthidias)  Map 58. Lat. 37.35, long. 22.00. Located at modern Dimitsana; see Jost (1985) 212 and Pikoulas (1986b). Size of territory: ? Type: C. The toponym is Τευθίδις, ή (Paus. 8.28.4); the ethnic is Τευθίδας, attested on Hellenistic coins (Head, HN² 418). At 8.28.4 Pausanias states that πάλαι δὲ ήν πόλισμα ή Τευθίδις, but the only reason for including it in this Inventory is the fact that according to Paus. 8.27.4 (1371) Teuthis was, prior to the foundation of Megalopolis (no. 282), among the communities whose relationship to Orchomenos (no. 286) could be described by the phrase συντελεύται. The other communities so described are Methydron (no. 283) and Thisoa (no. 301), both of which were probably poleis. So, by analogy, we may class Teuthis as a possible polis.

According to Paus. 8.27.4, Teuthis was among the communities that the Arkadian Confederacy decreed to relocate to Megalopolis; it is unknown, however, whether this decision was implemented, and the site seems not to have been abandoned at the synoeceis (Pikoulas (1986b)).

The city proper lay below the acropolis. The site is now occupied by the village of Dimitsana, and so the degree of ancient urbanisation cannot be estimated; but Pikoulas (1986b) 116 reports considerable numbers of Archaic and Hellenistic sherds, but fewer Classical. The acropolis was fortified (ibid. 110 with map 1 at 101). The date of the impressive fortification is uncertain, but it is not earlier than C4 and is probably Hellenistic (ibid. 113).

299. Thaliades  Map 58. Lat. 37.45, long. 21.55. Size of territory: ? Type: C. Paus. 8.25.2 has the toponym Ταλαίάδες, αί; the Archaic coinage of the city has the legend ΘΑΛΑΙΑΙ, probably an abbreviation of the otherwise unattested city-ethnic. The only reason for including the city in this Inventory is the existence of this Archaic coinage (Head, HN² 456; Six (1888) 103). The obv. type shows Hermes; attested denominations are obol and tetradrachm. SNG Cop., Argolis 317.

Meyer (1939a) 75–78 describes “pseudopolygionale” fortification walls at the site of Thaliades (modern Vaklia), a small temple on the separately fortified acropolis and three further small temples in the immediate surroundings of the city (all four temples undated); the sherds at the site range from Classical to Hellenistic, but Jost (1985) 44 refers to earlier material. Cf. Jost (1985) 44–45.

300. Thelphousa (Thelphousios) Map 58. Lat. 37.45, long. 21.55. Size of territory: 4. Type: B. The toponym shows several variants: (1) Θελφουσα (IG v.2 412 (Classical)); (2) Θελφουσα (IG v.2 1.64 (360s)); (3) Θελφουσα (Polyb. 2.54.13); (4) Θελφουσα, ή (Paus. 8.25.1). The ethnic shows the corresponding variations: (1) Θελφουσιος (IG v.2 1.64 (360s)); (2) Θελφουσιος (IG iv 727.B.13 (C4)); (3) Θελφουσιος (Polyb. 4.73.2); (4) Θελφουσιος (Head, HN² 418). In addition, Steph. Byz. s.v. has θάλφουσα, θαλφουσιος. Finally, a C5 dedication at Olympia has κάρυς δαμοίσια Θελφουσιος (SEG ii 1254α), which points to the form *Θελφουσα for the toponym. For a discussion of toponym and ethnic, see Meyer (1934) 1618.

Thelphousa is called a polis in the political sense at SEG 12 371 (242), and in the urban sense at Polyb. 25.4.13; it is referred to as πάτρα in IG v.2 412.2 (Classical). The city-ethnic is found in the external individual use in IG ix.13 31.89 (C3) and Phld. Acad. Ind. 20.8, Dorandi (rC3); the collective use is found internally on C4 coins (abbreviated to ΘΕΛΙΑ: Head, HN² 456) and externally in IG v.2 1.64 (360s).

The territory occupied c.275 km² and was called Τελφουσία (Lycoph. Alex. 1040; Polyb. 4.60.4). Steph. Byz. 306.5 describes Thelphousa as a πόλις Ἀρκαδίας τοῦ Ὀρχομενοῦ. Orchomenos (no. 286) seems to have ruled a number of dependent poleis (Nielsen (1996c) 84–86, but there is no other evidence that Thelphousa was one of these (Meyer (1934) 1619). At 8.25.1 Pausanias mentions a βοιαί by the name of Καουσίς; the settlement may have existed by C4e (Jost (1986b) 644), and its raison d’être was presumably to look after the sanctuary of Asklepios Kaousios (Jost (1986a) 149). Kaous, at modern Voutsì, lies 6.5 km north of the city (Jost (1985) 63). C.2 km south of the city Meyer (1957b) 13ff found traces of a settlement which includes a C6–C7 temple and thus existed in the Classical period; it must have constituted a second-order settlement of Thelphousa, possibly to be identified with ancient Onkeion (Paus. 8.25.4; cf. Jost (1985) 66). Another small settlement in the same general area is mentioned by Meyer (1957b) 15. For a possible settlement at Bertisia, see Jost (1985) 67. A fortress called Στράτος, ί was likewise situated in Thelphousian territory (Polyb. 4.73.2; Meyer (1934) 1619). It has not yet been located. The territory was dotted with sanctuaries (see Jost (1985) 66 (Classical), 67 (Archaic/Classical), 68 (possibly a temple), 68–69, 69 (a temple and Archaic votives)).

K. Tausend (1993) 18 argues that Thelphousa was an Azanian community, but certainly is impossible (Nielsen and Roy (1998) 33–36). In any case, even if the Azanians ever formed a political unity, this had broken up before C5 (Roy
The form of constitution is unknown; a Classical epigram commemorating fallen warriors refers to their saving the εὐνομίαν . . . πατέρων (IG v.2 412.6). Otherwise the earliest preserved public enactment is SEG 12 371 of 242, an asylium decree for Kos; it attests to an assembly in the enactment formula ἑδοκεῖ ταῖς παλί τῶν ἑθελοντῶν.

"Ancient Thelpousa is situated on the left bank of the Ladon about one kilometer north of the hamlet of Toubitsi" (Pritchett (1989) 38). The city was situated on a hill and covered an extensive area on the lower slopes, not all of which was occupied (Jost (1985) 62). Numerous scattered remains have been found, particularly in the lower city (ibid.). For a plan, see Jost (1986b) fig. 4. The only well-known feature of the city is the agora. It was huge, measuring 130 × c.120 m, and was laid out on an artificial terrace supported by a retaining wall (Jost (1986b) 618). The agora was flanked by stoas on all four sides, the western stoa, however, running for only half the length of the agora; on the southern side, the agora was flanked by a C4 stoa which measured at least 78 × 7 m (ibid.). For a plan, see Jost (1986a) fig. 5. All in all, the layout and construction of the agora is C4 (Jost (1986b) 642). No monumental structures have been found on the acropolis (ibid. 637). The city was walled, and traces of the wall are extant, but have not been investigated separately; cf. Meyer (1994a) 86–87. It may, however, be noted that a Classical epigram (= IG v.2 412) commemorating fallen warriors probably refers to the wall (ἱππακεία πύργων).

Thelpousa began minting c.400 and struck in both silver and bronze, the bronze issues beginning perhaps only c.323 (Babelon, Traité ii.3, 621–22); the legends used are: ΘΕΟΣΑ (Head, HN# 456; Babelon, Traité ii.3 nos. 935–39). Types: Demeter Erinyes, the horse Erion (= Arion), and later Apollo. The known silver coins are obols on the Aiginetan standard. SNG Cop. Argolis 318.

301. Thisoa (Thisoaḯos) Map 58. Lat. 37.40, long. 22.05. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: B (?). The toponym does not appear until BCH 45 (1921) 111.5 (c.230–210), which gives Θισόα, ἦ; the MSS of Pausanias have Θεισόα (which Rocha-Pereira prints) and Θισόα (which Casevitz prints); cf. 8.27.4, 28.3. The city-ethnic is Θεισοαḯος, which points to the toponym Θισόα; the ethnic occurs in, e.g., CID i 51.23–24 (358) and IG v.2 511 (C3l–C2e).

Thisoa is listed as a polis in the urban or political sense at Paus. 8.27.4 (1371), and refers to itself as a polis in the political sense in IG v.2 510–11 (C3l–C2e). The ethnic is found in the external individual use in SEG 14 455 (C4f), for which see Roy (1972c) 78; the internal collective use is found in IG v.2 510–11 (C3l–C2e).

The name and size of the territory are unknown; Paus. 8.28.3 (ἐν Ἰεροσαήν Τορθυνήων ὑπὸ ὀμόρων) and 8.28.4 (τῇ χώρᾳ δὲ τῇ Ἰεροσαήν) suggest that the toponym could be used as the name of the territory. At Paus. 8.27.3 (1371) Thisoa is listed among a number of communities whose relationship to Orchomenos (no. 286) could be described by the expression αὐτο[ε]λείν ὦς. It is not clear what this means, but it suggests that prior to 371 Thisoa was a dependency of Orchomenos (Nielsen (1996c) 84–86).

Membership of the Arkadian Confederacy can be inferred from Paus. 8.27.4; the same passage claims that Thisoa was one of the communities that the Arkadian Confederacy decreed to relocate to Megalopolis (no. 282), but it is not known whether the decision was implemented. SEG 14 455 (C4f) attests to a Delphic grant of proœxia to a Thisoaḯan; this man could conceivably originate from Kynourian Thisoa (for which see Paus. 8.27.3), but it is more likely that he was a citizen of the Thisoa under discussion (Roy (1972c) 78).

Thisoa was located at modern Karkalou. The city proper, unwalled, lay below the acropolis on a plateau (Jost (1985) 212). The acropolis was walled, but the fortification has not been dated; it may be C3 (Jost (1985) 212 n. 1). Remains of buildings have been found both on the acropolis and in the lower city; the oldest remains reported are C3 (Prakt (1911–12) 243).

302. Torthyneion (Torthynheus) Map 58 (at the Kolinos hill 1 km north-west of Lasta; see Pikoulas (1990–91)). Lat. 37.40, long. 22.10. Size of territory: ? Type: B. The toponym is Topθυ[ε]ονων, τόδε (Syll. 3 90.9 = REG 62 (1949) 4–12 (C5l–C4e)). The ethnic is found in the genitive plural as Topθυνηων in IPark no. 14.6 (360s).

Though Torthyneion occurs in two Classical sources only, these are enough to establish the community as a probable polis; (1) Syll. 3 90.9 = REG 62 (1949) 4–12 (C5l–C4e) attests the existence of a Delphic theorodokos at Torthyneion, and
(2) IPArk no. 14.5–7 has the ethnic in the external collective use (cf. Nielsen (1996a) 131–32) and attests to a Thortynean territory with fixed borders: ἀπ’ τοῦ ὀρίου τοῦ . . . τῶν Ὁρχομελείων καί τῶν Τραπεζήν καί Μετιδρήν κοινώ. In 262, a citizen of Thortyneion was awarded Aitolian proxenia (IG ix.12 17).

There are clear indications of habitation at Thortyneion, with abundant sherds ranging from the Geometric to the Hellenistic periods (Howell (1970) 99–100; Pikoulas (1990–91) 140–43). There are remains of fortification walls too (Pikoulas (1990–91) 144–45).

303. Trapezous (Trapezountios) Map 58. Lat. 37.25, long. 22.05. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: C. The toponym is Τραπεζοῦντος (Hdt. 6.127.3); the ethnic is Τραπεζούντιος (Paus 8.27.5 (1971)).

Trapezous is called polis in the urban or political sense at Paus. 8.27.4 (1971) and—implicitly—πάρηγη at Hdt. 6.127.3. The collective use of the ethnic is found at Paus. 8.27.5 (1971), probably taken over from a historiographic source.

The territory is called χώρα Τραπεζούντια at Paus. 8.29.1. According to Paus. 8.27.4, Trapezous was among the communities that the Arkadian Confederacy decreed to relocate to Megalopolis (no. 282); however, the Trapezountioi resisted the decision, but a part of the population was relocated by use of force, whereas another part left the Peloponnese (Paus. 8.27.5). The synoecism thus meant the end of the city’s existence (cf. Meyer (1937b) 2213).

The city was a Parrhasian community and a member of the Arkadian Confederacy (Paus. 8.27.4; Nielsen (1996a) 132–34). Membership of the Peloponnesian League is not explicitly attested, but may be assumed; it was probably mediated by the tribal state of the Parrhasians (Nielsen (1996c) 100–1), and the same is true of the C5 alliance with Mantinea (no. 281) (ibid. 79–86).

There is a very brief report on an excavation at a site which may be Trapezous (modern Mavria) by Stephanos in Prakt (1907) 123; he reports remains of several buildings and sherds “of Hellenic times” (i.e. Hellenistic; cf. Jost (1985) 170). However, recent rescue excavations near modern Kyparissia (c.20 km north-west of Megalopolis) by A. V. Karapanagiotou have brought to light a new candidate for Trapezous: a city with a rectangular street plan and a fortification wall with rectangular towers, of considerable size (18 ha) though not excavated in its entirety, and dated by the excavator to the earlier fifth century; the earliest material is C6 ceramic material; a C6–C4 sanctuary is located 1.5 km from the city (information derived from public lecture by A. V. Karapanagiotou in Athens, May 2002; for earlier finds at the site, see Bather and Yorke (1892–93) 229–30; Jost (1985) 170). If not to be equated with Trapezous, the site may be ancient Basilis (Paus. 8.29.5).

According to Paus. 8.31.5, some old xoana of Hera, Apollo and the Muses found at Megalopolis had been transferred to the city from Trapezous; the likely date is the 360s, and we may thus assume that before that date Trapezous possessed cults of these divinities; cf. Jost (1985) 169.
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I. The Region

The name of the region is Ῥιφυλία, ἦ (Dem. 16.16; Diod. 15.77.2 (1566)). The ethnic is Ῥιφύλιος (Xen. Hell. 4.2.16; SEG 35 389 (c.399–369)). The collective use of the ethnic is attested externally in Xen. Hell. 6.5.2, and internally in a decree found at Makiston (no. 307) (SEG 35 389 (c.399–369)). The individual use is attested—externally—only once, on a C4 gravestone from Attika, IG ii² 1040: Μαρκίας Ἀνδροκλέως Ῥιφύλιος. No Classical source describes Triphylia by the terms χώρα or γῆ, but Hdt. 4.148.4 uses χώρα of the area occupied by Lepreon (no. 306), Makiston, Phrixai(i) (no. 309), Pyrgos (no. 310), Ep(e)ion (no. 304) and Noudion (no. 308); a late source, Dionysis Periegetes (at 409), uses the expression Ῥιφύλις γαίη. No source describes the Triphylians as an ἕθνος vel sim., probably by coincidence.

Geographically, Triphylia is equated by modern scholars with the area between the river Alpheios south of Olympia and the river Neda north of Messenia (e.g. Tuplin (1993) 184); there are, however, considerable difficulties involved in establishing what the ancient Greeks themselves considered to be Triphylia, because (a) before C4, the concept of Triphylia probably did not yet exist (Niese (1910) 13; Nielsen (1997) 133–44); this means that no information about the extent of “Triphylia” can be found in Herodotos or Thucydides; (b) later sources such as Strabo and Pausanias are influenced by the debate of Homeric scholars who located the kingdom of Nestor in Sisatin and what was later called Triphylia (Strabo 8.3.3; Niese (1910) 35ff.).

For an outline of what was in Antiquity considered to be Triphylia we must begin with Polybios and work backwards to the period when the region was created. At 4.77.9 Polybios states that Triphylia comprised the following poleis: Samikon, Lepreon (no. 306), Hypana, Typaneiai, Pyrgos (no. 310), Ep(e)ion (= Aipion) (no. 304), Bolax, Stylangion and Phrixai(i) (no. 309). From Polyb. 4.80.13 it appears that Epitalion (no. 305) too was considered to be Triphylia. The passage at 4.77.9 employs the present tense (ἐχει [sc. Ῥιφυλία] ἐν αὐτη ἰπλεις ταύτας), and thus strictly speaking refers to C2; but the passage at 4.80.14 employs the past tense (παρέδοθε ... πᾶναν ὁδ' ἑαυτὸν πεποιηµένος τὴν Ῥιφυλίαν), and thus refers to the year 219. Since the extent of Triphylia implied by the two passages is virtually identical, this does not constitute a problem. It may be noted that all communities treated as Triphylian by Polybios were situated in the area between the river Alpheios and the river Neda.

Moving back into C4, Makiston (no. 307) is explicitly attested as Triphylia by a C4 inscription originating from the Triphylian federation itself (SEG 35 389). The importance of this should be stressed: since Makiston does not appear in Polybios’ list, this list cannot simply be retrojected back into the Classical period. But Makiston too was situated between the Neda and the Alpheios.

At Hell. 3.2.30 Xenophon reports that one of the terms of the peace treaty agreed upon by Elis (no. 251) and Sparta (no. 345) c.400 was the following: τὰς Ῥιφυλίδας ἰπλεῖς ἀδείναι (sc. the Eleians) Φρίζαν καὶ Ἐπιτάλιον καὶ Λετρίνοι καὶ Λευκόδους καὶ Μαργανέας. This passage is open to more than one interpretation: (a) it may—on a strict reading—be taken to mean that all communities listed were Triphylian; (b) since Amphidoli (no. 247) and probably also Letrinioi (no. 258) and Marganeis (no. 259) were north of the Alpheios (see Map 58), it may mean that only Phrixai(i) (no. 309) and Epitalion (no. 305) are thought of as Triphylian; (c) accepting Grote’s καὶ after ἀδείναι, it may be taken to mean that Phrixai(i) and Epitalion (and by implication the other items on the list) are not considered Triphylian. Item (c) would eliminate the significance of the passage as a source for the extent of Triphylia, and accepting it means tampering with the text. Item (b) seems more likely, since Phrixai(i) and Epitalion are both considered Triphylia by Polybios. Certainty is impossible, however,
since Triphylia was also a political concept which may well have included communities outside geographical Triphylia proper (whatever that was). For example, Diodoros records in reference to the year 366/5 that Lasion (no. 256) was a Τριφυλίας χωρίον (Diod. 15.77.1); this may simply be a slip (Nielsen (1997) 150 n. 133; cf. Stylianou (1998) ad loc.), but it cannot entirely be excluded that Lasion had been a part of Triphylia as a political entity (Lasion is treated as Eleian in the present work, supra 499). On balance, it seems best to accept (a); it must then be emphasised that (a) means accepting that sites north of the Alpheios are here described as Triphylian although the only other sources to do so are Diod. 15.77.1 (on Lasion; cf. Stylianou (1998) ad loc.) and Stephanos of Byzantion (s.v. Ἀκρώρειοι and Ἀμφίδολος, in both cases without source reference). This may mean that Xenophon was careless, though this is an unsatisfactory hypothesis in the light of his personal acquaintance with the area. A better explanation is that Triphylian identity may initially have been claimed by/for communities north of the Alpheios but that this was a short-lived phenomenon of which there are no traces in later sources of any note. (The communities north of the Alpheios are treated by Roy, supra 489–504).

Four of the communities described as Triphylian by Polybios reappear in Hdt. 4.148.4, in a list of Minyan foundations: viz. Lepreon (no. 306), Phrixai(i) (no. 309), Pyrgos (no. 310) and Ep(e)ion (no. 304). Herodotos’ list includes Makiston (no. 307) and Noudion (no. 308) as well. Since Makiston is explicitly attested as Triphylian by a C4 inscription (SEG 35 389), we may assume that Noudion became Triphylian too (if it survived into C4).

Summing up, we may tentatively conclude that Triphylia came to be conceived of as the area west of Arkadia between the Neda and the Alpheios, and that it comprised the following major sites: Bolax, Ep(e)ion (no. 304), Epitalion (no. 305), Hypana, Lepreon (no. 306), Makiston (no. 307), Noudion (no. 308), Phrixai(i) (no. 309), Pyrgos (no. 310), Samikon, Stylangion and Typaneiai, although it is uncertain whether all of these ever existed contemporaneously. Of the communities explicitly described as Triphylian, those securely located were all south of the Alpheios and north of the Neda; so was Skillous, which we may then include, although it is described as Triphylian only by Pausanias at 5.6.4 (see, however, Xen. Hell. 6.5.2 with Tuplin (1993) 183–84). The border towards Arkadia is not explicitly attested, but it presumably ran west of Heraia and Alipheira, but east of Ep(e)ion and Typaneiai (Nielsen (1997) 155; cf. Roy (2000)).

The written sources associate thirty² toponyms with Triphylia.³ Of these, three (Akrorieoi, Amphidoloi (no. 247) and Lasion (no. 256)) are probably described as Triphyleian by mistake;⁴ another nine (Aipy, Amphigeneia, Arene, Dorion, Helos, Kyparissia, Pteleos, Samos and Thryon) seem to be purely legendary or prehistoric; one (Chaa) is the name of a fort, and eight (Epéeion, Epitalion, Lepreon, Makiston, Noudion, Phrixai[i], Pyrgos and Skillous) of the remaining seventeen belong to communities which are described as poleis in the Inventory below; three (Alorion, Chalkis and Bolax) of the remaining nine are unlocated, and it is unknown whether they existed in the Archaic and Classical periods. The remaining six are as follows.

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis

Hypana (Ὑπανά) Polyb. 4.79.9 (πόλις), Meyer (1957) 33–34; Pritchett (1989) 49–50, 55–58. Among the remains are those of a possibly C4 theatre, and a phase of the fortification wall is C4 as well (Nielsen (2002) 609–10 with refs.). Barr. C.

Pylos (Πύλος) Unlocated. Strabo 8.3.1 (πόλις), 3.14, 3.26. According to Strabo 8.3.30, Pylos was at an unspecified date (Maggi, Sin. 168 proposes a date c.460; cf. Demand (1990) 64 who proposes a C5m date) synoecised into Lepreon (no. 306) by Elis (no. 251). Maggi, Sin. no. 26: Neue Pauly x. 618. Barr. AC.

Pyrgoi (Πύργοι) Strabo 8.3.22; Steph. Byz. 541.6 (πόλις); presumably to be distinguished from the Pyrgos (no. 310) of

² Four unlocated communities (the Anaitoi, the Ewaioi, the Metapoi and the Chaldreadoi) known only from epigraphical documents may possibly have been located in Triphylia; they are treated by Roy in the Eleian Inventory, supra 489–504. On the Ewaioi, see also Roy and Schofield (1999).
³ 1. Aipy (Strabo 8.3.24); 2. Akrorieoi (Steph. Byz. 64.5); 3. Alorion (Strabo 8.3.25); 4. Amphidoloi (Steph. Byz. 89.19); 5. Amphigeneia (Strabo 8.3.25); 6. Arene (Steph. Byz. 117.15; Eust. Ill. 1.459.23); 7. Bolax (Polyb. 4.77.9); 8. Chaa (Strabo 8.3.23); 9. Chalkis (Strabo 8.3.13); 10. Dorion (Strabo 8.3.25); 11. Ep(e)ion (Xen. Hell. 3.12.30; cf. Tuplin (1993) 183–84; Polyb. 4.77.9); 12. Epitalion (Xen. Hell. 3.2.30; cf. Tuplin (1993) 183–84; Polyb. 4.80.33); 13. Helos (Strabo 8.3.25); 14. Hypana (Polyb. 4.77.9; Strabo 8.3.13); 15. Kyparissia (Strabo 8.3.22; Steph. Byz. 395.13); 16. Lasion (Diod. 15.77.1); 17. Lepreon (Polyb. 4.77.9; Strabo 8.3.11; Paus. 5.5.3); 18. Makiston (SEG 35 389 (c.399–396); Paus. 6.2.24; Strabo 8.5.13); 19. Noudion (Hdt. 4.14.48, cf. supra; 20. Phrixai(i) (Xen. Hell. 3.3.30; cf. Tuplin (1993) 183–84; Polyb. 4.77.9); 21. Pyrgo (Strabo 8.3.27; Eust. Ill. 3.458.33); 22. Pyrgos (Strabo 8.3.22; cf. KIPauly iv. 1259); 23. Pyrgos (Polyb. 4.77.9); 24. Pteleos (Strabo 8.3.25); 25. Samikon (Polyb. 4.77.9; Paus. 6.25.6; Steph. Byz. 553.4); 26. Samos (Strabo 8.3.19); 27. Skillous (Xen. Hell. 6.5.2; cf. Tuplin (1993) 183–84; Paus. 5.6.4; Steph. Byz. 575.3); 28. Stylangion (Polyb. 4.77.9; Steph. Byz. 588.9); 29. Thryon (Strabo 8.3.24); 30. Typaneiai (Polyb. 4.77; Strabo 8.3.15).
⁴ On these three communities, see Roy’s introduction to the Eleian Inventory, supra 489–93.
Hdt. 4.148.4 and Polyb. 4.77.9; cf. KIPauly iv. 1259; Pritchett (1989) 75; however, Müller (1987) 840–41 (followed by Barr.) identifies the two. Barr. AC.


At least four (Hypana, Samikon, Stylangion and TYPANEIAI) of these may in fact possibly have been poleis. Admittedly, we have no evidence whatsoever for their political status prior to the Hellenistic period, but they are listed as poleis at Polyb. 4.77.9, and there is good reason to trust Polybios’ site-classification for this period (Nielsen (1997) 132). Since the archaeological record at these sites goes back to the Archaic and/or Classical periods, they surely existed in these periods and may possibly already have been poleis. Pyrgoi was presumably a second-order settlement in the territory of Lepreon (Pritchett (1989) 75) and so was Pylus after its inclusion in Lepreon.

2. Unidentified Settlements

Prasidaki Settlement associated with Archaic–Classical sanctuary, described below, s.v. Lepreon (no. 306); cannot be convincingly connected with any ancient toponym.

So, of fifteen settlements known to have existed in the Archaic and Classical periods, eight were considered to be poleis either throughout these periods or at least for some time within them. The topography of the region was thoroughly studied by Pritchett (1989) 1–78, whose identifications are followed here. In addition to such settlements, there was an important sanctuary of Artemis Limnatis at Kombothekra, but it is unknown which polis/poleis had the supervision of it (Sinn (1978), (1981)).

In C5, all communities of the later Triphylia were dependencies of Elis (no. 251) (Roy (1997) 283–85); however, when the Eleian perioikis was broken up by Sparta (no. 345) c.400, the former Eleian dependencies united and formed a small federal state (Nielsen (1997) 148–55). Two decrees (SEG 35 389 and 40 392 (both C4f)) passed by this state have survived (cf. Siewert (1987); Nielsen (1997) 148–49; Ruggieri, L’État fédéral). The decrees mention a body called τοι τριφυλάκιοι (SEG 35 389.1 and 40 392.1), presumably an assembly, and an eponymous damiorgos who was the head of a board (SEG 40 392.3).

One decree grants Triphylian citizenship as such (SEG 40 392; Siewert (1987) 276), whereas the other grants citizenship in Makiiston (no. 307) (SEG 35 389; Siewert (1987) 275; Nielsen (1997) 149). It thus seems that there were two levels of citizenship in Triphylia, which may then reasonably be described as a small federal state. See further Nielsen (1997) 148–55.

The Triphylians supplied Sparta with hoplites who fought in the battle of Nemea in 394 (Xen. Hell. 4.2.16) and were thus members of the Peloponnesian League; from Xen. Hell. 6.5.2–3 it can be inferred that the Triphylians took the oath of the second Common Peace of 371. In the 360s the Triphylians were members of the Arkadian Confederacy (IG v.2.1.20; Xen. Hell. 7.1.26). It is uncertain when the Triphylan Federation broke down; from Polyb. 4.77–80 it appears that it no longer existed in 219. See further Nielsen (1997) 152–53.

II. The Poleis

304. Ep(e)ion Map 58. Lat. 37.35, long. 21.50. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is Ἐπιόν (Hdt. 4.148.4), τό (cf. Steph. Byz. 302.16, who enters it as Ἡπιόν); Xen. Hell. 3.2.30 has Ἡπιόνοι, and Polyb. 4.77.9 has Ἀπιόνοι. A city-ethnic is attested only in Steph. Byz.

Ep(e)ion is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 4.148.4; Xen. Hell. 3.2.31 uses polis of the city twice, first in the urban, then in the political sense, in both cases with the territorial sense as a connotation; and a comparison between Hell. 3.2.23 and 31 shows that Xenophon thought of Ep(e)ion as a polis in the political sense too (Nielsen (1995) 88).

The territory is termed χώρα by Xen. Hell. 3.2.30. From Hdt. 4.148.4 and Xen. Hell. 3.2.23, 31 it appears that in C5s (at the latest) Ep(e)ion was a perioikic community of Elis (no. 251) (Roy (1997) 283–85). Xenophon attributes to the Eleians the claim that they had originally bought the territory of Ep(e)ion from τῶν τότε ἐχόντων τὴν πόλιν (Hell. 3.2.31). The identity of these “holders” is unknown; Xenophon’s phrasing suggests that, at the time of the sale, Ep(e)ion was not controlled by its own original population; Niese (1910) 7 suggested that it was held by Arkadians (cf. Roy (1997) 290).
C.400 Ep(e)ion was liberated from Eleian rule and made autonómos (Xen. Hell. 3.2.31); presumably the city now joined the Triphylan Federation and through it, in 369 at the latest, the Arkadian Confederacy (Nielsen (1997) 152–54).

Pritchett (1989) 57 (followed by Barr.) placed Ep(e)ion at modern Trypiti (formerly Bitsibardi). Here are “a good sprinkling of sherds, convincing evidence for a settlement”, the stelobate foundations of an ancient structure, a retaining wall and many tiles (Pritchett (1989) 52). Earlier scholars have noted walls of ashlar masonry, tiles and pottery of the Classical period, as well as blocks and column drums (ibid. 51). The acropolis covers an area of 150 × 25 m. The oldest find noted thus far is an Archaic sima (Papakonstantinou (1982)).

305. Epitalion (Epitalieus) Map 58. Lat. 37.40, long. 21.30. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is 'Επιστάλιον (Xen. Hell. 3.2.30), τό (Strabo 8.3.24). The city-ethnic is 'Επισταλεύς (Xen. Hell. 3.2.25).

Epitalion is called a polis in the political sense by Xen. Hell. 3.2.30. The city-ethnic is found in the external collective use at Xen. Hell. 3.2.25.

The territory is termed χώρα by Strabo 8.3.24. It appears from a combination of Xen. Hell. 3.2.20, 25 and 30 that by C31 (at the latest) Epitalion was a perioikic community of Elis (no. 251) (cf. Roy (1997) 283–85). During the war between Sparta (no. 345) and Elis c.400 Epitalion seceded from Elis and joined Sparta (Xen. Hell. 3.2.25). The Spartans placed a garrison and a harmost in the city with some Eleian refugees after the second Spartan invasion of Elis (Xen. Hell. 3.2.29).

According to Xen. Hell. 3.2.30, Epitalion was formally liberated from Eleian rule by the peace treaty concluded between Sparta and Elis after the war (Nielsen (1997) 137–39); it is a safe inference from Xenophon’s description of the city as a Τριφυλική πόλις (Hell. 3.2.30) that Epitalion now joined the Triphylan Federation with which it presumably joined the Arkadian Confederacy c.369 (Nielsen (1997) 153–55).

The site of Epitalion, at modern Aghulintsa, has as yet yielded no Archaic or Classical finds, though the Hellenistic and Roman town has been found (Themelis (1968); Papachatzes (1982) 223; Pritchett (1989) 75–76).

306. Lepreon (Lepreatas) Map 58. Lat. 37.25, long. 21.45. Size of territory: probably 3. Type: A. The toponym is Λέπρεασ (Hdt. 4.148.4; Thuc. 5.31.4); Ps.-Skylax 44 has Λέπρεσω, and Paus. 5.5.3 Λέπρεσω; the gender of the toponym in the Classical period is commonly taken to be neuter (for which see Polyb. 4.79.2), but Ar. Aves 149 (τόν 'Ηλείων Λέπρεσω) presupposes the masculine (cf. Paus. 5.5.3). The city-ethnic is Λέπρεατος (-τος); Heracl. Lemb. 42 has Λεπρείς as if from *Λεπρεύς.

Lepreon is called a polis in the urban sense by Hdt. 4.148.4 and Aristotle (Herac. Lemb. 42; Arist. no. 99, Gigon) and in the political sense by Thuc. 5.31.5. The city-ethnic is attested epigraphically in the external collective use on the Serpent Column (ML 27.11) and in IG v.2.1.20 (360s); in literature it is found at Hdt. 9.28.4, Thuc. 5.31, quater, Xen. Hell. 3.2.25 and Ps.-Skylax 44. The external individual use is found in Dubois (1986) Phi. 5.2 (C3). Patris is found in CEG 11 382 (C5f; completely restored).

The territory of Lepreon is described as χώρα in Ps.-Skylax 44, and as γῆ by Thuc. 5.31.2, 3. Sometime before the Peloponnesian War the city ceded half its territory to the Eleians as part of a treaty of symmachia and now had to pay 1 tal. (presumably each year) for the right to exploit this part of the territory (Thuc. 5.31.2; Staatsverträge 164). According to Strabo 8.3.30, Lepreon at some point absorbed Pylos by synoecism (Moggi, Sin. 168 proposes a date c.460; cf. Demand (1990) 64). There were a number of second-order settlements in the territory of Lepreon: one was associated with a large temple at Prasidaki (see infra) unless this was in fact Pyrgos (no. 310), as suggested by Arapogianni (1999) 168 itself a polis (infra). East of modern Tholo is a settlement which existed from the Archaic period (Yalouris (1973) 158; cf. Pritchett (1989) 75; Müller (1987) 839–40). At modern Kakovatos Classical sherds are reported by Yalouris (1973) 164. At 5-49.1, Thucydides mentions a teichos called Phyrkon which must have been in Lepreatan territory (see HCT ad loc.). A fortress that is a possible candidate for Strabo’s Χάα (8.3.21) is briefly discussed by Pritchett (1989) 61–62; it may have existed in the Classical period. A temple by the river Neda, at modern Prasidaki, is thought to have belonged to Lepreon (Pritchett (1989) 60 n. 138; see, however, Arapogianni (1999) 168, suggesting that Prasidaki was in fact Pyrgos). It was a monumental Doric limestone temple of the late Classical period; it had an Archaic predecessor; the votives at the site go back to C7n and, according to Yalouris, there was an ἀξίωμα ἔργων ὄικαιμος associated with the temple, which thus was perhaps situated in a second-order settlement of Lepreon (Yalouris (1971); cf. Yalouris (1973) 155, reporting remains of a wall and many buildings). The temple was dedicated to Athena Agorios (Arapogianni (1999), who interprets the epithet as equivalent to Agoraios).

Lepreon provided 200 hoplites for the battle of Plataiai in 479 (Hdt. 9.28.4), but this is the only indication we have for the order of size of the population.

Lepreon was a member of the Hellenic League against Persia (ML 27.11; Hdt. 9.28.4); in C35 the city was a perioikic
community of Elis (cf. Hdt. 4.148.4; Xen. Hell. 3.2.23, 25; Paus. 3.8.3; Roy (1997) 283–85). The city was briefly liberated from Eleian rule by Sparta (no. 345) in 421 and received a Spartan garrison (Thuc. 5.31.4; cf. 5.3.4.1; Roy (1998); Hunt (1998) 174; Falkner (1999)); however, the city was reconquered by Elis (no. 251) before the end of C5 (cf. Xen. Hell. 3.2.23, 25), but must have been liberated again by the peace treaty concluded between Elis and Sparta c.400 (Roy (1997) 291). Nothing is known with certainty about the position of Lepreon in the united Triphylian state of c.400–369, but it was probably the central city of Triphylia, since it seems that Lepreon represented Triphylia in the Arkadian Confederacy of which it is securely attested as a member (IG v.2.1.20 (360s); Nielsen (1997) 153–54).

Nothing is known about the form of constitution, but there was an Aristotelian treatise on the politeia of Lepreon; the only surviving fragment attests to the existence of laws on adultery, on atimia and on admission to citizenship (Heracl. Lemb. 42; Arist. no. 99, Gigon).

Lepreon was situated on a steep hill north of modern Lepreo (formerly Strivotizit), 27 km from the coast. The acropolis was fortified; the remains are mostly of the Hellenistic period, and an earlier phase may be C4 (PECS s.v. Lepreon, 499). On the acropolis was a Doric temple of Demeter dating to c.375–350; it was without sculptural ornamentation but had a predecessor (Knell (1979), (1983)).

The lower city was fortified too (Pritchett (1989) 60), but the wall has not been dated. The extent of the lower city was considerable, according to Frazer (1898) iii. 474 (cf. Pritchett (1989) 59). Heracl. Lemb. 42 refers to an agora.

In the Classical period, Lepreon may have produced as many as seven Olympic victors: Olympiakion 267 (c.460); nos. 276, 309 (c.535m); no. 331 (424); no. 338 (420); no. 360 (c.400); no. 405 (c.376); no. 426 (c.360). Furthermore, Antiochos (Olympiakion 360) was victorious in the pentathlon twice in both the Isthmian Games (cf. Nielsen, Lepreon) and the Nemean Games.

307. Makiston (Makistios) Map 58. Lat. 37.35, long. 21.40. Size of territory: possibly 3. Type: A. The toponym is found mostly in oblique cases in the Classical period; Hdt. 4.148.4 gives Μακίστος in the accusative, Xen. Hell. 3.2.30 Μακίστος in the genitive; Arist. Heracl. Lemb. 55 and a C3 inscription (for which see AR (1996–97) 49) have Μακίστω in the dative; thus the gender is unknown. Strabo has τὸ Μάκιστον at 8.3.18, but τὸν Μάκιστον at 8.3.16; Steph. Byz. at 428.11 gives Μακίστος without source reference; however, at 450.3 he cites Hekataios (= FGHist 1, fr. 122) for the form Μήκιστον, which tips the balance in favour of the neuter for C5. The city-ethnic is Μακίστιος (SEG 35 389,2–3 (c.399–369); Xen. An. 7.4.16). Schol.EUR. Or. 4 has ἐν Τριφυλία ἡμετέρων καὶ Μακίστιος, and correspondingly Steph. Byz. 428.14–15 states: τὸ ἐθνικὸν . . . εὑρήται καὶ Μακίστιος διὰ τοῦ ἐφέλον.

Makiston is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 4.148.4: there is no attestation of polis in the political sense specifically applied to Makiston, but from Hdt. 4.148.4 and Xen. Hell. 3.2.23, 25 it appears that Makiston was one of the perioikides polis of Elis (no. 251) (Roy (1997) 283–85); for the urban and territorial senses combined, see Xen. Hell. 3.2.30 (for the idiom, cf. Diod. 2.43.6, and see Smyth, Greek Grammar §1090); πολιτεύεσθαι is attested in SEG 35 389 (c.399–369). The external collective use of the city-ethnic is attested in SEG 35 389,2–3 (c.399–369) and at Xen. Hell. 3.2.25; Paus. 6.22.4 provides an instance referring to C6f. The external individual use is found in Xen. An. 7.4.16 (Σιλανὸς Μακίστιος).

It is likely that the city controlled the sanctuary of Poseidon Samios at Samikon (Strabo 8.3.13; Bölte (1930) 777–78; Tausend (1992) 19–21).

In C3s (at the latest) Makiston was a perioikic community of Elis (cf. Hdt. 4.148.4 and Xen. Hell. 3.2.23, 25; Roy (1997) 283–85); in the period c.400–369 Makiston was a member of the Triphylian federation (SEG 35 389 (c.399–369)), an organisation that was capable of granting Makistian citizenship to foreigners (SEG 35 389; cf. Nielsen (1997) 149); magistracies (τέλεα) and a τοῦτος are attested for C4f (ibid.; cf. Siewert (1987) 276). The city presumably joined the Arkadian Confederacy with the rest of Triphylia c.369 at the latest (Nielsen (1997) 152–55).

Makiston was presumably situated at modern Mázi (Pritchett (1989) 65; followed by Barr); this site was a large town and there are remains of houses and probably of public buildings (Trianti (1985) 22). Two burial areas of C4 have been excavated (ibid.; the acropolis was fortified (Trianti (1985) 21; Pritchett (1989) 68) and contained a Doric peripteral temple, probably of C5e (Trianti (1985) 23–24); the temple was presumably dedicated to Athena (ibid. 24–33). After c.400–369 (SEG 35 389) the city is mentioned as existing only once (AR (1996–97) 49 (C3)), and it is absent from Polybius’ list of Triphylian cities at 4.77.9; it may have ceased to exist by 219, the date to which Polybius’ description of Triphylia refers.

308. Noudion Unlocated. Type: A. The toponym is Νόοδων at Hdt. 4.148.4. A city-ethnic is not attested. Noudion is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 4.148.4. Herodotos is the only source to mention Noudion; it may possibly have been destroyed by the Eleians during their expansion into Triphylia.
309. Phrixa(i)  Map 58. Lat. 37.40, long. 21.45. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is Φρίξας, a' in Hdt. 4.148.4; Xen. Hell. 3.2.30 has Φρίξα, η (as Polyb. 4.77.9). Strabo 8.3.12 has Φρίξη. A city-ethnic is unattested apart from the entry in Steph. Byz. The territory was possibly homonymous with the city (Strabo 8.3.12).

Phrixa(i) is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 4.148.4 and in the political sense at Xen. Hell. 3.2.30. In C3m Phrixa(i) seems to have been considered to be Arkadian (Pherékydes (FGrHist 3) fr. 161), but from a combination of Hdt. 4.148.4 and Xen. Hell. 3.2.23, 30 it appears that in C5 (at the latest) the city was a perioikic community of Elis (no. 251) (Roy (1997) 283–85). However, according to Xen. Hell. 3.2.30, Phrixa(i) was formally liberated from Eleian rule by the peace treaty concluded between Sparta (no. 345) and Elis after their war in c.400; it is a safe inference from Xenophon's description of the city as a Τριφυλίας πόλις (Hell. 3.2.30) that Phrixa(i) now joined the Triphylian Federation with which it presumably entered the Arkadian Confederacy c.369 (Nielsen (1997) 152–54).

Phrixa(i) was located on a steep hill on the left bank of the river Alpheios (Pritchett (1989) 70–71; followed by Barr.). Yalouris describes the site as a Classical town with an acropolis, and reports remains of walls, abundant sherds and tiles, and the foundations of a large building (Yalouris (1973) 170–71).

310. Pyrgos  Map 58. Barr. follows Müller (1987) 839–40 in identifying Pyrgos with the Pyrgoi of Strabo 8.3.22 and locating it at Ag. Ilias south-west of Lepreon at lat. 37.25, long. 21.40; Arapogianni (1999) 168 identifies Pyrgos with the site at Prasidaki; here, however, both these sites are considered second-order settlements of Lepreon (no. 306), and Pyrgos is located at Bambes in accordance with Pritchett (1989) 73–75, more or less where Barr. puts 'Selinous' (cf. Lauffer (1989) 352–53), at lat. 37.35, long. 21.35. Size of territory: ? Type: A. The toponym is Πύργος, ὄ (at Hdt. 148.8 and Polyb. 4.77.9, 80.13 (both giving the accusative without article, though). The city-ethnic is unattested.

Pyrgos is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 4.148.4; Polyb. 4.77.9 describes it as a polis too, and c.230–210 a Delphic theorodokos resided in Pyrgos. (If Pyrgos is identified with Bambes (infra), then the Delphic theorodokos Ἐπίπρου (for which see Oulhen (1992) 43, l. 89) presumably resided in Herodotos' Pyrgos, since Phrixa(i), located only 5 km north-east of Bambes, is the next Triphylian entry in the list.) In C5 Pyrgos was probably the victim of Eleian aggression (Hdt. 4.148.4), but apart from that nothing is known about the political history of the city in the Archaic and Classical periods; it may be assumed, however, that it became a perioikic dependency of Elis (no. 251) (Roy (1997) 283–85), was liberated c.400, joined the Triphylian Federation and through it the Arkadian Confederacy (Nielsen (1997) 152–54). Pyrgos was probably located at modern Bambes (Pritchett (1989) 73–75). Here a small C3e temple of Zeus has been found, situated on a hill (Yalouris (1954) 290). Around the hill have been found four groups of houses, thus revealing a city of C3s (ibid. 291) with traces of earlier occupation (Yalouris (1958) 194). According to the excavator, the site was an important city occupying a considerable area, which has yielded Archaic and Classical pottery as well as displaced Archaic and Classical Doric columns (Yalouris (1956) 187, 191; Yalouris (1958) 194, 198).

311. Skillous (Skillountiors)  Map 58. Lat. 37.35, long. 21.35. Size of territory: ? Type: A. The toponym is Σκιλλοῦς, ὄ (Xen. An. 5.3.7, 8; Paus. 5.6.6). The city-ethnic is Σκιλλούντιοι (Xen. Hell. 6.5.2). Siewert (1991) 82 restores ΗθΟ 930 ΣΚΙΛΛΟΥΝΤΙΟΙ. The territory of the city is called ἡ γῆ ἡ Σκιλλουντία at Paus. 5.6.6, but the toponym could presumably also be used to denote the territory (Paus. 5.6.6: παρέχεται δὲ ὁ Σκιλλοῦς καὶ ἄγρας θηρίων κτλ). Skillous is—presumably—repeatedly referred to as a polis in the political sense in ΗθΟ 16 (c.450–425) (for which see Koerner (1993) no. 44 at 130 and Roy (1997) 296). Xen. Hell. 6.5.2 describes Skillous as a polis in the political sense too, and Xen. An. 5.3.7–8 twice uses πολίται about the inhabitants. The city-ethnic is found in the external collective use in ΗθΟ 16 and Xen. Hell. 6.5.2; Paus. 6.22.4 provides an instance referring to ΣΚΙΛΛΟΥΝΤΙΟΙ. In C5 Skillous was presumably a perioikic community of Elis (no. 251) (Roy (1997) 283–85); if so, it must have been liberated from Eleian rule by the peace treaty concluded by Sparta (no. 345) and Elis after their war in C5–C4e (for which see Xen. Hell. 3.2.23–31), and it may have joined the new Triphylian Federation and through it the Arkadian Confederacy (Nielsen (1997) 152–54); a board of officials (damniorgoi) is attested for C5 (ΗθΟ 16; Koerner (1993) 130). However, not much is known about the history of Skillous in C4e, apart from the fact that Xenophon lived there; according to An. 5.3.7, he was settled there by the Lakedaimonians (ὑπὸ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων οἰκησθέντων), but it is not clear how the Lakedaimonians could grant land in a foreign polis unless they did so with Skillountian acceptance and collaboration (cf. Hunt (1998) 174). Skillous may have granted citizenship to Xenophon: in An. 5.3.10 he refers to his own sons and those of τῶν ἄλλων πολιτῶν which seems to indicate that Xenophon too was a...
citizen; if so, it may be suggested that he served as *proxenos* of the Lakedaimonians at Skillous, since at Diog. Laert. 2.51 it is reported that αὐτῷ προσέβιαν ἔδοσαν οἱ Λακεδαίμονιοι but not in which state. In 371, the Eleians claimed that Skillous was a *polis* belonging to them, but the implications of this claim are uncertain (Tuplin (1993) 183–85). After 371, Skillous disappears from the records.

Skillous probably dedicated a bronze vessel in Olympia C5–C4 (IvO 930; cf. Siewert (1991) 82).

Skillous was presumably situated at modern Kampouli at Makrisia; here abundant evidence of Classical habitation has been found (Pritchett (1989) 67 n. 151 with refs.; followed by Barr.).


Tuplin, C. 1993. The Failings of Empire: A Reading of Xenophon Hellenica 2.3.11–7.5.27, Historia Einzelschriften 76 (Stuttgart).


MESSENIA

GRAHAM SHIPLEY

I. The Region

Perhaps no region of Mainland Greece can be regarded as typical in how it adopted the *polis*, but Messenia may be more unusual than most, for the simple reason that between C8I and C4e it had no autonomous civic communities, but was ruled by a colonial power, the Lakedaimonians. Such *poleis* as existed before its first, partial liberation in 369 were perioikic *poleis* dependent on Sparta. Four can be identified with a high degree of confidence: Aithaia (no. 312), Asine (no. 313), Mothone (no. 319) and Thouria (no. 322). A fifth, Kyparissos (no. 317), may have been perioikic, though it did not necessarily become a *polis* at all until after 369. Five more—Aulon (no. 314), Kardamyle (no. 315), Korone (no. 316), Pharai (no. 320) and Thalamai (no. 321)—are candidates for *polis* status before 369, though Aulon’s status is especially uncertain.

For the relatively short period between 369 or 338 and the notional cut-off date of the Copenhagen Polis Project, 323, the coarse resolution afforded by the literary and archaeological evidence in its present state makes it difficult to ascertain exactly how many *poleis* existed. The chief *polis* was the new “capital”, Messene-Ithome (no. 318), founded in 369. Chance has preserved epigraphic attestations of Asine and Thouria from just before and just after 300. At this time and in the Hellenistic period, these and probably other former perioikic *poleis*, such as Mothone, continued to exist as *poleis* within Messenia, probably in a federal arrangement (see Messene (no. 318)). Others, such as the possible Classical *poleis* of Aulon and Kardamyle, continued to exist as settlements, but we do not know whether they remained *poleis*. New *poleis* may have been created after 369 as counterweights to those still in Spartan hands.

For C2–C1 we possess documents from the *poleis* of the new “Laconian League” (more precisely, *koinon* of the Lakedaimonians), probably founded by Flamininus, which embraced some places west of Taygetos (e.g. Gerenia).1 Of the four later Eleutherolaconian *poleis* (members of the “League of Free Laconians” or *koinon* of the Eleutherolaconians, set up by Augustus) in this region—Leuktra, Thalamai, Alagonia and Gerenia—only Thalamai provides convincing evidence that it was earlier a perioikic *polis* of Sparta.

The fragmentary evidence at our disposal almost certainly underrepresents the number of *poleis* at any given time, as well as concealing the appearance of new cities and the disappearance of existing ones. Earlier scholarship on Messenian landscapes is dominated by topographical research, notably the extended explorations of Valmin ((1930) and other works of his) and the excellent doctoral thesis by Roebuck (1941). Excavation has tended to focus on the important prehistoric sites such as “Nestor’s palace”, while much historical discussion centres on the Second Messenian War and the topography of the surrounding legends, as told by Pausanias and others (see e.g. Kiechle (1959)). The post-Second World War Minnesota Messenia Expedition, or MME (McDonald and Rapp (1972)), set a benchmark for multi-period surveys, but despite the extended discussion of the ancient periods by Lazenby and Hope Simpson (1972), as well as other relevant studies by Hope Simpson, the main focus of that survey was explicitly prehistoric and its methods largely non-intensive. The data produced did not permit full differentiation between Classical and Hellenistic times, though they did allow broad conclusions to be drawn about the distribution of settlements and changes through time. The recent PRAP survey (infra) has refined our understanding of the landscape in some respects, but a renewal of exploration of larger centres, and a comprehensive synthesis of ancient settlement in Messenia, are still to be hoped for.

Archaeology has thus produced only piecemeal evidence for the major centres.2 Detailed site histories cannot be written except for Messene (no. 318), where a successful campaign of excavations has been conducted for many years by the Archaeological Society of Athens. Generally, the

---

1 On the history of the League, see most recently the synthetic treatment by Kennell (1999).
2 For an overview of topographical and historical problems, the articles of Meyer in RE, reprinted as Meyer (1978), can scarcely be bettered; his conclusions are summarised in his various articles in *KIPhaly*. 
chronological data are extremely crude—understandably, given the state of knowledge in pottery chronology for the Hellenistic and Roman periods at the times when most exploration took place. Major questions of toponymic identification remain unresolved, and a number of first- and especially second-order sites doubtless lie completely undetected. The lack of historical writings about Classical Messenia, let alone writings by Messenians during the Spartan occupation, caused our ancient counterparts, such as Strabo, the same kinds of onomastic problems as ourselves. We can only hope to do better once we have fuller archaeological and, if possible, epigraphic evidence.

For the general character of the system of perioikic poleis in Archaic and Classical Lakonike (the Spartan-dominated territory), the reader should consult the introduction to the Lakedaimon inventory. Up to now, scholars have had difficulty in establishing which Messenian communities were perioikic. As a result of the work of the Copenhagen Polis Centre, however, it seems clear that the Spartan perioikic system was intrinsically polis-based: perioikoi normally lived in poleis (see the introduction to the Lakedaimon inventory), and these were dependent upon Sparta (see Shipley (1997)). Harrison and Spencer (1998) 160 raise (though they also reject) the possibility that any nucleated settlement in Messenia must be perioikic, but this is to put the cart before the horse; the correct approach is to find out first which settlements were poleis, and this will reveal which settlements were probably perioikic. For example, although Harrison and Spencer (1998) 156 state that the known communities of the west coast, such as Kyparissos and Aulon, were “clearly” perioikic, closer examination shows that the evidence for the polis status of those settlements, and therefore their perioikic nature, is not clear-cut. In the following pages the normal criteria of the Copenhagen Polis Centre have been adopted.

While it is true that, given the inadequacies of the evidence, the only safe assumption is that at any given period there were more poleis than can be demonstrated, it seems likely that the small number of known poleis does in part reflect a relatively sparse population. Beloch (1886) 149 argued for low population levels in both Laconia and Messenia, and although Roebuck (1941) proposed a potential population of 112,000 for Messenia south of the river Neda in the late Hellenistic period, this has been considered too high.3 Archaeological survey has tended to confirm the existence of a relatively sparse population. The MME identified a sharp increase in rural site numbers in the Classical period in the richer agricultural regions of Messenia (the Alpheios valley, Stenyklaros, the Pamisos valley) and an increase in coastal settlement, perhaps reflecting improved trading conditions during independence (McDonald and Hope Simpson (1972) 145). There remained, however, a general lack of dispersed rural sites and a marked gap in settlement in the west. The Pylos Regional Archaeological Project (PRAP) has built on the work of the MME in the west, and its work has important implications for the nature of rural settlement in Spartan Messenia (Davis (1998a, b, c) and other works). Through a more intensive survey method the PRAP confirmed, at least for the area around Pylos, the finding of the MME that Messenia lacked a scatter of small rural sites, making the region untypical of Mainland Greece in the Classical period (see Davis (1998b) 284–88). Harrison and Spencer (1998) 159–60 link this unusual settlement pattern to Spartan domination, which may have inhibited normal demographic patterns and settlement evolution.

The situation of the numerically dominant semi-free, or unfree, population of Messenia, the helots (heilotai), has been outlined in the Lakedaimon chapter. Thucydides states that most were “descendants of the old-time Messenians who had once been enslaved, whereby they were all called Messenians” (1.101.2). Earlier debates centred around the number and timing of helot revolts (e.g. Wade-Gery (1966); de Ste Croix (2002)). It is agreed that helots worked the land and gave up a large part of their produce to the Spartans, though the precise degree of freedom they enjoyed and the extent to which they were able to construct and reproduce a “normal” social structure and economic environment are endlessly debated.4

Zunino (1997) has explored the evidence for Messenian religion during the Spartan occupation, concluding that the Messenians were not denatured but maintained their identity through Hellenic cult practices even under the colonial yoke. Her work has tilted the balance towards the view that the Messenian helots were more like other Greek agricultural communities than used to be imagined.5 The complex question of how Messenian identity crystallised and was rhetorically exploited by Spartans and Athenians in C5 has been perceptively examined by Figueira (1999) and Luraghi (2002).

3 Hope Simpson (1972) 99 n. 131; McDonald and Hope Simpson (1972) 144, 145; McDonald and Rapp (1972) 254–55.

4 Oliva (1986); Talbert (1989); Ducat (1990), (1994), (2002); Cartledge (1991); Hodkinson (1992); Whitty (1994). See also now Luraghi and Alcock (2003).

5 For a concise list of known cults, see Meyer (1978). See also Singor (1993) or Alcock (2002). On dependency relations in Laconia, see also Shipley (2002).
Harrison and Spencer’s rejection of the view that any nucleated settlement must be perioikic is based not on an appreciation of the *polis*-based nature of perioikic status, but on the evidence of the unique eleven-roomed late Archaic farmhouse at Kopanaki in north-central Messenia (Kaltsas (1983)), tentatively interpreted as evidence against the view that helot communities were dispersed. It is, however, strictly irrelevant, for it is not a nucleated settlement but a single building and (since *perióikoi* lived in *poleis* as far as we know) does not bear on the matter of perioikic settlement. That said, the Kopanaki building, violently destroyed around 475, is susceptible of various interpretations. Did helots work there for an absentee Spartan landlord? Did they work under the supervision of one or more Spartiates, or of *perióikoi*, or without supervision? Did citizens of a perioikic *polis* occupy this outlying large farmstead—though no *polis* can be conclusively shown to have lain within easy reach? We cannot yet answer these fundamental questions about society in Messenia. However, the lack of dispersed small sites, detected by the MME for Messenia in general and confirmed for the west coast by the PRAP (Harrison and Spencer (1998) 160), tells against a landscape dotted with dispersed helot farms and in favour of a high degree of centralised residence in “a few fairly large towns or villages”, whether perioikic or in some cases run by helots themselves—or, one might add, in helot barracks such as we may have at Kopanaki.

Regarding the *perióikoi* of Messenia as opposed to Laconia, a special question arises: were they normally of Lakedaimonian or Messenian origin? It may be significant that two of the most prominent and securely attested perioikic communities, Alagonia and Gerenia, were Lakedaimonian or Messenian origin. It may be significant that two of the most prominent and securely attested perioikic communities, Alagonia and Gerenia, were Lakedaimonian or Messenian origin. It may be significant that two of the most prominent and securely attested perioikic communities, Alagonia and Gerenia, were Lakedaimonian or Messenian origin.

For the purposes of this Inventory, the division of Laconia from Messenia is set between Oitylos (no. 340) and Thalamai (no. 321), to the second of which (or at least the nearby islet of Pepnos and the mainland opposite) the Messenians of Pausanias’ time laid claim (Paus. 3.20.6; cf. 3.26.3, 6). In the Roman period, however, the boundary lay between Laconian Gerenia and Alagonia on the one side (Paus. 3.26.11) and Messenian Abia on the other (Paus. 4.30.1), specifically at Choirios Nape (modern Sandava gorge; Paus. 4.1.1). Gerenia and Alagonia had, it appears, been given to Sparta by Octavian (as was Kardamyle, Paus. 3.26.7) in punishment for the Messenians having supported Antony and Cleopatra. Messenia in this study will thus include the district and islet of Pepnos between Thalamai and Leuktra, as well as the sometime *poleis* of Thalamai, Leuktra, Kardamyle, Gerenia and Alagonia, even though four of these were Eleutherolac ovarian *poleis* in the early Imperial period (the exception, Kardamyle, being directly subject to Sparta at that time).

Messenia is not named by Homer, Messene only at Od. 2.15, where Ortilochos’ home is wrongly located in Messenian Pharai instead of Arkadian (Meyer, KlPauly iii. 1251). Some settlements later situated in Messenia, however, are named by the poet. At Il. 9.350–52 = 9.292–94 (repeated by Strabo 8.4.5) we have a list of the seven cities that Agamemnon, lord of Sparta, gave to Achilles: Kardamyle, Enope, holy Poieessa (or “grassy Hire”), fertile Pharai, deep-meadowed Antheia, fine Aipeia and vine-clad Pedasos—all said to be near Pylos and the sea. Enope was later identified with Pellana, Kardamyle or Gerania; Hire with Mesola or Abia; Antheia with Asine or Thouria, Aipeia with Thouria or Mothone, and Pedasos with Mothone or Korone (see *infra*); even if these identifications were imaginary, the list may imply that Sparta already possessed south-eastern Messenia in Homer’s day (Meyer, KlPauly iii. 1251). The seven cities are discussed by Valmin (1930) 206–13 and Hope Simpson (1966).

The Spartans’ conquest of Messenia probably proceeded by stages (Lazenby (1972) 84–86). In C8l they captured

---

6 Müller (1895) 40–41 points out that the Spartan retention of Mothone and Asine after 369 may have been facilitated by the fact that populations were not ethnic Messenians.

mainly "the Sternyklaros plain and the lower plain west of the Pamisos" (ibid. 85). In the Second Messenian War (C7m), centred around Sternyklaros (Forrest (1980) 70–71; Lazenby (1972) 85–86), the inhabitants of the Hyameitis, Pylos and Mothone, still unconquered, were among those fighting against the Spartans (ibid. 85). The Spartans captured Arkadian Phigaleia (no. 292) in 659 (ibid. 86; Paus. 8.39.3) and the Messenian stronghold on Mt. Eira some time later (on its location, see Valmin (1930) 118–20). Paus. 4.27.9 refers to 287 years of Messenian exile, implying (if one counts back from 369) that it began in 656. Epameinondas’ allusion (Plut. Mor. 194B) to 230 years of Messenian oppression may imply a C7l stage in the conquest, when the Nauplians were settled at Mothone (no. 319) (Paus. 4.35.2), but we should not place too much weight on such seemingly exact dates (even leaving aside the more radical chronological anxieties of Shaw (1999), (2003)). By c.600 at the latest, then, the whole of Messenia was under Spartan control (Lazenby (1972) 86).

At the end of the colonial period, there were two main stages in the removal of Messenia from Spartan control (cf. Meyer (1978) 265–68; Shipley (2000)). In 369 and the years immediately following, Messene (no. 318) was founded and parts of central and northern Messenia detached from Sparta; but the process was still going on in 365/4 when the Arkadians attacked Kyparissos and Koryphasion (Diod. 15.77.4). Ps.-Skylax’s (46) laconic description of “Lakedaimon” begins with Mothone (no. 319) and Asine (no. 313), and thus reflects the situation between 369 and 338. After Philip II’s victory at Chaireneia in 338, Messenia received extra territory as a reward for supporting the king and for having remained neutral (summary at Alcock (1998) 182).

The usual name for the region before the foundation of the new capital was Μεσσανία (Pind. Pyth. 4.126) or Μεσσανή (Tyrtaios fr. 5; West; Hellan. fr. 124; Ar. Lys. 1141; Ephor. fr. 18b; Xen. Hell. 5.2.3, 7.4.9 (but at 7.1.27 and 36 of the city); Pl. Leg. 683c, D (early Messene as a polis); Ps.-Skylax 45; Isoc. 12.72 (Μεσσάνη counterposed to Λακεδαίμων); ibid. 177 etc.; Isoc. 4.61, 6.11, 16, 19, etc., referring to Messenia generally). Thuc. 4.41.2 refers to Pylos as located “in the former Μεσσανία γη”, whereas at 4.3.2 he locates it εν τῇ Μεσσανία ποτὲ οὖσῃ γη.

The region is called Μεσσανία (γη) in SEG 12 219 (322–310) and Μεσσανία by Polyb. 2.5.1 and by Strabo 8.4.1, who says it was originally named Μεσσήνη. The Classical usages of the feminine adjective, as in τῇ Μεσσανία ποτὲ οὖσῃ γη (Thuc. 4.3.2), γῆ Μεσσανία (Eur. P. Oxy. 27.2458), Μεσσανία χώρα (Ps.-Skylax 45), are not evidence for Μεσσανία tout court being used as a name for the region; that is a later usage, perhaps from C3 on (Meyer (1978) 159–60, 284), though Theophr. fr. 172 (if accurately quoted by Steph. Byz.) could be the earliest attestation. Μεσσανία does not occur in literary texts after Thucydides until Menander (and then perhaps as a feminine ethnic?); cf. Diod. 12.61.4 (with reference to the Pylos incidents).8

The ethnic is Μεθάνιος (IVo 247 (C5f); cf. Bauslaugh (1990)), Μεσσάνιος (IG 1355 (c.475–450)), Μεσσανίος (ML 74 (c.421)), or Μεσσάνιος (Thuc. 1.101.2, 2.9.4). Prior to 369, the ethnic is found in the internal collective use in a C5f dedication of Athenian spoils from Korone (LSAG Messenia no. 3); externally, the collective use is found in IVo 247 (C5f); ML 74 (c.421) and in Thuc. 1.101.2, 2.9.4. The external individual use is found in IG 1455 (c.475–450). For the construction of Messenian identity to which these instances of the ethnic testify, see Figueira (1999). After 369, Μεσσάνιος developed into the city-ethnic of the new polis of Messene (no. 318).

Before 369 Messenia (or Messene) may have comprised only the two plains of Sternyklaros and Makaria. After 369 Sparta retained control of Asine (no. 313), Mothone (no. 319) and perhaps Pharai (no. 320), while Thuria (no. 322) may have become independent (Valmin (1930) 24–25). Ps.-Skylax 45 in C4m makes Kyparissos (no. 317) already Messenian. After 338 it is enlarged on all sides and was probably bounded by the Neda on the north, the Pamisos in the south-east, the Taygetos on the east, and the sea on the west. Control of the Dentheliatis in the south-east was disputed with Sparta for centuries (Tac. Ann. 4.43; Pikoulas (1991)). Valmin (1930) 26–30 discusses its Hellenistic extent, 30–33 its Roman. Valmin (1930) 39 notes that the name Makaria for the lower plain is only in Strabo, though Steph. Byz. 427.8–9 may preserve a reference.9 For boundary markers between Messenia and Lakonike in Roman times, see Hope Simpson (1972) 99 n. 129 with references, including IG v.1 1431.

1. Identification of Place-names with Known Locations

Excluding geographical items such as capes, mountains and rivers, and names of cult places consisting simply of the name of a deity and a term such as “sanctuary” or “temple,”

---

8 For a map showing modern sites and ancient places, see Meyer (1978) 171–74. Roebuck (1941) 30 n. 12, notes that Bölte (RE iii. 1278–79) and Larsen (RE xix. 817) rebut Kahrstedt’s suggestion (Griechische Staatsrecht i. 5–6) that Λακωνική refers only to periokic territory.

9 s.v. Makarei, a town of Arkadia also known as Makaria and called Beata by the Romans.
our sources purport to transmit the names of fifty-five places in Messenia from the Archaic to Roman periods. First it is necessary to dispose of one name that is probably corrupted: (S120)10 Thea (Θεα, Philoch. apud Steph. Byz. 308.4; probably a doublet of Aithaia, q.v. infra).

A further five alleged settlements or poleis appear to be doubles of real places elsewhere:

(S121) Haliartos (Ἀλιάρτος) Listed by Ptol. Geog. 3.14.42; perhaps a doublet of Haliartos (no. 206) in Boiotia.

(—) Pteleon (Πτελεόν) Included by Hom. Il. 2.594 among Pylian places, which oddly include Helos. Plin. HN 4.5.15 includes Pteleon, Helos and Dorian among inland towns in Messenia. This Pteleon is otherwise unattested (that at 2.697 is in Achaia Phthiotis; others are in Ionia and Boiotia), and given the presence of Laconian Helos in Homer’s list, it cannot be presumed to be Messenian. MME no. 701 Vresto (Pikoulas 2001), hereafter A011 no. 504; Archaic to mediaeval, 10 ha in area) is tentatively identified as Pteleai (sic) (cf. Hope Simpson (1972) 98 n. 108), but the question remains open.

(S122) Tripolis (Τρίπολις) Mentioned without further details by Steph. Byz. 637.8; KIlpauly v. 964.

(S123) Troizen (Τροιζήν) Listed by Ptol. Geog. 3.14.42; perhaps a doublet of the Troizen (no. 357) in the Argolid.

(S124) Zankle (Ζάνκλε) Plin. HN 4.5.15. Was an epitomator confused by mention of Sicilian Zankle (no. 51) at Paus. 4.23.7?

In two cases, while the place-name is real, there is no firm basis for regarding it as the name of a settlement:

(—) Dera (Δέρα) IGV.1.1429 = SEG 41.325 (C2); probably the same as Derai (Δέραι), Paus. 4.15.4. Probably a district.

(S119) Pephnos or Pephnon (Πέφνος or Πέφνων) Islet with cult, and the coastal locality opposite (Apollod. fr. 196 apud Steph. Byz. 520.5–9; Paus. 3.26.2, citing but not quoting Alkman). Valmin (1930) 204 follows Forster in locating it at modern Pephnos (SLS ii. 300, 11149, formerly Platsa).

Two places, though very probably settlements at certain periods, did not exist primarily as nucleated settlements: the first may have been a settlement only during the Messenian revolt of Cyn; the second may have existed primarily to service a cult site.

(S76) Ithome (Ἰθώμη) A mountain; the source of the cult title of Zeus Ithomatas, whose sanctuary lay in the polis of Messene (no. 318) from 369. A settlement in Hom. Il. 2.729; allegedly a polisma during the First Messenian War (Paus. 4.9.1, etc.), but not necessarily more than a fortified place (see Hope Simpson (1972) 97 n. 90). Defended and fortified in the Messenian Revolt of the 460s (e.g. Thuc. 1.101.2–3, 102.2); a χωριόν at Thuc. 1.102.3, perhaps suggesting a settlement. Archaeological survey suggests limited occupation in the surrounding area before the foundation of Messene (McDonald and Hope Simpson (1972) 145, 146). Ithome was also, however, the official name of the new polis of Messene for a time (infra).


A further nine places may be legendary, or may not have existed as nucleated settlements after the Lakedaimonian conquest of Messenia:

(S70) Amphigeneia (Ἀμφιγενεία) Hom. Il. 2.593; Strabo 8.3.24, 25; Steph. Byz. 89.12–18, citing Apollod. fr. 186 and Antimachos, presumably the Kolophonian commentator on Homer.

(S88) Denthalioi Steph. Byz. 225.8–9; “a polis, one of those disputed between the Messenians and Lake-daimonians”, with an ethnic of the same form; cf. Denthiaides (Δένθιαδες), Ath. 1.31–D, who cites Alkman (PMG 92) for wine from this place, a fort (ἔρυμα) in Spartan territory; also the toponymic adjective (in its masculine singular accusative form), Δένθιν, ibid. (this is the word Alkman, as quoted, actually uses; it suggests a shorter place-name than Denthiaides). Cf. also the river Denthieos, Etymologicum Symeonis 1.344.22. All these should be situated in the Denthiales ager, whose history is outlined by Tac. Ann. 4.43. Probably Denthalioi vel sim. was believed to have been a settlement at the time of the First Messenian War. On Dentheiates, see Pikoulas (1991) and Shipley (2000) 386.

10 Serial numbers prefixed by S refer to the catalogue in Shipley (1997).
(89) *Echeiai* (Ἐχειαί) Strabo 8.4.4: the Spartan king Teleklos (reigned c.760–c.740) is said to have founded *(οἰκίσας)* this along with Poiaessa and Tragion. Lazenby (1972) 84 assumes it was in the vicinity of the river Neda.

(90) *Hyameia* (Ὑάμεια (Paus. 4.14.3; Steph. Byz. 644.6–7)) or *Hyameitis* (Ὑαμειτίς (Ephor. fr. 116 apud Strabo 8.4.7)) Both are described as one of the five *polis* into which Kresphontes “divided Messene” about two generations after the Trojan War, the others being Stenyklaros, Pylos, Rhion and Mesola. Probably, in Classical times at least, these were districts rather than nucleated settlements. Hope Simpson (1972) 97 n. 87 concurs, following Valmin (1930) 24.

(91) *Mesola* (Μεσόλα) Another *polis* of Kresphontes; evidently, from the description by Ephor. fr. 116 apud Strabo 8.4.7 (repeated by Nic. Dam. apud Steph. Byz. 447.1–2), a district. In Strabo it extends to the gulf between Taygetos and Messenia; he says it may be Homeric Ire/Hire, 8.4.5. Hope Simpson (1972) 97 n. 86 follows Valmin (1930) 23, 207–8, making Mesola approximate to the territories of Thouria (no. 322) and Pharai (no. 320).

(92) *Rhion* (Ῥίον) Another *polis* of Kresphontes; possibly, like Hyameia, Mesola and Stenyklaros, a district rather than a settlement; “opposite Tainaron” (Ephor. fr. 116 apud Strabo 8.4.7); possibly Korone (no. 316), but Hope Simpson (1972) 97 n. 88 follows Valmin (1930) 169 and Hope Simpson (1966) 127 n. 11 in placing Rhion at or near Asine (no. 313), perhaps at MME no. 512 itself (ancient Asine, mediaeval Coron, modern Koroni).

(93) *Stenyklaros* (Στενύκλαρος) Another *polis* of Kresphontes (Ephor. fr. 116 apud Strabo 8.4.7). Named by Hdt. 9.64.2 but not called a *polis*; it could be a district. Cf. πεδίον . . . Στενυκληρικόν (Paus. 4.33.4, cf. 4.3.7). Hope Simpson (1972) 97 n. 85 follows Valmin (1933–34) 12 (*contra* Valmin (1930) 38–85) and Roebuck (1941) in proposing no site. Probably removed from Messene (no. 318 in 182 (Lazenby 1972) 92, citing Roebuck (1941) 102 and n. 167); probably regained 146 (Syll. 2.736). KIPAlyv. 358 (Meyer); RE iiiA. 2339ff (Bölte).

(95) *Tragion* (Τράγιον) See Echeiai supra.

(82) *Trikka* (Τρίκκα) Mentioned by Hom. Il. 2.729 (Τρικκη) alongside Ithome and Oichalia but not again until Paus. 4.3.2, for whom it was a deserted spot in Messenia.11

We may note in passing that the *Makareai* or *Makaria* recorded as an Arkadian *polis* by Steph. Byz. 427.7–9 may be a doublet of the plain of Makaria in central Messenia (cf. Valmin (1930) 39).

Of the thirty-six historical settlements that remain, eighteen have locations that are disputed or highly uncertain; at best we know the general area where they lay. Two of these may refer to a single place (Hire, Poiaessa). Some may be more mythical than real, while some may have been (or were believed to have been) predecessors of known places under different names.

(86) *Aipeia* (Αἴπεια) One of Agamemnon’s seven *polis* ethra (Hom. Il. 9.152 = 9.294). For Strabo 8.4.5 it is Thouria (no. 322), though he says others located it at Mothone (no. 319); for Steph. Byz. 53.35 it is a *polis* in Lakonike. Modern Aipeia, formerly Phormi (*ΛΟΠ* no. 305), is no guide.

(86) *Aipy* (Αἴπυ or Αἴπυ) The *ἔθουσα* Aipú of Hom. Il. 2.592, it is located in Messenia by Steph. Byz. but was perhaps in Triphylia (e.g. MME no. 245, Ag. Dimitrios, near ancient Lepreon (no. 306); Neolithic, Bronze Age). A *polis* only in Steph. Byz. 54.4, not in Homer or in Strabo 8.3.24, who considers that either word may be the name and either the epithet, and that Aipy is the former name of one of (a) Margalai in Amphidolia, (b) a place in Makistia, or (c) Epitalion (see *infra* under Thryon). Zachos (1984) links Aipy with Strabo’s *Aipasian* plain and reaffirms the identification with Ag. Dimitrios.

(86) *Aithaia* (Αἴθαια (no. 312)) In south-central Messenia (probably fairly close to, but not at, modern Aithaia, formerly Delimiti (*ΛΟΠ* no. 304; the fortified acropolis near Aithaia is probably Thouria (no. 332)).

(85) *Amphieia* (Ἀμφεία) Alleged town in north-eastern Messenia at the time of the First Messenian War (C8I). It is not mentioned by Homer or Strabo. It was a former *polis* (*πόλισμα ἤν*), small and located on a lofty hill-top close to Lakonike (Paus. 4.5.9). (See Lazenby (1972) 84; Hope Simpson (1972) 97 n. 89. It is unlikely to be attested in *IG* v.1 1426 (C4L–C3E); see Roebuck (1941) 9 n. 20 but now Matthaiou (1990–91) 269 n. 1.) The proposed site (MME no. 211, Kokkala Loutrou; cf. Pikoulas (1987–88)) has no reported finds later than Geometric. (Valmin (1950) 13, 74–77 proposes MME no. 608, Elliniko Desylla (Desylla is formerly Dousila, *ΛΟΠ* no. 984): late Classical fortifications, Hellenistic pottery; but this is perhaps a fort rather than a town, see MME 319. Modern Ano Amphieia and Kato Amphieia in south-central Messenia, both correspon-

11 Strabo 8.4.4 reports a temple of Asklepios Trikkaios in Messenian Gerenia, a replica of that in Thessalian Trikka.
(S86) **Andania (Ἄνδαία)** North-west of Messene, this was a settlement by 217 (Polyb. 5.92.6) and a *parvum oppidum* in 191 (Livy 36.31.7) but may well, even then, have been a community centered upon a sanctuary rather than a polis; the Messenians did not wish to resettle it in 369 (Paus. 4.26.6). Lazenby (1972) 92 (see also Hope Simpson (1972) 98 n. 92), citing Roebuck (1941) 102 and n. 167, suggests that it was detached from Messene (no. 318) in 182, when Messene was required to rejoin the Achaian Confederacy, and was regained in 146. It was revived with new regulations in 92/1 (IG v.1 1390 = Syll. 3 736), but Paus. 4.33.6 saw ruins. A possible site is MME no. 607, Ag. Athanasios (Divari) at Konstandinioi ( Classical to Roman; see also Valmin (1930) 89–99; for the name Konstandinioi, cf. *AOII* no. 2020; see also Meyer (1978) 186), with a Bronze Age predecessor at MME no. 212, Ag. Taxiarchos Polichnis (MH? LH 11C). Pikoulas (1987–88) 483 suggests that Andania is to be located at Desyllas.

(S71) **Antheia (Ἀνθέεια)** One of Agamemnon’s seven *ptoleithra* (Hom. *Il.* 9.151 = 9.293). Strabo 8.4.5 seems inclined to identify it as Asine (no. 313), though others say Thouria (no. 322). IG v.1 1426 (SEG 11 1029, Messene (C41–C3ε)) was once thought to name either Antheia or Amphia, but see now under Amphia (supra). KIlPauly 1.371 (Kiechle, suggesting that the identification with Thouria was made only because the site was unknown); Kiechle (1960) 56ff (modern Antheia, formerly Venzami or Veis Aga (*AOII* no. 434), is no guide).

(S72) **Arene (Ἠρενα)** A sometime Spartan possession, in north-eastern Messenia (Hom. *Il.* 2.593; Paus. 4.2.4.5; Strabo 8.3.19 (cf. 8.3.23, 24, 8.4.6); Steph. Byz. 117.15–17). For Strabo, it was perhaps Samikon and certainly not Erana; possibly MME no. 302, Kleidi Kato Samikou (Bronze Age site, c.1.5 ha; Samiko is the former Ali Tselepi, *AOII* no. 3688) with no. 707 Kastro Kato Samikou (Archic to Roman, c.1.8 ha). See Hope Simpson (1972) 94 and nn. 97, 99 (also 98 n. 110), referring to MME nos. 701, 707.

(S20) **Aulon (ν. 314)** In north-western Messenia, near Kyparissos and the river Neda.

(S87) **Charadra (Χαράδρα)** Strabo 8.4.4. Founded by Pelops along with Leuktron and “Thalamoi”, it may have lain in the area of Kardamyle (no. 315) (Niese (1906) 117; KIlPauly i.1130 (E. Meyer)).

(S73) **Dorion (Δωρίων)** Hom. *Il.* 2.594. Strabo 8.3.24 saw nothing, but Paus. 4.33.7 saw ruins near Andania. It appears to be attested epigraphically as Δούρεων, BCH 44 (1921) 12 col. ii.84 (Delphi (i.200); ἐν Λαμπέων; this observation is due to Meyer (1978) 211, but I have corrected the spelling). Possibly MME no. 222, Malthi Vasilikou (Valmin (1938) 13, (1930) 112–17 on the excavations, 104–7, 111–12, 116–18 on questions of identification; Roebuck (1941) 7 n. 16), but this site is Bronze Age only; if there was a historical Doureon, this would also rule out a less likely candidate, MME no. 201, Elliniko Mouriadas, which existed only in LH III times.

(S74) **Enope (Ἐνόπη)** Another of Agamemnon’s seven *ptoleithra* (Hom. *Il.* 9.150 = 9.292). For Strabo 8.4.5 it is Pellana, Kardamyle or Gerena; Paus. 3.25.8 simply identifies it as Gerena (see *infra*), in which case it lay on the eastern side of the Messenian Gulf.

(S56) **Erana (Ἐρανα)** Placed by Strabo 8.3.23 (where MSS have *Ἐρανα, Ἐρανα*) on the coast between Kyparissos and Pylos and distinguished from Arene (*supra*), MME no. 406, Dialiskari Marathopolis (or D. Marathou, *AOII* no. 2341) is suggested by Valmin (1930) 156–41 (H, R), but Stone and Kampke (1998) regard that site as a Roman villa; another suggestion is MME no. 408, Aghia Kyriaki (Roman) (suggested in the MME catalogue but not at Hope Simpson (1972) 98 n. 102).

(S75) **Ire/Hire (Ἱρή, Ἰρή)** One of Agamemnon’s seven *ptoleithra* (Hom. *Il.* 9.150 = 9.292, Ἱρή/Ἰρή ποιήσσα, “grassy” (H)Ire, or Ἰρή Ποιήσσα, “holy Poieessa”). Either Iri or Poiaessa (*infra*) must be a concoction of ancient scholarship. For Strabo 8.4.5 (cf. 8.4.1) it is either a place near Megalopolis (no. 282) or the same as Mesola. Paus. 4.30.1 (followed by *MME*) identifies it with Abia, but if it was connected with Mt. (H)Eira (Paus. 4.7.10–23.4 *passim* and 4.27.4, 9) it is, rather, in north-central Messenia and may be correctly identified with MME no. 611, Ag. Athanasios Kakaletriou (two forts, one Archaic, the other Classical and Hellenistic; for the spelling of Kakaletriou, see *AOII* no. 1278); cf. Hope Simpson (1972) 98 n. 93.

(S77) **Oichalia (Ὀιχαλία)** Homeric site (Hom. *Il.* 2.730); c.8 stades (1.5 km) from Andania (Paus. 4.33.4). Pherekydes (FGrHist 3) fr. 82a (schol. Soph. *Trach.* 535) located it “at Thoule (i.e. “goodness knows where”) in Arkadia”; cf. Eust. *Il.* 1.461.18, 21–22, 31–32, 516.26–27. KIlPauly iv. 251; RE xvii. 2097ff no. 2.

(S78) **Pedasos (Πηδάσος)** One of Agamemnon’s seven *ptoleithra* (Hom. *Il.* 9.152 = 9.294). For Strabo (8.4.3 with...
8.4.5) it is Mothone (no. 319), though some say Korone (no. 316).

(S92) Poiaessa (Ποιάεσσα) Possibly an area; but since Homer only twice mentions Ἰρήν Poiaëssas (or Ἰρήν Ἰρήν ποιάεσσας; II 9.150 = 292), either Ire/Hire or Poiaessa must be a fiction. See under Ire/Hire.

(S60) Polichne (Πολιχνη) Attested only in Pausanias (4.33.6), who locates it in north-western Messenia; no evidence of polis status beyond the suggestive name. Marked in north-western Messenia, Barr. Hope Simpson (1972) 98 n. 103 does not contest the suggestion of Homer (1930) 79–81, 101–3, to locate it at MME no. 233, Stilari Ano Kopanakiou (Bronze Age, Classical, Hellenistic, possibly Roman; 0.4 ha; the “Ano” is unofficial, AΩΠ no. 1788), but notes that Roebuck (1941) 12 stresses the difficulty of locating toponyms in the Soulima valley.

(S62) Thryon/Thyroessa (Θρύων/Θρυοέσσα) Steph. Byz. 318.15–20; Plin. HN 4.5.15; in Homer (II 2.592 = Hom. Hymn to Apollo, 423 and 11.711–12) Thyroessa is a Pylian town on the river Alpheios, in Pliny and Steph. Byz. a Messenian town; for Strabo 8.3.24 it is later Epitalion (Ἐπιτάλιον (no. 305) (Steph. 274.15–16)); not listed separately here since it is never attested as Spartan or Messenian, only as Triphylian (Xen. Hell. 3.2.25; it joins Sparta) and later Eleian (Polib. 4.80); proposed sites include MME no. 303, Ag. Georgios Epitaliou (Epitalio was formerly Argoulinitsa, AΩΠ no. 1147; BA, Cl–R, c.3 ha) and no. 715, Samakia Epitaliou (Archai to Roman, c.5 ha).

A further eight are placed with probability at or near known sites:

(S55) Abia/Abea/Abeia (Αβία/Αβεα/Αβεία) This was a polis in 182, when it separated from Messene (no. 318) and joined the Achaian Confederacy (Polyb. 23.17.2: Ἀβία; cf. IG 1.1 1374.4–6 (late Hellenistic?): Ἀβεάτων πόλες; IG ff. 1353 (Hellenistic?): Ἀβείωναται) and down to Hadrianic times (IG v.1 1352 = SEG 11 967; Paus. 4.30.1, etc.: Ἀβία). It may have been a polis since 338 or earlier, but there is no written or archaeological evidence before C2. Pausanias says it is Homeric Hire or Ire (4.30.1), but that is more plausibly placed at Mt. (H)Eira near Andania (see supra). IG v.1 1356 (Cs? cf. LSAG 206 no. 6 (c.Cs?)) and 1357 (Cs5; LSAG 206 no. 9, “c.450?”) are votive stelae possibly from Abia, the former dedicated by two ἅρπα, perhaps on behalf of the community. Abia is probably MME no. 545, Avia (formerly Paliochora, AΩΠ no. 3; Hellenistic? Roman); Valmin (1930) 181–82; Meyer (1978) 178 notes Classical finds at MME no. 144, Ag. Georgios, c.500 m from Mikra Mantineia.

(S38) Alagonia Probably MME no. 548, Ag. Ilias Brindas (Classical to Roman), see infra.

(S102) Kalamai Probably Giannitsa near modern Kalama, see infra.

(S58) Kolonis/Kolonides On the western side of the Messenian Gulf; plausibly identified as one of two sites, see infra.

(S57) Gerenia Probably MME no. 146, Zarnata Kambou (Classical to Roman), see infra.

(S48) Leuktron At or near MME no. 148, Lefktro Stoupas, see infra.

(S21) Thalamai (no. 321) Probably MME no. 150, Svina Koutriphariou (now Platanos Thalamon, AΩΠ no. 3427).

(S21) Thouria (no. 322) Probably MME no. 137, Ellinika Aithaias, not far north of modern Thouria.

Finally, ten names are attached with certainty, or high probability, to known settlement remains (two of them refer to the same place), though some identifications remain inferential.

(S19) Asine (no. 313) MME no. 512, Bourgo Koronis (medieval Coron).

(S34) Kardamyle (no. 315) MME no. 147, Kastro Kardamylis.

(S59) Korone (no. 316) MME no. 502, Petalidi.

(S109) Koryphasion MME no. 9, Paliokastro Petrochoriou (Bronze Age, Protogeometric and Classical to Roman finds; 1.4 ha), see infra.

(S35) Kyparissos (no. 317) MME no. 70, Kastro Kyparissias.

(S11) Messene (no. 318) MME no. 529, Mavrommati (for spelling with mm cf. AΩΠ no. 2393).

(S36) Mothone (no. 319) MME no. 412, Methoni.

(S79) Pharai (no. 320) MME no. 142, Kastro Kalamatas.

(—) Prote MME no. 407, Proti, see infra.

(S81) Pylus The same as Koryphasion, see infra.
Messenia is a much more “Homerical” landscape than Laconia. The scholarly industry of trying to identify legendary and Homeric places began early, perhaps because of the lack of sources and documents for the Classical period. Homeric Pteleon, Amphigeneia and Trikka have no plausible location in the landscape, and only the first is assumed to have been a settlement. Homeric Ithome has a known location, but was not necessarily a settlement. Among the thirty-six places with certain or possible locations, eight that have Homeric names and were presumably real places at some early date are located only in a general area or are assigned (usually by ancient authorities) to different places:

Aipeia (Thouria (no. 322) or Mothone (no. 319)).
Aipy (Margalai, or a place in Triphylia, or Epitalion (no. 305); possibly MME no. 245).
Antheia (Asine (no. 313) or Thouria (no. 322)).
Arene (possibly Samikon, possibly MME no. 302).
Enope (Pellana, Kardamyle (no. 315), or Gerenia).
Pedasos (Mothone (no. 319) or Korone (no. 316)).
Thryson/Thryoessa (possibly Epitalion (no. 305), for which two locations have been proposed).
Hire/Ire/Poiaessa (either in north-central or in southeastern Messenia).

Homeric Dorion (possibly at the Bronze Age site known by its modern name of Malthi) and Oichalia (near ancient Andania) are not certainly identified, but are more confidently tied to specific localities. Homeric Kyparissieis may have been succeeded at a different location by Messenian Kyparissos (no. 317), whose site is known. Homeric Kardamyle (no. 315) and Phere (if it is Pharai (no. 320)) are more or less securely tied to actual historical sites. Homeric Pylos is presumed to be a different site from Classical Pylos (see under Pylos, infra). An oddity is that of the five poleis of Kresphontes (Hyameia, Stenyklaros, Pylos, Rhion and Mesola) only the third is mentioned in Homer, while of Teleklos’ three foundations of Echeiai, Poiaessa and Tragion, only the second—perhaps—occurs in Homer.

2. Identification of Poleis

Of the fifty-five place-names with which we started, we should first exclude spurious names and non-settlements (including Ithome). The thirty-six historical settlements can now be classified for the purposes of investigating the Archaic and Classical poleis of Messenia.

The Inventory describes eleven settlements, covering every place that, in the Archaic or Classical period, was certainly a polis (Asine (no. 313), Kyparissos (no. 317), Mothone (no. 319) and, after 369, Messene (no. 318) itself, probably a polis (Aithaia (no. 312) and Thouria (no. 322)), or possibly a polis (Aulon (no. 314), Kardamyle (no. 315), Korone (no. 316), Pharai (no. 320) and Thalamai (no. 321)).

Before the eleven Archaic and Classical poleis are catalogued, the other twenty-five settlements of all periods will be described briefly. There is a strong possibility that some were poleis before 360—either perioikic poleis before 369 or settlements subsequently elevated to polis status—but happened not to have been recorded in surviving evidence from the Classical period. Because in some cases the issues are more problematic than for similar places in Laconia, and because it is sometimes possible to be more precise than was the case in Shipley (1997), a little more detail will be given here than for the equivalent places in the Lakedaimon inventory.

3. Ancient Settlements without Demonstrable Archaic or Classical Occupation

In seventeen cases among the twenty-five known settlements, there is no firm evidence that the place was a settlement in the Archaic or Classical periods, but only at some later or (usually) earlier date. Details of some have already been given in the list of possible settlements supra:

(S55) Abea/Abia/Abeia (see supra) may not have existed before C2.
(S68) Aipeia (see supra) did not exist under this name in Classical times, though possibly it had been renamed Thouria.
(S69) Aipy (see supra) did not exist under this name in Classical times, though possibly it had changed its name.
(S85) Amphiea (see supra) probably did not exist in Classical times.
(S86) Andania (see supra) was a settlement by C3l and presumably existed earlier as a sanctuary, but the Messenians reportedly did not wish to resettle it after 369 (Paus. 4.26.6).
(S71) Antheia (see supra) did not exist under this name in Classical times, but possibly it had been renamed Asine; it is extremely doubtful whether it is named in a C4l-C3e inscription (see under Amphiea supra).
(S72) Arene did not exist under this name in Classical times, though possibly it had been renamed Samikon.
(S87) Charadra is only attested in Strabo and is possibly legendary.
(S73) Dorion is not mentioned after Homer and before Strabo, unless it existed as Doureon c.200 (BCH 44 (1921) 12 col. n.84 (Delphi (c.200))); it must be doubtful whether Pausanias could be sure the ruins he was shown were those of Dorion, let alone whether it existed in the Archaic/Classical periods.

(S74) Enope did not exist under this name in Classical times, though possibly it had been renamed Mothone or Gerenia or under another name.

(S76) Erana is attested only in Strabo 8.3.23 (who distinguishes it from Arene), and may have existed only in the Roman period.

(S75) Ire/Hire is either a doublet of Poiaessa or existed under another name in Classical times, possibly Abia.

(S77) Oichalia was shown to Pausanias as “the place formerly called Oichalia” (4.2.2), where the Messenians did not wish to resettle after 369; probably only Homeric (the name Oichalia has been adopted by the former Ali Tselepi, ΛΟΠ no. 3080).

(S78) Pedasos did not exist under this name in Classical times, though possibly it had been renamed Mothone or Korone.

(S92) Poiaessa is probably purely Homeric (if not a doublet of Hire/Ire).


(S62) Thryon did not exist under this name in Classical times, though possibly it had been renamed Epitalion.

The remaining seven settlements had, or probably had, Archaic or Classical occupation but cannot plausibly be shown to have been poleis at that time (two names refer to the same site):

4. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis

**Alagonia (Ἀλαγονία)** (S38) Attested only in the Imperial period, when it was an Eleutherolaconian polis (Paus. 3.12.7; 30 stades (5.6 km) from Gerena, 3.26.11); but the highly probable location (MME no. 548, Aghios Iliai, or Gaitses, at Brinda, the last now renamed Voreio, ΛΟΠ no. 719), adjoining the Sandava gorge (ancient Choirios Nape, Paus. 4.1.1), has Classical to mediaeval finds. Meyer (1978) 177–78; Hope Simpson (1972) 95 fig. 6.2, 98 n. 105, concurring with Valmin (1930) 187–89. (Alternately, at Zarnata Kambou: see infra, under Gerena; Meyer (1978) 177–78.) Barr. locates it at Anatoliko and dates it C.

**Gerena, Gerena (Γέρενια, Γέρηνα)** (S57) First attested in IG v.1 1336 = SEG 11 950 (date corrected to C2 at SEG 13 268; C3–C2 in LGPN 111a, s.v. Νικάνδριππος). Cf. Strabo 8.3.29, 4.4–5. Paus. 3.26.8 says its population is Messenian, though it is Eleutherolaconian (cf. 3.21.7). It may have existed shortly after Messenia’s independence; there is no definite evidence, though its identification with MME no. 146, Zarnata Kambou, is reasonably certain (prehistoric, Classical to Roman, mediaeval; traces of ancient circuit wall; probable findspot of C5 stelae IG v.1 1337–38; cf. another (C5?) in SEG 11 951). (Another proposed location, Kitries, has few finds, but Zarnata may nevertheless be Alagonia (Meyer (1978) 177)). For the location, see Valmin (1930) 182–86; Hope Simpson (1972) 98 n. 105 with refs. It may have belonged to the Messenian koinon after 338/7 (Lazenby (1972) 90). Since Kardamyle, further south-east, had to be detached from Messenia in order to be given to Sparta by Augustus (Paus. 3.21.6), it seems that Gerena, too, must have been Messenian at that time, and therefore not a member of the koinon of the Lakedaimonians founded after 195; this would be consistent with its having ceased to be periöikik in 338. Sanctuary of Machaon attested in C2 (IG v.1 1336.19; SEG 11 949). Barr. C (Zarnatas?).

**Kalamai (Καλάμαι)** (S102) First attested in Polyb. 5.92.4, where it is a settlement captured by Lykourgos in 217—implicitly a defensible one since it is taken by treachery. Although Kalamai probably existed in C4, there is no evidence that it was a polis. It is a kome in Paus. 4.31.3; Steph. Byz. 347.16 alone calls it a polis, but cites only Pausanias, who does not. Plausibly located at MME no. 537, Giannitsa, c.6 km east of Kalamata (Classical and Hellenistic site with C4–C3 buildings, fortifications; now Elaiochori, ΛΟΠ no. 1106) or at nearby MME no. 140, Sola Perivolakiom (LH 111, Hellenistic? Roman, o.8 ha; squared blocks, inscriptions). (Cf. Meyer (1978) 180–81 for full references; Roebuck (1941) 122–23, followed by Hope Simpson (1972) 98 n. 104; cf. Hope Simpson (1966) 119 and n. 27.) This locality is argued for on topographical grounds regarding Lykourgos’ invasion route in 217, supported by epigraphic finds naming Kalamai (IG v.1 1369–70) from the area of the church 20 minutes (c.2 km?) away at Ag. Vasileios. Meyer, KlPauly v. 51 (with refs. to earlier literature), prefers to put it at modern Kalamai c.2 km north-west of Kalamata (usually identified with Pharai). Barr. HR (Perivolakiom/Sola).

**Kolonis, Kolonides (Κολωνίς, Κολωνίδες)** (S58) It was a settlement by 188 and is plausibly linked with an excavated Classical cemetery, but is not attested before Plut. **Philop.**
Koryphasion (Κορυφάσιον) (S109) Koryphasion (which presumably meant "headland"); cf. LS s.v. κορυφή, i. 3) was the Lakedaimonian name for the then uninhabited promontory of Pylos, opposite the island of Sphakteria, on the northern side of modern Navarino Bay (Thuc. 4.3.2). Pylos (Πύλος) (S81) was presumably the Messenian name for the same place (preserving the Bronze Age πτολίεθρον, found in Linear B tablets from the nearby "palace of Nestor"). Paus. 4.36.1–5 (referring to Ἰον Πύλον on Koryphasion) takes it to be Nestor’s home (Hom. II. 2.153, etc.; Odyssey 3.4, where it is called a πολιείθρον). Pylos is located in Messenia, and is distinguished from other Pyloi, by Strabo 8.3.7 (τὸν Μεσσηνιακόν Πύλον, masc., τῷ κατὰ Κορυφάσιον), 8.4.2 (Πύλος Ἰον Μεσσηνιακῆ, this time fem., etc.). It is implicitly called a polis at 8.4.6, but this is vague. It is different from Triphyal Pylus and Eleian Pylos; Homer’s Pylos may be a fourth site, that of the excavated Bronze Age palace, MME no. 1, Ano Englianos Choras. (On the tablets, see Bennet (1998).) On all four sites, see Meyer in KI Pau ly iv. 1249–51. Modern Pylos is a fifth site, formerly Neakastro Navarinou (ΛΟΠ no. 3549), on the south side of the bay. Valmin (1930) 146–51 discusses the locations of Pylos, Sphaktaria and Koryphasion. For the migration of the name “Pylos” since the Bronze Age, see Davis (1998a) p. xx. The headland was garrisoned during 425–421 and 418–409 (or 408) by Messenian exiles (Thuc. 4.4.1.2, 5.35.6–7; Xen. Hell. 1.2.18). In 365 it was taken by Arkadians (not Argives as Alcock (1998) 183 has it) (Diod. 15.77.4). The headland site (MME no. 9, Paliokastro Petrochroniou) has Bronze Age, Protogeometric and Classical to Roman finds, including the C5 fortification connected with the Athenians’ operations in 425. Lazenby (1972) 86 suggests that it was left uninhabited after the conquest of Messenia was completed c.600. Recent survey confirms the dearth of Classical settlement in the area (Harrison and Spencer (1998) 160). The lower-lying settlement between the lagoon (smaller than in modern times) and the bay, at MME no. 401, Divari Gialova (cf. ΛΟΠ no. 841), had Archaic to Roman monument bases, etc., and was substantial in Hellinistic times (at least 1.5 ha; MME 310–11 no. 401; see also Pritchett (1965) 6–29). Alcock (1998) 183 speculates that the fort and the “true” polis may date from post-365; but it is not certain that it ever was a polis. Meyer, KIPau ly iii. 312 notes that Osmanaga village is now Koryphasion (cf. ΛΟΠ no. 1806) and cross-references to his article on Pylos at KIPau ly iv. 2149–50, where he notes C5 fortification. It was a small place in Imperial times, but claimed to be Nestor’s home; the fort is late thirteenth century AD, named Palaikastro, later Palai Avarino, once the Turkish fort was built on the south side of the bay at modern Pylos. Meyer also cites Pompon. 2.52; Plin. HN 4.55; Ptol. Geog. 3.14.31; Tab. Peut. 7.5; Meyer (1951); idem, RE xxiii. 2114–15; Marinatos, PP 16 (1961) 225–26; plan, JHS 16 (1896) fig. 3 (reproduced in Spencer (1998) 175). Full refs. in Meyer (1978) 201–3. IG v.1 1418 (= SEG 11 1004) and 1419 (= SEG 11 1003) are LCI stelae found in the vicinity, with single names on them. KI Pau ly iv. 1249–51 (Meyer): “Pylos I” (cols. 1249–50), Koryphasion; “Pylos 2” (col. 1250), Triphyal Pylos; “Pylos 3” (col. 1250), Eleian Pylos; “Pylos 4” (cols. 1250–51), site of the BA palace, Hom. II. 2.153 = 2.295, 9.591, 11.682, 712; Od. 3.4 (πολιείθρων), similarly 3.485, 15.193. BArr. AC.

Leuktron, Leuktra (Λευκτρον, Λευκτρα) (S48) Leuktron is not attested (except in Linear B) before Strabo 8.4.4, though he claims it was founded by Pelops. Plut. Pelo p. 20.7 tells that in the run-up to the battle of Leuktra in 371 the Thebans were uncertain whether the πολιείθρων of Leuktron in Laconia was meant in the relevant oracle, but we cannot rely on this as evidence for its existence then. Plin. HN 4.5.16 lists it, and in Paus. 3.21.7 it is an Eleutherolaconian polis. Valmin (1950) 203–4 locates it at the village of Leftra. If re-uo-ko-to-ro (“Leuktron?”) in the Pylos tablets is the name of the predecessor of Thouria (no. 332) (see Bennet (1998) 122, 124), the toponym has migrated to its present site. The probable site, MME no. 148, Leftra Stoupas, has Bronze Age, Classical to Roman, and mediaeval remains. IG v.1 1329 is a late Archaic or Classical cultic stele found in a field near Leuktra; Hope
Simpson (1972) 98 n. 100 says that Leuktron must have been occupied in the Archaic period, but direct evidence seems lacking. Roebuck (1941) 30–31 n. 17, notes that Heidemann (1904) 51 suggests it was a Messenian foundation after 369, but again evidence is lacking. See also Meyer (1978) 176. Barr. AC (Stoupa).

**Prote** (Πρωτή) A deserted island, Thuc. 4.13.3; Ps.-Skylax 45 (depending on the orthography: TLG reads πρωτή Μεσσήνη και λιμήν, Κυπάρισσος, but one could read (as Meyer evidently does) Πρωτή, Μεσσήνη, και λιμήν Κυπάρισσος. Ps.-Skylax uses πρωτή elsewhere to pick out the first polis in a region, though in every other case the phrase πρωτή πόλεις occurs, so Meyer may be right.) See Meyer, KLPauly iv. 1195–96. It is described as νησίον καὶ πολέμουν in Strabo 8.3.23. It is also named in Plin. HN 4.55, Ptol. 3.14.44 and Steph. Byz. 537.16–17, who claims the ethnic is Protoiōs, but there are no parallels. The island has a substantial late Classical (?) and Hellenistic settlement, including a Hellenistic fortress enclosing 2.8 ha (MME no. 407, Pröti; better Proti, ΛΟΠ no. 3536). Archaeological evidence confirms that it was apparently uninhabited in C5 but was a settlement by C1, and possibly as early as C4. Valmin (1930) 141–45: rock-cut inscriptions (including IG v.1 1533 (C5); SEG 11 1005 (C6) = LSAG 206 no. 2 (C6)); ancient fortress on south point, probably C4e at earliest; pottery (cites Niese (1906) 131). Full refs. in Meyer (1978) 204. Barr. C.

In addition, a few significant Archaic or Classical settlements might be linked with unlocated known toponyms. They include MME no. 216, Krebeni Kato Melpeias (Krebeni Melpeias was formerly Krebeni Garantza, ΛΟΠ no. 2430; Bronze Age, Classical, Hellenistic, C9 ha), in northern Messenia. Others are cited under particular sites in this introduction or in the main Inventory.

Some of the settlements listed supra, both those attested in sources and those known only from archaeological evidence, may have been poleis in the Classical period. Indeed, good candidates for Classical polis status, in addition to the “possible” poleis in the main part of the Inventory, are not hard to find: the strongest candidates are perhaps Alagonia, Gerenia, Kolonis and Leuktron. If any of these places was a polis before 369, it presumably had perioikic status.

On the other hand, many of these settlements had only small territories, and at least two, neither of which has been assigned to the Inventory of poleis, are described as komai (a category not inconsistent with polis status) after the Classical period: Kolonis (Plut. Philop. 18.3) and Kalamai (Paus. 4.31.3). There is also the stray comic reference from the Hellenistic period to an unnamed kome in the vicinity of Thouria (no. 322). As with poleis, since no place is called a kome twice, there were probably more of which we hear nothing. Such places may have been dependent upon larger perioikic centres. On local settlement hierarchies, see Shipley (1992).

II. The Poleis

312. Aithaia (Aithaieus) Unlocated. Type: B. (S18). The toponym is probably Αἴθαεα (Philoch. fr. 32a apud Steph. Byz. 46.4; vv.l. Αἴθαεα, Αἴθαλα; Θέα at Philoch. fr. 32b (apud Steph. Byz. 308.4 s.v. Θέα, also citing Thuc.), is probably a doublet. The city-ethnic is probably Αἴθαιεοι (Thuc. 1.101.2; vv.l. Αἴθαλεοι, Αἴθαεοι, Αἴθαεοι; restored on the basis of Steph. Byz. 46.5, who attributes it to Thuc.).

Aithaia is not located with certainty, but may have been near Thouria (no. 322) in south-eastern Messenia, the only other perioikic polis to revolt in 465 (Thuc. 1.101.2). Valmin (1930) 61–64 suggests Samarina (Santa Marina), north-east of the village of Kalogeraki (or rather Kalogerorachi: see MME 314), or one of several sites in the vicinity, such as Karteroli further south (Mycenaean, Hellenistic). See also Roebuck (1941) 30–31 and 7 n. 16; Lazenby (1972) 86; Hope Simpson (1972) 94 and 98 n. 95. One possible site is MME no. 137, Ellinika Aithaias (at Aithaia, formerly Delimimi, ΛΟΠ no. 304: Meyer (1978) 183); but this is more probably Thouria (no. 322). If it is Karteroli, it had a Hellenistic existence and so did not cease to exist after the liberation of Messenia; but nothing is known about the status of Aithaia after C5.

Aithaia is never called a polis in Classical sources, but apparently it was by Philoch. fr. 32a, who included it as “one of the 100”. It may be assumed to have been a perioikic polis during Spartan rule on the basis of Thuc. 1.101.2, the only Archaic or Classical use of the city-ethnic (external collective). There is no evidence for the name or extent of its territory; it is assigned to Lakonike in Philoch. fr. 32a (as is Thea, its possible double, in fr. 32b).

Unlike Mothone (no. 319) and Asine (no. 313), Aithaia is not said to have been the home of exiles from another polis. The ethnic affiliation of its population therefore depends on whether the perioikoi in Messenia were originally Lakedaimonians, even Spartiates, or ethnic Messenians.

12 References to komai in Laconia and Messenia are assembled by Shipley (1997) 261–63.
elevated above their helot compatriots. Malkin (1994) 85
tentatively advances Thouria (no. 322) and Aithaia as possi-
ble C8 foundations. Lazenby (1972) 86 assumes that the peo-
ples of Thouria and elsewhere were still “free Messenians”
after the conquest.

Given its possible location, it would have been detached
from Sparta (no. 345) in 338 rather than 369. Lazenby (1972)
90 suggests it may have belonged to a Messenian koinon after
338/7.

313. Asine (Asinaios) Map 58. Lat. 36.45, long. 21.55. Size
of territory: 2 or 3. Type: [A]. (S19). The toponym is Ἀσίνη,
ἡ (Hdt. 8.73.2; Thuc. 4.13.4; Xen. Hell. 7.1.25; Ps.-Skylax 46).
Although Xen. Hell. 7.1.25 places it in Δακαϊνα, the
Messenian town is presumably meant, since Lakaina is
probably equivalent to Stapistikos, the territory controlled by
Sparta (no. 345); it is explicitly distinguished from Laconian
Asine at e.g. Strabo 8.4.1 (τῆς Μεσσηνικῆς Ἀσίνης) and
Steph. Byz. 131.11–13 (Ἀσίνη, πόλις Λακωνική... δευτέρα
Μεσσηνίας παρὰ τὴν Λακωνικήν). The ethnic is Asinaios
(κατὰ τῆς Ασίνης – C). (cf. Valmin (1978)). In
 SEG 512 ). It is specified as Ασιναῖος ἐγ Μεσσαν
in Hdt. 36.8.45.); it is found at modern Koroni, which the editors in
infra

Asine was implicitly called a polis in Hdt. 8.73.2, where polis
is used in the urban and/or political sense; in Ps.-Skylax 46,
where polis is used in the urban sense, Asine (presumably the
Messenian one, cf. infra) is listed as the first toponym after
the heading πόλεως αἰῶνες (though Mothone (no. 319), listed
second, ought to have been named first). Otherwise it is
called a polis only in post-Classical sources: e.g. IG iv 679
(C3–C2) where the polis of the Ἀσιναίων asks to take part
in the rites of Demeter at Hermione.

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic occurs in
Hellenistic decrees (e.g. SEG 11 986 (C3–C2)). The external
collective use occurs in Xen. Hell. 7.1.25, and the external indi-
vidual use in Xenophon’s references to Neon of Asine (infra),
in IG 112 8387a (C4) and in SEG 12 219 (322–310), a grant of
proxyenia, theorodokia, etc. by Delphi to two citizens of Asine.

Asine was peopled with the expelled population of
Argolic Asine (Dryopians, cf. Hdt. 8.73.2) when it was
destroyed (Theopomp. fr. 383 apud Strabo 8.6.11; Paus. 3.7.4,
4.8.3, 14.3; cf. 4.24.4, 34.9) after the First Messenian War
(Lazenby (1972) 85; Harrison and Spencer (1998) 154). Its ter-
ritory was supposedly exempt from the general allotment of
land after the conquest of Messenia (Paus. 4.24.4).

In 425, during the Sphakteria campaign, the Spartans sent
to Asine for timber with which to make siege engines (Thuc.
4.13.1). Later, in the Peloponnesian War, the Spartan com-
mander Gyllippos had ships sent there (Thuc. 6.93.3).

Neon of Asine (most likely from Messenian Asine) took a
leading part in the expedition of the Ten Thousand (Xen.
An. 5.3.4, etc.; he is also called Λακωνικός, 7.2.29 (for a pos-
sible reason for the variation, see Shipley (1997) 209)). In 369
or 368 the Arkadians attacked Asine; again, presumably
Messenian Asine is meant (and it is not contradicted by τῆς
Λακαΐνης) since there was a Spartan garrison (φρουρά
there; they defeated it, killing its Spartan commander and
devastating the outskirts (proasteion) of the city (Xen. Hell.
7.1.25). After the Spartans lost part of Messenia, the
Asinaians were allowed to remain in their homeland (κατὰ
χώραν, Paus. 4.27.8); Asine was in fact within the part of

Hence, perhaps, it is put in Lakedaimon, not Messenia, by
Ps.-Skylax 46. After 338/7 it may have belonged to a
Messenian koinon (cf. Lazenby (1972) 90). The population
was presumably a mixture of Argolic Asinaians (Dryopians;
cf. Hdt. 8.73.2) and pre-existing Messenians and/or
Lakedaimonians.

Asine was certainly perioikic; the use of its ethnic for its
citizen Neon conforms to the rule whereby Lakedaimonian
perioikoi are identified by their city-ethnics (Shipley (1997)

territory: 1 or 2. Type: C. (S20). The toponym is Ἄυλων, ὁ
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and possibly Classical finds. Hope Simpson (could still have had authority over colonists were sent by Sparta. Aulon to arrest certain

Paus. 4.36.7 places Aulon between Kyparissos (no. 317) and the river Neda. Valmin (1930) 107–11 (and Barr.) locates it at MME no. 601, Vounaki Palioneriou (cf. Roebuck (1941) 25–26 n. 95; for the name Palioneri, cf. ΛΟΠ no. 3124), a fortified site with an area of 0.8 ha, and with Hellenistic, Roman and possibly Classical finds. Hope Simpson (1972) 94 and n. 101, however, suggests MME no. 602, Ag. Ilias, a Classical and Hellenistic site of at least 3 ha with a good view over the coastal route.

Aulon is a polis only by Steph. Byz. 147.6, who lists it as “one of the 100 poleis,” suggesting a Classical or Hellenistic source such as Theopompos; it is not clear whether polis is here used in the urban or the political sense. It is not certain, however, that Aulon was a polis in the Classical period. A possible comparandum is Laconian Σκιρίται, whose name may be a sub-regional ethnic rather than a city-ethnic. Roebuck (1941) 25–26 n. 95 (followed by Hope Simpson (1972) 98 n. 101) takes Aulon in Xen. Hell. 3.2.25 (where Agis invades Elis δι’ Αὐλώνων, “via Aulon” or “through the aulon”) to be a district. At Hell. 3.3.10 Xenophon uses the preposition ἐνι, with the dative to locate men previously sent to Aulon (ἐνι Αὐλώνιοι); this, again, may possibly suggest that the name denotes a geographical location rather than a polis, though there may also have been a polis. At 3.3.8 Xenophon says (with reference to c.399) that the conspirator Kinadon was sent to Aulon to bring back “certain of the Aulonitai” and certain helots; Roebuck (ibid.) accepts that this passage probably refers to a town. It is implicitly called an oppidum by Plin. HN 4.5.14, who lists it first among the westward oppida of Elis.

Aulon may well have been a perioikic polis during the period of Spartan rule in Messenia. Kinadon, the conspirator sent to arrest certain Aulonitai, is described by Xen. Hell. 3.3.5 as “not of the homoioi” (the full-citizen Spartiates), while at 3.3.11 he is reported to have said that he aspired to be “a lesser man (ὑποµείονε) than none in Lakedaimon”. He has generally been assumed to have belonged to the class of “inferiors” (ὑποσαµελέανες) attested only in the enumeration of his fellow-plotters at Xen. Hell. 3.3.6. As a demoted Spartan, Kinadon could still have had authority over perioikoi. Roebuck (1941) 30 n. 13 and Spencer (1998) 176 assume that Aulon was perioikic. If perioikic, the population of Aulon may have been ethnically Messenian or Lakedaimonian, depending on whether colonists were sent by Sparta.

The external collective use of the city-ethnic (if it is one) occurs at Xen. Hell. 3.3.8.

No name is given to the territory of Aulon. Given its proposed location, it would have been lost by Sparta (no. 345) in 369. It was probably bounded by the territory of Triphylia on the north. Aulon may have belonged to a Messenian koinon after 338/7 (cf. Lazenby (1972) 90).

315. Kardamyle (Skardamyliites) Map 58. Lat. 36.50, long. 22.15. Size of territory: 1. Type: C. (534). The toponym is Καρδαµήλη, (Hom. Il. 9.150 = 9.252; Hdt. 8.73.2; Strabo 8.4.1, etc.; Paus. 3.26.7). The city-ethnic may be Καρδαµήλητης (Hdn. 11.2 530.22; Steph. Byz. 357.17; these could refer to Kardamyle in Chios (no. 840; Thuc. 8.24.3), but that was not a polis). Both late authors state that the locals used the form Σκαρδαµήλητης.

Strabo 8.4.4 locates Kardamyle “on a deserted rock” between Leuktron and Pharai (no. 320), which does not mean that it had been abandoned. Paus. 3.26.7 locates it 60 stades (11 km) after Leuktra (overestimating by a factor of two; Valmin (1930) 199) and an unspecified distance before Gerenia. It is generally identified with MME no. 147, Kastro Kardamylis (Archaic to mediaeval remains, as well as pre-historic). Hope Simpson (1972) 98 n. 100 notes that early Doric columns have been found (citing ArchDelt 22 (1967) B1.206; see also ArchDelt 20 (1965) B208).

Kardamyle is not called a polis in Classical sources, but Hdt. 8.73.2 identifies Messenian Asine (no. 313), which he describes as a polis, as “the Asine by (or opposite) the Laconian Kardamyle (Καρδαµήλη τῇ Λακωνικῇ),” possibly implying that Kardamyle was at least as prominent a place as Asine, and so possibly a polis. It is called a polisma by Paus. 3.26.7. Herodotos’ description of Kardamyle as “Laconian” (Λακωνική) implicitly places it in Lakonike, the territory of Sparta (no. 345). Steph. Byz. 357.17, while citing Herodotos, places it in Messenia, perhaps reflecting the changed circumstances of the Roman period (though the words πόλις Μεσσηνίας are restored from the parallel passage in Eust. Il. 743.17).

Kardamyle is one of Agamemnon’s seven ptolietha (Hom. Il. 9.150 = 9.292). It is generally thought to have been a perioikic polis during Spartan rule over Messenia (e.g. Roebuck (1941) 30–31 n. 17). Though situated between two Eleutherolaconian poleis, Leuktra and Gerenia, it did not join that League when it was founded under Augustus, being instead detached from Messenia and given to Sparta (Paus. 3.26.7). Since the Eleutherolaconian league was largely a refoundation of the koinon of the Lakedaimonians that was
set up after after the Roman take-over in 195, Kardamyle had probably not been a member of that body either, which probably means that it ceased to be periioikic in 338, when Philip II detached southern Messenia and the Dentheliatis from Sparta (Shipley (2000) 385–86).

316. Korone (Koronaioi)  Map 58. Lat. 36.50, long. 21.55. Size of territory: 2 or 3. Type: C. (S59). The toponym is Koróna, Ἱ (Apolloodoros apud Steph. Byz. 378.1; Strabo 8.4.5; Paus. 4.34.4) or Kopoeia (IG v.1 34 = SEG 11 479 (second century AD)). Strabo 8.4.5 cites the view that it was Homer’s Pedasos; Paus. 4.34.5 states that its original name was Aipeia. The city-ethnic is Koronaioi but occurs first on C2m coins of the Achaian Confederacy inscribed ἶξιαιοι Ἰκορναιοι (Head, HN 433); cf. SEG 11 985 (second century AD), a decree of the polis. On Korone’s location, see Hope Simpson (1972) 97–98 n. 91; Roebuck (1941) 19–22; Valmin (1930) 171–80, (1934–35) 44–46; Meyer (1978) 195–96.

Korone is called a polis only by late sources such as Strabo 8.4.5, Paus. 4.34.4, SEG 11 985 (second century AD), and Steph. Byz. 378.1. However, if Korone is correctly identified with MME no. 502, Petalidhi (rather than mediaeval Coron, modern Koronei), the archaeological evidence suggests the possibility that it was a Classical polis. The main evidence is the supposed date of the substantial city walls, which Valmin (1930) 178 regards as including renovations from Epameinondas’ time.

At 4.34.5, Pausanias says that it was originally called Aipeia, but was renamed Koroneia by its Theban oecist, Epimelides (for whom there was a hero shrine at Korone, 4.34.6), after the liberation of Messenia; the name was shortened to Korone by the Messenians (Kopoeia is actually found in inscriptions of Roman date from Sparta (supra)). This suggests a refundation c.369; however, Lazenby (1972) 89 and Hope Simpson (1972) 99 n. 125 suggest that Korone (and Kolonides) were founded in the aftermath of 369 to isolate periioikic Asine (no. 313) and Mothone (no. 319).

Under Spartan rule, the surrounding area was one of the most densely settled in Messenia (Harrison and Spencer (1998) 159). The important Classical sanctuary of Apollo Korythos (Paus. 4.34.7) probably lay in Korone’s territory. Votive there include SEG 42 342, 40 362 + (c.460?), a bronze spear-butt dedicated by the Messenians, possibly celebrating a victory over the Spartans during the revolt of the 460s (cf. Bauslaugh (1990); LSAG Messenia no. 3 (c.C4e)). Other early votives include SEG 11 993 (c.500). Full refs. in Meyer (1978) 196–97. Paus. 4.34.4 locates Korone 20 stades (3.7 km) from an inland spring, Plataston, which supplied the town. At 4.34.6 he notes temples of Artemis Paidotrophos, Dionysos and Asklepios, as well as a hero shrine to Epimelides.

317. Kyparissos (Kyparissieus) Map 58. Lat. 37.15, long. 21.40. Size of territory: 3 or 4. Type: [A], (S35). The toponym is Kypárrisos, Ἱ in Ps.-Skylax 45 (cf. Plin. HN 4.5.15); elsewhere it is Kypárrisma, Ἱ (Strabo 8.3.22; Κυπαρίσσιον in MSS; cf. 8.3.25; Steph. Byz. 395.1) or Kypárrisi (Paus. 4.36.7). The city-ethnic is Kyparissiōs (IG v.1 1421 (C4–C3); Head, HN 433) or Kypárrisiōs (Polyb. 5.92.5; SEG 11 1021 (C2–C1); Strabo 8.3.22). The polis is plausibly located at MME no. 70 (Kyparissia), a site with Classical walls, Hellenistic and Roman buildings; a settlement of 1 ha or more (modern Kyparissia is also called Arkadia, ΛΟΠ no. 2000). For the walls, see Valmin (1930) 129–31 (parts are C5 or later; some black-figured pottery); Hope Simpson (1972) 99 n. 123 (where “#72” should read “#70”) cites Valmin (1930) 131–32 on the extent of the fortifications. Full references in Meyer (1978) 204–5.

In Ps.-Skylax 45, where polis is used in the urban sense, Kyparissos may be the first toponym listed after the heading πόλεις αὐτῆς. It seems also to be implicitly described as a polis in the urban sense in Diod. 15.77.4 (1365/4). In the political sense, polis is not attested until the Roman era (SEG 11 1025 (C2–C1); πόλεις is a near-certain restoration). However, the decree IG v.1 1421 (C4–C3) demonstrates that it was a polis in the political sense long before that date: it uses the internal collective city-ethnic (1–2), attests to the existence of a territory ruled by the Kyparissians (ἐ[πὶ] τις κα ἐσάγη ἐπὶ τῶν Κυπαρισσίων . . . 1–2), and names a board of officials called οἱ πεντηκοστοῦλοι (9), a name that suggests the raising of customs dues. Moreover, IG v.2 390 (C4–C3e) is a grant of proxeny and theorodokia by Arkadian Lousoi (no. 279) to two citizens of Kyparissos (cf. Perlman (2000) 241–42); and Polyb. 5.92.5 attests that in 217 the people were able to mobilise military forces.

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic occurs in IG v.1 1421 (C4–C3); the external collective use is attested at Polyb. 5.92.5, and the external individual use in IG v.2 390 (C4–C3e).

In 365/4, when Kyparissos was captured by Arkadian forces, it was evidently a defended settlement (Diod. 15.77.4) and thus quite probably periioikic; alternatively, it became a polis only after this time; cf. Roebuck (1941) 30 n. 12; Harrison and Spencer (1998) 156.

The name of the polis founded in 369 is regularly Μεσσηνία, ἦ (Dem. 16.25; Lycurg. 1.62), to which corresponds the city-ethnic Μεσσάνιοι (CID ii 4.1.28 (360)), but it is also called Ἰθώμη, ἦ (Ps.-Skylax 45; F.Delphes 311.4.6 (326 or 316); Diod. 19.54.4 (1316)), to which the corresponding city-ethnic was probably Ἰθωμαῖοι, abbreviated as ΙΘΩΜ on C4 coins (Head, HN* 432). Μεσσηνία, as is normal in earlier literature (supra 350), could still denote the region (e.g. Xen. Hell. 5.2.3; see Meyer (1978) 159–60, 283). The two names are combined at Ps.-Skylax 45: ἠθνὸς Μεσσηνία (the regional name) καὶ πόλεις ἐν αὐτῇ ἀιὲν ἐτάραξαν ἵδε· Ἰθώμη ἐν μεσογείᾳ κτλ. (the name of the polis). Roebuck (1941) 37 and Lazenby (1972) 89 note that until at least the end of C4 the polis was apparently called Ithome; thereafter Messene was the usual name (cf. KIPauly ii.1,488).

In CID ii 4.1.14–15 and 28 (360), where polis is used in the political sense, Messene is one of the polities listed (as Μεσσάνιοι) after the heading ταῦτα πόλεις καὶ ἵδεται ἐτάραξαν ἵδε· Ἰθώμη ἐν μακραια … Ἰθώμη ἐν μεσογείᾳ κτλ. (the name of the polis). Roebuck (1941) 37 and Lazenby (1972) 89 note that until at least the end of C4 the polis was apparently called Ithome; thereafter Messene was the usual name (cf. KIPauly ii.1,488).

In CID ii 4.1.14–15 and 28 (360), where polis is used in the political sense, Messene is one of the polities listed (as Μεσσάνιοι) after the heading ταῦτα πόλεις καὶ ἵδεται ἐτάραξαν ἵδε· Ἰθώμη ἐν μακραια … Ἰθώμη ἐν μεσογείᾳ κτλ. (the name of the polis). Roebuck (1941) 37 and Lazenby (1972) 89 note that until at least the end of C4 the polis was apparently called Ithome; thereafter Messene was the usual name (cf. KIPauly ii.1,488).

The usual city-ethnic, Μέσσανιοι, is of course attested before the foundation of the polis, for it was also the regional ethnic of the Messenians (e.g. IG i² 1355 (475–450); ML 74 (c.421); Thuc. 4.9.1; see Figueira (1999) and Luraghi (2002) for the development of Messenian identity). After 369, the internal collective use of the city-ethnic is attested by coins inscribed ΜΕΣΣΑΝΙΩΝ (infra) and in IG v.1 1425.10 (C4–C3); the external collective use is found e.g. in SEG 29 405.10 (365/4), CID ii 4.1.28 (360), IG v.1 225.6 (343/2) and in Xen. Hell. 7.4.27, 7.5.5. The external individual use is found in F.Delphes 311.4.4 (340), IG v.1 2347 (C4m), IG v.1 122.129 (C4) and IvO 172 (360–300). We cannot, however, always determine whether the ethnic functions as a city-ethnic and thus refers to citizens of the polis of Messene specifically, or as a regional ethnic and thus to members of the wider community (ethnos) of Messenians. A particularly ambiguous instance is found in Syll.3 224 (c.345), a response by the Amphictyonic League to a request by the Μεγαλοπολίται and the Μεσσηνίοι for membership of the League: the fact that Μεσσηνίοι occurs alongside Μεγαλοπολίται suggests that it is here a city-ethnic, whereas the request to become an Amphictyonic member suggests that it may be the regional ethnic, since the League was organised on the basis of ethne (Lefèvre (1998) 17–20). When it functions as the regional ethnic, it is sometimes amplified by the addition of a phrase denoting a local community of Messenia, e.g. Μεσσανίοι ἐκ Θουρίας (BCH 6 (1882) 221 no. 53 = F.Delphes 311.4.5 (315–280)) and Μεσσανίοι ἐκ Θουρίας (BCH 6 (1882) 221 no. 52 = F.Delphes 311.4.6 (post-327/6)); cf. ΜΕΣΣΑΝΙΩΝ ΙΘΩΜΑΙΩΝ ΙΘΩΜΑΙΩΝ on coins of c.330–280 (Head, HN² 431–32). This plurality of usage may reflect the fact that a federal structure was probably introduced after 369, no doubt under Thesan influence, in which the new polis played the leading role. The koinon is attested in ΙΜαγνησία 43 (207/6): τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Μεσσηνίων (cf. Lazenby (1972) 90; Meyer (1978) 283, arguing for isopolity rather than sympolity; see Polyb. 23.17.2 on Abia, Thouria and Pharai; also McDonald and Hope Simpson (1972) 145; Davis (1998a) p. xxx). In that case the symmachia treaty of the Arkadian Confederacy with the Messenians (SEG 22 339, Olympia (365/4)) may have been concluded with a Messenian koinon rather than with the polis of Messene alone, as may the treaty of symmachia with Athens (no. 361) et al. attested in IG ii² 225 (343/2). The city of Messene was no doubt meant to be dominant, not least for the sake of the stability and security of the region. To that extent the other poleis of post-liberation Messenia can be regarded as dependent poleis, but there seems to have been considerable polis autonomy: see Kyparissos (no. 317) for a decree on customs and proxeny relations of that polis in C4–C3; note also that Mothon (no. 319) minted its own coins c.C3 (Head, HN² 433). Even c.240 the polis of Messene made its own treaty of isopolity with Phigaleia (no. 292) (IG v.2 419 = Syll.3 472; Meyer (1978) 283). These indications may hold good for C4 also; strong central control by Messene was perhaps a development of C3 or even C3l rather than C4. It was perhaps during C3 that Messenia came to replace Messene as the usual name of the region (Meyer (1978) 284). The federal arrangement appears to have ended in 182, when Messene was required to rejoin the Achaian Confederacy separately from the three poleis to its south-east—Abia, Thouria (no. 322) and Pharai (no. 320), which joined the league individually (Polyb. 23.17.2). Cf. also under Mothon infra, with reference to 191.

Messene was founded after the first Boiotian invasion of Laconia by Epameinondas and his allies in 370/69 (Roebuck (1941) 27–39). Although Epiteles of Argos was put in charge of building the polis (Paus. 4.26.7), Epameinondas was evidently regarded as the oecist, since statues were erected to him (Paus. 4.31.10, 32.1); he was revered as such in the second century AD (Paus. 9.14.5, 15.6). For an account of how he organised the construction of Messene and other polismata, see
Paus. 4.27.5–7 (cf. Roebuck (1941) 31–32 n. 21). Philip II was honoured as second eoctist for his benefactions after Chaironeia (Strabo 8.4.8). The inhabitants of the new polis included former helots (Isoc. 6.28; cf. Roebuck (1941) 34), expatriated Messenians, and “others who so wished” (Diod. 15.66.1; cf. Lycurg. 1.62: Μεσσηνίων . . . ἐκ τῶν τυχόντων ἀνθρώπων συνοικισθέασιν).

The territory of the new polis probably embraced the upper Messenian plain and the western part of the lower one, marching with those of Korone (no. 316) to the south, Pylos to the south-west (if it was a polis), and Kyparissos (no. 317) to the west and north-west (Meyer (1978) 150); probably also with that of Thouria (no. 322) to the east; and with those of the Arkadian poleis to the north—unless Dorion and Andania to the north, and Amypeia to the north-east, were poleis. For a possible network of Late Classical/Early Hellenistic forts in the chora, see Hope Simpson (1972) 94 with 98–99 nn. 117–20; Roebuck (1941) 39–40 n. 68, 59–60, 64–65, 122–24; Valmin (1930) 67–73, 78–82, 90, 92–93. SEG 34 321 lists graffiti from a fort at Vasiliko near Messene, probably dating to C5m and later.

C4 treaties concluded by Messene include one with Pisa (no. 262) and Sikyon (no. 228) (Ringel et al. (1999) 417–20), and at least two with Athens (no. 361) (Staatsverträge 337 and 343 (on which see, however, Roebuck (1941) 52 n. 113); Dem. 16.9 with Roebuck (1941) 47; though not explicitly attested, alliances with Boiotia/Thebes (no. 221) (cf. Xen. Hell. 7.5.4–5), Arkadia and Argos (no. 347) may be assumed to have been concluded immediately after the foundation (Roebuck (1941) 40–41). Messenian troops fought on the anti-Spartan side in the battle of Mantinea in 362 (Diod. 15.85.2). Messene was a party to the koine eirene concluded after the battle (Diod. 15.89.1; Ryder (1965) 84–85, 140–44) and thus gained international recognition of its existence (Roebuck (1941) 47). An alliance with Megalopolis (no. 282) is attested by Diod. 16.39.2–3 (1352/1) and one with Philip II was concluded c.344 (Roebuck (1941) 49). Messene also became a member of the Corinthian League ([Dem.] 17.4; Roebuck (1941) 55 n. 120); see, however, supra for the possibility that the contracting party in such cases was the ethnos of the Messenians and not the polis of Messene.

Exiles restored by Alexander the Great are attested in [Dem.] 17.4. IG v.1 1425 (C4l–C3e) is a grant of proxeny by Messene to a citizen of Zakynthos (no. 141); citizens of Messene were granted proxeny by Delphi (no. 177) in 340 (F.Delphes 111.4.4) and 326–316 (F.Delphes 111.4.6). Grants of proxeny and theorodokia by Argos (no. 347) to citizens of Messene are listed in SEG 13 243 (post-315).

A C4l–C3e decree (IGv.1 1425.2) attests to the existence of a phyle named Δαίφωντίς, and it seems probable that a system of five phylai was created at the foundation in 369 (Jones, POAG 146–48). The existence of a calendar is attested by IG v.1 1425 (C4l–C3), where a month is referred to by number: δευδά(εκάτω) ἵ.

Although Meyer (1978) 151 supposes the city’s original constitution to have been “oligarchic-timocratic”, decrees of the polis demonstrate the existence of democratic institutions. IG v.1 1426 (C4l–C3e) is a decree for citizens of another polis (cf. under Amphiapolis in the introduction, supra) who receive ἰα(σοπολιτείαν) and γας τε καὶ οἰκίας ἐγκτ]ασων (SEG 11 1029, 41 321). IG v.1 1425 is a possibly C4–C3 proxeny of the damos (ἔδοξε τῶι δάµωι) for a citizen of Zakynthos (no. 141) (though it is downdated to C2–C1 by Roebuck at SEG 11 1030). IG v.1 1435 (= SEG 11 1037) is a C4–C3 list of names. In SEG 43 135 = 41 320 (317), the Messenians made a treaty with Polyperchon and his son Alexandros for the installation of a garrison on Mt. Ithome; the text mentions the damos, presumably of Messene. SEG 45 290 = 41 322 (C3e), an alliance of Messene with Lysimachos, probably dates from immediately before 295/4 (Matthaiou (1990–91)) and mentions ephors of the city (line 23; cf. Polyb. 4.4.2–3, 4.31.2). IG v.1 1471 (C4), from the Artemis Limnatis sanctuary, suggests that a priest, presumably that of Zeus Ithomatas, was the annual eponym of the city. Arist. Rh. 1418b11 refers to the Μεσσηνική ἐκκλησία, presumably the assembly of the polis (or the Messenian Federation?).

The site is located below Mt. Ithome by Paus. 4.31.4, at a distance of c.40 stades (7.3 km) from the sources of the river Pamisos (4.31.4) and c.80 stades (15 km) from its mouth (4.34.1). It is MME no. 529, Mavrommatai (Geometric to Roman, including a Geometric figurine), where excavations have been carried out for the Archaeological Society of Athens, latterly by Themelis (see e.g. AR 47 (2000–1) 48–49; references prior to 1973 collected by Meyer (1978) 137). The site is at a considerable elevation (350–400 m above sea level: ibid. 139), in a hollow between three hills. Diod. 15.67.1 appears to say that the city was built in 85 days, though this can hardly have extended beyond a fort capable of housing the Theban garrison. The completed walls are among the finest (cf. Paus. 4.31.5) and best preserved in Greece. They cannot be shown to postdate C4, and should predate Cassander’s unsuccessful siege of 316–315 (Diod. 19.54.4, 64.1; Meyer (1978) 140–41, 142). They are c.8 km long and enclose c.290 ha (Meyer (1978) 138), not all of which was built up. The "Arkadian gate" in the north wall is the
best-known city gate surviving from ancient Greece (photograph of part of the wall and a tower: *MMÉ* pl. 9.3). Mt. Ithome, above the town, has polygonal fortifications probably dating from the helot revolt of the 460s (Meyer 1978: 149). An unpublished C₄ inscription (*SEG* 45 297) contains financial accounts of the construction and repair of public and cult buildings. Stamped roof-tiles with fragmentary legends have been found in the C₄ construction fill of the sanctuary of Demeter (see *SEG* 45 333–34). The city exhibits a Hippodamian plan. Some C₄ buildings have been excavated (e.g. a two-storey hall with Ionic interior colonnade, dated C₄b: Orlandos, *Ergon* (1957) 147–48). Most buildings and sculptures, however, notably the Asklepieion complex, are Hellenistic or Roman; see e.g. Themelis (1994a) on the sculptor Damophon (also Alcock (1998) 183, 186–87).

The important Messenian cult of Zeus Ithomatas, depicted on the city’s first coins (*infra*), was based at Messene (Paus. 4.33.2). Other cults from the generations after its foundation include Artemis Limnatis (*IG* v.1 1442 (C₃–C₅); temple excavated: Le Bas (1844–45); Meyer (1978) 149); Artemis Ortheia (Themelis (1994b)); Athena Kyparissia, with cult officials (*SEG* 23 209–10 (C₃)); Asklepios and Hygieia (e.g. *SEG* 38 339 (C₂207), 45 301 (C₅);) Achenlois (*SEG* 41 360+ (early Hellenistic)); the Dioskouroi (*SEG* 45 302 (C₃00)); Eileithya (*SEG* 41 359 (C₄–C₅), 45 303 (C₅);) Herakles (*SEG* 41 362 (C₃)); Hermes (*SEG* 41 361 (C₃–C₅)); and Poseidon (*SEG* 45 305 (seemingly Late Classical/Early Hellenistic)). See also Jost (1996). On hero cults, see Themelis (2000). Note also *SEG* 45 324 (C₄?), a musical notation (cf. *SEG* 43 164, 44 382) in Doric mode, found in the Hierothesion and presumably originating from a cult. The temple of Pamisos at MME no. 530, Ag. Phloros (ACHR), excavated by Valmín (1938), may have lain in the territory of Messene. An Archaike stele was dedicated to the river Pamisos: *LSAG* 206 no. 1 (”c.550?”; now C₆ or later, *LSAG* 448 no. A; Richter (1949) 89–90).

As early as 368, Damiskos of Messene (whose later career included Nemean and Isthmian victories) won the boys’ stadium at Olympia (*Olympionikai* 417); the victory of Damaretos of Messene in boys’ boxing is placed c.344 by Moretti (*Olympionikai* 448), and that of Teletas, also in boys’ boxing, in 340 (*Olympionikai* 453).


**319. Mothone** (Mothonaios) *Map* 58. Lat. 36.50, long. 21.40. Size of territory: 2 or 3. Type: A. (*S36*). The toponym is given as *Μεθόνη*, by Thuc. 2.25.1 (cf. Plin. *HN* 45.11; Strabo 8.4.3; Steph. Byz. 440–41); but as *Μοθώνη* in Ps.-Sklaxyn 46 (also Paus. 4.3.10). That the latter is correct for the Classical and at least the early Hellenistic period is suggested by C₃ coins with the legend *MO* (Head, *HN*² 433; Babelon, *Traité* ii.3 no. 1035; *SNG* Cop. *Philiasia–Laconia* 537). The former spelling was perhaps an assimilation to Methone (no. 541) in Makedonia, just as Methana (no. 352) in the Argolid was sometimes misspelled Methone in some MSS of Thucydides (as noted by Strabo 8.6.15 = Theopomp. fr. 384). The city-ethnic is *Μοθωναῖος* in Paus. 4.18.1 and on third century AD coins (Head, *HN*² 433).

Mothone is called a *polis* in the urban sense by Thuc. 2.25.2; at Ps.-Sklaxyn 46, where *polis* is used in the urban sense, Mothone is the second (or first) toponym listed after the heading πόλεις αἰδή.

Mothone is located in Lakonike by Thuc. 2.25.1 (cf. Diod. 11.84.6 (1454)), and in Lakedaimon by Ps.-Sklaxyn 46. Mothone’s territory (*Μοθωναία, Paus. 4.35.6) has been bounded by those of Asine (no. 333) to the east, Pylos to the north, and possibly Korone (no. 316) to the north-east and Kolonides (if, as Lazenby and Hope Simpson (1972) suggest, it was founded post-369 to isolate Asine and Mothone). Mothone is assumed to have been periokic by Harrison and Spencer (1998) 156; this seems certain, since the Athenians twice thought it worth attacking. It remained periokic after 369, being listed under Lakedaimon by Ps.-Sklaxyn 46. It was probably dependent upon Messene after 338, perhaps as a member of a Messenian Federation (see under Messene, *supra*).

The city is securely located at MME no. 412, Methoni (Archaic to mediaeval pottery, graves, architectural fragments), mediaeval Modon with its Venetian fortress. Hope Simpson (1972) 98 n. 96 notes evidence of late Archaic habitation, citing *ArchDelt* 21 (1966) B.1 164; at p. 99 n. 121,
however, it is stated that the precise date of (sc. other) remains at Methoni is uncertain. Full references in Meyer (1978) 200–1. Valmin (1930) 152–54 notes a Classical or Hellenistic cemetery c.1.5 km to the north. In 454, it was taken by Tolmides (Diod. 11.84.6); in 431 it was fortified, but weak and unmanned (Thuc. 2.25.1; cf. HCT ad loc.; cf. also Diod. 12.43.2–3, which mentions an unsuccessful Athenian siege). The walls and harbour mole were incorporated into the spectacular Venetian fortifications (Meyer (1978) 200).

Pausanias gives Mothone a legendary origin, its harbour having been built by King Dotadas (4.3.10), and its name before the Trojan War having been Pedasos (see Hom. Il. 9.152 = 9.294 and supra 549, 553–54). The same is asserted by Strabo 8.4.3, who notes that some people locate Homer’s Aipeia here. More plausibly, at 4.24.4 Pausanias says that Mothone was founded by exiles from Nauplia, who were not expelled after Leuktra (4.37.8).

320. Pharai (Pharaiai) Map 58. Lat. 37.00, long. 22.10. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: C. (S79). The toponym is Φαραί, αί, in Xen. Hell. 4.8.7, Polyb. 16.16.3, Paus. 4.16.8; Φηραί is found in Strabo 8.4.4 and Steph. Byz. 658.4 (cf. Phaea at Nep. Conon 1.1); Ptol. Geog. 3.14.31 has Φεραί. The city-ethnic was Φηραίατης, according to Strabo 8.7.5, who explicitly distinguishes it from the ethnic of Achaian Pharai (no. 241); cf. Paus. 4.30.3; Φαραίατης is found in Steph. Byz. 658.5.

Pharai was clearly a polis by 182, when it joined the Achaean Confederacy separately from Messene (Polyb. 23.17.2); but earlier references are vague about its status. Xen. Hell. 4.8.7 refers to it as a chora, but not in such a way as to exclude a polis, and it was clearly already a settlement. Archaeological evidence suggests that it was a significant settlement from early times, and a fortified polis at least post-369. It is plausibly located at modern Kalamata (officially Kalamai), specifically MME no. 142, Kastro Kalamatas (LH ιι, Geometric to mediaeval; extent not stated; Hellenistic foundations, C4(?) city walls, Archaic to Roman funerary reliefs). The Classical fortifications appear to have occupied a much smaller area than those of the Hellenistic period (Hope Simpson (1972) 99 n. 124). See Meyer (1978) 181 for full bibliography. Ancient authors identified it with Pharai or Phere (Φηράντης, η), home of Diokles (a descendant of the river Alpheios: Hom. Il. 5.543, Od. 3.488 = 15.186) and one of Agamemnon’s seven politeithra (Il. 9.151 = 9.293; cf. 2.743). In Pausanias, it has a legendary oecist (4.30.2) and is described as having been a polis during the Second Messenian War (4.16.8).

To the west, the temple of Poseidon at Akovitika will have lain within the territory of Pharai; finds there include C6 and C5 votives to Pohoidan (SEG 25 431), tiles with δημόσιοι stamps (SEG 25 432 (C6–C5)), and the earliest Messenian text, a C6m(?) relief pithos dedicated to Poseidon (LSAG addenda, p. 448 no. 1a;Themelis (1969) fig. 4, (1970) figs 1–2, pl. 37). Cultic rock-cut inscriptions, seemingly Late Archaic or Early Classical, are found about an hour away (c. 6km?) and include votives to Kore, Pan and the Tityroi(?); (see IG v.1, addenda); IG v.1 1362 a–g; cf. SEG 11 969 (LSAG 206 no. 5 (c. C5e(?)). Paus. 3.21.7 mentions the grove of Apollo Karneios; if correctly identified with MME no. 540, 1 km east of Ag. Pantes near Kalamata, this should date back to Geometric and Archaic times.

After 369, Pharai may, like Mothone (no. 319), have been dependent on Messene within a loose federal structure (cf. Lazenby (1972) 90).

321. Thalaimai (Thalames) Map 58. Lat. 36.45, long. 22.20. Size of territory: 1. Type: C. (S3); LS ii. 299–300 11150. The toponym is Θαλάμαι, αί (Theopomp. fr. 172 apud Steph. Byz. 306.1; Polyb. 16.16.3). The city-ethnic is Θαλαμάτης (IG v.1 1312 = SEG 11 945 (Hell.); Paus. 3.21.7).

No Archaic or Classical source calls Thalamai a polis, but archaeological evidence suggests that it was a settlement and thus possibly a polis. Its location is very probably MME no. 150, Svina Koutiphariou (now Platanos Thalamon, ΛΟΠ no. 3427; for modern Thalaimai see ΛΟΠ no. 1222), where there are Classical walls and a Hellenistic well-house, and where Archaic to Roman finds have been made, including a C7(?) terracotta statuette (cf. LS ii. 299–300, 11150; Levi (1971) ii. 96 n. 271; Hope Simpson (1972) 98 n. 100; Dickens (1904–5); Valmin (1930) 204–5).

Theopomp. fr. 172 apud Steph. Byz. 306.1 assigns Thalaimai to Messenia; Pausanias implicitly places it in Lakonike, since he includes it in book 3, but attributes it to Messenia in connection with the legend of Tyndareos (3.1.4) and says that the Messenians claim that the district containing Pephnos (only 4 km away) was once theirs (3.26.3).

Wide (1893) 313 collects references to the famous cult of the Dioskouroi at Thalaimai. IG v.1 11316, a C5e votive stele to Apollo Kabatas, is probably from Thalaimai; IG v.1 1317 is a C4–C3 votive statue to Pasiphae.

322. Thouria (Thouriates) Map 58. Lat. 37.05, long. 21.00. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: B. (S21). The toponym is Θουρία, η (Polyb. 23.17.2; restored in IG v.1 1387.4 (C3)); Θευρία, η is found in IG v.1 213.19 (= SEG 38 333+; now dated post-403, LSAG 201 no. 52, addenda p. 448). Ptol.
Homeric Aipeia (Hom. Il. 9.152 = 9.294) but notes that others locate Antheia (9.151, 293) here. Paus. 4.31.1 opts for the latter identification. The city-ethnic is Ἑῳρίατῆς (Thuc. 1.101.2; SEG 11 972 + (C2m); Paus. 4.31.1) and Ἑῳρίεως (IvO 46 (C2m)). ἞ PIO [πιέ] λῶ is restored in SEG 11 974 (C1), though ἞ PIO [πιάρ] λῶ seems equally possible. Andortion apud Steph. Byz. 320.22, s.v. Ἑῳρία, where the ethnic is unexpectedly Ἑonioς, may be a garbled C4 reference to this polis and may preserve a further variant of the name. Thouria would have been detached from Sparta either in 338 or, perhaps more likely, in 369, and under the probably federal arrangements that followed the foundation of Messene (supra) we find the phrase Μεσσανίος ἐκ Ἑῳρίας applied to a citizen of the polis (BCH 6 (1882) 221 no. 53 = F.Delphes III.1.4.5 (315–280)). The feminine Ἑῃορία (IG II² 8895 (C4m)) may refer to this or another, similarly named polis.

Thouria was the only periokic polity apart from Aithaia (no. 312) to revolt in 465 (Thuc. 1.101.2). It is not explicitly called a polis, however, before IvO 46 (a C2m boundary adjudication with Megalopolis (no. 282)), where it is called polis in the political sense. But it was probably a polis long before: Thuc. 1.101.2 uses the external collective city-ethnic, and if it refers to the present city, IG II² 8895 (C4m) attests the external individual usage. Finally, a citizen of Thouria was granted proxyen at Delphi (no. 177) c.316 (BCH 6 (1882), 221 no. 53; F.Delphes III.1.4.5).

The site of Thouria is probably MME no. 137, Ellinika Aithaia, not far north of modern Thouria (Aithaia is the former Delimimi, AIOI no. 304; the latter was formerly Phroudzalakama, AIOI no. 1237). From Ellinika come Bronze Age and Protogeometric to Roman finds; the extent of the historical site is not stated in the literature (cf. McDonald and Rapp (1972) 243). See Lazenyi (1972) 86 and Hope Simpson (1972) 98 n. 94 for more details; Valmin (1930) 51, 56–61; Meyer in KIPAuv, 801–2, s.v. Thuria; Meyer (1978) 182. The late Classical or Hellenistic fortifications at Ellinika are C4–C6 (Hope Simpson (1972) 98 n. 111, (1966) 123–24; illustrated, MME pl. 9.4). Paus. 4.31.2 says that the city was formerly on higher ground, where he saw ruined walls and a sanctuary of the Syrian goddess; while the sanctuary would have been Hellenistic, the walls may have been Classical.

Paus. 4.31.1 includes Thouria in his account of Messenia. Strabo 8.4.4.4 implies that it is a polis with a territory. It was probably detached from Sparta (no. 345) in 338/7 rather than 369, since Sparta seems to have retained the land around the head of the Messenian (or Thouriate) Gulf (Shipley (2000) 385). In the early Hellenistic period, StephanusComicus, Philolakon, fr. 1 apud Athen. 469 a–b (κώμη μέν οὖν τίς ἔστι περί τίνι Ἑῃορίαις) implies that at least one subordinate centre existed in this district in the time of King Pyrrhos.

Various public institutions and officials are named in inscriptions, but only in the Hellenistic period: e.g. IG v.1 1379 (C2–C1), 1380 (C2), 1384 (C2l), 1386 (C.C2), 1388 (undated). They imply a democratic constitution at that time, which may have existed since 369 or 338.

In c.C4e a festival of Poseidon, the Ποιονδία, was held at Thouria (IG v.1 213).
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LAKEDAIMON

GRAHAM SHIPLEY

I. The Region

The *polis* of *Sparte* (no. 345) (in the local Doric dialect *Sparta*) was also called *Lakedaimon*. Its citizens, the *Spartiatai* (Spartans, Spartiates) were the dominant class in a larger state whose members were the *Lakedaimonoi*. Thus all Spartans were Lakedaimonians, but most Lakedaimonians were not Spartans. All Lakedaimonians were free and were citizens of *poleis* but the other *poleis* were dependent upon Sparta, and their citizens were known as the *perioikoi*, “dwellers around” (*sc. around Sparta*). The *perioikoi* could be referred to as *perioikides poleis* (see refs. in Shipley [1997] 207–9) and the territory in which they were located was sometimes called the *perioikis* (ibid. 200, 216–17).

The army that earned such a spectacular reputation between C6 and C4 was not the Spartan army but the Lakedaimonian. Sparta exercised military power and political leadership while depending heavily upon the *perioikoi*, who made roughly the same numerical contribution to the army as themselves (cf. Hdt. 9.10.1, 11.3; 5,000 *Spartietai* and 5,000 select *perioikoi* for the Plataiai campaign in 479). The *perioikoi* seem to have conceded to Sparta the right to decide on peace and war, and to have regarded Sparta’s wars as their wars (Thuc. 4.8.1; Xen. *Hell. 1.3.15, 6.5.21; Shipley (1997) 214–15). Sparta’s two kings were in fact “kings of the Lakedaimonians” (e.g. Alcm. fr. 5.2.1.20, Page; Hdt. 6.58.2; Hampl (1937) 22). By C6 Sparta had a naval capability (Hdt. 4.54.1; Cartledge (1979) 142–43), even though it was one of the most important Greek city-states not situated on a coast;

doubtless those of the *perioikoi* who lived in coastal towns played a major role in the Lakedaimonian navy. For access to the sea, the Spartans relied upon the port of Gytheion (no. 333) (Diod. 11.84.6 (1456/5); Xen. *Hell. 6.5.32; Ps.-Skylax 46; Cartledge (1979) 228), some 40 km to the south of Sparta, which was possibly a perioikic *polis* in Classical times.

The third main group in the population, and the one that arguably made the greatest numerical contribution to Lakedaimonian military success (Hdt. 9.10.1, 28.2; Hunt (1998) 33–39), was the helots or *heilotai*. Various explanations in etymological terms as the descendants of the people of Helos or of captives (from the root of *eDov*), they were composed mainly of the subjugated population of the pre-existing towns and villages of Messenia, the south-west Peloponnese west of Mt. Táygetos, an area the Lakedaimonians had conquered in C8. The suppression of a Messenian rising in C7m was perhaps the point at which the Spartans set up the full-blown helot system. Helots were akin in some respects to the land-bound serfs of mediaeval Europe and early modern Russia, but were tied to the Spartan *polis* rather than to individual landowners. They were required to surrender part of their agricultural produce to support a non-productive Spartiate citizen body which devoted its energies, at least in the late Archaic and Classical periods, to military and (on a narrow front) cultural excellence. They were periodically terrorized by the Spartans. They were allegedly subject to periodic declarations of war by the Spartan ephors (Plut. *Lyc. 28.7; MacDowell (1986) 37). Plutarch goes on to describe the Krypteia, a sort of initiation ritual whereby young Spartiate soldiers would randomly murder able-bodied helots (for a bloodless version see Pl. *Leg. 633B–C*). Yet they seem, like the *perioikoi*, to have identified Sparta’s wars as theirs (*supra*). At Plataia in 479 they heavily outnumbered their Spartan masters and the *perioikoi* (Hdt. 9.10.1, 28.2); yet they remained loyal, though there were periodic helot revolts before and after this date. Spartan and Lakedaimonian control of the Messenian helots was no doubt exercised partly through the several perioikic *poleis* west of Taýgetos. The helots should not be thought of as slave gangs, estate slaves, or even state slaves,

---

1 The areas covered include Sparta/Lakedaimon, the island of Kythera, and areas that were under Spartan control for prolonged periods, but excluding Messenia. Although much of Messenia was Lakedaimonian territory in the Classical period, I end Laconia before Kardamyte, since the latter was Messenian immediately before Augustus’ boundary changes (Paus. 3.26.7). In Pausanias’ day, Messenia began just north-west of Gerenia, at the Choirios valley (4.1.1).

The following abbreviations are used in addition to standard ones:


Distances are prefaced by “c.” only if an ancient author gives them as approximate. Serial numbers prefixed by “S” refer to the catalogue in Shipley (1997).
but as communities which were typically Greek in all respects
(some may even have lived in nucleated settlements) but were
prevented from organising politically: that is to say, into poleis.

Intermediate groups included “inferiors” (ὑπομείονες),
a term that occurs only once (Xen. Hell. 3.3.6) and may cover
more than one kind of demoted Spartan.² Mothakes (μοθάκες, Phylarchos (FGrHist 81) fr. 43) were probably the
sons of poor Spartiates who were sponsored through the
training by wealthier men (rather than being, as some have
supposed, the illegitimate children of Spartiates by helot women).³ The trophimoi (Xen. Hell. 5.3.9), sons of xenoi who
had been admitted to the Spartan upbringing or agoge
(ἄγωγοι), would have been a similar group.⁴ From mothakes
we should probably distinguish mothones (μοθόνες), who
may have been sons of helot families who were attached to
Spartan households and brought up as personal attendants
to Spartans.⁵ Neodamodeis (νεοδαµώδεις) were probably
full Spartiates who had been promoted from the helot ranks.⁶ Chattle slaves probably existed too.⁷ Most of the
population of Lakonike (infra), however, was made up of
Spartiatai, periokoi and helots.

Beloch’s estimate for the combined CSl population of
Laconia and Messenia, 55,000 including 18,000 free men
and their families, is probably of the right order; it makes
Laconia–Messenia the least populous part of the
Peloponnese, with one-tenth of its inhabitants.⁸ As archae-
ological survey progresses, it may be possible to improve on
these estimates. R. Catling, for example, has estimated the
population of the Laconia Survey area (c.70 km², not prime
land but near Sparta) as 875 in late Archaic and early
Classical times, falling to 705 in the late Classical period.
From these figures, crude totals for mainland Laconia may
be extrapolated of 45,000 and 32,000 respectively, or 64,000
and 45,000 if Thyrreatis and Kythera (no. 346) are included.⁹

Lakedaimon, one of the two names of the poleis of Sparta,
also serves as a geographical term for the region around
Sparta. Ps.-Skylax divides the central and southern
Peloponnese into Elis (43), Arkadia (44), Messene (45),
“Lakedaimon ethnēs” (46) and Argos with the Argeia (49).
Lakedaimon is the nearest part of Europe to Crete (47). His
Lakedaimon begins with Methone (no. 319) and (presum-
ably Messenian) Asine (no. 313), reflecting the continued
Spartan possession of southern Messenia after 369.¹⁰ It ends
at Prasiai (no. 342), which is in Kynouria, and “Methana”
(possibly a corruption of Anthana (no. 324), which was in
Thyrreatis, the northernmost part of Kynouria). He then
mentions the inland poleis: Sparta (no. 345) “and many
others” which he does not name.

In Homer, Lakedaimon is both a settlement (Od. 4.702,
paired with Pylos: 13.414) and a region containing Sparte
and eight other centres of population (Il. 2.581–85). Five of
these (Pharis, Bryseiai, Augeiai—later Aigaiai/Aigai—
Amyklai and Helos) are in the Eurus valley, three (Messe,
Laas and Oitylos) in the Tainaron peninsula (modern
Mani). In Herodotos’ striking formulation, “there is in
Lakedaimon the poleis of Sparta” (Hdt. 7.234.2: ἐν τῇ
Λακεδαιμονί τοις Πολῖσι; elsewhere, he makes “the
whole of Lakedaimon” embrace the homelands of both peri-
okoi and Spartiatai (Hdt. 6.58.2). As a geographical term in
Classical authors, Lakedaimon approximates to Sparta’s core territory, but extends wider, embracing the middle
Eurous valley and possibly (in Homer) the Helos plain and
Tainaron peninsula. It may thus have included the territo-
ries of periokic poleis such as Geronthrai (no. 332) and
Pellana (no. 341). Since Hom. Il. 2.581 describes Lakedaimon
as “hollow” (κοιλεῖ), which certainly does not describe the sit-
uations of Messe, Las and Oitylos, the passage may perhaps
be evidence of the extent of Spartan power even before the
conquest of Messenia in c.735–710. Perhaps the Spartans also
conquered the Malea peninsula¹¹ of south-eastern Laconia
at this time; the foundation of Boia, for example, is attrib-
uted to a Heraklid (son of Herakles), suggesting an early ori-
gin (Paus. 3.22.11).

In Pherekydes (FGrHist 3) fr. 168 (Οἴτυλοι ἔν τῇ
Πόλις ἔν τῇ Σπαρτῇ) Sparte seems, as Lakedaimon often does, to
denote the region and not the town of the Spartiates.

However, the wider Lakedaimonian territory formed by the
chorai of Sparta and those of the periokic towns, plus
Messenia, was generally called Lakonike (Λακωνική, from
Λάκων) rather than Lakedaimon (or Sparta).¹² Periokic
Kythera (no. 336), however, is repeatedly said by Thucydides

² MacDowell (1986) 42–46.
⁶ Thuc. 5.34.1; MacDowell (1986) 39–42.
⁸ Beloch (1886) 149; at p. 150 he cites Clinton’s earlier estimates of c.99,000
including a free population of c.24,000, making Laconia–Messenia about one-
sixth of the total population of the Peloponnese.
¹⁰ Müller, GGM i.40–41, points out that the Spartan retention of Methone and
Asine was facilitated by the fact that populations were not ethnic Messenians but
descendants of exiled Argives and Naupaktians to whom the Lakedaimonians had
granted a home.
¹¹ Ps.-Skylax 46. Also called Maleiai (fem. pl., Polyb. 34.7.12 = Strabo 8.5.1).
Also Maleia, Ephor. fr. 145 = Ps.-Skymnos 337.
¹² The name “Lakonike” (modern Greek Λακωνία) has no justification
beyond the Imperial Latin form Laconia (e.g. Plin. HN 4.5.16).
to “lie opposite” Lakonike (4.53.2, 54.3; cf. 7.26.2), suggesting that Lakonike may be restricted to the mainland. It occurs as a toponym first in Herodotos (1.69.4, cf. 6.58.1; but cf. Hymn. Hom. Ap. 410: Λακωνίδα γαίαν); later as an adjective with chora (Xen. Hell. 6.2.9). Damaratos (Hdt. 7.235.1) uses τῆς Λακαίνης ἱππαρκία, by which Herodotos perhaps intends to convey the Spartan habit of speech or simply the change of voice.

Since Lakonike denoted the total territory controlled by Sparta and the Lakedaimonians, its extent varied through time. In Classical sources, it includes coastal territories (Thuc. 3.7.2; cf. 8.6.5) as well as places in the Spartan chora proper such as Therapnai (Isoc. Hel. 63.4) and Thornax (Hdt. 1.69.4). Pellana (no. 341) and Geronthrai (no. 332), both within easy reach of Sparta, were probably dependent poleis in the Archaic and Classical periods, and presumably within Lakonike. Writers include Messenia within Lakonike, since the Spartans conquered it in C81 (northern Messenia is included even after the rest was lost in 369); west of Taygetos, Lakonike includes Kardamyle (no. 315) (Hdt. 8.73.2), Methone (no. 319) (Thuc. 2.25.1), Messenian Asine (no. 313) (in τῆς Λακαίνης, Xen. Hell. 7.1.25), and even the Sphagiai islands off the west coast (Xen. Hell. 6.2.31). By C81 or earlier Sparta controlled the peninsulas of Tainaron and Malea; in Classical sources Lakonike explicitly includes Tainaron (Thuc. 7.19.4), Epidaurus Limera (no. 329) (Thuc. 7.26.2), and Las (no. 337) (Thuc. 8.91.2). In C6 or earlier Sparta gained Kynouria, the eastern seaboard beyond the crest of Parnon (a mountain named only at Paus. 2.38.7).13 Prasiai in Kynouria was now part of Lakonike (Thuc. 2.56.6). The northern part of Kynouria, Thyreatis on the borders of Argeia and Lakonike (Thuc. 2.27.2, 4.56.2), was captured from the Argives c.545 and thereafter administered by the Lakedaimonians (Hdt. 1.82.2). Lakonike was now bounded on the north-east by Argive territory. In the area containing the headwaters of the two great rivers of the Peloponnese, Eurotas and Alpheios, the frontier was with Arkadia, specifically Tegea (no. 297) (cf. Hdt. 8.124.3). The borderland of Skiritis was in Lakonike (Thuc. 5.3.3); it contained the settlement of Oios (no. 339) or Oion (Xen. Hell. 6.5.24). Nearby Karyai may have been placed in Lakonike by Theopomp. fr. 238 (apud Steph. Byz. 362.5). Closer to Sparta, Sellasia is "close to Lakonike" in the MSS of Xen. Hell. 2.2.13 (but see Sellasia (no. 343)); it was, rather, part of Lakonike from the time of its foundation in C65. The Lakedaimonians also possessed Aigytis, in the hill-land bordering the western Arkadian plain; this area, too, may have contained dependent poleis (Paus. 8.27.4).14

After Epameinondas’ invasions of 370/9 and 369, much of Messenia was confiscated and given to the new foundation of Messene, while in the north-west Aigytis and part or all of Skiritis was absorbed into the new Arkadian capital of Megalopolis (no. 282). In 338/7 Philip II confiscated the remaining northern lands as well as Thyreatis. After the battle of Sellasia (222) the eastern seaboard and several inland towns were detached from Sparta, probably for the first time. Finally, the Roman general Flamininus removed the southern perioikoi in 195. The Dentheliatis continued to alternate between Spartan and Messenian control from C2 until well into the Roman period, but after 195 other changes were modest.15

Excluding geographical items such as capes, mountains and rivers, and names of cult places consisting simply of the name of a deity and a term such as “sanctuary” or “temple”, our sources purport to transmit the names of eighty-four places in Laconia (including the islands of Kythera and Aigilia) from the Archaic to Roman periods.

First it is necessary to dispose of four names that are probably erroneous, spurious, invented or corrupt:

(S16) Lerne (from Ptol. Geog. 3.14.43, misplaced from the Argolid)
(S17) †Litai (Apollodoros apud Steph. Byz. 418.15) = Aigiai?
(S18) Oinoë (Ptol. Geog. 3.14.43) = Oinous (no. 338)? Oios (no. 339)?
(S19) †Thea (Philoch. apud Steph. Byz. 308.4) = Messenian Aithaia (no. 312)?

A further five alleged settlements or poleis are recorded in the surviving epitome of Stephanos of Byzantion without a source being named, and there is no other evidence for them:

(S127) Aphidna (Steph. Byz. 149.16–17)
(S12) †Ataia (Steph. Byz. 141.10) = Aigion?
(S13) Dyrrachtion (Steph. Byz. 244.4–5)
(S14) Etaei (Steph. Byz. 283.6–7), related to Eitis (no. 330)?
(S52) Tenos (Steph. Byz. 622.2–3), unless IG v.1 931.12 (SEG 13 259 +) refers to this Tenos


14 Leprecon, however, is between Lakonike and Eleia (Thuc. 5.34) and not in Lakonike.

In nine cases among the seventy-five valid place-names that remain, there is no firm basis in the source evidence for regarding the place as a settlement: (S19) Pephnos (modern Platsa?) is an islet with cult activity but no probable settlement; (S130) Harpleia (Xirokambos?) and (S106) Skiritis are geographical areas, though the latter may have had some sort of political organisation (see infra); (S104) Onogloi (spelling uncertain) and (S107) Stathmoi, both inferred from adjectives in Alkman (fr. 92, Page) but lacking confirmation, may also be districts; they have no known locations; (S125) Aigila (Kionia?), (S129) Epidelion (near Voutama?), and (S108) Therapne (Menelaia) are probably exclusively from adjectives in Alkman (fr. 83); (S103) Skiritis are probably exclusively cult places—the last despite the statements of Pliny and late authors that it was a polis (Plin. HN 4.5.16; cf. Shipley (1997) 264–65); finally, (S105) Phoinikous, on Kythera, may be only a harbour (possibly Avlemonas). Another eight are placed with confidence in particular areas, though their identification with actual sites is more speculative or debatable:

(S1) Anthana (no. 324) (Tsiorovos? Nisi Ag. Andrea? Nisi Paraliou Astrous?)
(S128) Arainos (Ageranos)
(S29) Asine (Laconian) (Skoutari?)
(S30) Eua (no. 331) (Elliniko? Loukou?)
(S96) Glymeis (Glyppa? Kosmas?)
(S97) Krokeis (one of various sites near Krokees)
(S98) Neris (Kourmeli? Tsiorovos?)
(S10) Thrysea (no. 346) (Nisi Paraliou Astrous? Nisi Ag. Andrea?)

A further twenty-three are placed with reasonable certainty at or near known settlement sites:

(S63) Aigaiai/Aigaia (Palaiochora Aigion; see infra)
(S12) Aigys (no. 323) (Tsamaina Kamaras)
(S37) Akria (Kokkinia; see infra)
(S39) Asapos (Plytra; see Kyparissia)
(S22) Belbina (no. 326) (one of various sites near Chelmos)
(S42) Hippola (Kipoula)
(S24) Karyai (Analipsi Vousvouras; see infra)
(S31) Kotyrica (Kastelli Daimoniassis)
(S25) Kromnos (no. 334) (Martiakos Paradision)
(S46) Kyparissia (Boza and Kastelli Goula)
(S14) Kypri (no. 335) (Kyparissi)
(S26) Leuktra (north-western Laconia, Leondari?)
(S27) Malea (north-western Laconia, Mali or Maliokambos Voutsara)
(S49) Marios (one of various sites near Mari)
(S31) Messapei (Analipsi Anthchoriou; see infra)
(S16) Oios (no. 339) (Ai-Gianni Kerasias)
(S17) Pellana (no. 341) (one of various sites at or near Pellana)
(S50) Polichna (Poulithra)
(S32) Psamathous (Porto Kagio? see infra)
(S28) Sellasia (no. 343) (Palaigoula)
(S53) Teuthrone (Skopas Kotrona)
(S134) Thornax (Geladari? see infra)
(S135) Trinasos (Trinisa; see infra)

16 Cartledge (1979) 172 gives the name as Stathmos.
17 Cartledge (1979) 283, following Huxley (1972) 37, suggests the bay of Avlemonas.
18 Identified as a settlement from archaeological evidence.
Finally, fifteen names are attached with certainty to known archaeological settlement remains:

Aigilia Island
(S2) Boia (no. 327) (Neapoli Voion)
(S3) Epidaurus Limera (no. 329) (Epidavros Limira)
(S41) Geronthrai (no. 332) (Geraki)
(S23) Gytheion (no. 333) (Gytheio)
(S45) Kainepolis (Kyparissos; see infra s.v. Tainaron)
(S4) Kythera (no. 336) (Palaiokastro, Kythira)
(S5) Las (no. 337) (Passava)
(S6) Oitylos (no. 340) (Oitylo)
(S7) Prasiai (no. 342) (Leonidi)
(S51) Pyrrhichos (Pyrrichos; Paus. 3.21.7)
(S5) Lakedaimon (as the name of a settlement) and Amyklai (infra s.v. Tainaron)

Before the Inventory, the remaining thirty-two named settlements that had, or may have had, an Archaic or Classical existence, but were not polis, are described briefly in alphabetical order, with the addition of a non-settlement, Skiritis, the subject of a special discussion at the end of this section.

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements

Not Attested as Polis

Aigiai, Aigaiai (Αἴγιαι, Αἴγαιαι) (S63; cf. S112, S117). Possibly a settlement; Strabo 8.5.3 identifies it with Homer’s Augeiai (cf. II. 2.583); Paus. 3.21.5 (πέτυχα), 3.21.7; etc. Located at Palaiochora Aigion near Aigies (Waterhouse and Hope Simpson (1961) 114; LS ii. 296,1112; followed by Barr). Archaic to Roman cult site now excavated and identified as sanctuary of Artemis (Bonias (1998)). Barr. AC.

Aigilia (Αἰγιλία)/Ogylos (Ὤγυλος) Steph. Byz. 41.5–6 refers to an island named Αἴγιλα (Αἴγυλος) and situated μεταξύ Κρήτης καὶ Πελοποννήσου (cf. Ps.-Skylax 113; Plut. Cleom. 31(52).2, 32(53).1); at 706.3–4, he refers to an island μεταξύ Πελοποννήσου καὶ Κρήτης which is called Ὄγυλος (Ὤγυλος); these two names presumably both refer to the island of Antikythera/Lious (RE xxvii. 2. 2079).

As a footnote to this list, we may note that Homer names ten places in Laconia. Four that presumably belonged to real places at some early date cannot be securely related to remains on the ground: Bryse(i)ai, Helos, Messe and Pharis. Another four are securely tied to actual Archaic to Roman sites: Augeiai (assuming it is Aigai), Las, Oitylos and Sparte (II. 2.584), to which two not listed above can be added: Lakedaimon (as the name of a settlement) and Amyklai (II. 2.584), one of the five constituent villages of Classical Sparta (for all five of which, see Sparta (no. 345).

The sixty-six settlements (or possible settlements (i.e. excluding the nine non-valid names and nine non-settlement toponyms) can now be classified for the purposes of the investigation into Archaic and Classical polis.

As a footnote to this list, we may note that Homer names ten places in Laconia. Four that presumably belonged to real places at some early date cannot be securely related to remains on the ground: Bryse(i)ai, Helos, Messe and Pharis. Another four are securely tied to actual Archaic to Roman sites: Augeiai (assuming it is Aigai), Las, Oitylos and Sparte (II. 2.584), to which two not listed above can be added: Lakedaimon (as the name of a settlement) and Amyklai (II. 2.584), one of the five constituent villages of Classical Sparta (for all five of which, see Sparta (no. 345).

The main Inventory below describes twenty-four settlements, covering every place in Laconia (including Kythera and the borderlands) that, in the Archaic or Classical period, was certainly a polis (type A, nine places), probably a polis (type B, five places), or possibly a polis (type C, ten places).

Ten places were settlements, and in some cases polis, at some period other than Archaic or Classical, and are not described in detail:

(S128) Arainos (Roman place)
(S39) Asopus (middle Hellenistic and Roman; see infra s.v. Kyparissia)
(S40) Biadina (Roman polis)
(S115) Genesion/Genese (Roman place)
(S43) Hyposi (Roman, possibly Hellenistic place)
(S45) Kainepolis (Eleutherolaconian polis; see under infra s.v. Tainaron)
(S47) Leukai (possible Hellenistic polis)
(S66) Messe (early place, Roman polis)
(S67) Pharis (early place)²²
(S51) Pyrrhichos (Eleutherolaconian polis)

The main Inventory below describes twenty-four settlements, covering every place in Laconia (including Kythera and the borderlands) that, in the Archaic or Classical period, was certainly a polis (type A, nine places), probably a polis (type B, five places), or possibly a polis (type C, ten places).

Ten places were settlements, and in some cases polis, at some period other than Archaic or Classical, and are not described in detail:

(S128) Arainos (Roman place)
(S39) Asopus (middle Hellenistic and Roman; see infra s.v. Kyparissia)
(S40) Biadina (Roman polis)
(S115) Genesion/Genese (Roman place)
(S43) Hyposi (Roman, possibly Hellenistic place)
(S45) Kainepolis (Eleutherolaconian polis; see under infra s.v. Tainaron)
(S47) Leukai (possible Hellenistic polis)
(S66) Messe (early place, Roman polis)
(S67) Pharis (early place)
(S51) Pyrrhichos (Eleutherolaconian polis)

²² Jeffery (1976) 114 suggests that since Pharis and Geronthrai were conquered at the same time (Paus. 3.2.6), they may both have become periöike. The difference between them is that Paus. 3.20.3 speaks of Pharis as a former polis.
Aitolia (Ἄιτωλία) (S10) Doubtful Classical polis. Androton (FGHist 324) fr. 63 apud Steph. Byz. 55.13–15 apparently catalogued Aitolia among Laconian poleis. The rather precise citation by Stephanos suggests a genuine quotation, but the implausible name and the absence of other evidence leave this an uncertain case. Possibly the name is a corruption of another, genuine name. No date in Barr. but Androton (supra) attests C.

Akrai (Ἀκραία) (S37) Probable Archaic and Classical cult site and/or settlement; later a polis (e.g. IG v.1 1189 (c.C2); IG vii 415, late Hellenistic or early Roman; name restored in site and/or settlement; later a ...); 111; LLS. (extensive Classical site, probably also Hellenistic or Roman; name possibly a cult site (temple of Mother of Gods; Barr ii. 308–9, MM219). Barr. gives only HRL, but see supra.

Alesi (Ἄλεσι) (S126) Possible Classical settlement; Paus. 3.20.2 (χωρίον). Possibly at Tseramio Ag. Ioanni (extensive Classical site, probably also Hellenistic or Roman; LLS ii. 289, gg85; S126, followed by Barr. (without indication of date)).

Asine (Ἀσίνη) (S29) Thuc. 4.54.4; Xen. Hell. 7.1.25 (?); Polyb. 5.19.5; Strabo 8.5.2. Classical settlement, possibly at Skoutari (LLS ii. 301, LL162; S29 followed by Barr.). Barr. AC.

Astron (Ἀστρων) (S111) Ptol. Geog. 3.14.33 (implicit πόλις). Possible Archaic and Classical settlement, possibly at Nisi Paraliou Astrous (fortified Bronze Age and Protogeometric to Roman settlement with acropolis; LLS ii. 277, LA6; Phaklaris (1990) 56–78; Goester (1993) 91–93, 99; S111, followed by Barr. (C)); but see Anthana (no. 324) and Thymea (no. 346).

Bryseia (Βρυσεία) (S64) Early and possibly Classical settlement; e.g. Hom. Il. 2.583; Paus. 3.20.3 (χωρίον, former πόλις), 3.20.4. Possibly at Ag. Vasilios (prehistoric, Classical–Hellenistic site; Waterhouse and Hope Simpson (1960) 80–81; LLS ii. 290, 291–92, GG87, GG339, GG101 respectively; treated as unlocated by Barr. without indication of date).

Glyppia, Glympheis (Γλυππία, Γλυμπήεις) (S96) Possible Classical settlement and Hellenistic kome (and/or polis e.g. Polyb. 4.36.5 (Γλυμπήεις, a seeming city-ethnic possibly implying polis status); Paus. 3.22.8 (κόμη). Probably at Glyppia (formerly Lymiada, Τά Λυμιαία); C4 to Roman finds, mainly post-C4; LLS ii. 281–82, BB31; Phaklaris (1990) 153–57; Shipley (2000) 379). Barr., though citing S96, dates it H; but see supra.

Helos (Ἑλός) (S65) Hom. II. 2.584 (πολιόλεθρον); Hellan. fr. 188; Thuc. 4.54.4; Xen. Hell. 6.5.32; Theopomp. fr. 13; Strabo 8.5.2 (κόμη, former πόλις), 8.3.12; Paus. 3.2.7, 20.6, 22.3. Early settlement, perhaps revived as a kome and/or polis in late Hellenistic or Roman times; in C4 a site of festivals (IGv.1 213). Possibly at Ag. Stephanus, a possible Classical or Hellenistic settlement (LLS ii. 299, KK141; S65, followed by Barr. (A2)).

Hippola (Ἱππόλα) (S42) Classical settlement. Paus. 3.25.9 (πόλις); IG v.1 1336 (πόλις). The ethnic, Ἱππολαίοι, occurs in e.g. IG v.1 1312 (SEG 11 945 (Hell.)); Stephanos 336.2 gives Ἱππολαίτης, which may be invented. From the distances given by Pausanias, Hippola is probably a Geometric to Hellenistic site near Kipoula, which preserves the name (LLS ii. 304, LL188). Ruined in Pausanias’ day (3.25.9), it may by then have relocated c.1.4 km south to Kounos (LLS ii. 304, LL193). Barr. AC.

Iasos (Ἰασώς) (S44) Paus. 7.13.7 (πόλισµα (rC2)), 8.27.3 (r37), but text uncertain; cf. S44. Possible Archaic and Classical settlement, possibly at ðd45, Analipsi Vourvouras, but see Karyai (infra); Iasos was probably nearer Sparta (no. 345) (Pikoulas (1987) 137–39; LLS ii. 284). Barr. tentatively suggests that Iasos be equated with Karyai.

Karyai (Καρύαι) (S24) Thuc. 5.55.3; Xen. Hell. 6.5.25, 7.1.28; Theopomp. fr. 238; Paus. 3.10.7 (χωρίον), 4.16.9. Archaic and Classical settlement, whose destruction for medism gave rise to Caryatid statues (Vitr. 1.15; Huxley (1967)). Probably at Analipsi (Geometric to Hellenistic acropolis, Classical houses, pottery including C5m–C2m; LLS ii. 284, ðd45; Pikoulas (1987) 137–39; Barr.).

Karystos (Κάρυστος) (S103) Strabo 10.1.6 (τόπος of Aigys), citing Alkmán (cf. fr. 92d, Page, apud Ath. 31D) for wine from Karystos. Possible Archaic settlement, possibly near Dyrrachium or the upper Xerilas valley (Pikoulas (1988a) 239, no. II); Barr., citing Stoi 303, treats it as unlocated, with no indication of date, though Alkmán (supra) attests to A.

Kotyra (Κοτύρα) (S31) Classical settlement. Thuc. 4.56.1; IG v.1 951.10–11 (C2; polis). The ethnic, Κωτυρτάτης, occurs in e.g. IG v.1 961.8–9, 11 (post-195); Stephanos 379.4 gives Κωτυρτάοιος, which may be invented. Probably at Kastelli Daimonias, a hill with ancient foundations and Geometric, Classical to Hellenistic, and possible Roman

23 Cartledge (1979) 300 gives reasons for seeing Xen. Hell. 7.1.25 as a reference to Messenian Asine, despite τῆς Ἀσιναίης.

24 “Karyatis” as the name of a district is an invention of modern scholarship.
finds (LS ii. 311, NN239). Public buildings are evidenced by C3l terracotta reliefs; there are architectural fragments, cultic and cemetery material, and evidence of cults of Artemis and Asklepios (e.g. AR 2 (1955) 15). Barr. AC.

**Krokeai (Κροκέα) (S97)** Paus. 3.21.4 (κώµη with quarry, cf. 2.3.5), 3.12.5; Steph. Byz. 385.13. Possible Archaic and Classical settlement and later kome, near the source of lapis lacedemonius; probably at Krikies (Archaic to Roman?) rather than Krokees (formerly Levetsova); Protogeometric finds nearby (LS ii. 295, jji120; S97, followed by Barr. (AC)).

**Kyparissia (Κυπαρισσία) (S46)** Classical cult site and settlement. Strabo 8.5.2 (polis). Probably the same as the ruined “polis of the Parakyprassian Achaiaens” (i.e. Achaiaens beside Kyparissia), of Paus. 8.22.9. (Possible attestations of an ethnic—e.g. IGIV 1.390; SEG 33 290 (c.90–80); Grunauer-von Hoerschelmann (1978) 60, 162—are inconclusive, or may refer to places with similar names. Cf. Kennell (1999) 195.) Very probably at Cape Kastelli, the evident location of the sanctuary of Athena Kyparissia (Paus. 3.22.9), where ancient remains around the foot of the hill may be at the site of Pausanias’ ruins and Strabo’s Kyparissia. It appears to have moved less than 2 km east–south to Aspos (e.g. IGV 1.962.7 (Hell.); Strabo 8.5.2; modern Plytra, mediaeval Asopolis; see Kourinou and Pikoulas (1989)), which had the Athena sanctuary on its acropolis. Since the inhabitants of Kyparissia were known as Achaiaiens, Kyparissia may have been believed to be a pre-Dorian foundation like Geronthræi. The Hyperteoikic, the periokic sanctuary of Apollo at modern Phoiniki, was in the territory of Aspos (Paus. 3.22.10), so will have been in the territory of Kyparissia earlier. Barr. C.

**Leuktra, Leuktron (Λεύκτρα, Λευκτρον) (S26)** Thuc. 5.54.1; Xen. Hell. 6.5.24. Classical settlement in north-western Laconia. (Not to be confused with Messenian Leuktra or Leuktron.) Called a polis only by Paus. 8.27.4 (1371). Probably Leondari, which partly preserves the name (Hellenistic architectural fragments; Archaic, Classical but mainly Hellenistic; Roman sherds; fortified acropolis; possible Archaic cemetery: Pikoulas (1988a) 131–35, no. 92). Paus. 8.27.4, if we accept the Niese–Pikoulas emendation, includes it among the former Aigytian and/or Skiritan poleis taken from Sparta and synoecised into Megalopolis (no. 282) (it was in Aigytis rather than Skiritis; for its Megalopolitan affiliation see Plut. Cleom. 6.3 (27.3); Pelop. 20.7). It may have been settled by Spartans and/or other Lakedaimonians in the late Archaic period. Barr. AC.

**Malea, Melea (Μηλέα, Μαλέα, presumably the original Doric form) (S27)** Xen. Hell. 7.1.28; Paus. 8.27.4. Classical settlement in north-west Laconia. (Not to be confused with Cape Malea in the south-east.) Probably Mali (also called Maliokambos) at Voutsaras (formerly Zaimi; Pikoulas (1988a) 129–31 no. 91), which preserves the name. Called a polis only by Paus. 8.27.4 (1371), in the same context as Leuktra; it certainly belonged to Aigytis. Its territory is η Μαλεάτις (Xen. Hell. 6.5.24). The large settlement (15 ha) has Archaic and early Classical tiles and pottery, a C5e inscribed grave stele, walls, architectural fragments including a possible stoa, and probably a cemetery (Pikoulas (1988a) 130, (1985) 85–86 no. 1; SEG 35 357). The evidence is consistent with abandonment or relocation around the time of the founding of Megalopolis (no. 282). Barr. AC.

**Marios (Μαρίος) (S49)** Classical settlement. Paus. 3.21.7 (polis), 3.22.8 (polisma). Modern Mari is consistent with Pausanias’ distances; there are several possible sites nearby (LS ii. 286, ff263, 287, 262 and 66). The archaeological evidence suggests an Archaic and Classical settlement, and Paus. 3.22.8 mentions an “old” sanctuary of all the gods (as well as another of Artemis). Barr. gives no date.

**Messapeai (Μεσσαπεαί) (S131)** Theopomp. fr. 245 apud Steph. Byz. 447.8; Paus. 3.20.3 (temenos of Zeus Messapeus; cf. SEG 26 460, 39 373). Archaic to Hellenistic settlement and cult site, at Analipisi Anthochoriou (prehistoric, Protogeometric to Hellenistic settlement and cult site; LS ii. 293, GG108). For another shrine of Zeus Messapeus, see under Sparta (no. 345). Treated as unlocated by Barr. (C), citing S131.

**Neris (Νηρίς) (S98)** Possible Classical town site and later kome, e.g. Paus. 2.38.6 (κώµη). Possibly at Kourmeki Kato Doliannes (late Hellenistic to late Roman unfortified site; LS II: 277, ΛΑ3; Phaklaris (1990) 94–96; Barr., following S98, and adding a question mark), alternatively (or earlier?) at Tsioroves (C5–late Roman fortified town site with C5l/C4e walls; LS ii. 276, ΛΑ1, but see Anthana (no. 324)).

**Pleiài, Palaia (Πλεία, Παλαιά) (S99)** Possible Archaic and Classical settlement and later kome: Livy 25.27.2 (Pleiæ); Paus. 3.22.6 (Παλαιά, κάµη); IG v.1 602 (early third century AD). Possibly at Apidea (prehistoric, Protogeometric to Hellenistic, Roman (?), and Byzantine site; LS ii. 307–8, MM216; Barr. (AC), following S99). Possibly two separate settlements, however.

**Polichna (Πολίχνα) (S50)** Classical settlement. Polyb. 4.36.5 (r220). Probably Pouliithra, approximately preserving
the name (fortification, Classical pottery, Hellenistic tombs: LS ii. 282, B35; Phaklaris (1990) 141–42). The name may imply polis status, but it may be too close to Prasiai to be a separate polis. Barr. H, but see supra.

Psamathous (Ψαµαθοῦς) (S32) Ps.–Skylax 46 (λυµήρ); Strabo 8.5.2 (πόλις); Paus. 3.25.4. Classical harbour and possibly settlement, possibly near Porto Kagio (Hellenistic, post-Roman; LS ii. 306, ll.209; Barr. following S32, but without indication of date, though Ps.–Skylax 46 attests C).

Selinous (Σελινοῦς) (Stoo) Paus. 3.22.8 (κόµη). Possible Classical settlement and later kome, possibly at Ag. Athanasios Nerotriviov (ashlar walls, BG pottery; LS ii. 286, ff98; same location as Barr.).

Skiritis (Σκρίττις) See at end of this list.

Tainaron (Ταϊνάρων) (S9) Classical sanctuary with probable Classical settlement and possible polis; also a geographical location (Hdt. 7.168.2; Thuc. 7.19.4), specifically the cape of that name (Strabo 8.4.1) with its famous sanctuary of Poseidon (e.g. Paus. 3.25.4–8). Pherekydes (FGrHist 3, fr. 39 = schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.102) calls it a polis (named after its founder, Taineros), a cape and a sanctuary, but it is uncertain whether polis here stems from Pherekydes or the scholar. Tainapoios, ης, in Pind. Pyth. 4.43–44 (462), may refer to the cape or the cult site. Taineros is later the official name of the “New City”, Kainepolis (neatly rendered “New Taenarum” by Cartledge and Spawforth (1989) 174, 175; named e.g. in IG v.1 1249 = SEG 23 200 (second to third century AD; cf. Paus. 3.21.7, Eleutherolacon polis), which probably came into existence after Gythion (no. 333) became independent of Sparta (no. 345) c.195 and before C. Iulius Lakan was honoured there (IG v.1 1243, found near Kainepolis (early first century AD)). Tainapoios is attested as an ethnic from Late Hellenistic times (e.g. IG v.1 210, 211–12 = SEG 11 648–49 (C1 or earlier); possibly in IG v.1 1271 (Hell.?), but may already refer to Kainepolis (as in IG v.1 1244 = SEG 23 199 (198–211 AD)). The Classical settlement of Taineron probably lay beside the sanctuary of Poseidon at Ag. Asamotai (also called Konia) at Steres on the east side of the cape (LS ii. 306, ll.210; cf. ii. 305, ll.201; Moschou (1975); Moskou (1976–78)). Taineron was the site of a mercenary hiring fair at least from the late 330s (Cartledge and Spawforth (1989) 21). Barr. AC.

Teuthrone (Τευθρώνη) (S33) Classical settlement. Paus. 3.21.7 (polis). The ethnic is Teuthrównos (IG v.2 538 (C1/first century AD)). Its acropolis was very probably Paliokastro Kolokythias (LS ii. 306, ll.204; C4e fortification), with the main settlement probably at Skopas Kotrona (large site finds including Classical to Roman, mainly late Classical and Roman; LS ii. 305–6, ll.203). Paliokastro may have formed part of a system of coastal defence during the Corinthian War (Moschou and Moschos (1981)). The story of an Athenian oikistes named Teuthras (Paus. 3.25.4) could be classical. Barr. C.

Thornax (Θόρναξ) (S134) Archaic and Classical settlement with important cult of Apollo, not polis, e.g. Paus. 3.10.8, 11.1. Probably Laconia Survey site no 145, Geladari (prehistoric and Late Archaic to Ottoman settlement and cult site, LS ii. 355–57; Barr., tentatively and citing S134). So close to Sparta, it cannot have had a corporate existence unless it was part of the obe of Pitana (see Sparta (no. 345)); it may have been simply a cult site.

Trinatos (Τρινάσος) (S135) Paus. 3.22.3 (φρούριον rather than πόλις); Ptol. Geog. 3.14.32 (Τρίνασος, ἐπίνειον). Possible Archaic and Classical settlement, not polis; probably at Trinisa, but there are no clear remains (LS ii. 296, ll.126; Barr. (C) following S135).

Tyros (Τύρος) (Stoo) Classical sanctuary and probable settlement. Tyrus (Steph. Byz. 643.5, no site-classification). The ethnic is attested in the early Hellenistic period (Tyri Aeg, Syll. ³407 = F.Delphes 211.1 68 (275)). If Tyros was a polis, its chora would have included the major cult site of Apollo Tyritas; the cult of Apollo Tyritas is attested earlier by votives, e.g. IG v.1 1517 (SEG 11 893; late Archaic?). Cf. Hansen (1995a) 68. The alternative restorations of an ethnic, T[υριτάς] and Ξ[αράχως], on the same block as Syll. ³407 (part of the Aigos potamoi monument) would be strong evidence that one of these places was a perioikik polis in C3 (cf. ML 95 j–k). Admittedly, Tyros is a κώµα Λακεδαιµονίων in Syll. ³407, but being a kome in C3e is not incompatible with being a polis then or earlier. The site is very probably the acropolis of Kastri Tyrou (formerly Lygarias; late Classical to late Roman; Roman inscriptions, coins; fortification wall including polygonal masonry; LS ii. 281, 8228; Phaklaris (1990) 142–45, near the cult site of Apollo Tyritas (C7–C4; C6 temple, votives; LS ii. 281, 8229; Phaklaris (1990) 173–78). Barr. C.

Zarax (Ζάραξ) (S54) Possible Classical settlement. Polyb. 4.36.5 (1219); Paus. 3.21.7 (polis). The ethnic is Zaraos (sic), SEG 17 143 (with 18 146; Argos, probably C3), also the earliest attestation of the place; later Zaraĥios (IG v.1 931 (c22m)). A possible restoration of the Aigos potamoi monument (cf. s.v. Tyros) would make Zarax a probable
The Skiritai (Σκιρίται) (S106) deserves a special word. For the name of this upland territory between Sparta and Tegea (no. 297), see e.g. Thuc. 5.33.1, Xen. Hell. 6.5.24, Cyropaedia 4.2.1; for its extent (c.100 km²), see Pikoulas (1987) 127–34. The ethnic is Σκιρήτης (e.g. Thuc. 5.67.1). The Skiritai were a special corps within the Lakedaimonian army, having the privilege of occupying the left wing while the Spartans held the right. In view of their geographical location, they may have been Arkadians by descent, as they asserted in Σκιρίται (Syll.3 665 = Ισθμίος 47; cf. Pikoulas (1987) 122). Skiritai was presumably not a polis (Bölte (1929) 1323; contra Niese (1906) 112 n. 2). The name Skiritai presumably derives from a place, however, putting it in the category of Ortsnamen rather than primitive Volksnamen (cf. Hansen (1996) 174 with refs.; the toponym [Σ]κίριον (acc.) occurs in F.Delphes II.14 239 (220–217)). In Classical sources it occurs only in the plural[26] and as the name of a group; in principle it could be either a city-ethnic or a (sub-)regional ethnic. Which of these it was depends on whether there was an urban centre from which the name derived, and on whether the Skiritai were organised as a political community. The Skiritai may in fact have belonged, in Classical times or earlier, to a settlement of Skiros, as asserted by Steph. Byz. 575.7–8, who calls Skiros a κατοικία in Arkadia near the Mainalians and Parrhasians. One might support this with an argument from analogy: the other sub-regions of Laconia whose names have similar feminine terminations (Thyreatis, Belbinatis, Aigytis, Maleatis) were also in the north, and each contained a settlement from which its name presumably derived. On the other hand, the link with Arkadia could refer to the period after 338 when part or all of the Skiritis had probably been awarded to Tegea (no. 297) by Philip II (cf. Polyb. 9.28.7, etc.; Shipley (2000) 371). The Skiritai may have enjoyed perioikic status (as suggested by Pikoulas (1987) 144), but Σκιρίται is nowhere used in any way that suggests a community organised into a polis, and there is as yet no Classical evidence for the existence of a central settlement, let alone a polis. At Hell. 5.2.24, indeed, Xenophon appears to distinguish the Skiritai from the periöikoi. Σκιρίται, then, is probably a “regional ethnic” denoting the inhabitants of a region but not a polis. (Cf. also discussion of Aigys, infra.)

In addition, a few significant Archaic or Classical settlements have not been linked with known toponyms. They include the following.

2. Unidentified Settlements

Armakades LS ii. 279, A220: upland settlement (or cult site) in Thyreatis. Not in Barr.

Marmaralono, Ag. Petros LS ii. 280, A223: hill-top (fortified?) with late Classical to early Hellenistic settlement, controlling the route west from Thyreatis (Argive?). Not in Barr.

Paliochora LS ii. 281, B827: settlement in fertile upland plain c.8 km west of ancient Tyros (supra). Not in Barr.


Paizoula, Valtaki LS ii. 296, J1125: substantial Classical to Roman pottery scatter with Roman structures. Not in Barr.

Some of the settlements listed above, both those attested in sources and those known only from archaeological evidence, may have been poleis in the Classical period. Statistically, indeed, this is highly likely to have been the case: given that some of the places of whose polis status we can be confident are attested as poleis in only one or two sources, it must be a matter of chance that they and not others are so recorded. Good candidates for polis status are not hard to find. The cult places at Aigiai and Akriai have substantial remains, possibly indicative of full-blown settlements. Other significant Classical sites include Alesiai, Astron, Bryseis, Iasos, Messape and Pleiai, if their locations are correctly identified. Some of these were poleis in the

---

25 The fundamental modern study is Pikoulas (1987).
26 Σκιρήτης is used in the singular only as a kletic: Diod. 15.32.1, Σκιρήτης λόχος.
Hellenistic period, namely Akriai (cf. S 57) and possibly Asine (cf. S 59) and Glyppia (cf. S 56); they may simply have failed to be named in surviving sources. Helos is also possible, since Xenophon may imply polis status; but it seems unlikely that the Spartans recognized a polis whose name mirrored that of the helots. Karyai may have had a city-ethnic corresponding to the feminine form used for the well-known statue type, and may have been politically organised if it did medise in the Persian wars; if the story is true, however, it also ceased to exist thereafter. More speculatively, the Skiritis may have contained a polis (supra). If any of these places were poleis, they presumably had perioikic status. On the other hand, many of these settlements had only small territories, and several are described as komai (a category not inconsistent with polis status) in the Classical or Hellenistic period.²⁸ As with poleis, since no place is called a kome in two sources, there were probably more of them than we hear of. Such places may have been dependent upon larger perioikic centres.²⁹

Thus, of 56 known Archaic and/or Classical settlements, 24 were organised as poleis.

II. The Poleis

323. Aigys (Aigyeus) Map 58. Lat. 37.15, long. 22.10. Size of territory: ? Type: C. (S12). The toponym is Aīγυς, ᾿η, not used before Ephor. fr. 117 apud Strabo 8.5.4 (dat. Aīγυν; Aīγων codd.); Steph. Byz. 45.1. The ethnic attested in Classical times is Ἀἰγυεύς (Theopomp. fr. 361 apud Steph. Byz. 45.6–7); in post-C4 sources Aἰγυτής (e.g. Paus. 3.2.5).

It is possible that Ephor. fr. 117 regards Aigys as a polis in the political and urban senses; however, he refers to legendary times, and the passage is not conclusive evidence that Aigys was a polis in Ephoros’ day. Paus. 3.2.5 (rC8e) gives an anachronistic version of history in which Aigys, already a perioikic polis, was enslaved by the Lakedaimonians under Archelaos (c.775–c.760). The (external) collective use of the ethnic Aigyeis occurs only in Theopomp. fr. 361 apud Steph. Byz. 45.6–7 (Ἀἰγυέας αἰτίων φυγαίων), but we do not know whether he used it as a “sub-regional” ethnic or as a city-ethnic.

²⁸ References to komai are assembled by Shipley (1997) 261–63. The only pre-Hellenistic reference to a kome is Xenophon’s description of S6, Oion (Hell. 6.5.25). The inhabitants of Sion, Tyros, described their town as a kome in 275. Two settlements are described as komai in Hellenistic sources: S22, Belbina (C1 papyrus, perhaps quoting Phylarchos) and S66, Helos (Strabo). Pausanias adds the rest: S1, Anthana; S30, Euia; S96, Glyppia; S97, Krokeai; S98, Neris; S99, Pleiai/Palaia; and S100, Selinous.

²⁹ On local settlement hierarchies, see Shipley (1992).

If Aigys existed as a named settlement from late Classical to Roman times, it was probably Tsamaina Kamaras in the south of Megalopolitan territory, which has C4l–second century AD pottery (LS ii. 283, cc528; Pikoulas (1982–83) 264, (1988a) 139–47 no. 95). Both Paus. 8.27.4 and Theopomp. fr. 361 would be consistent with Aigys existing as a named settlement only from c.C4l. We are left with no certain evidence that Aigys was ever a perioikic polis, but it was a settlement after C4m and perhaps in early times. If it was not an Archaic and Classical polis, then Aigyeis (like the later Aigytai and possibly like Skiritai) may have been a sub-regional ethnic denoting inhabitants of this area who were not politically organised.

The territory was Aigytis (e.g. Polyb. 2.54.3; Syll.3 665, post-164). Pikoulas (1988a) 141, 143 identifies it as the valley of the Xerilas, ancient Karnion, on the basis of Paus. 8.34.5. Strabo 10.1.6 (citing Alkman, PMG92) may be correct in calling Karyastos a “place (ῥότος) of Aigys near Arkadia” (Shipley (1997) 263 no. 103). In Strabo and Steph. Byz., Aigys belongs to Lakonike. Aigys may have embraced Leuktron and perhaps Kromoi (Pikoulas (1988a) 143; Shipley (2000) 371–72).

324. Anthana Map 58. Lat. 37.20, long. 22.50. Size of territory: ? Type: A. (S1). The toponym is Ἀνθήνη, ἦ (Thuc. 5.41.2; Lys. fr. 21, Sauppe). In the Doric dialect it is Ἀνθάνα (Steph. Byz. 95.11), which is a plausible restoration (in place of Μέθανα) in Ps.-Skylax 46. The city-ethnic Ἀνθανεύς is attested (or was invented) by Steph. Byz. 95.15.

Anthana is called a polis in the urban sense by Thuc. 5.41.2, and presumably by Ps.-Skylax 46 (accepting Ἀνθάνα for Μέθανα).

Thuc. 5.41.2 places Anthana (with Thyrea) in Kynouria, and says it was a Lakedaimonian possession in C5l (ῥέμιστας Ἀκαδαμίων); Harp. s.v. (quoting Lys. fr. 31 for the toponym) puts it in Lakonike, and Ps.-Skylax (as restored, supra) in Lakedaimon; Paus. 2.38.6 seemingly in Threyatis. It will have remained Spartan until 338, when Philip II assigned some Spartan territory to Argos (no. 347) (Shipley (2000) 371, 376–77); it may never have been retaken. Given that its location is disputed, the extent and borders of its territory must remain uncertain. Several possible locations have been proposed in Threyatis, the northern part of Kynouria, the area long disputed by Sparta and Argos (cf. Thuc. 5.41.2). Tsiorovos and Nisi Agiou Andrea both have Classical to Roman pottery (Shipley (1997) 226 no. 1; cf. 330–31 no. 10; see also under Neris, supra 575), but Frazer (1898) iii. 309 points out that, if we read Ἀνθάνα in
Ps.-Skylax 46, it would be a coastal place; this would rule out Tsirovoros. (On the problems of identification, see summary in Shipley (1993) 132–33.) Barr's location, "on Mt. Zavitsa," presumably derives from the possible location of Athana at Tsirovoros, a village 2 km west–south-west of the mountain (cf. Phaklaris (1990) 41 fig. 3).

According to Paus. 2.38.6, Anthana was formerly inhabited by Aiginetans; these would be the ones who in C 3 settled at nearby Thyrrea with the permission of the Lakedaimonians (Thuc. 2.27.2), as Pausanias is aware (2.29.5).


325. Aphroditia, Aphrodisia Unlocated. Type: C. (S83). The toponym is Ἀφροδίσια, η (Thuc. 4.56.1 codd.), perhaps best emended to the laconizing Ἀφροδίτια, as by Herodian (repeated by Steph. Byz. 150.24), less plausibly Ἀφροδοιαί (Paus. 3.22.11, 8.12.8; Steph. Byz. 150.17). A city-ethnic is not attested. Aphroditia's location is unknown (LS ii. 312–13, ΑΝ251), but was presumably in the same region as Eris and Side, the other two poleis from which Boia is said to have been synoecised (Paus. 3.22.11).

In Thuc. 4.56.1, Aphroditia is a coastal place with a guardpost. The only reference to it as a polis is Paus. 3.22.11 (retrospective but referring to legendary times), apparently in both the topographical and the personal/political senses (repeated by Steph. Byz. 150.17). Steph. Byz. 150.24 seems to infer χωρίον from Thuc. Aphroditia may still have existed in C 4m or later (see Boia (no. 327)). The only reason for including it here is analogy with Side, which was, according to Paus. 3.22.11, like Aphroditia synoecised into Boia, presumably in C 4S; Side is described as a polis (in the urban sense) by Ps.-Skylax 46 and was, then, a polis before the synoecism; Aphroditia may possibly have been one as well. See further Boia (no. 327), Eris (no. 330) and Side (no. 344).

The name implies a cult of Aphrodite. Paus. (3.22.11, 8.12.8) says the town was founded by Aineias. It is not attested after C 4 (except in Paus. 3.22.11), and if it disappeared as a polis by c. 300, both cult and legend should predate that time.

326. Belbina (Belinetes?) Map 58. Lat. 37.15, long. 22.15. Size of territory: ? Type: C. (S22). The toponym is Βελβίνα, η (Plut. Cleom. 4.1 (25.1), 4.4 (25.4); Ptol. Geog. 3.14.43; Hsch. s.v.; restored in Phylarchos apud P. Oxy. xv. 1801 (C1) (PGC Adesp. 1043 (Κ/Α = fr. 343, Austin)); Phylarchos is thus the earliest source. Βελβίνα is regular in Paus.; but at 3.21.3 and 8.35.3–4 it is a sub-region, not a settlement. (At 8.27.4 Βλέννα (Teubner) is presumably a scribal error.) The city-ethnic Βελβίνητος is attested (or invented?) by Steph. Byz. 161.13. Paus. 3.21.3 locates Belmina 100 stades (18 km) beyond Pellana. The settlement was probably not on the hill of Chelmos (LS ii. 283, cc41); Pikoulas (1988a) 122 regards Βελβίνητις χώρα or Belmina as the area around Chelmos. Possible sites for Classical Belmina/Belbina, if there was one, are Vardouka Skortsinou (C 4 to Roman finds) and three less precisely dated sites near Giakoumaita (Pikoulas (1988a) 120–21 nos. 75, 77). Geometric to Archaic finds in the area (Pikoulas (1988a) 119 no. 74, 1, 11) tend to push the existence of this possible polis back before 300.

Belbina is called a polis in the topographical sense by Ptol. Geog. 3.14.43 and Steph. Byz. 161.12, in the (urban and) political sense only by Paus. 8.27.4 (r369), in his list of poleis from which Megalopolis (no. 282) was founded. It is called a koné by Phylarchos and Hsch.

Belbina is explicitly placed in Lakanike by Phylarchos and by Paus. 3.21.3. The area is Βελβίνητος χώρα (Polyb. 2.54.3), ager Belbinates (Livy 38.34.8), Βελβίνητος (Strabo 8.3.12). As the territory of a polis, if it existed before the synoecism of Megalopolis, it will have bordered on those of its fellow Aigytian towns Leuktron and Malea to the north-west and of the Arkadian towns of Oresthasion (no. 287) to the north and Eutalía (no. 270) to the north–north-east. Athenaikon, a C 3 fort (Plut. Cleom. 4.1 (25.1)), may have been an important pre-C 3 cult place.

327. Boia (Boiases) Map 58. Lat. 36.30, long. 23.04. Size of territory: 2’ Type: A. (S2). The toponym is Boia, η (Ps.-Skylax 46); Boia, η (Strabo 8.5.2); or Boiases, α (e.g. Polyb. 5.19.8; Paus. 1.27.5, 3.21.7, 3.22.11, etc.; second century A.D. grave-epigram, Forrest (1972)). The city-ethnic is Βοιάτης (e.g. Paus. 3.22.13; restored in IG v.1 932 (C2m); cf. SEG ii 894). The polis is located c. 200 stades (c. 37 km) from Epidaurus Limera by Paus. 3.23.6. It lay in the Malea (Malias) peninsula, at or immediately north of Neapolis Voion (formerly Vatika; LS ii. 312–13, ΑΝ251; Pikoulas (1988b); (S2), followed by Barr.). Epigraphic finds (especially IG v.1 952, late Hellenistic) confirm the presence of a polis before Roman times even if they do not preserve its name.

Boia is first called a polis, in the urban sense, by Ps.-Skylax 46; in the political sense in IG v.1 932 (if correctly restored (C2m)). According to Paus. 3.22.11, Boia was founded by
Boios the Heraklid, who brought men from three poleis, Etis, Aphrodizia and Side; but since Aphroditia (no. 325) existed in C4l and Side (no. 344) was a polis in or not long before C3m, it seems that the three did not disappear early; in fact the ruins of Etis (no. 330) were still visible in the second century AD. Neither Aphroditia nor Side is attested after C4 except in Paus. 3.22.11 (retrospectively) and Steph. Byz. (derivatively). Possibly these poleis or settlements synoecised with an existing polis of Boia in the late Classical period, perhaps as a result of changes in the Spartan state following 369. See further Aphroditia (no. 325), Etis (no. 330) and Side (no. 344).

The collective and internal use of the city-ethnic occurs only on Roman coins (Head, HN² 433). The collective and external use occurs in IG v.1 932, otherwise only in literary texts such as Paus. 3.23.13.

Ps.-Skylax 46 lists Boia under Ἀλεκτριάμων ἔθνος, and the polis can be assumed to have been perioikic (cf. Paus. 1.27.5 (1456/5): τῶν περιοίκων Βοιᾶς). The only evidence for the extent of its territory, or for cult places, is post-C4 (Paus. 3.23.2, 6). Supposing Boia to have been founded in C4m (supra), it certainly absorbed the territory of Etis, less than a mile away (if Paus. 3.22.13 is correctly restored).

Archaeological evidence for the Classical polis is so far lacking, though Paus. 3.22.13 mentions temples that could be Classical.

328. Chen (Cheneus) Unlocated. Type: C. (S13). The toponym is Χήν, ὁ (oracle apud Diog. Laert. 1.30, 106, whose source may be Eudoxos of Knidos, c.390-c.340; see 1.29-30). The Classically attested city-ethnic is Χηνειας e.g. Pl. Prt. 343A, the earliest evidence for the place. Paus. 10.24.2 and Diod. 9 frs. 5-7 put Chen, birthplace of Myson (one of the seven wise men), in Thessalia, but sources cited by Diog. Laert. 1.106-7, of whom the earliest is Aristoxenos (born c.370), located it in Laconia or Arkadia.

Chen is called a polis only by Steph. Byz. 692.13; Aristox. fr. 130, Wehrli, apud Diog. Laert. 1.108 implicitly calls it a κωμή.

The Ci gravaestone of a Lakadaimonian from Koroneia (IG vii 2936) is the only epigraphic evidence for the external use of the individual city-ethnic (in the form Χήν); the literary evidence comprises Plato and Eudoxos (supra).

329. Epidauros (Epidaureioi) Map 58. Lat. 36.45, long. 23.00. Size of territory: ? Type: A. (S5). The toponym is Ἐπίδαυρος, ἡ (Thuc. 4.56.2, 6.105.2; Ps.-Skylax 46), distinguished from its famous homonym in the Argolid by the addition of ἡ Λιμήρα (Thuc. 4.56.2, 6.105.2; cf. Strabo 8.6.1: ἡ Λιμήρα Ἐπίδαυρος, citing Artemidoros). The city-ethnic is Ἐπιδαύριος, restored in IG v.1 931.24–25 (SEG 11 894, 13 259 (c.C2m); for the attribution to Epidauros Limera see SEG ad loc.; J. and L. Robert, BE (1953) 138 no. 76), and occurs on votives from the Hyperteleaton (e.g. IG v.1 1005 (Hellenistic)). In a proxeny decree of one of the poleis of Keos (IG xi.5 542.22–23; Karthia (no. 492) (C4m)), it is [Ἐπιδαύριος ἐκ τῆς Λακα[ωνικῆς] (or Ἀκα[ποιμονος]?).

Epidauros is called a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 46 (πόλεις καὶ λιμήν); the first references to it as a polis in the political sense are Hellenistic: e.g. IG v.1 932 (Epidauros Limera (C2m); cf. SEG 11 894). The proxeny decree from Keos is the only example of the external individual use of the city-ethnic.

Ps.-Skylax 46 lists the city under Ἀλεκτριάμων ἔθνος; in IG xi.5 542.22–23 it belongs to Λακα[ωνικῆς] or Ἀκα[ποιμονος]. Its territory is not directly named, but Thucydides refers to its γῆ being ravaged by the Athenians (4.56.2, 6.105.2; cf. 7.18.3, 7.26.2). It is presumed to have been a perioikic polis; in Thuc. 6.105.2 an attack upon it is an attack upon the Lakadaimonians. Its C2 boundary dispute with Zarax is recorded in IG v.1 931 (supra); in Paus. 3.23.6 its territory marches with that of Boia (no. 327).

According to Paus. 3.23.6–7, Epidauros Limera was founded by envoys from the Asklepieion of Argolic Epidauros. If true, this would imply a date after c.500. Pausanias records various features in the town and its territory (3.23.7–10). The fortification walls on the acropolis may be C5 in part, with an extension possibly in C4m (Lawrence (1979) 147). The fortified area enclosed c.3 ha; the lower town was probably much more extensive (Hasluck (1907–8) 179–82; Lawrence (1979) 146–47; LS ii. 310–11, NN235; Zavou (1996–97)).

330. Etis (Eteois) (Map 58). Lat. c.36.30 (?), long. c.23.05. Size of territory: ? Type: C. (S84). The toponym is Ἰτεις, Ἰτεός, ἦ (first in Paus. 3.22.11). The city-ethnic is Ἰτεῖος (Steph. Byz. 305.2), and it occurs in one of the two versions of an oracle quoted by Diog. Laert. 1.106–7, which may have a C4 or earlier origin (see Chen (no. 328)). The obscure polis of Ἐστειεῖς (Steph. Byz. 283.6–7; Shipley (1997) 266 no. 114) may be a doublet of Etis. If Etis is correctly restored in Paus. 3.22.13, it was “not more than 7 stades” (1.3 km) from Boia. A possible location is Palaiakastro Neapoleos (LS ii. 313, NN253), but there is no definite archaeological evidence.

Etis is called a polis only by Paus. 3.22.11 (retrospectively); it is here reported that Etis, with Aphroditia and Side, were synoecised into Boia, presumably in C4b (cf. no. 327); since Side is described as a polis (in the urban sense) by Ps.-Skylax
46, it was presumably a polis prior to the synoecism, and Etis may possibly have been one as well. See further Aphroditia (no. 325), Boia (no. 327) and Side (no. 344). The only possible attestation of the city-ethnic is individual and external, if it is recognized in the oracle cited supra.

Paus. 3.22.13 (if correctly restored) describes Etis as in ruins. It may have disappeared in C4m. If so, Pausanias' sanctuary of Asklepios and Hygieia will have been Classical.

According to Paus. 3.22.11, 8.12.8, it was founded by Aineias; if it disappeared before 300, this myth, too, may have a Classical or Archaic origin.

331. Euia (Euitas) Map 58. Lat. 37.20 (?), long. 22.40 (?). Size of territory: ? Type: C. (S30). The toponym is Eυία, η (Theopomp. fr. 60, if this refers to Euia in Thyreatis (Nielsen 1996a) 44, (2002) 106–7); again at Paus. 2.38.6).

A city-ethnic may be attested as early as c.500 in the form Еυία (SEG 35 378 (ML 17, Syll. 9, LSAG 220 no. 6, IvO 9 (c.500)), assuming it refers to this place (see Dubois (1985); contra Morgan (1999) 414, 450–51 no. 212; see now also Roy and Schofield (1999) suggesting that the inscription refers to an otherwise unknown community of the Ewaioi (no. 253) in the wider region of Elis). Other forms occur once each: Еυίατος (SEG13 267, from Phonemenoi (C4)); Еυίατης, on a Hellenistic stamped tile (SEG 30 377; cf. 35 287, 39 367) from Anemomyllos Ellinikou; Еυαίος, on a coin of Euia when a member of the Achaean League (BCH 39 (1915) 118). Hill (1917) notes an Achaean League hemidrachm with the legend ΕΥ (cf. Nielsen (1996b) 119–20; SEG 35 287); Phaklaris (1990) 103–4 doubts that the coin belongs to Euia. Еυαίος (Steph. Byz. 283.3) may be an invention.

Euia is probably Elliniko, a settlement with Geometric to Roman finds near Anemomyllos, the findspot of SEG 30 377. Anemomyllos, a Classical to Roman cult site, is possibly the sanctuary of Asklepios, of whom a statuette was found. Less plausibly, Euia could be the nearby site now renamed Eva (near Moni Loukous) with the excavated villa of Herodes Atticus and a cult of Asklepios (so Phaklaris (1990) 78–90, 96–104, 185–92); but Eva is mainly Roman, and for Pritchett not a nucleated settlement ((1965–91) vi. 87–89). (See also LS ii. 277, ΑΑ5 Eva, Moni Loukous; 278, ΑΑ10 Anemomyllos, Ellinikou; 278, ΑΑ13 Ellinikou; Goester (1993) 81–84, 100–6).

It is possible that Euia was called a polis by Theopomp. fr. 60, but there is no certainty that Steph. Byz. (the source of the fragment) is not adding his own gloss. The city-ethnic is used individually and presumably internally on the C4 gravestone from Phonemenoi (SEG 13 267), and this is the primary reason for its inclusion here (cf. Hansen (1996)).

The Hellenistic stamped tile cited above preserves a collective internal use, as does the Achaean League coin. The city-ethnic is used collectively and externally in the Eleian treaty of c.500, if it refers to Euia (see supra).

Pausanias appears to place Euia in Thyreatis. It will have been Spartan between C3m and C4m (Shipley (2000) 377). It was later a member of the Achaean Confederacy (BCH 39 (1915) 118). The extent and borders of Euia's territory are uncertain, but it will have included the important cult site of Asklepios at modern Eva, which may have had a late Classical origin. If the ethnics all refer to the same place, and it is Elliniko, it has a long life, though the archaeological evidence suggests late Classical and Hellenistic decline. The nearby sanctuary, however, may have continued to flourish. The Hellenistic stamped tile is evidence of the capacity to take a communal decision about a building project, perhaps at the nearby sanctuary. Elliniko also has fortification walls (Phaklaris (1990) 78–90, esp. 80–81).

332. Geronthrai (Geronthretes) Map 58. Lat. 36.60, long. 22.45. Size of territory: ? Type: C. (S41). The toponym is Γερόνθρατος, ας (e.g. Paus. 3.21.7, but MSS also have Γερόνθρατος (e.g. Paus. 3.2.6, repeated by Steph. Byz. 203.33)); Γερόνθρατος occurs later (Hierocl. Synecd. 647.9, second half of sixth century AD). The city-ethnic is Γερόνθρατης (IG v.1 1111; cf. SEG 11 911+ (C2s), the earliest attestation of the place); Doricised as Γερόνθρατας (IG v.1 1113 (Hellenistic)); Γερόνθρατης (Paus. 3.2.6; Steph. Byz. 203.14).

Geronthrai is first called a polis in the political sense in IG v.1 1111 (C2s). Paus. 3.2.6 (rC8m) says it was a periōikos polis when captured by King Teleklos (c.760–740) (Cartledge (1979) 109), but this cannot be relied upon. If the name lists IG v.1 1133–34 (infra) are public records of athletic victories by people (citizens) of Geronthrai (Hodkinson (1999) 156–57), then it was possibly a polis by c.500. Decrees of the polis use the city-ethnic collectively and internally; see IG v.1 1111, 1113 (both Hellenistic). Externally it is used collectively by Paus. 3.2.6.

According to Pausanias, the Dorians of Lakedaimon under Teleklos replaced the Achaean population of the pre-Heraklid settlement with έτοικοι from among their own number (3.22.6, cf. 3.2.6). The probable Archaic and Classical polis was presumably periōikos. It was probably lost to Sparta in 195 (Shipley (2000) 379–80). Archaeological and epigraphic finds, especially the name lists IG v.1 1133–34 (c.500; LSAG 201 no. 46, SEG 11 918) and the victory stele, IG v.1 1120 (C5; SEG17 189 +), found on the acropolis, make the
existence of an important Archaic and Classical settlement a virtual certainty. In the Hellenistic period the city granted proynes with various combinations of rights (IG v.1 1110–13).

Two sepulchral inscriptions commemorating men fallen in battle (ἐγινεῖοι) may provide evidence of Geronthriate military forces (IG v.1 1124 (= SEG 11 915, 33 313; LSAG 202 no. 60 (C58)) and 1125 (= SEG 11 916, 33 313; LSAG 201 no. 58 (C46)); see Hodkinson (2000) 250–54.


IG v.1 1120 (C5) lists athletic victories, but the name and location of the festival are missing. Pausanias and Hellenistic votives testify to cults, but none need be early other than the temple of Apollo destroyed by fire (Paus. 3.22.7); probable capitals and votives from it have been found, as well as Archaic to Classical votive pottery, relief sculptures, and architectural fragments (Crouwel et al. (1995), (1996), (1997); Wace and Hasluck (1904–5)). IG v.1 1113 (Hellenistic) refers to the sanctuary of Apollo. IG v.1 1118 is a C3/C2 votive relief to Eleusia (i.e. Demeter); her cult may have existed earlier.

333. Gytheion (Gytheates) Map 58. Lat. 36.5, long. 22.35. Size of territory: 2½. Type: B (but see infra). (S23). The toponym is Γύθειον, τὸ (Xen. Hell. 1.4.11; Ps.-Sklavyn 46; Strabo 8.5.2), later also Γοθείον (Strabo 8.3.12; Paus. 1.27.5); once Γόθην (Jalabert (1904) 8–9, no. 5, Sidon (C2)). The city-ethnic is Γοθεάτης, first in IG v.1 1165 (C26) and usually thus in Hellenistic and Roman texts, also coins (Head, HNG 433–34); once Γοθεάτης (IG v.1 1111 (SEG 11 911 (C25))).

No Archaic or Classical source explicitly calls Gytheion a polis, but is seems very likely that Xen. Hell. 6.5.32 thinks of it as a polis in the urban sense: καὶ τὰς μὲν ἄτειχος τῶν πόλεων ἐντειμπρασαν, Γοθείοι δὲ, ἐνταῦθα ταῖς Λακεδαιμονίαις ἐν, καὶ προσβάλλον τρεῖς ἱμέρας: it is explicitly called a polis (in the urban sense) by Diod. 11.84.6 (r156 only). The only individual internal use of the city-ethnic is IG v.1 1176 (Imperial date). The only individual external use is IG v.1 1111 (C28); in Jalabert (1904) 8–9, no. 5 (supra) the fuller specification Λακεδαιμόνιος ἀπὸ Γοθήνου is used. The city-ethnic is used collectively and internally in IG v.1 1165 (C28) and on Roman coins; externally in IG v.1 1147 (SEG 15 222 +, c.ad 122–135).

Gytheion is placed in Lakedaimon by Ps.-Skylax 46; implicitly in Lakonike by Diod. 11.84.6 (r156). Tolmides ravaged its chora in 456 (Diod. 11.84.6). Paus. 3.21.6 locates Gytheion 30 stades (5,5 km) from Aigai, on the sea, and about the same distance from Trinasos (3.22.3). Epigraphic and archaeological finds confirm the site as the modern town of Gytheio (formerly Marathonisi). The city was evidently fortified in 370–369 (Xen. Hell. 6.5.32, quoted supra; Ps.-Sklavyn 46: τειχεῖος). Archaeological finds, however, begin in the Archaic period. SEG 11 926 (C5) is a bronze goat dedicated to Apollo—inioi (Karneoi?). Nearby, rock-cut cult inscriptions have been found: IG v.1 1154 (SEG 11 927 (C5) is to Zeus Terastios; IG v.1 1155 (SEG 11 928, 15 223 (C5)) may relate to Zeus Kappotas (Paus. 3.22.1); IG v.1 1153 is a Classical (?) relief to the Eleusinian goddess. For Hellenistic cults of the polis, see e.g. IG v.1 1152 (C2), 1144 (C2/C4). Rescue archaeology has brought to light Hellenistic structures and many more of Roman date (AR 26 (1979–80) 32; 35 (1988–89) 31; Roman at AR 38 (1990–91) 27 and earlier). See generally Giannakopoulos (1987); LS ii. 296–97, 11218+.

Gytheion served the Lakedaimonians as naval base: Diod. 11.84.6 (r1456) refers to it as an ἐπίνειον where there are νεώρια (similarly Paus. 1.27.5; Cic. Off. 3.11.49 (rC5)). For other references to the Spartan dockyards here, see e.g. Thuc. 1.108.5 (not naming Gytheion); Xen. Hell. 1.4.11. Ps.-Sklavyn 46 adds a fort. Falkner (1994) argues that Gytheion developed into a naval base only in C3. For Roman-period ship sheds, see Scoufopoulos and McKernan (1975).

334. Kromnos (Kronmites) Map 58. Lat. 37.20, long. 22.05. Size of territory: 1½. Type: C. (S25). The toponym is Κρώμων, ὁ, first in Xen. Hell. 7.4.20, 26; used alongside Κρώμων or Κρώμων, ἡ, by Kallisthenes (FGrHist 124) fr. 13 apud Ath. 452AB (cf. Steph. Byz. 388.3–7; Suda s.v.); Κρώμων, οἱ, e.g. Paus. 8.3.4, 27.4 (r1371). The possible city-ethnic Κρομνίτης occurs in IG iv 9094 (365–340), and in SEG 22 219 (Corinth, 325–280); but both could belong to Paphlagonian Kromna (no. 723) (cf. Steph. Byz. 388.4–5), though it seems much more likely that in particular SEG 22 219, found at Corinth, refers to the Kromna which was a subordinate settlement of Corinth (no. 227).

Kromnos is called a polichinion in the urban sense by Kallisthenes (FGrHist 124) fr. 13 apud Ath. 452AB, if the words in question are not added by Athenaios. It is called a polis, apparently in the urban and political senses, by Paus.
8.27.4 (1371). IG ii² 9094 and SEG 22.219, if they belong to this Kromnos (supra), both attest the external individual use of the city-ethnic.

The town probably lay at Martiakos Paradision (Classical to early Hellenistic pottery: Pikoulas 1988a) 161–64 no. 121; Roy et al. (1992) 190–93; Barr.). Accepting the Niese–Pikoulas emendation of Paus. 8.27.4 (Niese 1899) 540 n. 1; Pikoulas (1987) 137, 148), it belonged to Aigytis and/or Skiritis in his day or earlier. It was temporarily recaptured from the Arkadians in 365 (Xen. Hell. 7.4.20, 27) by Archidamos, who left a garri-son (φρούρα) there. Now or earlier, the town was synoecised into Megalopolis (no. 282) (Paus. 8.27.4); it was ruined but “not quite vanished” in Pausanias’ day (8.34.6). The pottery (C5m–C4) suggests a Classical foundation (Pikoulas 1988a) 161–64; AR 29 (1982–83) 28–29; BCH 107 (1983) 764–67), possibly by Lakedaimonians. The finds are consistent with abandonment during or after C4.

The story that the town was named after Krom(n)os, son of Lykaon (Paus. 8.3.4 with Steph. Byz. 388.7) could be a Classical myth (Roy 1968)).

335. Kyphanta (Kyphantaseus) Map 58. Lat. 37.00, long. 23.00. Size of territory: 1? Type: B. (St14). The toponym is Κύφαντα, τα (Polyb. 4.36.5; Paus. 3.24.2); Κύφας, ὁ, is found in Hdn. 111.1 57.16. The city-ethnic is Κυφαντασεύς, restored with certainty in IG xii.5 542.21 (Karthaia (no. 492) (C4m)), the earliest evidence for the place.

It is called a polis only by Ptol. Geog. 3.14.43 (urban sense); however, the appearance of one of its citizens in a catalogue of proxenoi from Keos (IG xii.5 542.21, Karthaia (no. 492) (C4m)) proves that it was a polity already in the Classical period.

Pausanias implicitly places Kyphanta in Lakonike (named at e.g. 3.23.11). Its territory perhaps matched with that of Prasiai (no. 342), since Pausanias gives the distance from Prasiai to Kyphanta (3.24.3); Kyphanta is c.100 stades (c.18 km) from Zarax and c.10 stades (c.1.8 km) inland (3.24.2); 200 stades (37 km) from Prasiai by sea (3.24.3). It was probably at Kyparissi (ancient fort with polygonal masonry, presumably late Classical or Hellenistic; LS ii. 282–83, 8b38). It was ruined in Pausanias’ day (3.24.2); if correctly identified, the archaeology points to occupation into Roman times (Wace and Hasluck (1908–9) 173–74; Hood (1956) 12).

336. Kythera (Kytherios) Map 58. Lat. 36.15, long. 23.05. Size of territory: 4 (262 km²). Type: A. (S4). The island (called Κύθηρα at Hdt. 7.235.2 and ἡ Κυθηρία νῆσος at 1.82.2) and the town were homonymous, so the toponym was Κύθηρα, τά (Ps.-Skylax 46: νῆσος καὶ πόλις). The city-ethnic is Κυθηρίος (Thuc. 4.54.1, the earliest evidence for the town; IG ii² 9110, C4e).

Kythera is called a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 46. There are many references to a πόλις τῶν Κυθηρίων in the urban sense (e.g. Thuc. 4.54.1 and Xen. Hell. 4.8.8), but it appears that no source uses polis in the political sense about the community, surely by coincidence. Its politia was the subject of an Aristotelian treatise (Heracl. Lemb. 54; Arist. no. 88, Gigon).

The external individual use of the city-ethnic is found in Ephor. fr. 2 (apud Ath. 352.C) and IG ii² 9110 (C4e); the external collective use occurs in Thuc. 4.54.1; 2; Xen. Hell. 4.8.8; RO 96.48, 52 (Kyrene, 330–326), a record of grain donations by Kyrene (no. 1028) to the Kytherioi amounting to 8,100 medimnoi.

Ps.-Skylax 46 places Kythera in Lakedaimon. Thuc. 4.53.2 and perhaps 7.26.2 seem to imply that Lakonike does not include Kythera, though usually it includes all places under Spartan control; at 4.53.2 he locates Kythera the island oppo-site Lakonike (ἐπίκειται ... τῇ Λακωνικῇ). The territory of the polis is ἡ Κυθηρία (Xen. Hell. 4.8.7). Its inhabitants are Lakedaimonians and periokoi, but used (in C4?) to be administered by a magistrate called the kytherodikes and were garrisoned (Thuc. 4.53.2). According to Hdt. 1.82.2, the island had been taken from the Argives prior to C6m. For the strategic importance of the island to Sparta (no. 345), see Hdt. 7.235.2.

The polis was on the homonymous island, c.10 stades (c.1.8 km) inland (Paus. 3.23.1) at Palaikastro (Huxley (1972) 38–39; Cartledge (1979) 122). Xen. Hell. 4.8.8 mentions the fortification walls of the polis; cf. Huxley (1972) 38–39. The second settlement on the island was (ἡ) Σκάνδεια (KIPauly v. 221; RE IIIA. 438), probably at Palaipolis Kastriou; post-Bronze Age archaeological evidence begins in C6 (Huxley (1972) 34). Skandea, the epineion of Kythera according to Paus. 3.23.1, is called ἡ ἐπὶ θάλασσα πόλις at Thuc. 4.54.1 (to be contrasted with ἡ ᾿Αττική πόλις, i.e. Kythera town itself, at 4.52.2) and τὸ ἐπὶ τῶν λιμένων πόλισα at 4.54.4; it is apparently thought of as a part of Kythera town and not as a polis in its own right (Hansen (1995b) 43–44; Shipley (1997) 227–28; see also the note by Hansen in CPCActs 4: 173–75). Hdt. 1.105.3 mentions the famous sanctuary of Aphrodite, which was at Palaikastro (Waterhouse and Hope Simpson (1961) 148ff; alternative location: Huxley (1972) 35 with fig. 6, pl. 4). (The island was the mythical place of arrival of the goddess (Hes. Theog. 198).) For lead slings-bullets found on Kythera, on the island of Antikythera, and
in its main town of Aigilia (fortified in C5), see IG v.1 951. On Antikythera/Aigilia, see further supra 573.

In 424, the Athenians with allies attacked Kythera (Thuc. 4.53.1), captured Skandea (54.1), and defeated the Kytherians in battle outside the city (54.2); there had already been contact between the Athenians and some of the Kytherians before the attack (54.3), and soon after the battle an agreement was reached (54.4, ξύμβασις): the Athenians took over Skandea and placed a garrison in the city of Kythera (ibid.). A little later, the Kytherians were enrolled in the Delian League on the conditions (Thuc. 4.57.4; they are not, however, named in the extant tribute quota lists. The Athenian–Spartan treaty in Thuc. 4.118.4 stipulates that the Athenians on Kythera are not to have dealings with Peloponnesian League members (μὴ ἐπιμισγοµένους ἐς τὴν ἤµμαχίαν). The Peace of Nikias stipulated that the Athenians restore Kythera to the Lakedaimonians (Thuc. 5.18.7); however, Kytherian forces joined the Athenians in the attack on Syracuse (Thuc. 7.57.6), so “it had evidently not been evacuated by 431” (HCT iv: 399 ad 7.26.2). In 393, Pharnabazos landed on Kythera; οἱ ἔχοντες τὴν πόλιν τῶν Κυθηρίων left the fortifications and were sent ὑποσπόνδοι to Lakenike, whereupon Pharnabazos had the teichos repaired and left a garrison and the Athenian Nikophemos as harmost (Xen. Hell. 4.8.8).

According to Thuc. 7.57.6 the Kytherians were Dorians and colonists (ἄποικοι) of the Lakedaimonians. They had the capacity to organise themselves militarily during the Peloponnesian War (Thuc. 4.54.1, cf. 7.57.6).

IG v.1 937 (SEG 11 896 (C4)) is a dedication to the Tyndaridai by an αὐτοστήρ, perhaps the Spartan Kytherodikes (Cartledge (1979) 244) or possibly an Athenian commander (cf. Xen. Hell. 4.8.8; MacDowell (1986) 30).

337. Las (Laos) Map 58. Lat. 36.40, long. 22.30. Size of territory: ? Type: A. (S5). The toponym is Λάς, ὁ (Ps.-Skylax 46); alternatively Λά, ἡ (Thuc. 8.91.2, 92.3). Steph. Byz. 404.5 lists the feminine, but comments (6–7) λέγεται καὶ ἄρσενικός. Sometimes it is unclear which is being declined: e.g. at Hom. Il. 2.585, the earliest mention. The city-ethnic Λάος in Steph. Byz. 404.9 is confirmed by coins of Λά 193–211 (Head, HN² 436) and Horos 10–12 (1992–98) 564 (Hadrianic).

Las is called a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 46 (πόλις καὶ λῆµνον).

Paus. at 3.24.6 locates Las 40 stades (7 km) “right” (i.e. west) of Gytheion (no. 333) and 10 stades (1.8 km) from the sea; at 3.24.8 it is c.30 stades (c.5.5 km) from Hypsoi, which is at the edge of Spartan territory. It was probably near Chiosiari, on the hill with the Frankish castle of Passava (so Barr., following S5); in the land beneath the acropolis, Classical finds have been noted (LS ii. 300, 11153; Giannakopoulos (1987) 52–54 and 51 fig. 12 notes Archaic finds from Chiosiari).

Las is explicitly assigned to Lakenike by Thuc. 8.91.2. Its territory would have been bounded on the east by that of Gytheion (cf. Paus. 3.24.6), on the west by that of Pyrrhichos (3.25.2). Paus. 3.24.7 refers to the spring of Galako, which presumably existed earlier; his sanctuaries of Asklepios and Artemis Daphnaia at Hypsoi (3.24.8), and of Diktynna Artemis on a cape (3.24.9), need not be Classical, but the tomb of the hero Las at nearby Arainos (3.24.10) is more likely to be.

The acropolis has produced Protogeometric to Roman finds, including a late Archaic or early Classical votive stele (IGV.11217). Paus. 3.24.6 says that the city was formerly on the summit of Asia, where the ruins of the old city and its fortification walls were situated. A stretch of polygonal walling has been found (Forster (1906–7) 232–34; cf. Traquair (1905–6) 262 fig. 3), suggesting that Passava is Mt. Asia.

On the acropolis was Pausanias’ ruined temple of Athena Asia (3.24.7); it could be Classical, as could his “ancient” statue of Hermes (ibid.). His temples of Dionysos and Asklepios on Mt. Ilion, and of Apollo Karneios by Knakadion, need not be old, though Apollo Karneios is a classicist cult of Laconia. His story of the oecist Las, buried at Arainos (3.24.10), may have a Classical origin.

According to Ephor. fr. 117 apud Strabo 8.5.4, Las was euilmenos, and Ps.-Skylax mentions a limen; Thuc. 8.91.2, 92.3, mentions naval activities at, presumably, this harbour. The harbour of Las was probably at Vathy Bay, where there are Roman remains (Forster (1906–7) 233). This is supported by the location of the tomb of the founding hero, Las, on the promontory of Arainos (Paus. 3.24.10), probably modern Ageranos on the south side of Vathy Bay (Waterhouse and Hope Simpson (1961) 118 n. 28).

338. Oinous (Woinountios) Unlocated. Type: B. (S15). The toponym is ὸιοῦντος, ὅ, Androtion (ForHist 324) fr. 49 apud Steph. Byz. 486.9; Ath. 31CD. The city-ethnic is Ἡφαῖντος on the bronze plaque SEG 13 239 (LSAG 169 no. 22; BCH 77 (1953) 395ff; Argos, c.475?), the earliest evidence for Oinous and the only attestation of the city-ethnic (an external, individual use) apart from Steph. Byz. 486.10, ὸιοῦντος.
Androtion (FGrHist 324) fr. 49 apud Steph. Byz. 486.9 calls Oinos a πολιτηρίον, if accurately cited by Steph. Byz. (the unusual noun and the use of ὧς may make this more likely). Ath. 31CD makes it a χωρίον near Pitane, but may be drawing an inference from Alkman. Oinos is ascribed to Lakonike by Steph. Byz. 486.9–10; doubtless it lay in the valley of the river Oinos (Ptol. Geog. 2.65.7ff, 66.7.; Livy 34.28.1), the modern Kelephina.

The attestation of a C5e proxeny decree of Argos (no. 347) in favour of a citizen of Oinos (SEG13 239; LSAG 169 no. 22; BCH 77 (1953) 395ff: Ἀλαίας ἕδραξε πρὸς ἑαυτῷ ὑμνάσας τὸν Θεὸν τοῖς Σκηνείοις) is a salutary reminder of the paucity of our evidence and the likelihood that a significant number of Classical periopic polis simply fail to be named in our written sources.

339. Οῖος (Oiates) Map 58. Lat. 37.20 (?), long. 22.25. Size of territory: 1 (2?). Type: C (S6). The toponym is Οῖος, ὁ (Aesch. Mysoi fr. 416, the earliest mention, but preserved only by Steph. Byz. 487.5); Οἶος (dat.) at Xen. Hell. 6.5.24 and Οἰόν (acc.) at 6.5.25 could be masculine or neuter; the assumption that the nominative is τὸ Οἰόν may have no foundation other than similarity with the Attic demo. At Paus. 8.27.4, however, Οἶον (nom.) is a likelier emendation than Οῖος (Pikoulas 1987) 137, 148, (1988a) 145 n. 445, 239, following Niese (1899) 540 n. 1). The city-ethnic is Οἰάτης (Xen. Hell. 6.5.26). (Paus. 8.45.1 refers to Οίαται, a δήμος of Tegea (no. 297) in early times; it may refer to the same place.)

Attestations of Oios as a polis are only post-C4 and implicit. Paus. 8.27.4 (1371) may combine the topographical and political senses.

The only attested collective external use of the ethnic is at Xen. Hell. 6.5.26, where he calls it a κόμη (Hansen 1995a 74).

At Hell. 6.5.24 Xenophon assigns Oios to Lakonike; at 6.5.24, 25, specifically to Skiritis. It is the only settlement explicitly included in Skiritis in any source (Pikoulas 1987 135). In Paus. 8.27.4 (1371), if correctly read, Oion is an Aigytian and/or Skiritan polis; but Skiritis had probably been subsumed under Aigytis by then.

Oios was possibly at Ai-Gianni Kerasias (Kerasia was formerly Arvanitokerasia; Loring (1895) 60 and n. 141; Pikoulas (1987) 135–37 and n. 35; cf. (1988a) 239 no. 1) where Romaios identified a sanctuary of Demeter (PAE 1907: 121); unauthor- ized excavation later revealed a large building. Xen. Hell. 6.5.26 mentions that attacking Arkadians went up on to the roofs of houses (ἐπὶ τῶν ὀικείων). (See also LS ii. 283, 3443.) If correctly identified, Oios may have existed only in the Classical period.

340. Oitylos (Oitylios?)/Beitylos (Beitles) Map 58. Lat. 36.40, long. 22.25. Size of territory: 1 (2?). Type: C (S6). The toponym is Οἴτυλος, ὁ, first in IL 2.585; Pherekydes (FGrHist 3) fr. 168; Paus. 3.21.7, etc.; but *Beίτυλος is implied by the earliest epigraphic attestations of the city-ethnic, in Hellenistic and Roman inscriptions. Strabo 8.4.4 gives Βαίτυλος as an alternative, perhaps an error for Βείτυλος; cf. Βίτυλος, Ptol. Geog. 3.14.43. The city-ethnic Οἰτύλος given by Steph. Byz. 487.17 is perhaps purely inferential. The few genuine attestations, all post-C4, are of Βείτυλος, e.g. IG v.1 935 (Kythera, Ca2).

Oitylos is called a polis in the topographical sense by Pherekydes (FGrHist 3) fr. 168 using the unusual expression "the polis in Sparta"; but as he is writing about mythological material, and as this usage is unparalleled, it does not amount to reliable evidence of polis status (cf. Hansen and Nielsen (2000) 148–49).

Paus. locates Oitylos 150 stades (27 km) from Hippola (3.25.10) and c.80 stades (15 km) from Thalamai (3.26.1). It is near modern Oitylo (formerly Vitylo). Architectural fragments found in churches could be from the ancient polis part of a possible cult building has been uncovered, and a possible defensive wall (AR (4) (1957) 10: LS ii. 300–1, 11,154; Waterhouse and Hope Simpson (1961) 121), Pausanias’ xoanon of Karneian Apollo in the agora may be old. The archaeological evidence to date is too imprecise to confirm that Oitylos was a Classical polis, though that remains a possibility.

341. Pellana (Pellaneus) Map 58. Lat. 37.10, long. 22.20. Size of territory: 1 (2?). Type: B (S17). The Doric form of the toponym is Πελλάνα, ἡ, as in Pausanias’ citation (3.26.2) of Alkman (fr. 23, Page). Earlier sources the name is Πελλάνη, ἡ; e.g. Xen. Hell. 7.5.9. In Strabo 8.4.5 (Πέλλαννα, Πέλλαννα codd.) and 8.7.5, however, it is neuter plural: Πέλλανα, τα. The city-ethnic is Πελλανεύς or Πελλάνης; either can be restored in IG xi.5 542.20 (Karthaia (no. 492)? (C4m)). Πελλάνης occurs at Polymb. 18.17.1.

Pellana is called a polis only retrospectively, by Diod. 15.67.2 bis (1369/8) (Παλλάνης, Παλλάνης codd.), using polis in both the topographical and the political senses. Polymb. 4.81.7 makes it part of a τριπόλις, implying that it is itself a polis. For Paus. 3.21.2 Pellana was a polis "of old". The only Classical attestation of the city-ethnic is individual and external, in IG xi.5 542.20–1 (Karthaia (no. 492)? (C4m)), which lists a man of Pellana as proxenos of the issuing polis and provides confirmation that it was a polity in C4m. A C4I sepulchral inscription commemorating a man fallen in
battle (ἐν πολέμοι) may provide evidence of Pellanian military forces (Zavvou (1999) 65–66 no. 6); see Hodkinson (2000) 250–54.

Pellana belongs to Lakonike (or Lakedaimon?) in IG XII.5 542; to Lakonike in Diod. 15.67.2 (1369/8); it is a Ἀλκαιονικόν χωρίον in Strabo 8.7.5. Polyb. 4.81.7 refers to τὴν ἐν τῇ τριπόλει. Ἡ Πελλήνην, possibly referring to Aigys (no. 323), Belbina (no. 326) and Pellana (no. 341) with their chorai (cf. perhaps the tripolim bordering on Megalopolitan territory in Livy 35.27.10). In Diod. 15.67.2 (1369/8) it has 7 χώρα that is ravaged by the Arkadians. It was 100 stades (18 km) from Belemina (Paus. 3.21.3), and more than 5,00 stades (c.9 km) from Sparta (3.20.10 with 3.21.1). It is probably Paalioskastro Pellanas and/or Spilies Pellanas (major prehistoric site with Hellenistic (?) and Roman (?) finds). (LS ii. 288, gg669; ibid. Gg264; cf. Spyropoulos (1998) and Pikoulas (1999)).

Pausanias’ sanctuary of Asklepios (3.21.2) may be late Classical or post-C4. According to Paus. 3.21.2 (cf. 3.1.4) it was founded by Tyndareos; this could well be a pre-Hellenistic legend.

342. Prasiai (Brasiates) Map 58. Lat. 37.10, long. 22.55. Size of territory: 2? Type: A. (S7). The toponym is Πρασιαί, α’, first in Ar. Παξ 242; Thuc. 2.56.6, 6.105.2; Xen. Hell. 7.2.2–3; Πρασία (Ps.-Skylax 46); Βρασιαί (e.g. Paus. 3.21.7). According to Paus. 3.24.4 its name was Ὄρειαται before the Lakedaimonians took it over; an archaizing or poetic form of that name, Ὅρεοι, appears in the grave epigram IG v.1 723 (SEG 1995 375 or possibly 376). The city-ethnic is Βρασιαίττων (e.g. Paus. 3.24.4; Steph. Byz. 184.10) and Πρασιανός (Strabo 8.6.14; Steph. Byz. 534.17).

Prasiai is called a polis (kai limen) at Ps.-Skylax 46, using polis in the urban sense; Thuc. 2.56.6 twice calls it a πόλις (cf. Flensted-Jensen (1995) 129–31; Hansen (1998) 21, 25), once adding ἐπιθελάςσατον. If IG v.1 723 (supra) refers to it, it is here called patriis.

The territory is termed γῆ by Thuc. 2.56.6. The C7–C5 sanctuary of Apollo Tyratis at the kome of Tyros (11 km north of Plaka), and that of Apollo Maleatas at Kosmas in Mt. Parnon, may both have lain in the territory of Prasiai (unless Tyros was a polis). Thuc. 2.54.6 assigns Prasiai to Lakonike, Ps.-Skylax 46 to Lakedaimon. It also belonged to Kynouria (as indicated by the extent of this area), periodically disputed between Sparta and Argos (Thuc. 5.14.4, 41.2). By C3 it was Argive again (Polyb. 4.36.5; Shipley (2000) 378). Strabo 8.6.2 locates it on the Ἀργολικὸς κόλπος; Pausanias calls the area Lakonike (e.g. 3.23.11).

According to Strabo 8.6.14, Prasiai was one of seven cities in the Kalaurian Amphiktyony, the Lakedaimonians paying their dues on their behalf (presumably after they captured Kynouria in C6m). This perhaps preserves a non-Lakedaimonian ethnic categorization of Prasiai (OCDS 273).

In 430, Prasiai was captured and plundered by the Athenians who also ravaged its territory (Thuc. 2.56.6; cf. Ar. Pux 242); it was raided by Athenian forces twice again later (Thuc. 6.105.2, 7.18.3). In 366, Peloponnesian League troops assembled at Prasiai (Xen. Hell. 7.2.2–3).

Prasiai was 200 stades (37 km) by sea from Kyphanta (no. 335) (Paus. 3.24.3). The town was at Paralia Leonidiou, with an acropolis at Plaka, south of Leonidi, where ancient remains have been found; there has been no systematic investigation of the area. Finds from C3 to Roman are evidence of a nucleated settlement. There are ancient towers and foundations on the acropolis hill between the two har-
200 stades (37 km) from Sparta (it is actually 20–25 km). The probable location is the rounded hill of Palaiogoulas (so Barr.), Laconia Survey site A118 (late Archaic to early Hellenistic; LS ii. 321–23, A118), rather than the nearby mountain-top fortress at Ag. Konstantinos (B111, late Archaic to middle Hellenistic). From archaeological evidence, Sellasia was probably founded in C6m and abandoned in C3 (Catling (2002) 238–40). It was seen in ruins by Pausanias (3.10.7).

A cult of Artemis at Sellasia is implied by Hsch. s.v. Σελασία. A cult of the Dioskouroi in or near Sellasia is indicated by IG v.1 919 (LSAG 200 no. 24; SEG 42 307+ (c.525?)), a votive found near the modern village of Sellasia (formerly Vourlia). IG v.1 920 (SEG 11 889 (C6)) is a votive to an unnamed deity.

344. Side Map 58. Lat. 36.30(?), long. 23.10(?) Size of territory: ? Type: A. (S8): no archaeological site known; ΝΝ354 Velanidia proposed on topographical grounds (Hasluck (1907–8) 174; LS ii. 313, ΝΝ354; Ag. Georgios near Velanidia is supported by Pikoulas (2002) 236). The toponym is Σίδη, η, only in Ps.-Skylax 46; Paus. 3.22.11. A city-ethnic is not attested.

Side is called a polis (in the urban sense) only by Ps.-Skylax 46 (πόλεις καί λιµήν), and retrospectively by Pausanias, who says that it was one of three poleis from which Boia was synoecised in early times (see Boia (no. 327); cf. also Aphroditia (no. 325) and Etis (no. 330)).

Ps.-Skylax 46 lists Side under Lakedaimon. Paus. 3.22.11 says it was named after Side, daughter of Danaos; this could reflect a Classical foundation myth.

345. Sparta (Spartiates)/Lakedaimon (Lakedaimonios) Map 58. Lat. 37.05, long. 22.30. Size of territory: ?. Type: A. Two different toponyms are used for the central settlement of Lakonike:

(1) Σπαρτιάτης, η, (Hom. Il. 2.582; Tyrtaios fr. 4.4; Thgn. 785 = Anon. Megarensis (c.480); Hdt. 1.68.5; Thuc. 1.130.1, 4.3.2; Xen. Hell. 7.1.28; Ps.-Skylax 46; SEG 22 460 post 369); in Doric Σπάρτα (Alc. fr. 360.2, Liberman (Aeolic); Pind. Pyth. 1.77; IG xii.9 286 (c.500–475); ΙvO 160.1 (C46); IG v.2 173.37 (C4m)). Sometimes Homer seems to think of Sparte as an area (Od. 11.460), as does Pherekydes (FGrHist 3) fr. 168 (cf. Oitylos (no. 340)).

(2) Λακεδαίμονις, η (Hdt. 1.82.1), also a word for the region (see supra 570). It was already the name of the settlement in the late Bronze Age (Hall (2000)). Lakedaimon, probably in the sense of the city of Sparta, includes the Amyklaion (treaty quoted at Thuc. 5.18.10). For Lakedaimon (without πόλεις) as probably meaning the town, see Pind. Pyth. 4.49; Hdt. 1.82.1; Thuc. 1.43.1; Xen. Hell. 2.3.8; IG iv.2.1 122.xxi.1 (C45); Polyb. 8.33.8. In a C4th dedication by a Lakedaimonian victor at Olympia (Syll. 3 1067 = ΙvO 171, 316), Lakedaimon is said to be 660 stades (121 km) from Olympia, which should refer to the city of Sparta rather than its territory. See further Hall (2000) 78–79.

Sometimes the two seem to be combined for variety’s sake: Maiandrians sail “to Lakedaimon” (though this could be the region) and meets Kleomenes who is “ruling Sparta” (Hdt. 3.148.1). At other times the distinction seems deliberate: if Dorieus had remained in Sparta, he would have been king of Lakedaimon (Hdt. 5.48). On other occasions the variation seems to have no special significance: the kings may rule in Sparta (Hdt. 1.65.1) or in Lakedaimon (Hdt. 1.67.1); Ainesias is ephor in Sparta (Thuc. 2.2.1), Pleistolas in Lakedaimon (Thuc. 5.25.1).

The city-ethnic also has two versions:

(1) Σπαρτιάτης (Thuc. 1.128.3, 2.25.2; Xen. Hell. 3.3.5, 7.4.19); Doric Σπάρτιάτας (LSAG 446 no. 16a (c.550); ΙvO 263 (C6); ΙvO 244 (C6/C5e)); Ionic Σπαρτιάτης (Hdt. 8.42.2, 9.54.2).

(2) Λακεδαίμονις (Pind. Pyth. 4.257; Hdt. 1.6.2; Thuc. 1.6.4; Xen. Hell. 1.2.18; SEG 11 1180a (C6f); SEG 26 476 (C6); ΙvO 247 (C6/C5e)); ML 22 (490–480), no. 67 (c.427); IG ii2 43.A.9 (378/7)).

Σπαρτιατής denotes only the citizens of Sparta, the dominant polis. Λακεδαίμονις strictly denotes all Lakedaimonians (Spartans and perioikoi), but today it is often translated as if Greek authors used it as a synonym for “Spartans”. This misconception may be based partly on the false premiss that the perioikoi were treated almost as badly as helots. It is, of course, true that the Spartans held almost all decision-making power in Lakonike, and when Thuc. 1.10.2 comments on the underdeveloped physical urban form of the “polis of the Lakedaimonians”, he certainly means the town of Sparta. Sparta was the dominant political community, purporting to speak for all Lakedaimonians; this may be why “Lakedaimonians” often appears to denote the Spartans. This need not be true in every case, however. When Simonides, in his epigram on Thermopylai (Hdt. 7.228.2), asks the passer-by to take a message to “the Lakedaimonians”, he may mean what he says. The same consideration may apply to Thucydides’ statements that the Lakedaimonians do not make their allies pay tribute but favour oligarchies (1.19.1), and that it was Lakedaimonian fear of growing Athenian power that led to war (1.24.5). A telling pairing of the two ethnics is at Thuc. 1.128.3, where King Pausanias ὁ Λακεδαίμων is sent for by the
The claim to "speak for Lakonike" may explain why a Spartan abroad is usually called *Lakedaimonios*, the only epigraphic exception being the lion dedicated to Hera in Samos by Eumnastos Spartiates (Dunst (1972) 140–44; LSAG 2 446 no. 16a (c.550)). On the other hand, there are no demonstrable examples of “Lakedaimonios” being used as the ethnic of an individual *perioikos* as far as we know, he is always called by the ethnic of his own *polis* (e.g. Gytheates, Oinountios; Hansen (1996) 185 and n. 96; Shipley (1997) 209). Therefore, when we encounter *Lakedaimonios individual* we can probably assume it means a Spartan. Thus, in IG xii.5 542, a C4M catalogue of *proxenoi* from (presumably) Karthaia (no. 492), while three citizens of periokic *poleis* of *Lakonike* are listed with their city-ethnics (20–22), a *Lakedaimonios* is also catalogued (18), and he ought to be a Spartan, as though the two Lakedaimonians attested as Eilean *proxenoi* in C6 (SEG 11 1180a (C6f); SEG 26 476 (C6)) and the Lakedaimonian sculptor who signed *Corinth* viii.3 15 (C5–C4e).

The short form *Δάκων* (SEG 31 559 (369/8); Arist. *Pol*. 1271b28) is less common. It is sometimes used in poetic and colloquial contexts (Ar. *Ach*. 305; Hdt. 1.68.2) or for variety. It seems to be interchangeable with *Lakedaimonios*, but can be applied specifically to *Spartiati* (Xen. *An*. 2.1.3, 5, 5.31) as well as to Lakedaimonians in general (cf. Xen. *An*. 5.1.15, where it is applied to a man explicitly described as being a *perioikos*).

Both *Sparte* and *Lakedaimon* are described as a *polis*.

(1) *Sparte*: A rare, perhaps unique, epigraphic description of Sparta as a *polis* is in Tod 204 (καὶ ὅπως ἀναστήσω Λάκων ὁδὸς ὁδὸς Σπάρτην ... ὁδὸς τῶν ἄλλων πόλεων οὐδεμίαν), where the political sense may also be present. For the Archaic period we have Tyrtaios fr. 4.4, West, with connotations of state and perhaps country; frt. 8 and 10 seem to use *polis* in the political sense. Hdt. 7.234.2 combines the urban and political senses of *polis* with a reference to Lakedaimon the district, and includes the *polis* of *Sparte* within Lakedaimon (ἐστι ἐν τῇ Λακεδαιμονίῳ Σπάρτη πόλει). Ps.-Skylax 46 implicitly includes *Sparte* among the inland *poleis* of Lakedaimon. Couplings of *πόλις* in the urban sense with *Σπαρτιάται* occurs at Xen. *Hell*. 6.5.28: οἱ δὲ Σπαρτιάται ἄτείχισαν ἔχοντες τὴν πόλιν and 7.5.11: ἐν τῇ πόλει τῶν Σπαρτιάτων. Whereas the urban sense of *polis* is somewhat rare, the political sense occurs somewhat more frequently (e.g. Xen. *Lac*. 1.1, cf. 10.4). Phrases combining *πόλις* and *Σπαρτιάται* occur more often (Thuc. 1.132.1; Anaximenes, *Ars rhetorica* 24.3; *Isoc. Hel*. 63, *Panath*. 41, 65; Arist. *Pol*. 1271b11). There seem to be no examples of Sparta or the *Spartiati* being described as a *polis* in the rarer territorial sense, unless Tyrt. fr. 4 (supra) or Thuc. 5.63.4 (ἀπάγειν στρατιῶν ἕκ τῆς πόλεως) are examples.

(2) *Lakedaimon*: Lakedaimon is never explicitly called a *polis* in the urban sense, though *Λακεδαίμονων* on its own often clearly denotes the city (e.g. the Corinthians deliver a speech ἐν Λακεδαιμονίῳ (Thuc. 1.43.1)) and Ἡ Λακεδαιμονίων πόλις in the urban sense is found at Thuc. 1.10.2; note also that at *Aen*. Tact. 2.2 the ethnic Λακεδαιμονίων is coupled with πόλισσα (cf. Flensted-Jensen (1995) 129). However, at Pl. *Leg*. 683D *polis* is used about Lakedaimon primarily in the urban sense (τρεῖς πόλεις κατοικίζειν, Ἀργος, Μεσσήνη, Λακεδαίμων; cf. Hansen (2000) 178), but the political sense is a connotation, and the reference is to the mythical period. Lakedaimon is also called a *polis* in the political sense (Xen. *Hell*. 5.2.32; cf. 5.3.25, 4.23; *Lac*. 9.4; Pl. *Resp*. 599D; *Isoc. Paneg*. 64). The phrase “*polis* of the Lakedaimonians” in the political sense also occurs at Thuc. 5.23.2, where the text of a treaty couples “the Lakedaimonians and Athenians” as τώ Βόλεις; cf. 8.2.3; Xen. *Hell*. 2.1.14, 3.5.6; Arist. *Eth. Nic*. 1180a25; *CIL* 11 4.11.48, 360). Sometimes, when *Λακεδαίμονων* is not called a *polis*, the name possibly refers to the wider *polis* embracing *Spartiati* and *perioikoi* (Thuc. 5.28.2). Apparently, *Λακεδαίμονων* is not described as a *polis* in the territorial sense. For *Λακεδαίμονων*, Thuc. 8.40.2 provides a probable example (there are more slaves in Chios than in any *polis* except that of the Lakedaimonians). Lakedaimon is also called an ἔθνος in the sense of an ethnic territory containing *poleis* (Ps.-Skylax 46: Λακεδαίμων ἔθνος ... καὶ πόλεις ἐν αὐτῇ, including Sparta itself). For the periokic *poleis* see Hdt. 7.234.2: Λακεδαιμονίων ... πόλεις πολλαί (perioikoi and Spartans together); *Isoc. Anon*. 7: Λακεδαιμονίων ... ἐκ φαίλων καὶ τασείων πόλεων; Ps.-Skylax 46: εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλαι πολλαὶ πόλεις Λακεδαιμονίων.

Without being explicitly coupled with *Sparte* or *Lakedaimon* the urban sense of *polis* occurs at Hdt. 6.58.1, Thuc. 1.134.1; Xen. *Hell*. 3.3.10–11; *Isoc*. 5.48; the political sense occurs at Xen. *Hell*. 1.6.5, 3.3.4, 4.2.9.

The term *πολίτης* is applied to Spartans (Hdt. 6.85.2, 9.35.1) and Lakedaimonians (Xen. *Hell*. 5.4.13, 7.4.20, 21; *Aeschin*. 1.180). Without being explicitly coupled with *Spartiati* or Lakedaimonians, *polítai* occurs at Xen. *Hell*. 5.4.28, 23.6.4.26.

There are many references to the *πολιτεία* of the Lakedaimonian or Spartan state. Sometimes it is that of the
Spartiatai (Isoc. Panath. 109), much more often that of the Lakedaimonion (Thuc. 1.18.1; Xen. Hell. 2.3.34; Arist. Pol. 1269a29). Λακεδαιμονίων πολιτεία was the title of works by Xenophon (Lac.), Kritias (DK no. 88 fr. 6–9, 32–37), and Aristotle (frs. 539–51). Occasionally πολιτεία is linked with Λακεδαιμίων (Pl. Leg. 712D). We also find ἡ Λακωνική πολιτεία (Arist. Pol. 1272b33) and ἡ Λακώνων πολιτεία (Ephor. fr. 118 apud Strabo 8.5.5).

The verb πολιτεύομαι is used in laudatory accounts of the Lakedaimonian constitution (Isoc. 3.24; Dem. 20.105). The terms τὸ πολιτικόν (Xen. Hell. 4.4.19) and οἱ πολιτικοί (Xen. Hell. 7.1.28) are used to distinguish Lakedaimonian (including perioikic) forces from those of the allies. Polyb. 6.45.3 refers to τῆς πολιτικῆς χώρας, “the land divided among the citizens” (see Hodkinson (1986) 385).

Sparte is called an asy in Thgn. 785 = Anon. Megarensis (c.480, Hdt. 7.220.4); and Simon. fr. 11.29, West²; ἄστοι occurs at Hdt. 6.57.2, 61.2 (cf. Hansen (1997) 10–11).

Sparta was called patris in IG xi1.29 286 (Eretria, C6) and Xen. Lac. 1.2 and πατρὶς πόλιν περὶ ὧν is in Simon. fr. 11.32, West². Lakedaimon is called “the akropolis of Greece” and patris in Lysander’s monument commemorating the battle of Aigost potamoi (ML 95c; SEG 33 439; F.DelphesIII 1.50). Cf. Xen. Hell. 7.1.30 (patris) and Hdt. 9.76.1 (patre).

The different uses of the two city-ethnic terms are found as follows.

1. Spartiates: internally, Spartiates is not attested in the Archaic or Classical periods. The external individual use is found in LSAG 446 no. 164 (c.570) and IV O 263 (C6) (Dunst 1972 140–44); and in Hdt. 7.226.1, 8.42.2; Thuc. 2.66.2, 4.11.2; Xen. Hell. 5.4.39, 7.1.25; An. 4.8.25. The external collective use is found in IV O 244 (= LSAG 199 no. 10 (C6P?)); and in Hdt. 1.65.4, 6.7.1; Thuc. 1.28.3, 132.1; Xen. Hell. 3.3.5, 4.3.23, 6.5.21.

2. Lakedaimonios is much more common than Spartiates. The internal collective use occurs in the list of contributions to the “Spartan” war fund (IG v.1 1; ML 67, with SEG 39 370+; 44 342; LSAG 201 no. 55 and Matthaiou and Pikoula 1989). Loomis (1992) (C5/G4) and the treaty with the Aitoloi/Eradeis (ML 67 bis (c.426?); cf. IG v.1 219.2 (C5)). The external individual use (on which see supra) is found in C6 SEG 11 1180a (C6f) and 29 408+ (LSAG 199 no. 20; Olympia (c.C6s)); in C5 in SEG 28 724 (Eretria, C5l) and IG x1.2 161.B.59 (Delos), votive by Ἀνασάνθρος Λακεδαιμονίου (Lysander was a mothax, see supra 570); and in C4 in Tod 135 (367); IG xi.5 542.18 (Cam). The external collective use is found in ML 22 (c.490–80); IV O 247 (C5e); IG i1 522, 425; F.Delphes III 1.4 462.A.3 (375/4); CID II 4.11.48 (360); Hdt. 1.6.3; Thuc. 5.77.1 (certainly equivalent to Spartiatai here); Xen. Hell. 1.2.18. Coupled with the wider ethnic “Dorian” it occurs in CID II 32.43. Διωριτέων Διοικήσεως Λακωνίων (C4l). For the use of the variant ethnic Lakon, see SEG 31 559 (Delphi, 369–368), weapons captured from LAKΩΝΩΝ, the external individual use is found in Xen. An. 2.1.5, 5.31.

The territory, when referred to as ge or chor in prose, is always that of the Lakedaimonians (Thuc. 8.58.3; Xen. Hell. 6.5.24; Ps.-Skylax 46; F.Delphes III 1.6, 369), never of the Spartans. Between C6s and 371 Sparta controlled two-fifths of the Peloponnese (Thuc. 11.10.2), an area of c.8,500 km² (Cartledge (1979) 7). (For Lakedaimon the region, and for Lakonike, see Introduction).

The Eurotas valley, or without the hills of Vardounia and the coastal plain of Helos including Gytheion (no. 333) to its west, has sometimes been considered the Spartan “core territory”. Even if such an entity was not juridically defined or precisely bounded (which it may have been), it seems likely that Sparta had a contiguous territory which was ringed by those of perioikic polis. In the Classical period it would have been bounded on the north by those of Pellana (no. 341) (Plut. Agis 8.1) and Sellasia (no. 343), on the east by that of Geronthrai (no. 332), to the south perhaps by that of Gytheion, and on the west by the crest of Taygetos and/or the area known as Dentheliatis. The Archaic and Classical territory of Sparta proper amounted to c.270 km², of which almost half was prime arable land (Catling (2002)). There are no ancient references to the so-called Spartiatike ge, a fragment of modern scholarship. Instead, post-Classical authors refer to “the land belonging to the asy” (Plut. Lyc. 8.5) or “the civic land” (πολιτικὴ γῆ: Polyb. 6.45.3; see MacDowell (1986) 91–92; Hodkinson (1986) 385).

Notoriously, the Spartan land economy was based on extraction. The Spartans expropriated a large part of the agricultural produce of helot cultivators, mostly in Messenia but also in Laconia (Tyrt. fr. 6–7 apud Paus. 4.14.5; Myron (FGHist 106) fr. 2 apud Ath. 657d; Plut. Lyc. 24.2; Mor. 239D–E). Their farms were allegedly assigned as kleroi (plots) to individual Spartiates from which to draw their contributions to the communal moneys (syssitia). Lykourgos was believed to have allocated 9,000 kleroi to the Spartiates and 30,000 to the perioikoi (Plut. Lyc. 8.5). The Spartans supposedly held equal kleroi from the state (possibly called “the ancient portion”, Heracl. Lemb. 12; or “the ancienly distributed portion”, Plut. Mor. 238E); but Hodkinson (2000) argues that it is the helots’ tribute, and doubts that the kleros system existed.
Spartiate numbers probably peaked in C5e; they may have increased after new farmland was opened up in C6m (Catling (2002) 210–11). Referring to 480, Hdt. 7.23.2 makes Damaratos say that the polis of Sparta contains approximately 8,000 men—possibly the only remotely reliable estimate of total Spartan numbers. At Plataiai in 479 there were 5,000 Spartans (Hdt. 9.28.2), perhaps formally two-thirds of the total levy (Cartledge (1979) 207–8). Arist. Pol. 1270a36–38 reports that there were “once” 10,000 Spartiates. According to Diod. 11.63.1–2, the earthquake of c.465 and subsequent shocks killed more than 20,000 Lakedaimonians, but this is no basis for reliable statistics (Cartledge (1979) 218, 222). In 480, the total population in citizen families may have been c.35,000–40,000 (Cartledge (1979) 222). At Nemea in 394, there were some 6,000 Lakedaimonian hoplites (Xen. Hell. 4.2.16). At Leuktra in 371, there were only 700 Spartiates (Xen. Hell. 6.4.15), plus half as many left at home (6.4.17), suggesting a total Spartan class of c.1,050. On the causes of the decline in Spartan numbers, commonly called “oligarchy”, see Hodkinson (1986), (2000) 406–23.

The Lakedaimonians were the leaders of the Hellenic League which defeated the Persian invasion of 480–479 (Thuc. 1.18.2; ML 27 coil 2; Brunt (1953)). They were likewise the leaders of the “Peloponnesian League” (a modern name), referred to in our sources as “the Lakedaimonians and the allies” (Thuc. 1.108.1) or “the Peloponnesians” (Thuc. 1.1.1). This system of alliances, often one-sided, probably came into being during C6 and functioned until the League was dissolved after the Spartans’ defeat at Leuktra (371), which caused the loss of most of Messenia and some of the perioikoi. (These alliances did not involve the perioikoi; as members of the Lakedaimonian polis, they and the Spartans formed a single party in treaties.) In 506 the Corinthians (no. 227) showed that allies could restrain Sparta, causing an expedition to be halted (Hdt. 5.91–93). Soon after, c.504, decision-making procedures were regularised (Cartledge (1979) 147–48). On the League, see Cartledge (2002); Salmon (1984) ch. 17; Gschntzer (1978).

There are many references to the Lakedaimonian–Peloponnesian alliance (e.g. Thuc. 1.108.1) and to other alliances made by the Lakedaimonians (e.g. Staatsverträge II nos. 112, 144, etc.). An important epigraphic example from Sparta, dating from perhaps 460–380, is the treaty between the Lakedaimonians and the Aitolian Erxadeis (ML 67 bis (p. 312); SEG 26 461, 42 308+; LSAG 447g, 448), which contains the key phrase ἡσσομένοι οἱ ἰθαγενεῖς καὶ Λακεδαίμονες, ἡγαίονται (for similar formulations, see Hdt. 1.151.3; Xen. Hell. 2.2.20, 4.6.2, 5.3.26; Lac. 15.2; Isoc. 12.180). When a treaty or alliance involves Sparta, the contracting party is the Ἀκαδαιμίων: I.Dél. 6–7 fr. a.1 (402–399): ἡ Λῆψε γά τέλε τῶν Ἀκαδαιμίων; Thuc. 5.18.1: ἔποιήσαντο Ἡθηναίοι καὶ Λακεδαίμονες καὶ ξέ φημιαν.

Exiles are attested at Thuc. 5.72.1; Xen. Hell. 1.1.32, An. 1.1.9; and Theopomp. fr. 240.

The Spartans, with the Lakedaimonians, enjoyed the greatest military reputation of any hoplite army from the late Archaic period until their catastrophic defeat by the Thebans at Boiotian Leuktra in 371. On the Serpent Column celebrating victory over Xerxes, the Lakedaimonians head the list of Greek allies (ML 27). As in other matters, it is generally as Lakedaimonians, not Spartans, that the army takes the field (Hdt. 6.72.1; Thuc. 2.66.1, 5.33.1; Xen. An. 7.6.1; cf. IG i3 86.d–g.14; IG ii2 107.43 (368/7)), and indeed the shield badge was often Λ for Λακεδαίμονες (Eupolis fr. 359, Kock; Theopomp. fr. 402; cf. Xen. Hell. 4.4.10, 7.5.20; see further Lazenby (1985) 30); booty is taken from the Lakedaimonians (Ivo 247; LSAG 182 no. 4 (c.C5m?); Bauslaugh (1990); IG i3 522, 425; F.Delphes 111.4 462.A.3 (375/4)); Leuktra was remembered as a Lakedaimonian defeat (Parian Chronicle of 264/3: IG xii.5 444; Tod 205.84). It is possible that in practice each of the five divisions, lochoi, of the hoplite army was recruited primarily from one oba of the polis (infra), without there being any formal link (Singor (1999) 74–75). Chief command of the land army was normally held by one or both kings; that of the navy in the Classical period by a nauarchos (Thuc. 2.66.2; Xen. Hell. 1.5.1), sometimes with an epistoleus, secretary (Hell. 2.1.7). Further details of Spartan military organisation and its chronological development may be found in Lazenby (1985) and Sekunda and Hook (1998).

The perioikoi were integral to the army; at Plataiai there were 10,000 Lakedaimonians, of whom only half were Spartans (Hdt. 9.28.2). Until the late Classical period, however, they were probably brigaded separately from Spartiates (Lazenby (1985) 15–16). At times they exercised command in the navy (Thuc. 8.22.1). Helots also normally served: Hdt. 9.10.1 says that at Plataiai there were seven helots to each Spartan (no doubt an exaggeration; see further Hunt (1998) 33–39).

Spartans of military age were required to reside in the city (Xen. Lac. 5; Plut. Lyc. 15.3–4), but their private farms were presumably spread all over the core territory of Lakedaimon and probably the whole of Lakonike, perhaps their families resided there.

Envos are regularly sent to and from Lakedaimon or the Lakedaimonians, not Sparta or the Spartans (though see
Citizenship is attested prior to the Persian War by Hdt. 7.1.139.3; IG II² 106.7 (368/7); (d) from the Lakedaimonians: Ktesias (FGrHist 688) T 7, cf. fr. 30; Dem. 20.73; Arist. Ath. Pol. 32.3; (c) from Lakedaimon: Thuc. 1.139.3; IG II² 106.7 (368/7); (b) to the Lakedaimonians: Ktesias (FGrHist 688) T 7, cf. fr. 30; Dem. 20.73; Arist. Ath. Pol. 32.3; (c) from Lakedaimon: Thuc. 1.139.3; IG II² 106.7 (368/7); (d) from the Lakedaimonians: Hdt. 7.1.139.3; Thuc. 1.128.1; Xen. Hell. 5.4.22; Ktesias (FGrHist 688) T 7. The Lakedaimonians acted as arbitrators between Elis (no. 251) and Lepreon (no. 306) in 421 (Thuc. 5.31.4).

Proxenia, too, is conducted in the name of the Lakedaimonians. For proxenoí of the Lakedaimonians in other poleis, see e.g. Thuc. 3.52.5 (Plataiai (no. 216)); 5.43.2 (Athens (no. 361)); 5.59.5 (Argos (no. 347)); Xen. Hell. 5.4.22 (Athens); 6.1.3 (Pharsalos (no. 413)). For Lakedaimonal acting as proxenoí of other poleis, see SEG 11 180a (LSAG 199 no. 15 (C6f) (Elis (no. 251)); SEG 26 467 (C6f) (Elis); IG XI 5 542.18 (Karthaia (no. 492) (C4m)); Thuc. 5.76.3 (Argos). According to Hdt. 6.57.2, it was a royal privilege to appoint Spartans (astoi) to act as proxenoí of foreign states (Cartledge (1987) 108, 245–46); however, grants of proxenoi to Lakedaimonians by foreign poleis are attested, e.g. IG II² 106.14 (368/7).

Citizenship grants may have been enacted by allowing the sons of favoured xenoi, such as Xenophon (Diog. Laert. 2.54), to proceed through the agoge and join the Lakedaimonian army (cf. the τρόφιμοι of Xen. Hell. 5.3.9). Poor Spartans could be sponsored through the upbringings (cf. Introduction). At times of crisis even helots might be offered citizenship in return for military service (Thuc. 4.80.3, 5.34.2; Xen. Hell. 6.5.28–29); some were selected for elevation to the citizen body as νεοδαµώδεις (Thuc. 7.19.3, 8.5.1; Xen. Hell. 3.3.4), presumably as members of the Lakedaimonian damos rather than the Spartan. A grant of citizenship is attested prior to the Persian War by Hdt. 9.35.1.

In later political theory the Spartan constitution was famously “balanced”, containing elements of monarchy, oligarchy and democracy through the combination of kingship, council and popular assembly. To these were added five ephors elected annually by shooting. This constitution—the renowned eunomia—and the social organisation that went with it were attributed to Lykourgos, who, if he was not wholly legendary, may have enacted reforms in C7ε (Forrest (1980) 55–58). (On Archaic developments see Hodkinson (1997).) The Great Rhetra, of which a seemingly genuine (C7ε?) text in early Doric has come down to us (Plut. Lyc. 6), established (or recognised) the phylai and obai (tribes and villages), the gerousia, or council of elders (twenty-eight plus the two kings), and an apella or assembly of Spartan citizens. The phylai (civic tribes) may have been the standard Dorian ones: Pamphyloi, Hylleis, and Dymanes (Tyrt. fr. 19, West; Jones, POAG 118). The peculiar social practices of Classical Sparta, however, were perhaps partly “reinstitutionalizations” (Finley (1981)) of traditional customs, given new meaning c.C6m in order to strengthen Sparta’s military security.

The C4 Athenian orator Lykourgos was able to produce a text of a Spartan law (Lec. 129), so at least some laws were written down. New laws probably required the initial backing of an ephor, after which they were discussed by the gerousia and only then by the assembly (MacDowell (1986) 6–7). In the Archaic and Classical periods the Spartans inscribed few public documents, but important examples include the list of war contributions and the treaty with the Erxadicis, both cited above. A stele recording a treaty with Athens is to be put up at the Amyklaoi (rather than Sparta), according to Thuc. 5.18.10 (cf. 5.23.6). Possibly the earliest preserved decree of the Lakedaimonians is a C3 resolution in Doric dialect granting asylia to Kos (SEG 12 371 (Kos, 242), beginning Λακεδαιμιονίων δόγμα. It avoids, perhaps deliberately, the wordy formulas of normal Hellenistic decrees. Cf. Thuc. 5.77.

Spartan civic order was famously stable (Thuc. 1.18.1), but the accounts of the foundation of its colony at Taras (no. 71) in C8l include references to instability and stasis (Antiichos (FGrHist 555) fr. 13; Arist. Pol. 1306b31).

On trial procedures and punishments, see MacDowell (1986) 135–50. Hdt. 6.57.4–5 states that the kings adjudicated cases concerning heiresses (cf. Hodkinson (2000) 94–95), adoption and public roads. Arist. Pol. 1285b6–7 adds religious matters. Beyond that, the extent of kings’ functions is debatable (MacDowell (1986) 123–26; see supra on proxenoí). The gerousia was the ultimate capital court for Spartiatai (Xen. Lac. 10.2; cf. Arist. Pol. 1294b33–34, 1275b10). Ephors could perhaps impose the death penalty on periokoi (Isoc. 12.181), no doubt after due process. They probably did so upon the rebel Kinadon, apparently an inferior (Xen. Hell. 3.3.11). Probably the assembly did not try cases except those involving disputed royal succession, and then not automatically (MacDowell (1986) 133–35. A death sentence against a king is attested by Xen. Hell. 3.5.25 (on trials of kings, see de Ste Croix (1972) 350–53).

The eponymous official was the ephoros (IG v.1 213.66, 73–74, 81, 90 (C55 or C46), 1228; Thuc. 2.2.1), who acted as chairman (Sherk (1990) 241–43) of the board of five (Arist. Pol. 1272a6). According to tradition, the high office of ephoros was instituted by Lykourgos (Hdt. 1.65.6) or by King Theopompos (Arist. Pol. 1313a26ff). Ephors are attested in
manumission _stelai_ from Tainaron, e.g. IG v.1 1228–33 (C3l–C4e). The ephors were elected annually ἐκ τοῦ δήµου παντῶς (Arist. _Pol._ 1270b7–8; see Rahe (1980); Rhodes (1981)). The ephors’ official residence was the _ephoreion_ (Xen. _Ages._ 1.36).

The council was called _γεροντία_ (Dem. 20.107; Arist. _Pol._ 1270b24, 1272b37; Ar. _Lys._ 980 has _γερωντία_; Xen. _Lac._ 10.3 calls it _γερωντία_). It was composed of thirty members who held tenure for life and acted as the probouleumatic body: the two kings were members _ex officio_, and the remaining twenty-eight members were chosen by the assembly from among citizens above the age of 60 (Pl. _Leg._ 691D–692A; Plut. _Lyc._ 26; Michell (1952) 135–40).

The post of _kytherodikes_, magistrate in charge of Kythera (no. 336), was probably a special institution; there is no evidence that Sparta appointed _harmostai_ as governors of _peri-oikic polis_ in the normal course of events (Cartledge (1979) 179; MacDowell (1986) 28–30). The existence of lesser magistrates seems certain from Xen. _Lac._ 8.3.

The existence of an assembly is attested already in the Great Rhetra (Plut. _Lyc._ 6.2). Meetings of the assembly are attested in Thuc. 6.88.18 (cf. 1.67.3, 87.1) and Xen. _Hell._ 2.2.19, 3.2.23, 5.2.11, etc. (Andrewes (1966) 6). The assembly was presided over by the ephorate (Thuc. 1.87.1–2; Andrewes (1966) 13–14). In Thuc. 5.77.1, a treaty with Argos voted by the assembly, the name is _ἐκκλησία_ τῶν Ἀκαδημαύων (cf. Thuc. 1.87.2, 5.34.1; Aeschin. 1.180). Its early epichoric name was possibly _apella_ (Plut. _Lyc._ 6.2), but see de Ste Croix (1972) 346–7. In Xen. _Hell._ 3.3.8 is a unique reference to ἣ μικρά καλουμένη _ἐκκλησία_.

The city of Sparta is 48 km from the sea, further than most major _polis_. Its location is modern Sparti. The low _acropolis_ (now Paliakastro), “standing out to no conspicuous height” (Paus. 3.17.1), overlooks the northern end of the town. The layout of the town is increasingly well understood (Cartledge (1979) 102–29; Raftopoulou (1998); Kourinou (2000)). In Classical and even Hellenistic times the city had no regular street plan (Raftopoulou (1998) 127). It was, as Thucydides famously remarked (1.10.2), an unimpressive urban entity, discontinuously settled (κατὰ κώμας; cf. Hansen (1997) 34–35), but apparently somewhat densely built up in the 360s (Aen. _Tact._ 2.2). Only the completion of the city wall paved the way for the infilling of the _asty_ (probably from _C3l_ on: Kourinou (2000) 59–60, 277). Sparta comprised four neighbouring villages: Pitana in the northern and north-western part of the city, Limnai to the east, Mesoa in the south and south-west, and Kynosoura (Konooura, Konosoura) in the south-east (Kourinou (2000) 89–95, 279–80). (Xenophon mentions rich houses on the east bank of the Eurotas, _Hell._ 6.5.27; cf. 7.5.11.) A fifth village, Amyklai, lay c.6 km south at modern Amykles and included the sanctuary of Apollo Hyakinthios. These probably corresponded to the five Classical _obai_ (civic subdivisions) of the _polis_ (on which see Wade-Gery (1958) and Lazebny (1985) 51–52). The main roads and gates have been traced in part (Kourinou (2000) 67–75, 131–54, 277–78), as have the bridges across the Eurotas and its tributaries (Armstrong, Cavanagh and Shipley (1992); superseded by Kourinou (2000) 77–88, 278–79). The agora (Xen. _Hell._ 3.3.5; Paus. 3.11.2–11), once thought to lie east or south-east of the acropolis (Cartledge and Spawforth (1989) 128), has now been placed on its summit (Kourinou (2000) 109–14, 281). The C5 Persian _stoa_ (Paus. 3.11.3) built to celebrate the victory over Xerxes may have lain on the north-western side of the agora (Kourinou (2000) 278). The famous C6m Skias was designed by Theodoros of Samos (Paus. 3.12.10). The excavated “Round Building”, sometimes thought to be the Skias, is now tentatively dated C3/C2 and identified as the Choros (Paus. 3.11.9), successor to an earlier structure or space where the _Gymnopaidiai_ took place (Kourinou (2000) 114–27, 281). _Palaistrai_ are referred to at Pl. _Th._ 162B.

The Archaic and Classical town of Sparta was without a city wall (Xen. _Hell._ 6.5.28), a fact which contributed to Spartans’ military reputation (Lys. 33.7). They apparently built a rudimentary one in 317 under the threat of invasion from Cassander (Just. _Epit._ 14.5.5, 7), though this is not archaeologically confirmed. The C3e ditches and palisades (Paus. 1.13.6; Plut. _Pyrrh._ 27.5; Polyb. 5.19.4) were expanded into walls with a circuit of 48 stades (Polyb. 9.26a.2), enclosing c.209 ha (Cartledge and Spawforth (1989) 133). (For details of the walls, see Kourinou (2000) 35–66.)

Burials took place at the margin of each of the four main _obai_ and thus within the “urban” area, continuing for several generations after the single city wall was built in C3. The earliest burials are thus evidence for the boundaries of the _obai_ (Kourinou (2000) 215–19, 283–84). One C6e–C5m cemetery contained two-storey tombs (Raftopoulou (1998) 134–35).

There is little evidence for the Classical management of water-supply and drainage before C3, only some C4 drains in different _obai_ (Kourinou (2000) 229–33, 284–85).

The Rhetra of Epitadeus, alleged by Plut. _Agis_ 5.2–4 (cf. Arist. _Pol._ 1270b15–34) to be a C5 decree allowing land to be disposed by will, is probably fictitious (Hodkinson (1986) 389–91, (2000) 90–94). Spartans could certainly acquire and dispose of private land; on the mechanisms of inheritance, notably the effects of partible transmission, see MacDowell.
(1986) 89–110; Hodkinson (1986), (2000). Sparta differed from many *poleis* in permitting women to own and bequeath land; Arist. *Pol.* 1.276*15–34* estimates that in his day two-fifths of the land belonged to them. (On other aspects of women’s life in Sparta, see Cartledge (1981); Schaps (1979); MacDowell (1986) 71–88.) Some land in *perioikikia* was assigned to the kings (Xen. *Lac.* 15.3). Land in *Lakonike* was sometimes granted to homeless groups of outsiders: at Methone (no. 319) to Nauplians (Paus. 4.24.4, 27.8), at Messenian Asine (no. 313) to the Argive Asinaians (Paus. 4.8.3, 14.3, 27.8, 34.9), and at Thyrea (no. 346) to the Aiginetans (Thuc. 2.27.2, 4.57.1, 3). We do not know whether in such a case the perioikikia community in question was consulted, but it is possible.

Spartan citizens made regular contributions in kind to the common *messeis* (*sysitia*) (Arist. *Pol.* 1.271*26–37, 1272*13–15; Hodkinson (2000) 190–99), and probably paid the cost of their sons’ education (Ducat (1999) 48). A system of *eisphora* is mentioned (and criticised) by Arist. *Pol.* 1.271*11–15* (Hodkinson (2000) 189–90). It is disputed whether the *perioikoi* paid taxes; the account of Efor. fr. 117 (*apud* Strabo 8.5.4) is not creditworthy (but see Hodkinson (2000) 188, 190). Helots, of course, paid a fixed proportion of their agricultural produce, or a fixed amount, to the Spartan state. On the realities of wealth and property in Classical Sparta, which recent research suggests was closer to “normal” Greek societies than previously thought, Hodkinson (2000) supersedes previous studies.

Despite the notorious secrecy of Sparta (Thuc. 5.68.2) and periodic expulsions of aliens (Ar. *Av.* 1012–13; Thuc. 1.144.2, 2.39.1), foreigners did reside there: Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.6 refers to *xenoi* “visiting Lakedaimon” (επιθυμεῖν ἐν Λακεδαίμονι; cf. Hodkinson (2000) 337 with n. 6).

The Lakedaimonians were proverbially pious (on cults see Wide (1893); Ziehen (1929); Parker (1989)). The *Diokouroi* were among the most popular heroes. At Sparta, cult worship was also paid to Leukippides, Lykourgos, Agamemnon, Orestes, Talthybios and the ephor Chilon. The major festivals were devoted to Apollo: the Karneia (Hdt. 7.206.1, 8.73; Gymnopaidia(i) (Thuc. 5.82.2, 3; Xen. *Hell.* 6.4.16); and Hyakinthia (Hdt. 9.11.1). Important Archaic and Classical cult places include the temple of Athena Chalkioikos, built on the acropolis by Gitiadas (Paus. 3.17.2; Dickens (1906–7); on Gitiadas, see Romano (1980) 129–32: he may have been active 6th c.). That of Athena Poliachos was the premier intra-urban cult site, shared by all five *obai* (Cartledge (1979) 55, 106). At the edge of the city, beside the river Eurotas, was the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia (first temple c.700, second c.575–560; Dawkins (1929); Boardman (1963)). Other sanctuaries identified from archaeological evidence include those of Athena Alea (Xen. *Hell.* 6.5.27), Artemis Agrotera (converted to or combined with Artemis Kyparissia *C3*), Poseidon Tainarios and the Phoibaion (Hdt. 6.61.3; on these see Kourinou (2000) 155–213). There was another important cult of Apollo at Thornax just north of the city (Paus. 3.10.8; probably LS site H145, Geladari).

On a ridge overlooking the south-eastern part of the city across the Eurotas stands the Menelaion, or sanctuary of Menelaos and Helen, established c.700 near the site of a late Bronze Age mansion; the third Menelaion dates from C5e (Cartledge (1979) 120–21, 155). At Amyklai, Bathylkes of Magnesia built the temple of Apollo known as the Amyklaiion, where important public documents were lodged (Thuc. 5.18.11; Paus. 3.18.9; Tomlinson (1992)). Its colossal Archaic statue of Apollo, some 15 m high, was a key monument in Laconia (Parker (1989) 146). Amyklai was one of a ring of sacred sites protecting the city at a few kilometres’ distance, such as Zeus Messapeus on the Tsakona ridge (Catling and Shiple (1989); Catling (1990)), another cult site of Messapian Zeus at Messapei in the plain to the south, a hill-top sanctuary of unknown identity to the east at Phagia (LS site v3002), and the Eleusinion at Kalyvia Sochas to the south. Most or all of these were mutually inter-visible.

A regular calendar of festivals involving both Spartans and *perioikoi* took place around Laconia. (Agonistic culture within Laconia is discussed by Hodkinson (1999) 148–60.) The “Damonon inscription” *IG* v1 223 (*SEG* 38 333 + *LSAG* 201 no. 52, addenda p. 448 (post-403)) records the victories of Damonon, and his son at several of them: the Pohoidaia for Poseidon (in Sparta, Thouria and Helos), the Athenaia (at Sparta), the Eleuthenia (at Kalyvia Sochas?), the Ariontiai (probably at Sparta), the Lithieia (in the Malea peninsula?), the Pararomia in Thyrreatis, and the Maleateia (probably at the sanctuary of Apollo Maleatias at modern Kosmas). *IG* v1 222 (*SEG* 30 402 +; *LSAG* 199 no. 22 (c.530–500?)), a votive to (Apollo) Karneios, commemorates a victor at the Athenaia.

The calendar appears to have been same throughout Lakedaimon. It began in midsummer (Trynup, *Monat.* 140). Months attested as Lakedaimonian (never Spartan) in Archaic or Classical texts are Ἀρτέμισιος (Thuc. 5.19.1; also *IG* v1 11 (C1)), Γεράστος (Thuc. 4.119.2) and Καρνέιος (Thuc. 5.54.2; cf. Epidaurus Limera (no. 329) (Hellenistic)).

The Spartans not infrequently consulted the Delphic oracle, for example in C8l (Parke and Wormell (1956) i.71–73; ii. no. 46), C7e (Hdt. 1.65.2–4; Xen. *Lac.* 8.5; Plut. *Lyc.* 6), C6e
(Hdt. 1.66.2, 67.4), and in 426 (Thuc. 3.92.5). In C4, Lakedaimonians served the Delphic Amphiktyony as naoioi (CID II 31.35, 356; 31.75, 345) and hieronmomenos (CID II 32.43 (C4)).

Numerous Spartan victors at international games are known, particularly from Archaic and Classical times (Olympionikai 17–18, 21–22, 24, 30, 32–35, 37, 40–47, 50, 55, 57, 59, 60–68, 70, 72–73, 75–76, 78, 80, 82–86, 91, 108, etc.; for the importance of Olympic competition to Spartans, see Hodkinson (1999) 160–76, (2000) 307–11, 319–23; two periododonikai are on record (Paus. 6.1.7, 2.1; Knab (1934) 8). In surviving victory dedications, victors use the ethnic Λακεδαιμόνιος, e.g. SEG 11 1227 (c.500) (cf. SEG 32 217.3–4 (1628); 15 (1384)). In 420, Spartans were excluded from the Olympic Games by the Eleian authorities due to an alleged breach of the Olympic Truce (Thuc. 5.49.1–50.4, on which see Roy (1998); cf. Hodkinson (2000) 329 n.10).

Communal dedications by the Spartanai are rare: see IvO 244 (C6?). Those in the name of the Lakedaimonians include ML 22, a dedication to Zeus Olympios; cf. Hdt. 1.51.4; CID II 4.11.48 (360); 3.11.28 (358); 24.1.15 (336) (donations to Delphi).

Coinage, like luxuries generally, was proverbially eschewed by the late Archaic and Classical Spartans (Xen. Lac. 7.2; Plut. Lyc. 24.2), though Xen. Lac. 14.3 alleges that this law is no longer observed (cf. Hodkinson (2000) 154–76). Only under Areus I (309/8–265) and intermittently thereafter was coinage struck (Grunauer-von Hoerschelmann (1978)).

It is often asserted that Sparta founded only one overseas colony, at Taras (no. 71), founded according to tradition in 706 (Antiochos of Syracuse (FGrHist 555) fr.13; see Cartledge (1979) 123–4; Malkin (1994) 115–42). Malkin (1994), however, has shown that the Spartans were active colonizers, both inside and outside the Peloponnesian. According to Strabo 8.4.4, King Teleklos (c.760–740) established colonies at Poiéessa, Echeiai and Tragion in south-eastern Messenia some time before the main conquest of Messenia. Whether the perioikic towns of Messenia were colonies is debatable; Malkin (1994) 85 tentatively advances Thouria (no. 332) and Aithaia (no. 312) as possible C8 foundations. Both Geronthrai (no. 332) and Pharis (S67) are said to have been captured from their Achaian inhabitants (Paus. 3.2.6). Geronthrai was resettled by the “Dorians occupying Lakedaimon” (3.22.6), but Pharis may have gone out of existence (cf. 3.20.3). The Spartans settled Minyans in six Triphylian towns (Hdt. 4.148.4), of which Lepreon (no. 306) was resettled in 421 (Thuc. 5.31.4, 34.1). Sparta colonized Herakleia in Trachis (no. 430) in 432 (Thuc. 3.92.1; Malkin (1994) 219–35). Links with Sparta as a metropolis were claimed by various communities. Thera (no. 527) was allegedly an apoikia of Lakedaimon (Hdt. 4.147.1), as were Knidos (no. 903) (Hdt. 1.174.2; Malkin (1994) 80–81), Kythera (no. 336) (Thuc. 7.57.6; Malkin (1994) 81–82), and Melos (no. 505) (Hdt. 8.48; Thuc. 5.84.2, etc.; Malkin (1994) 74–76). Several Cretan cities came to believe the same (Malkin (1994) 8.78–80).

The Spartans and/or Lakedaimonians regarded themselves as an immigrant population, having arrived as Dorians (Thuc. 3.92.3) or, in a developed version of the myth, returned (a feature of Dorian ideology unique to Sparta) after the Trojan War together with the descendants of Herakles, the Herakleidai (Hdt. 9.26.2, 4; Malkin (1994) 15–45, esp. 43).

346. Thyrea Map 58. Lat. 37.25(?), long. 22.40. Size of territory: ? Type: A. (Sio). The toponym is Θυρέα, θ (Thuc. 4.56.2, 57.3), which is also a name for the surrounding area (cf. Hdt. 1.82.2; Thuc. 4.57.3, if the wording implies that the place captured was not the polis town). The plural form Θυρέαι seems to be used only of the district (e.g. Hdt. 1.82.2, who uses it despite having just given the singular form for the district; Isoc. 6.99). A city-ethnic is not attested in Classical evidence.

Although Thyrea is never quite explicitly called a polis, Thucydides in effect twice calls it a polis in the topographical sense (4.57.1 with 4.57.3).

Thuc. 2.27.2 and 4.56.2 says that the Lakedaimonians gave the exiled Aiginetans one of their own frontier possessions, Thyrea in Kynouria, as a new home. At 2.27.2 the expressions “Thyrea to live in (οικείων) and the land to cultivate . . . The land (named) Thyreaitis . . . “ clearly imply that Thyrea was already a nucleated settlement, and Thyreaitis its territory. Later he tells how the Athenians attacked the Aiginetans as they were building a fort on the coast, whereupon they retreated ἐς . . . τὴν ἄνω πόλιν ἐν ἥμισυ οἰκον (4.57.1). Here, too, it is a reasonable inference that the inland town existed before the Aiginetans started building the coastal fort. When the Athenians “capture Thyrea and burn the polis” (4.57.3), this equally implies that the town was called Thyrea like the district, otherwise Thucydides would have given its name.

The “upper polis”, the main part of Thyrea, has been variously located (see Shipley (1997) 231, and cf. Shipley (1993)). The MSS of Thuc. place it c.10 stades (c.1.8 km) inland, which might suit Kastraki Kato Meligous, but archaeological confirmation is lacking (Phaklaris (1990) 104–5, late Hellenistic and

The Aiginetan fort next to the sea must be one of three promontories in the bay of Astros. It is unlikely to be at Cherronisi in the centre of the bay, which is a small, rounded hill not easy to fortify; pottery may include Classical and probably Hellenistic pieces (Goester (1993) 88, 98, though Phaklaris (1990) 40–46 reports nothing later than C6). The fort may have been at Nisi Agiou Andrea (LS ii. 279, AA19; Phaklaris (1990) 51 fig. 12; Goester (1993) 84–88, 97–98), which has a street grid and a Classical circuit wall with towers. This could, however, be a late Classical to Hellenistic successor of the fort on the same site, since the Aiginetans had not completed their work when the Athenians attacked and may have had no opportunity to resume it. Alternatively, this site may be Anthana (no. 324), and the site of the Aiginetan fort might be Nisi Paraliou Astrous, where there is a Classical circuit wall (Goester (1993) 91–93, undated; 99). Of course, no trace of the fort may survive at all.

The district of Thyrea is placed in Argolis by Hdt. 1.82.2 prior to c.545; at 6.76.2 it is a coastal place within reach of Tiryns and Nauplion. It is placed on the borders of Argea and Lakanike by Thuc. 4.56.2 (cf. 8); in Kynouria by Thuc. 5.41.2.

Thuc. 2.27.3 suggests that Thyreatis (or Thyrea, cf. 4.56.2) is the *chora* of a *polis*. Hdt.’s χώρος . . . Θυρέη (1.82.1) and Θυρέα (1.82.2), like Thuc.’s Θυρεά (2.27.2, 4.56.2, 5.41.2), Θυρεάτις γῆ (supra) and χώρα (4.57.2), will be different names for the *chora* of the *polis* of Thyrea, which existed before the Aiginetans came (though there may have been a time when the area was called Thyrea but did not contain a *polis*). The cult of Polemokrates at Eua (Paus. 2.38.6; modern Eva) and that of Parparos on a nearby mountain (Marmaralona, Xerokambi) may have been in the territory of Thyrea.

Though there is implicit evidence that the *polis* existed before the Lakedaimonians’ grant to the Aiginetans, there is no written evidence that it survived later. Thucydides’ juxtaposition of “Thyrea and the *polis* of Anthana” (no. 324) (5.41.2) could imply that Thyrea is not now a *polis*; perhaps it ceased to exist in 424. If, however, Thyrea was Nisi Agiou Andrea, it had a long post-C4 life.
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I. The Region

The hinterland of the Argolic Gulf (Ὀργαλίκος κόλπος (Ps.-Skylax 49, 50)) comprises the Kynouria to the west, the Argive plain, or Argeia (IG inv 506.3 (C6m); Ps.-Skylax 49), to the north, and the peninsula known as the Argolic Akte (Ephor. fr. 18c; Diod. 12.43.1; Polyb. 5.91.8; cf. Jameson et al. (1994) 13–15) to the east.

At the western end of an alluvial plain of c.250 km², on the site where later the city of Argos grew up, habitation is attested from the Neolithic period. From MH onwards the site had become a nucleated settlement of some size, but not large enough to deserve the name of “city” or “town”. Further extended in LH, it was still smaller than Mykenai and Tiryns. The toponym Ἀργος, which was used in the following period, seems to be a Greek word, which is rather surprising for a site of that time (Leukart (1994) 307; but see Frisk (1960) s.v. “Unerklärt, sicher vorgriechisch” and Chantraine (1968) s.v.). In Homer, however, the toponym designates one of the cities of the Achaian in the broad sense of this term (Hom. Il. 2.115, 3.75, 4.52), and in particular the “capital” of the kingdom of Diomedes (Il. 2.559). In the poem, the plural of the corresponding ethnic (Ἀργεῖος) is used metonymically about all the Greeks. It is not always easy to distinguish the mythical sources from those relating to the Dorian town. The earliest attestation of the adjective Ἀργεῖος used as a proper city-ethnic seems to be in C7m in Tyrtaios (fr. 23a.15, West). Later the inhabitants of Argos always claimed that they were the descendants of the Argeioi of the Homeric poems.

According to Hdt. 1.82.2, the Argives once controlled the entire western coast of the Argolic Gulf as far as Cape Malea and the island of Kythera (cf. no. 336); but this is extremely unlikely (Kelly (1976) 40, 73, 116–17). From C6m until 338, the plain of Thyrea or Kynouria was controlled by Sparta (Piérart (1997) 326–27, (2001) 34–36, for the name). In a study of the natural borders of the Argive plain, the watershed offers a reliable guide-line: to the north, the Tretos Pass separates the Corinthian Gulf from that of Argos; to the east is the Arachnaion massif; to the west rises the range of the Arkadian mountains. It follows that Argos (no. 347) naturally tried to secure for itself the political control of the entire valley of the rivers Inachos and Charadros. The plan was implemented by destroying and incorporating Tiryns (no. 356) in C5m, Mykenai (no. 353) in C5m, Orneai (no. 354) in C5l and Kleonai (no. 351) with the sanctuary at Nemea in C4l. Furthermore, the following settlements were dependencies of Argos: Oinoe in the valley of Charadros, Lykeion in the upper valley of Inachos, Nauplia and Asine on the coast, and Hysiai situated in its own valley towards Arkadia.

The name of the region is Ἀργολίς, -ίδος, ἱ (Hdt. 1.82.2, 6.92.1; Aesch. Suppl. 236, adjective) with Ἀργόλας as a rare ethnic, attested only in poetry (Eur. Rhes. 41; Ar. fr. 311, PCG), and Ἀργολικός as the corresponding Κττίκον (Dem. 52.5; Ps.-Skylax 49; Polyb. 5.91.8). All are derived from Ἀργος, but not coined before the Dorian period (Leukart (1994) 307–8). In modern scholarship “Argeia and Akte together are known as the Argolid (Argolis in Greek)” (Jameson et al. (1994) 13); but the ancient Greek nomenclature was, in fact, more variable. Argolis (Paus. 8.1.2) and even Argeia (Paus. 8.1.1) designates sometimes the whole north-eastern part of the Peloponnese, including Corinthia and Sikyonia. The periploi mention Kleonai (no. 351) (Ps.-Skylax 49) and Phleious (no. 355) (Ps.-Skymnos 523–24) as adjacent to the Argolic Gulf (Ps.-Skylax) and Akte (Ps.-Skymnos). Both dominated a fertile valley, traversed by a road of major commercial and military importance.

Epidauros (no. 348) (Paus. 2.8.5) and Troizen (no. 357) (Paus. 2.8.5), Hermione (no. 350) (Hdn. III.2 724.2–3) and Halieis (no. 349) (Ephor. fr. 56), where the inhabitants of Tiryns (no. 356) were settled after their expulsion by the Argives, were all called Argolic cities. Thus, from Antiquity onwards, the toponym Ἀργολίς denoted the entire peninsula connected with the Argive plain, but the mountains divided the region into two parts: the territory of Argos itself and the peninsula called Akte, adjacent to the Saronic Gulf. In the sources it is not always easy to determine how many cities are included under the heading “the cities of Akte”. The
phrase ὰσι αὐτὲν Ἀργολίδα Ἀργολίδα ἡκτήτων πόλεις (Ps.-Skymnos 523) implies that there were several, but according to Paus. 2.8.5, the inhabitants of Argolid Akte (αι την Ἀργολίδα Ἀργολίδα ἡκτήτων ὀικοντες) were the Epidaurians and the Troizenians only. Viewed from the sea, Akte lies at the south-eastern limit of the Saronic Gulf and separated from the Gulf of Hermion by Cape Skyllaion (Eudoxos, fr. 350.9, Lasserre; Polyb. 5.91.8). In addition to the cities mentioned above, Akte comprised the peninsula of Methana (cf. no. 352) and the island of Kalauria (cf. no. 360). On the island was a sanctuary of Poseidon which, according to Strabo 8.6.14, was the seat of an amphiktyony of seven cities, viz., originally, Hermion (no. 350), Epidaurus (no. 348), Aigina (no. 358), Athens (no. 361), Prasieis (no. 342) (later replaced by Sparta (no. 345)), Nauplia (later replaced by Argos (no. 347)) and Boiotian Orchomenos (no. 213) (Tausend (1992) 12–19; Hall (1995) 584–85).

The historians tend to juxtapose Epidaurus, Troizen, Hermion (and Haliæis), and the soldiers from these poleis often fought side by side (Hdt. 8.43, 72, 9.28.4, 31.3–4; Thuc. 1.27.2, 8.3.2; Xen. Hell. 4.2.16, 6.2.3, 7.2.2). But the solidarity attested in the army of the Peloponnesian League does not exclude fervent local disputes between neighbours (cf. Troizen and Epidaurus: IG iv 1.7 75 (cf. SEG 11 505, 31 328); Troizen and Hermion: IG iv 751, 791 (all late Hellenistic)).

The Argolic poleis supported themselves by agriculture and stock breeding, in the coastal regions supplemented by fishing (cf. Baladié (1980) 215–16). Stock breeding was normally confined to the border regions and resulted in disputes over boundaries, difficult to determine in mountainous terrain (Jameson et al. (1994) 596–606).

Both the date and the composition of the periplous ascribed to Ps.-Skylax are disputed, but the chapters on Argos and Argolis (49–52) seem to reflect the period after the Tirynthians (no. 356) had moved to Haliæis (no. 349) in C5f. of the coastline of the Argolic Gulf, Argos (no. 347) controls 150 stades, Epidaurus (no. 348) 30, Haliæis (no. 349) 100, Hermion (no. 350) 80, and Cape Skyllaion is in the territory of Troizen (no. 357) (Baladié (1980) 215; Jameson et al. (1994) 568–72). The inhabitants of the poleis on Akte in particular supported themselves by fishing (Baladié (1980) 211–20). Looking sea-wards, the cities of the peninsula were open to cultural influences from overseas communities, and as a result came to differ from the poleis of Argos. Cut off from the sea by a belt of marshes along the coast, Argos became primarily an inland poleis, whose policy was shaped, above all, by its opposition to neighbouring Sparta (no. 345), the great power of Greece.

Our written sources provide us with information about twenty-nine named settlements in Argolis of the Archaic and Classical periods. With one exception (Kerkas) they have all been identified, most beyond reasonable doubt, some with a certain amount of probability only. As against eleven poleis there are eighteen non-poleis settlements. Furthermore, we have remains of no fewer than thirty-two small nucleated settlements which cannot be convincingly matched with any of the toponyms found in the written sources. Thus we know of sixty-one Archaic and Classical settlements altogether, of which eleven were poleis and are described below in the Inventory. With a few additions and omissions, the following list comprises those sites listed in Barr. as settlements of the Archaic and/or Classical periods.

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements

not Attested as Poleis

Asine (Ἄσινη) Hom. Il. 2.560; Strabo 8.4.4, 6.3, 10, 11, 17; Paus. 2.36.4. Captured by the Argives in C8 (Frödin and Persson (1938) 437) and reduced to the status of kome; cf. Vollgraff (1916) 221.32 = SEG 19.317 (C4): Ἀσίνα. Barr. AC.

Eileoi (Ἐιλεοί) Paus. 2.34.6 (χοροίν). Jameson et al. (1994) 30–33. Barr. AC.


Genesion (Γενεσίον) or Genethlion (Γενεθλίον) Paus. 2.38.4 (χοροίν), 8.7.2. Pritchett (1965) 131–34. Shipley (1997) 266 adduces Steph. Byz. 202.11: Γενεσία πόλις Λακωνικῆς; a C5m dedication found at Xeropighado shows that the site was at that time in Argolis (Piérart (2001) 28–29). Barr. AC.

¹ Doubtful or spurious settlements, mostly mentioned in late sources only, are Argos (Ἄργος) (Steph. Byz. 112.24: πόλις ... κατὰ Τροιζῆνα); Δία (Δία) (Steph. Byz. 229.1–5: πόλις ... Πελοποννήσην περί τοῦ Σκύλλειον); Δυσφέρ (Δυσφέρη) (Steph. Byz. 239.25: πόλις περὶ τῆς Ἡρμιόνας); Διονυσί (Διονύσιος) (Hom. Il. 2.610; Strabo 8.6.33: κόιμη, παῖσσαθηνούς); Jameson et al. (1994) 122, 480: Genethlion (Γενεθλίον) = Genesion (Paus. 2.34.9 (χοροίν)), cf. Pritchett (1965) 131–34, settlement near Troizen; Haloussa (Ἀλουσσά) (Paus. 2.34.8 (λιμήν); island near Spetsai); Ηρυηθηνίον (Ἡρυηθηνίον) (Paus. 2.28.3 (χοροίν); settlement near Epidaurus); Καλέντες (Καλέντες) (Steph. Byz. 339.7 (πόλις Ἀργούς) citing Kallimachos (fr. 55, Pfeiffer); Λάμπη (Λάμη) (Steph. Byz. 410.5 (πόλις ... τῆς Ἡρμιόνας), citing Philon); Μελίνα (Μελίνα) (Steph. Byz. 442.11 (πόλις Ἀργούς), citing Lykopron Alx. 403); Rhodoussa (Ῥοδούσσα) (Steph. Byz. 547.3 (πόλις τῆς Ἡρμιόνας)); Saminths (Σαμινθῶς) (Thuc. 5.58.5, a passage that offers no clue to whether Saminths was a tract of land or a settlement); Spharia (Σφαίρια) (Paus. 2.33.1; island near Kalaura, sometimes identified with Kalauria).

² The list includes only sites that are explicitly called “settlement”, “village” or “town” in the inventories of Faraklas (1972a and b), (1972); Foley (1988), Runnels and Munn (1994), and Mee and Forbes (1997). None of the settlements is recorded in Barr.
Hysia or Hysiae (Ὑσία, Ὑσιαί) Thuc. 5.83.2; Strabo 8.6.17; Paus. 2.24.7 (ἐφεσία Ὑσιῶν ἐστι πόλεως ποτε ἐν τῇ Ἀργολίδῃ); 2.27.1, 54.7. Cf. Vollgraff (1915) 372 D 10 = SEG 13 242 (C38). Pritchett (1980) 54–64. Barr. AC.


Lykrea (Λύκρεα) Strabo 6.2.4, 8.6.17; Paus. 2.25.4–5; Hesych. Ληδι (Λυκρείας δήμον ... ἔστι δὲ καὶ ῥόος καὶ πόλις); SEG 17 143.3 (C38) (Λύρκεων). Pritchett (1980) 12–17; Pikoulas (1995) 263–64. Prior to C5f, Lykrea may have been a dependent polis cf. the sub-ethnic Λυκρειεύς (Piérart (1997) 334–35 (Col/C5e)). No date in Barr., but the inscription published by Piérart (1997) suggests AC.

Mases (Μάσης) Hom. II. 2.562; Strabo 8.6.10, 17; Paus. 2.35.11, 36.1–3 (ἐπίνειοι); Steph. Byz. 435.5 (πόλεις). Jameson et al. (1994) 374–76: “If Mases ever reached the status of a polis, by the classical period it could only have been a subunit of Hermion” (376). Barr. AC.

Midea (Μίδεα) or Mideia (Μιδεία) Strabo 8.6.11; Paus. 2.25.9, 6.20.7, 8.27.1 (πόλισμα). Barr. No date.

Mysia (Μυσία) Paus. 2.18.3 (χωριοί). Barr. AC(?)

Nauplia (Ναυπλία) See s.v. Argos (no. 347).

Oina (Οἰνά) or Oinoe (Οἰνόη) or Oine (Οἰνή) IG IV 823.57 (C4); Paus. 1.15.1 (ἐν Οἰνή τῆς Ἀργείας), 2.25.2–3 (cf. SEG 38 314), 10.10.4; Apollod. Bibl. 1.8.6, 2.5.3; Hsch. Οίνε; Pediasimus, De duodecim Hercules laboris 8 (Myth. Graec. 1). Pritchett (1980) 2–12, (1991) 222–26; Pikoulas (1995) 260–61. Barr. AC.

Philetarion (Φιλεταρόν) IGIV 1.175.16, 34 (Φιλεταρέα); Paus. 2.36.3. Jameson et al. (1994) 33–36, 596–606. Barr. AC.

Temennion (Τημένιον) Strabo 8.6.2; Paus. 2.38.1. Dorovinis (1997). Barr. AC.

Thermasia (?) Paus. 2.34.6 (ἱερὸν Δήμητρος ἐστὶν ἐπίκλησιν Θερμασίας). Jameson et al. (1994) 121–22, 480. Barr. C.

2. Unidentified Settlements

Ano Phanari Faraklas (1972a) figs. 15a–b; Foley (1988) 172: 7 (settlement and watch-tower in the territory of Epidaurus (no. 348)). C.

Ag. Ioannis Runnels and Munn (1994) F4 (village, region of Fournai). ACH.

Ag. Ioannis Faraklas (1972a) 12; Foley (1988) 176: 15. Settlement and sanctuary (territory of Epidaurus (no. 348)). C.


Brinies (or Dherpeza) Runnels and Munn (1994) 475: C4:2 (village (?), region of Koiladha). H.

Chinitsa Runnels and Munn (1994) 424: A 12 (village(?), region of Porto-Cheli (Halieis (no. 349))). C.

Choritis Foley (1988) 177: 20. “In the C period, it was probably a town.” AC.

Fousia Faraklas (1973) figs. 12a–16b; Foley (1988) 193: 85 (unfortified settlement; territory of Troizen (no. 357)). AC.

Gifokastro Faraklas (1972a) 12; Foley (1988) 180: 31. Settlement (territory of Epidaurus (no. 348)). AC.


Iría (?) Faraklas (1972a) 13; Foley (1988) 182: 40 (fortified settlement (?) in the territory of Epidaurus (no. 348)). A (?) C.

Kallonio (Ag. Yioryios) Faraklas (1972b) 15; Foley (1988) 182: 42 (settlement in the territory of Troizen (no. 357)). C.


Koroni Faraklas (1972a) 12; Foley (1988) 185: 58 (fortified settlement in the territory of Epidaurus (no. 348)). C.


Koukouras Runnels and Munn (1994) 431: A 49 (village(?), region of Porto-Cheli (Halieis (no. 349))). (C)H.


Magoula sta Iliia Runnels and Munn (1994) 519: G1: (village(?), region of Iliokastro). AC.

Magoula Mee and Forbes (1997) 65, 68, 143–44: MS 60 (settlement of Methana Peninsula (no. 352)). AC.


Oga Mee and Forbes (1997) 65, 68, 146–48: MS 67 (settlement of Methana Peninsula (no. 352)). C.


Petrothallas Faraklas (1973) 9; Foley (1988) 196: 105 (where it is called Thalassopetra); Runnels and Munn (1994) 483: E6 (village or small town, region of Hermioni). H.

Pigadhaki Faraklas (1972a) 11; Foley (1988) 193: 89 (fortified settlement in the territory of Epidaurus (no. 348)). C.


Tracheia Faraklas (1972a) 12; Foley (1988) 198: 109 (fortified settlement in the territory of Epidaurus (no. 348)). C.

II. The Poleis

347. Argos (Argeios) Map 58. Lat. 37.40, long. 22.45. Size of territory: 5. Type: A. The toponym is Ἀργείας, τό (Hdt. 1.82.5; IvO 630.3 = SEG 11 1249 (480–475?)); ML 77.15 = IG 13 370 (418–414); IG IV 583.1 (C4l); on this name, see Hall (1995) 580. The city-ethnic is Ἀργείοις (SEG 3 395 = LAG 168.4 (C7) = Gec); NIEpi 10.4–5 (4703); Bacchyl. Ep. 1.142, 2.4–5.

Argos is called a polis in the urban sense (SEG 11 1084.6 (C4l); Hdt. 6.82.1; Thuc. 5.59.3; Xen. Hell. 4.7.3), in the political sense (ML 42B.32–33 (C5in); SEG 11 1084.25 (C4l); Thuc. 5.67.2; Aen. Tact. 11.8), and in the territorial sense (Xen. Hell. 4.7.2). Πολιτής is found in Hdt. 6.76.2. The oldest attestation of the city-ethnic in a historical context is in Tyrraioi (fr. 23a.15, West = P Oxy. 3316). The collective use is attested internally in SEG 13 239 (c.475), on coins (infra) and in a C4l/C3e dedicatory inscription (IG IV 4877) and externally in a dedication of Corinthian spoils at Olympia (SEG 11 1203 (c.500–480)), in the list of Argives killed at Tanagra in 458 (ML 35 = IG 1 t.1149) and in literary sources (Hdt. 1.31.2; Thuc. 1.102.4; Arist. Pol. 1270a2). The individual use is attested internally in a C3 honorific decree (IG IV 585) and externally on a bronze plaque found in Epidaurus (SEG 26 449 (C5e)), in an honorific decree of Epidaurians (NIEpi 10.5–6 (4703)) and in literary sources (Hdt. 9.75; Xen. Hell. 1.3.13). Patris is found in Thuc. 2.68.4 and IG IV 3.1 618 (C4).

The territory of Argos is referred to as γας τας Ἀργείαις in a law of C6m (IG IV 506.3, 10 = Nomina 1 100; cf. Thuc. 2.27.2) and as ἦ Ἀργείων χώρη at Hdt. 7.149.3; at Thuc. 4.133.2 the toponym Ἀργος designates the territory of the city (ὄ νεος τῆς Ἡπας . . . ἐν Ἀργεία). The plain of Argos covers 275 km² and is surrounded by mountains from which streams flow into the valley. The whole region covers almost 1,300 km², most of which is mountainous. To the north the divide between the hinterland of the Argolic Gulf and that of the Corinthian Gulf follows the Tretos range. The Arkadian mountains tower over the plain to the west: Lykeion, Artemision, Krapelos and Parthenion. To the east is the Archaic massif, and to the south the plain ends at the Argolic Gulf. After the destruction of Asine in 281 and the conquest of Nauplia in C7, Argos dominated the entire valley, which seems to form a natural unit and is well suited to being the territory of one polity (Piérart (1997)). But the political status of some dependent communities remains obscure. Nauplia may just possibly have been a dependent polis: it is called Ἀργείων ναύσταθµον at Strabo 8.6.2; but Ps.-Skylax 49 calls it πόλεις καὶ λιµήν, thus suggesting that as late as C4 it may have been more than just a harbour town (cf. Hansen (1997) 36–37). There is, however, no other evidence to support Ps.-Skylax’s classification of Nauplia as a polis, and the application of the term to Nauplia may be an error (cf. Hansen (2000) 196 n. 49). Others were allies—e.g. Ornea (no. 354) (Thuc. 5.47.1) and perhaps Mykenai (no.
ing defeat at Sepeia in 356 (Piérart (1997) 334–36). From C5m the territory of Argos comprised Hysiai, Tyrins, Midea and Mykenai (Paus. 8.27.1). Orneai—almost certainly situated at Kato Belesi = modern Lykaia—was incorporated in C5l (Moggi (1974)) but was still a polis in 352/1 according to Diod. 16.34.3, 39.4. The boundary stones between Argos and Corinth (no. 227) were removed in 392 when the two poleis united (Xen. Hell. 4.4.6), but the occupation of Corinth by Argos was terminated in 387/6 by the King’s Peace (Xen. Hell. 5.1.34). In c.C4l the territory of Argos grew to c.1,400 km² by the annexation of Kleonai (no. 351) (Piérart (1982); Perlman (2000) 148–49), which dominated the neighbouring valley of Nemea with the sanctuary of Zeus where one of the four Panhellenic festivals was celebrated every second year (Golden (1998) 11, table 1). It is more difficult to assess the increase in territory due to the incorporation of Kynouria to the south-west. The toponym denotes both the plain of Thyrea and the plateau further south, which was probably acquired by the Argives in 338 as far as and including Zarax (Piérart (2001); but see Shipley (2000) 378). Argos was mainly an agricultural polis (Piérart (1997) 332), and according to Lehmann (1937) 77–78 the Argive plain may in Antiquity have produced some 320,000 hl of grain per year. Nevertheless, Argos was one of the principal recipients of grain from Kyrene (no. 1028) during the grain crisis of 330–326 (Tod 196.7).

For the size of population the only information we possess is some army figures. According to Hdt. 7.148.2, 6,000 Argives were killed in 494 at the battle of Sepeia, and the city suffered a severe shortage of manpower during the next generation (Hdt. 6.83.1). Nevertheless, at Nemea in 394, the Argives could muster c.7,000 hoplites (Xen. Hell. 4.2.17), to whom should be added a contingent of knights (Charneux (1991) 316 n. 126). A total of perhaps 7,500 hoplites and knights in the field army corresponds to some 12,000 adult male citizens of hoplite status (Hansen (1985) 11–13, 16–21).

The early history of Argos and the rule of King Pheidon (Hdt. 6.127.3; Arist. Pol. 1310b26–28; Ephor. fr. 115) is too obscure to be told. Similarly, the existence of amphiktyonies dominated by Argos in the Archaic period is still a moot point (Tausend (1992) 8–12; Piérart (1995)). After the crushing defeat at Sepeia in 494 (Hdt. 6.77–80), Argos observed a strict neutrality and declined the invitation to join the Hellenic League against Persia (Hdt. 7.148–52). The Argive resentment of Sparta (no. 345) led to a rapprochement with Athens (no. 361), but after his ostracism Themistokles found refuge in Argos (Thuc. 1.135.3). Argos took advantage of the weakening of Sparta during the revolt of the helots and succeeded in destroying Mykenai (no. 353) and expelling its population (Diod. 11.65; Paus. 2.16.5, 5.23.3, 7.25.5–6, 8.27.1, 32.2; Strabo 8.6.19; Piérart (1992) 377–82). A few years later Argos, now a democratic polis, concluded an alliance with Athens (Thuc. 1.102.4 (c.460)), and in 458, 1,000 Argives supported the Athenians in the battle of Tanagra (Thuc. 1.107.5). At the same time Argos played a dominant role in a treaty (ML 42 (C5m)) between Knosos (no. 967) and Tylisos (no. 992) and concluded alliances with neighbouring poleis (cf. Hdt. 9.35.2 implying a C5f alliance with Tegea (no. 297) and the decree SEG 11 1084 (C4l) renewing friendly relations with Pallantion (no. 289)).

In 451 a thirty years’ peace was concluded between Argos and Sparta (Thuc. 5.14.4; Staatsverträge 144). It was strictly observed; but those Peloponnesians who in 421 were dissatisfied with the Peace of Nikias approached Argos, and a treaty was concluded with Mantinea (no. 281), Elis (no. 251), Corinth (no. 227) and the Chalkidians (Thuc. 5.28, 31 = Staatsverträge 190). After the breakdown of the attempt to renew the thirty years’ peace, a new treaty was concluded in 420 with Mantinea, Elis and Athens (Thuc. 5.47.8; IG I3 83 = Staatsverträge 193). According to Thucydides, the ensuing war between Argos and Epidauros (no. 348) was provoked by the Athenians for strategic reasons (Thuc. 5.26.2, 53–58, 75.4–5). It resulted in 418 in the battle of Mantinea (Thuc. 5.66–73) in which Argos, Orneai (no. 354) and Kleonai (no. 351) lost 700 men (Thuc. 5.74.3). A fifty-year alliance was concluded in 418 between Sparta and Argos, now dominated by a pro-Lakedaimonian faction (Thuc. 5.77–79 = Staatsverträge 194), but the restoration of the democratic regime at Argos led to a new rapprochement with Athens (Thuc. 5.82.4; IG I3 86 = Staatsverträge 196).

By forming a quadruple alliance in 395 with Boiotia, Athens (no. 361) and Corinth (no. 227), Argos for the first time joined an organisation ruled by a synedrion (Diod. 14.82.1 = Staatsverträge 225). In the Corinthian War Argos was involved in numerous military operations, some of which took place in its own territory (Xen. Hell. 4.2.17–22, 3.15–21, 4.19, 7.2.1–4). In 392 the Argives annexed Corinth and forced their own laws on the Corinthians (Xen. Hell. 4.4.1–6), but Corinth regained its independence by the King’s Peace in 387/6 (Xen. Hell. 5.1.34–36). Argos was a party to the koine eirene of 362 (IG IV 556 = Staatsverträge 292) and observed neutrality during the war against Philip of Makedon in 340–338 (Dem. 18.64), but in 338/7 the Argives joined the Corinthian League (Arr. Anab. 1.17.8), and in the 330s they were appointed arbitrators in a dispute referred to
the synedrion of the League by two of the members (IG xi.3 1259 = RO 82 = Ager (1996) 3). Argos recovered Thyrea (supra) and may for a short period have dominated Epidauros (no. 348) (IG iv.2.1 69 and SEG 11 400, see infra 607). After the death of Alexander the Great, Argos joined the anti-Makedonian alliance (Diod. 18.11.2).

In the course of the Archaic and Classical periods the constitution of Argos changed from monarchy to oligarchy and then to democracy. According to tradition, the dynasty of Temenids was deposed two generations after Pheidon (in C6f, if one accepts the synchronism suggested at Hdt. 6.127.3). But the king (βασιλεύς) was kept as an eponymous official (ML 42.43 (C5m); cf. Hdt. 7.149.2). The principal body of government was now the damiourgoi (δαµιοργοί), a board of first nine and later six officials with judicial and financial powers (IG1v 614 = Nomina 1 87 (575–550); SEG 11 314 (C6) = Nomina 1 88). In spite of growing resentment among the commoners, the oligarchy was still upheld after the defeat at Sepeia (Diod. 10.26; cf. Gehrke, Stasis 24–25); but after the Persian Wars the constitution was changed into a democracy (Gehrke, Stasis 361–65), and ostracism was introduced in order to avoid a return to monarchy or a dynastia (Arist. Pol. 1302b8–19). Apart from two short oligarchic episodes, the democracy lasted to the end of the Classical period. The democratic constitution was briefly overthrown in 417 and was seriously under threat in 370 (Gehrke, Stasis 26–33). (1) During the Heraia celebrated in February 417 a pro-Lakedaimonian faction of Argives supported by the Lakedaimonians overthrew the democracy February 1304*25–27; Aen. Tact. 17.2–4, but see Labarbe (1974)). But only half a year later a counter-revolution brought the democrats back to power; some of the oligarchs were killed, and others were exiled (Thuc. 5.82.2; Diod. 12.80.3; Plut. Alc. 15.4). (2) After the battle of Leuktra, the oligarchs planned a coup d’état; but their plans were disclosed. In the aftermath 1,200 wealthy citizens were killed, and others exiled (Diod. 15.57.3–58.4). It is a moot point whether the stasis described at Aen. Tact. 11.7–8 refers to (1) or (2) (Stylianou (1998) 414).

During the democracy, decisions (called δόκημα, SEG 34 282.15 (330–300)) were made by the people (ὁ δάµος τῶν Ἀργείων, SEG 34 282.4; cf. Thuc. 5.28.1) meeting in assembly (ἀλλαία τέλεια, SEG 30 355.1 (330–300); cf. SEG 34 282.6 (330–300)) at regular intervals, probably every month (SEG 30 355.1), but a meeting could be adjourned and held as an extraordinary meeting in the following month (ἄρμβόλιμος, SEG 11 1084.1–2 (C4f)). The assembly was chaired by the president of the council (ἀρρήτευε βωλᾶς ὁ δείνα, SEG 34 282.3), which indicates a probouleumatic procedure (Piérart (2000) 305, pace Rhodes, DGS 71). The council was assisted by a secretary (γροφεύς βωλᾶς) and seems to have had a term of office of six months (Tod 179.15; cf. Rhodes, DGS 71). Alongside the βωλᾶ there was another council, called “The Eighty” (ὀγδοάρχαι, Thuc. 5.47.9), presumably subdivided into four sections of twenty, one for each of the four phylai (Ἑκαδές; SEG 33 286 (C4f)).

Other boards of officials were the five strategoi (Thuc. 5.59.5; SEG 29 361 (400)) and, as commanders of the cavalry, two ilarchoi from each phyle (SEG 11 293 (C4–C3); Charneux (1991) 314–17), further a board of four hieromnomenes, one from each phyle, associated with the administration of the Heraion (IG iv 517 (C5)) and a board of artynai (ἀρτύναι) mentioned in the treaty of 420 alongside the Council and the Eighty (Thuc. 5.47.9). See Piérart (2000) 305–6 for details.

After the destruction of Tiryns (no. 356) and Mykenai (no. 355), Argos possessed a large public domain, called δαµοσία καὶ ἱερά χώρα (SEG 41 282 (C1)) and presumably administered by the phylai (Kritzas (1992) 236–40; cf. SEG 41 284; Piérart (1997) 332–33). Argos had its own calendar, and nine months are known (Charneux (1990) 397–402; Trümpy, Monat. 143–44).

The Argive citizens were subdivided into the three Dorian phylai (Hyleis, Dymanes, Pamphyloi), to which a fourth phyle was added perhaps as late as C5m: viz. the Hynnathioi (Ephor. fr. 15; IG iv 487–88 (C4f/C3e) = SEG 11 293). Each phyle was further subdivided into twelve artificial units, probably named phatrai (φάτραι) and named after local heroes, e.g. Τεμενίδαι (SEG 29 361.111.18 (400); cf. Piérart (2000) 299). In each phyle, finances were handled by a board of twelve (δύοδέκα), probably one from each phatra (SEG 41 284). In c.330 a new civic subdivision was added to the two others: in all probability the pentekostys (πεντηκοστύς), e.g. Κλεωναί (SEG 30 355.3 (330–300)). Members of the same phatra might belong to different pentekostys. Membership of the civic subdivisions was hereditary, but the subdivision into pentekostys was at least to some extent territorial. From c.330 naturalised citizens had to be inscribed in a phyle, a phatra and a pentekostys (ISE no. 41.11–13 (C3f)). In personal names a sub-ethnic was sometimes added to the name and patronymic, first the phyle (IG iv 517 (C5)), later the phatra (SEG 30 355.4–5) or the pentekostys (SEG 30 355.3) or a combination of the two (IG iv 616 (C4f) = SEG 33 288); for the whole system and its chronology, see Piérart (2000) 297–301.
In C4l block grants of citizenship were bestowed on the cities of Rhodos (no. 1000), Aspendos (no. 1001) and Soloi (no. 1011) (SEG 34 2824–8). In C5f Argos granted proxeny to a citizen of Oinous (no. 338), one of the Lakonian perioikic poleis (SEG 13 239), in C5s to a citizen of Sparta (no. 345) (Thuc. 5.76.3), and later in C4 to citizens of Athens (no. 361) (SEG 30 355), Pheneos (no. 291) (SEG 30 356) and Lampsakos (no. 748) (SEG 30 360). Argeian citizens received grants of proxeny from Sparta (Thuc. 5.59.5), Athens (IG ii2 78, ethnic restored), Epidaurus (no. 348) (SEG 26 445 (C4m)) and Megara (no. 225) (IG vii 2 (C4)). Reception of envos is recorded in Hdt. 7.148.1 and in Thuc. 5.31.3; IG iv 2.1 102B.11.203 (400–350) records a payment to a κάρυκι ἐς Ἀργος. Sending of envos is attested at Hdt. 7.151, 9.12; Thuc. 5.30.3 and Xen. Hell. 1.3.13 (cf. 4.7.3).

Metics (πεδάγοις) are attested in lists of C5 (IG iv 552, 615 (C5?); Inv. E 88 (C5m)). According to Hdt. 6.83, followed by Diod. 10.26, the slaves (οἱ δοῦλοι) seized power in Argos in 494 and married the widows of the Argives killed in the battle of Sepeia. They were later expelled by the descendants of the Argeian citizens and found refuge in Tiryns (no. 356). However, Arist. Pol. 1305–6, followed by Plut. Mor. 245F, calls them περισσοῦκοι and asserts that many of them became citizens after the defeat at Sepeia. There is no clue to resolving this problem. Probably, the inhabitants of the dependent poleis had an inferior status and acquired the status of full citizens only with the introduction of the democracy in c.470–460 (Paus. 8.27.11; cf. Piérart (1997) 327–31).

The protective deity of Argos was Apollo Lykeios (Cole (1995) 302; Foley (1988) 139–40; SEG 13 240.9 (C4/C3e)). His temple in the agora has not been found, but the remains of an altar, inscribed as belonging to Apollo Lykeios, have been recovered (Pariente et al. (1998) 218). Other important urban cults were those of Zeus Larisaios (Paus. 2.24.3; Piérart (1996)) and Athena Polias (SEG 11 314 (C6f)), both with their sanctuaries on the Larisa hill. On the south slope of the Deiras hill were the sanctuaries of Athena Oxyderras (Paus. 2.24.1; Piérart (1996)) and the oracular shrine of Apollo Pythaeus or Deiradotias (Paus. 2.24.3; BCH 33 (1909) 172; Foley (1988) 140; Piérart (1990)).

The territory of Argos was protected by the goddess Hera, whose principal sanctuary lay some 10 km north-east of Argos (Billot (1997)). The most famous festival of Argos was the Heraea celebrated at the Heraion in connection with a procession from the town (Hdt. 1.31.2; Pind. Nem. 10.24; Paus. 2.20.3; Hall (1995) 592–96). The Heraea were a Panhellenic festival announced by theoroi, since c.330 hosted in the various poleis by theorodokoi, of whom a fragmentary list has been preserved (SEG 23 189 (c.330), see Perlman (2000) 100–4, 149–55). The festival of Hera Argeia included competitions called Hekatombaia, and a C6 bronze prize hyria from the games has been found in Sinope (no. 729) (SEG 30 1456; cf. SEG 30 52 (430–420), 366 (460–450), 367 (440), 648 (430–420) with Amandry (1980) 211–17). The priestesses of Argive Hera served for life, and the list of priestesses, collected by Hellan. fr. 74–84, served in C3s as a kind of Panhellenic chronology (Thuc. 2.2.1). After the subjection of Kleonai (no. 351), Argos assumed the presidency of the Nemean Games, and the C4l list of theorodokoi found at Nemea was probably drawn up by the Argives (SEG 36 331; Perlman (2000) 131–55).

Argive citizens were victorious in the Olympic Games (Olympionikai 204 (480), 210 (476), 222 (472), 241 (468), 260 (460), 298 (448), 335 (420) and 464 (328)); in the Pythian Games (Paus. 10.7.4 (586, 582, 578); Pind. Nem. 10.25); in the Isthmian Games (Pind. Nem. 10.26); in the Nemean Games (Paus. 1.29.5 (C5f), 2.20.6); in the Lykaia (IG v 2 549 (C4s)); and in the Amphiaeraia (IG vii 414 (C4s)). Argos made several communal dedications at Olympia (IvO250 = SEG 11 1203 (500–480?), 251 (500–480); SEG 11 1203 nos. 3–5 (500–480); Corinthian spoils) and Delphi (Jacquemin (1999) nos. 71 (C6e), 72 (C6e), 74 (C5f), 70 (456), 68 (C5m), 67 (C5l), 69 (369)). Consultation of the oracle at Delphi is recorded by Hdt. 6.19.1.

The site of Argos is dominated by two hills, one much higher than the other: to the south, Larisa with escarpments rising to c.290 m (ἄκρα: Strabo 8.6.7; άγρόπολις: Strabo 8.6.9; Paus. 2.24.1), and to the north Profites Elias, called Aspis (the shield), a rocky outcrop of less than 90 m. Its real name was almost certainly Deiras (Piérart (1990) 327–28). Larisa and Deiras were both surrounded by a defence circuit, of which only parts have been recovered. The oldest remains date from C6. In the Classical period the walls seem to have enclosed an area of over 200 ha (Lang (1996) 174 and Abb. 34). An attempt in 417/16 to construct a set of long walls down to the sea was stopped by Spartan intervention (Thuc. 5.82.5–83.2). The ancient town grew up on the south side of the Larisa hill. The habitation area was organised around the axes of the thoroughfares. The oldest of the city’s two theatres was built into the eastern spur of Larisa hill, called Pron (the promontory). It had a nearly rectangular koilon of between thirty-seven and thirty-eight straight rows of seats accommodating c.2,700–3,000 persons, and it seems to have served as meeting-place of the assembly and the courts (TGR ii. 123). In C3e a curved theatre of the canonical type was constructed in its vicinity (Piérart (1998) 344–45;
Hansen and Fischer-Hansen (1994) 56–57; TGR ii. 125–26. The agora (Thuc. 5.47.11) occupied a low-lying area below the theatre. Here stood the temple of Apollo Lykeios, the most famous sanctuary of the city of Argos (Paus. 2.19.3), where public enactments were set up (Thuc. 5.47.11; SEG 34 282.16). The oldest known public political building is the hypostyle hall; it was constructed c.475–450 and probably served as bouleuterion (Bommelaer and des Courtils (1994)) (SEG 31 315, 41 284). East of this, some Archaic buildings apparently used for administrative purposes were replaced in the period 450–425 by a large building flanked by three colonnades. It was used as a gymnasion and served a number of other purposes. It contained a long narrow court flanked by a colonnade (Pariente et al. (1998) 213–14, 218). North of this building a C5s stoaion 180 m (= 1 stade) long was laid out towards the east (ibid. 216, 218–19). The north and east sides of the agora were bordered by two stoas (ibid. 214–15). In, probably, 315 Kassander’s general Apollorones had the pytaneion burnt down and killed 500 Argives who were gathered in the building (Diod. 19.63.2). The prison of Argos is mentioned in Arist. Rh. 1375–5–6.

In literary sources (Ephor. frs. 115, 176) the invention of coinage is erroneously attributed to Pheidon, the C7f king of Argos. But Argos struck coins only from C5e (before c.480) and onwards. (1) Silver, from before 480 onwards; denominations: drachm, tetrobol, hemidrachm and smaller denominations down to tetartemorion; types: obv. forepart of wolf; rev. A in incuse. (2) These types are also found on a C5–C4 issue of iron coins. (3) Silver, from c.421 onwards; denominations: stater, drachm and smaller denominations; types: obv. head of Hera wearing stephanos; rev. various types, often two dolphins swimming in opposite direction, legend: on some APTEION or APTEI2N. (4) Bronze from C4 onwards with various types (for the date, see IGCH no. 11 and Kraay (1976) 96); Babelon, Traité ii.3.447–75; SNG Cap. Argolis 1–66.

348. Epidauros (Epidaurea) Map 58. Lat. 37.40, long. 23.10. Size of territory: 4. Type: A. The toponym is Ἐπίδαυρος (Pind. Isthm. 8.68; IG iv.2.1 122.12 (C4)), either ὘ (Hom. Il. 2.561) or Ἑ (Hdt. 3.52.7; Thuc. 2.56.4–5). The city-ethnic is Ἐπίδαιρος (ML 27.4 (479); IG iv.2.1 47.2–3 (C4); Hdt. 5.82–84). Epidauros is called a polis both in the urban sense (Thuc. 5.75.5; Ps.-Skylax 54; IG iv.2.1 115.14, 25 (C4)); and in the political sense (IG iv.2.1 48–51 (C4–C5f); Xen. Hell. 6.5.29). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in an honorific decree (ΝΙΕΠι 10.5–5 (470s: τόπιονκύρας) and in a dedication of an Argive (SEG 26 449 = Nomina II 28 (C5f)), and externally on the Serpent Column in Delphi (ML 23.4) and in literary sources (Hdt. 5.82–84; Thuc. 1.27.2; Xen. Hell. 4.2.16). The individual use is found internally in a dedication of an Epidaurian (SEG II 438 (C4s)) and externally at Delphi, where an Epidaurian made a dedication to Apollo in C5 (EPh. 111.14 195) and an Astias of Epidaurus served as naopoioi in 356/5 (CID II 31.35), and in Olympia on a monument commemorating the Olympic victor Aristion (IVO 165 (C4m); Olympinikai 415). It is presumably called patra (= patris) in IG iv.2.1 619 (C4s).

The name of the territory is Ἑπίδαιρα γῆ (Thuc. 4.45.2) or Ἑπίδαιρος, where the toponym denotes the territory (Thuc. 5.55.1, 77.1; Xen. Hell. 7.1.18; cf. Ps.-Skylax 50, 54: Ἑπίδαιρος χώρας). It covered 473 km² (Jameson et al. (1994) 18). The frontier between Epidauros and Troizen (no. 357) was near Methana (no. 352) (Thuc. 4.45.2); to the west, the frontier towards Argos (no. 347) was at Mt. Arachnaion. The Epidaureans possessed part of the coast of the Argolic Gulf but had no harbour there (Ps.-Skylax 50). A C5 dedication found in the Iria plain indicates that the plain belonged to Epidauros (SEG 24 274; cf. Jameson et al. (1994) 570).

In 480 Epidauros provided eight triremes at Artemision (Hdt. 8.1.2) and ten at Salamin (Hdt. 8.43), as well as 800 men at Plataiai in 479 (Hdt. 9.28.4). Assuming that there is no overlap between the forces, Jameson et al. (1994) 556–59 estimates the military strength of Troizen at 2,800 men, and the total population at c.16,000 minimum and 23,500 maximum.

Epidauros was a member of the Kalaurian amphiktyony (Strabo 8.6.14; Tausend (1992) 12–19). In C5e, after the Argive defeat at Sepeia, Epidauros gave shelter to some Argive refugees (SEG 26 449 = Nomina II 28 (C5f); cf. Lambrinoudakis (1990)).

Epidauros fought on the Greek side in the Persian War (Hdt. 8.1.2, 43, 9.28.4), and is recorded on the Serpent Column in Delphi (ML 27.4) and in Olympia (Paus. 5.23.1–2). It was a member of the Peloponnesian League (Thuc. 5.57.1). Alongside the Corinthians they defeated the Athenians at Halieis in 460/59 (Thuc. 1.105.3). In 435 the Epidaureans supported Corinth (no. 227) against Korkyra (no. 123) with five triremes (Thuc. 1.27.2). From 430 the Athenians ravaged the territory of Epidauros (Thuc. 2.56.4–5, 4.45.2, 6.31.2).

Controlling a territory which bordered on the Gulf of Argos but also had an excellent harbour on the Saronic Gulf, Epidauros occupied a strategic position and was an indispensable link in all relations between Athens (no. 361) and
Argos (no. 347). A war between Argos and Epidauros was fought in 419–418, caused by a sacrifice owed by the Epidaureans to Apollo Pythaios (Thuc. 5.53.1). The territory of Epidauros was repeatedly plundered by the Argives (Thuc. 5.54.3–55.4). The Epidaureans received a Lakadaimonian garrison, and an Argive attack on the town was called off (Thuc. 5.56). After the battle of Mantinea, the Athenians, being allied with the Argives, built a blockading wall around the town of Epidauros, but in 418/17 a peace was concluded between Lakadaimon and Argos in which it was stipulated that the blockading wall be pulled down and the Argive and Athenian troops withdrawn from the territory of Epidauros (Thuc. 5.77.1). After the Athenian defeat at Syracuse, Epidauros took an active part in the mobilisation of a Peloponnesian fleet (Thuc. 8.3.2), and after the battle of Aigos potami in 405, a statue was set up in Delphi of the commander of the Epidaurean squadron (Paus. 10.9.10).

Epidauros fought on the Spartan side in the battle of Nemea (Xen. Hell. 4.2.16) and remained loyal to Sparta (no. 345) even after the battle of Leuktra (Xen. Hell. 6.2.3, 7.2.2). In 369 Epaminondas ravaged the territory of Epidauros but failed to conquer the city (Diod. 15.69.1). Alongside Sparta and other members of the Peloponnesian League, Epidauros concluded an alliance with Athens in 370/69 (Xen. Hell. 7.1.1, 2.2; Arist. Rh. 1411τ11–13; cf. Staatsverträge 274); but in 366/5 Epidauros appears as an ally of Thebes (no. 221) (loc. 6.91; cf. Staatsverträge 285). After the battle of Chaeroneia in 338, Epidauros may have become a dependency of Argos (Burford (1969) 17), and there may have been an Argive kleu-ouchy in Epidauros (IG iv2.1 69 and SEG 11 400, if restored: [ἐνεργεῖ]ταν ἐμὲν τὸ [δύσμων Ἀργείων ἐν Ἐ]πιδαύρων κα τοικούντων. ἥλιος] Πειθήλια [s]). Epidauros joined the revolt against Makedonia after the death of Alexander the Great (Diod. 18.11.2).

In C53s the sanctuary of Asklepios transformed Epidauros into a Panhellenic site visited by pilgrims from all parts. Contacts with other poleis increased because of the pilgrims and the erection of monumental buildings in the sanctuary. Construction began in the second quarter of C4, and the accounts mention heralds sent not only to neighbouring poleis but even to some more remote cities, such as Athens, Tegea (no. 297) and Thebes (no. 221) (IG iv2.1 102, 103), from which artisans came to Epidauros (Burford (1969) 16–18). From the 350s, inscriptions attest to the sending out of theo-roi and the appointment of theorodokoi in other poleis. We have preserved lists of theorodokoi in the various poleis recorded region by region in accordance with the itinerary of the theoroi (IG iv2.1 94–95 = Perlman (2000) E1–2 (350s)),

decrees endowing individuals with the title of theorodokos, sometimes connected with the title of proxenos (SEG 26 445 = Perlman (2000) E12 p. 200 (C4m)), and chronologically organised surveys of such decrees passed by the Epidaureans (IG iv2.1 96 = Perlman (2000) E5 (C5f)). For an account of the institution of theorodokia, see Perlman (2000) 81–95. Citizens of Epidauros were appointed prox- enoi by Karthaia (no. 492) (IG xi.4 542.15–16 (C4m)) and Megara (no. 225) (IG vii 13 (C4d)).

The Aristotelian collection of politeiai included a constituti-
on of the Epidaureans (Arist. fr. 498), and the first entry in Plutarch’s Aitia Graeca may stem from this work: there were in Epidauros 180 enfranchised citizens; they constituted the politeia from which were elected the councilors (bouleutai), in Epidauros called arydoi. Most of the com-
mon people were settled in the countryside and nicknamed κοινόποδες, i.e. those with dust on their feet (Plut. Mor. 291E). No date is indicated, but the narrow politeia points to an oligarchy in the Archaic period. In C7s Epidauros was ruled by a tyrant called Prokles, whose daughter was mar-
ried to Periander, the tyrant of Corinth (no. 227) (Hdt. 3.50–52). The numerous decrees passed in C4 by boule and demos (Rhodes, DGS 74) point to a democratic constitution.

The Epidaureans were Dorianis (Hdt. 1.146.1, 7.99.2–3), and in C4 the citizens were organised into four phylai: two of the old Dorian phylai, Dymanes and Hylleis, and two other phylai, Azantiioi and Hysminatai (IG iv2.1 106.11.37–40 (C4)). The subdivision into phylai was applied in the work-
ing of political institutions, the composition of boards of of-
cials, and the organisation of the army. The four phylai were further subdivided into at least thirty-nine territorial units (Jones, POAG 107–11; Perlman (2000) 85–87). The names of these units were used as sub-ethnicss to identify Epidaurean citizens (see IG iv2.1 58.5: Τιμοκράτης Παγασίαν). The combination of a personal and a territori-
al subdivision of the citizenry remains problematic. Perhaps the citizens were reassigned to the various phylai in accor-
dance with their place of residence.

In C4 decrees were passed by the boule and the demos and authenticated by a magistrate called κατάλογος βουλίας (SEG 26 445 (C4m); cf. Rhodes, DGS 73–74). The priest of Asklepios served as eponymous official (IG iv2.1 103; cf. Sherk (1990) 267–68). The Epidaureian calendar was of the Doric type, and all months are attested (Trümpy, Monat. 140–43).

At Ps. Skylax 54 (cf. Paus. 2.29.1) the urban centre is de-
scribed as πόλις καὶ λιμήν. It lay on the Saronic Gulf west of Aigina (no. 358) and the peninsula of Methana (no. 352).
The remains are partly submerged and have not been systematically explored. The town occupied a peninsula consisting of two hills, nisi, with a harbour on either side. Pausanias saw six temples in the town, on the acropolis and near the harbour (2.29.1). The theatre was situated on the western slope of the acropolis and has been excavated (Deilaki-Protonotariou (1972), (1973)). It dates to C4–Hellen. (TGR ii. 233), accommodated some 5,000–6,000 persons, and had seats inscribed with the names of magistrates and citizens of the period c.350–200 (SEG 26 452). A boundary stone inscribed ἐρως ἀγορᾶς found on the neck of the peninsula indicates that the agora was near the theatre (SEG 26 452). Epidaurus was fortified in C5 (Thuc. 5.56.5, 75.5).

The sanctuary of Asklepios was situated inland some 9 km south of the harbour. The peak of Mt. Kynortion, which rises behind the theatre, was consecrated to Apollo, originally a hero with healing powers, later worshipped as the god of medicine and the tutelary god of Epidauros (Paus. 2.26.3). His cult can be traced back to C6 (IG iv².1 136 (C61/C5e)). From C4 onwards the Epidaurians implemented an ambitious building programme. The archives are partially preserved (IG iv².1 102–20 (C4–C3e)). Famous architects and sculptors were invited, among them Polykleitos the Younger, allegedly responsible for the plans of the theatre (TGR ii. 208–10) and the tholos (Paus. 2.27–8.1; cf. Roux (1961); Burford (1969)).

Several Epidaurian citizens were victorious in the Olympic Games (Olympionikai 19 (712), 74 (608), 77 (600), 223 (472), 415 (368)). Participation in the Nemean Games is indicated by the city’s possession of an oikos in Nemea (SEG 26 420; Miller (1990) 71, 119). The Asklepiacía can be traced back to C6l through the victory in boxing and pankration won by Themistios, the ancestor of Pytheas of Aigina, who was active c.490–480 (Pind. Nem. 5.53). Whereas Apollo Maleatas is closely associated with Asklepios in the healing inscriptions, there is no connection with the Games before C3m (Perlman (2000) 82). In the beginning the Games mostly attracted local contestants, but in C4 they acquired Panhellenic status. Thus, the rhapsode Ion of Ephesos (no. 844) took part in the games c.390 (Pl. Io 530B; cf. Sève (1993)).

Epidaurus struck coins of silver and bronze from c.350 onwards. (1) Silver on the Aiginetan standard, c.350–323 or later; denominations: drachm, hemidrachm, obol, tetartemorion; types: obv. head of Asklepios laureate; rev. E or EΠ within laurel wreath; or obv. head of Apollo; rev. Asklepios enthroned holding sceptre and extending his right hand over a serpent, with a dog beneath the throne (a depiction of the cult statue of Asklepios described in Paus. 2.27.2); legend: ΕΠΙ. (2) Bronze, after c.350; types: obv. head of Asklepios; rev. Epione (the wife of Asklepios) holding a phiale; legend: ΕΠΙ (Head, HN Π. 441–42; SNG Cop. Argolis 114–30).

According to Hdt. 7.99.3, Epidaurus colonised Kos (no. 499), Nisyros (no. 508) and Kalymna (no. 485); in the Archaic period the Epidaurians controlled Aigina (no. 358; Hdt. 5.83.1).

349. Halieis (Halkos) Map 58. Lat. 37.20, long. 23.10. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Ἁλιεύς, οί (IG v 4 1147.3 (c.460); Xen. Hell. 6.2.3; Diod. 11.78.2), or Ἁλια, η (Ps.-Skytax 50) or, in a late source only, Ἁλικεύ (Paus. 2.36.1). The city-ethnic is, in the plural form, Ἁλιεῖς (Xen. Hell. 4.2.16), from *Ἀλιείς which, however, is unattested (Steph. Byz. 73.12); instead we find the kτεικον Ἀλικός (IG iv².1 122.69 (C4)), which is attested in the plural form as well (Bacchyl. fr. 4.49; IG iv².1.122.80: [ὁ τόδε ἐν ἡ τῶν Ἀλικών]. Halieis is called a polis implicitly in the urban sense (Ps.-Skytax 50; cf. Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 142) and explicitly in the political sense (IG iv².1 122.74, 80 (C4)). The external use of the city-ethnic is attested both collectively (IG v 75.6–7, 19, 27 (424/3); IG iv².1 122.80 (C4); Xen. Hell. 4.2.16, 7.2.2) and individually (IG iv².1.121.120 (C4), 122.69 (C4)). The internal collective use of the city-ethnic Tirynthioi is attested on C5 coins (infra).

The territory is called γῆ Ἁλιάς (Thuc. 2.56.5, 4.45.2) and its area is estimated at 84 km² (Jameson et al. (1994) 18). The earliest community was probably Dryopian (Bacchyl. fr 4.49; Callim. fr. 705, Pfeiffer; cf. Jameson et al. (1994) 63–65). Remains of a settlement at Halieis can be traced back to the Geometric period. The town flourished in the Archaic and Classical periods (Jameson et al. (1994) 45–37). It may have been a polis already in the Archaic period, but the absence of Halieis from the victory dedications at Olympia and Delphi (Paus. 5.23.1–2; ML 27) indicates that, if it was a polis, it must have been a dependent polis, dominated by, probably, Hermion (no. 350) as may be inferred from Ephor. fr. 56 (cf. Jameson et al. (1994) 75). In c.460 Halieis must have been ceded by Hermion to the Tirynthians (no. 356) after they had been expelled from Tiryns by the Argives (Hdt. 6.83.1–2; Strabo 8.6.11–12; Paus. 2.25.8). They formed a community called Ἁλιεῖς οί ἔκ Τίρυνθος at Hdt. 7.137.2, though
on their coins they used their original city-ethnic: ΤΙΡΥΝΘΙΩΝ (infra). In 460/59 a battle between the Athenians and the Peloponnesians was fought at Halieis (Thuc. 1.105; IG 13 1147.3); the territory of Halieis was repeatedly ravaged by the Athenians during the Peloponnesian War (Thuc. 2.56.5, 4.45.2 (r425)), and in 425/4 the Halieans concluded an alliance with the Athenians in which they handed over a fortified port for the duration of the war (IG 13 75 = Staatsverträge 184). Halieis was a member of the Peloponnesian League (Diod. 11.78.2; Xen. Hell. 4.2.16) until after the battle of Leuktra in 371. Halieis may have been among the poleis won over by Epameinondas in 369 (Diod. 15.69.1; cf. Jameson et al. (1994) 80).

The only known source for the constitution of Halieis is a bronze plaque inscribed in the Argive alphabet with a public enactment of C5f, allegedly found at Hermione but now commonly assigned to Halieis (IG 1v 554 = SEG 11 315 = Nomina 1107; cf. Jameson (1974) 68–69; contra Brandt (1992)). A tentative date of c.480, suggested at LSAG 169 no. 20, is probably too high. The document concerns the calling to account of officials in charge of the treasures of Athena and mentions an assembly (haliaia), a boule, and some magistrates (synaryntes and tamiain).

The natural harbour of Halieis (limen at Ps.-Skylax 50) was one of the best along the coast; the sea-ward approach stretched for 1,300 m and narrowed to less than 300 m. The town, today partly submerged, was situated on a small promontory dominating the southern bay of Porto-Cheli. A defence circuit connected the town with an acropolis on which there was a modest temple, perhaps to Athena (Jameson (1974) 73–74). Halieis was fortified in C5 (cf. IG 13 75.11 (425/4)); the circuit was of mudbrick on conglomerate foundations with interval towers; fortification on the site can be traced back to at least C7 (Jameson et al. (1994) 435); Lang (1996) 176 with refs.). The walls enclosed an area of 18 ha, of which some 15 ha were suitable for habitation in C4m. Assuming a population density of 250 per ha, the town may have inhabited 3,750 inhabitants (Jameson et al. (1994) 551). The north-eastern quarter of the lower town was built on a grid plan from C6f (Rudolph (1984)). Outside the walls were found remains of a Classical stadiion (Romano (1993) 36), a stoa and a C7e temple to Apollo (Jameson (1974) 71–72). In C4, after the miraculous cure of a citizen by a snake from the Asklepion in Epidaurus, the polis of Halieis consulted the Delphic oracle and was instructed to build a temple with a statue of Asklepios (IG 1v 2.1 122.69–82; cf. Edelstein and Edelstein (1945) 423.33). Excavations show that the town was abandoned in C3e at the latest (Jameson et al. (1994) 436–37), but an inscription still uses the city-ethnic Αλκικώς in Epidaurus in 220/19 (IG 1v 2.1 42.10–11). Fishermen may have used the site sporadically, as they had when the Tirynthians settled in Halieis in C5f (Baladié (1980) 267).

Halieis struck bronze coins in C4. Types: obv. head of bearded Herakles or head of Apollo laureate; rev. palm tree or club; legend: ΤΙ or ΤΙΡΥ or ΤΙΡΥΝΘΙΩΝ (Head, HN 443; SNG Cop. Argolis 148–55).

350. Hermion (Hermionēs) Map 58. Lat. 37.25, long. 23.15. Size of territory: 4. Type: A. The epichoric form of the toponym is ‘Ερµιον, -όνος η, attested both in inscriptions (IG 1v.1 102.107, 204, 228 (C4f)) and in literary sources (Hdt. 8.73.2; Xen. Hell. 6.2.4; Polyb. 2.52.2). The Ionic form ‘Ερµιόνη, η is mostly attested in literature (Hom. Il. 2.560; Aristocles in Anth. Pal. App. 4.45 (C3); Strabo 8.6.3; Paus. 2.32.7; but see also IG 4v 619.5 (late?)). The city-ethnic is ‘Ερµιονείς (IG 1v 683 = Hesperia 22 (1953) 148–54 no. 1 = LSAG 182.8 (C5m); IG 13 31.2 (C5m)). Hermion is called a polis in the urban sense (Ps.-Skylax 51) and is repeatedly listed under the heading of polis used in the political sense (Hdt. 8.42.1, 43.1, 49.1; Thuc. 8.3.2). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form on coins from C4m on (infra) and externally in inscriptions (ML 27.5 (479); Syll. 3 32 = LSAG 182.7 (C5f); IG 13 31.2 (C5)) and in literature (Hdt. 9.28.4; Thuc. 1.27.2; Xen. Hell. 4.2.16.).

The individual use is found internally in dedications to Demeter Chthonia (Hesperia 22 (1953) 148–54 nos. 1–4 (C5–C4)) and externally in inscriptions (CID 11 5.1.12 (C4f)) and in literature (Hdt. 7.6.3 (rC6m)).

The name of the territory is η ‘Ερµιονείς γιγαντιαί (Thuc. 2.56.5). It comprised the south-eastern part of Akte. Hermion bordered on Troizen (no. 357) to the north-east, on Epidaurus (no. 348) to the north-west, and on Halieis (no. 349) to the south-west (Thuc. 2.56.5). The territory covered 276 km² (Jameson et al. (1994) 18). It also comprised the islands of Pityoussa (Spetses), Aristera (Spetsopoula), Aperonia (Dokos) and Hydra (Hydra) (Paus. 2.34.8–9). In C6s a group of Samian refugees bought the island of Hydra from Hermion for some money they had exacted from the Siphnians, whereupon they handed over the island in trust to the Troizenians (Hdt. 3.59.1). Prior to c.460, when the Tirynthians settled at Halieis, that site may have been controlled by Hermion (Ephor. fr. 56; Jameson et al. (1994) 75).

Hermion provided three triremes at Salamin in 480 (Hdt. 8.43) and 300 men at Plataiai in 479 (Hdt. 9.28.4). Assuming that there is no overlap between the two forces, Jameson et
al. (1994) 556–59 estimate the military strength of Hermion at 900 men, and the total population at 5,000 minimum and 7,500 maximum. During the grain crisis in 330–326 Hermion received 8,000 medimnoi from Kyrene (no. 1028) (Tod 196.40). A communal dedication at Delphi is attested by Syll. 32 (Csf); cf. Jacquemin (1999) no. 314.

Hermion was a Dryopian community (Hdt. 8.43, 78.2). It was a member of the Kalaurian amphictyony (Strabo 8.6.14; Tausend (1992) 12–19) and of the Peloponnesian League (Thuc. 8.3.2). It fought on the Greek side in the Persian War (Hdt. 8.43, 72, 9.28.4, 31.4), and is recorded on the Serpent Column in Delphi (ML 27.5) and in Olympia (Paus. 5.23.2). The importance of the cities on Akte for Athenian maritime interests resulted in an alliance between Hermion and Athens (no. 361), concluded either c.450 (IG i 31 = Staatsverträge 150) or c.425 (Mattingly (1996) 34–35). In 435 Hermion supported Corinth (no. 227) against Korkyra (no. 123) with one trireme (Thuc. 1.27.2). During the Peloponnesian War the territory of Hermion was plundered by the Athenians (Thuc. 2.56.5). After the Athenian defeat at Syracuse, Hermion took an active part in the mobilisation of a Peloponnesian fleet (Thuc. 8.3.2), and after the battle of Aigos potami in 405, a statue was set up in Delphi of the commander of the squadron from Hermion (Paus. 10.9.10). Hermion fought on the Spartan side in the battle of Nemea (Xen. Hell. 4.2.16) and remained loyal to Sparta (no. 345) even after the battle of Leuktra (Xen. Hell. 6.2.3, 7.2.2).

Hermion may have been among the poleis won over by Epameinondas in 369 (Diod 15.69.1; cf. Jameson et al. (1994) 80). Alongside Sparta and other members of the Peloponnesian League, Hermion concluded an alliance with Athens in 370/69 (Xen. Hell. 7.2.2; cf. Staatsverträge 274). Hermion joined the revolt against Makedonia after the death of Alexander the Great (Diod. 18.11.2). IG iv 2.1 102.B.11.203 (400–350) records a payment to a κάρυκη . . . ἐς Ἐρμιόνα.

We have no information about the political institutions of Hermion, and there is no support in the sources for the view that the Aristotelian collection of politeiai included a constitution of the Hermionians (pace Arist. III p. 635, Gigon).

In Ps.-Skylax 51 Hermion is classified as a πόλις καὶ λιμήν. The town lay on the Gulf of Hydra. In the Archaic and Classical periods it was situated at the tip of a headland between two well-protected natural harbours, but later, perhaps in C4 or C5, it was moved c.1 km westwards to the far end of the peninsula and to the lower slopes of Mt. Pron (Paus. 2.34.9; Jameson et al. (1994) 584–90). The older town was fortified with a defence circuit in trapezoidal masonry. Some stretches of the wall and the remains of a round tower can still be seen. The wall has tentatively been dated to C4, perhaps C4r (Jameson et al. 1994) 585–86). The walls enclosed an area of 22.5 ha, of which some 8.5 ha were available for habitation in C6, and almost 17 ha in C4. Assuming a population density of 250 per ha, the town may in C4m have had some 4,200 inhabitants (ibid. 551). Paus. 2.34.10 records seven sanctuaries in the old town; that of Poseidon has been matched with the foundations of a temple of C6 (ibid. 589–90). The most famous cult was that of Demeter Chthonia, for whom Lasos of Hermion composed a dithyramb (fr. 702, PMG (C68); Paus. 2.35.5–8; Ael. NA 11.4).


351. Kleonai (Kleonios) Map 58. Lat. 37.50, long. 22.45. Size of territory: 3. Type: B. The toponym is Κλεωναί, αί (Hom. II. 2.570; Thuc. 6.95.1; Ps.-Skylax 49; IG iv 2.1 103.69 (C4f)). The city-ethnic is Κλεωναίοις (SEG 11 290.6 (c.560?) = ML 9; Pind. Nem. 10.42). Kleonai is attested as a polis in late sources only (Polyb. 2.52.1, 2; Paus. 2.15.1), but its status as a polis in the Archaic and Classical periods is ensured by its mint, its control of the Nemean Games, its Panhellenic victors, and the proxeny decrees for Kleonai citizens (infra). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form on C5–C4 coins (infra) and externally on a C6f bronze plate from Olympia (SEG 31 365) and in literary sources (Pind. Nem. 10.42; Thuc. 5.67.2). The individual use is attested internally in a C6m dedication (SEG 11 290.6) and externally in two Athenian C4 proxeny decrees for citizens of Kleonai (IG iv 2.63 and 365 (on which latter, see infra)).

Kleonai was squeezed in between Corinth (no. 227) and Argos (no. 347) (Paus. 2.15.1–2; Strabo 8.6.19). Its territory covered some 135 km², and its total population has been assessed at c.8,000 persons (Sakellarious and Faraklas (1971) 122, 125, 128). Hostile relations with Corinth (Plut. Cim. 17.1–2) made Kleonai an ally of Argos, and the Kleonaïans assisted the Argives when, in the 460s, they conquered and destroyed Mykenai (no. 353) (Strabo 8.6.19; cf. Diod. 11.65).
Some of the surviving Mykenaians settled in Kleonai (Paus. 7.25.6). During the Peloponnesian War Kleonai was still allied to Argos (Thuc. 5.67.2, 72.4, 74.3). A citizen of Kleonai was appointed proxenos by Athens prior to 378/7 (IG 11.2 63). If the restoration [Kleovai]ov in an Athenian proconess decree of 323/2 (IG 11.2 365; cf. Piérart and Touchais 1996 62–64) is accepted, the inference is that Kleonai was still a polis in C4l (Piérart 1982 129) and that is further confirmed by the bronze coins struck by Kleonai in C4l (infra). But at some point in C4l Kleonai was incorporated into Argos and became a civic subdivision of that polis (SEG 30 355 (C4l); IG IV 616 (c.315)). Remains of a polygonal acropolis fortification with interval towers and a defence circuit of the lower town (Scheer 1989 332) may antedate the incorporation of Kleonai into Argos.

The biennial Panhellenic games held in the sanctuary of Zeus in Nemea (on which see Hart (1977)) were controlled by Kleonai in C3f (Pind. Nem. 4.17.10.42); they had probably been organised by Kleonai from their foundation in 573 (Euseb. 10.18, Helm) and continued to be so until Kleonai was integrated into Argos in C4l. Citizens of Kleonai were victors in the Olympic Games in 732 and 456 (Olympionikai 12 and 273) and in the Nemean Games in C6m (SEG 11 290 = ML 9).

Paus. 2.15.1 records a sanctuary of Athena, apparently of the Archaic period. A sanctuary of Herakles is mentioned at Diod. 4.33.3. Remains found at Archaia Nemea have been tentatively identified with this sanctuary by Frickenhaus (Karo 1993 114).

The sanctuary of Zeus in the valley of Nemea was excavated by S. Miller (1990), and in it was found a C4l list of the orodokoi for the Nemean Games, presumably drawn up by Argos when it took over control of the games c.315 (Perlm 2000 105–55).

Kleonai struck coins of silver on the Aiginetan standard c.471–421 and of bronze in C4l. (1) Silver (C5); types: obv. head of Herakles (obol), or lion’s skin (hemibol), or bunch of grapes (tetartemorion); rev. incuse square; legend: K. (2) Bronze (C4l); types: obv. head of Herakles; rev. parsley wreath; legend: KA or KΛE or KΛΕΩ (Babelon, Traité ii.3. 481–84; SNG Cop. Argolis 111–13). For the date of the bronze coins, see Miller (1976) 192. On later coins the city-ethnic is spelled out: ΚΛΕΩΝΑΙΩΝ (Head, HN4 441).

352. Methana (Methanaios) Map 58. Lat. 37.35, long. 23.20. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Mεθάνα, ἦ (IG 1IV 853.20 (first century AD)), in the Ionic dialect Mεθάνη, ἦ (Ps.-Skylax 46; cf. infra) or Mεθώνη, ἦ (Thuc. 4.45.2 bis, but most editors emend the first occurrence and delete the second; see Maurer (1995) 75) or Mεθάνα, τά (Thuc. 5.18.7; Strabo 8.6.15; Paus. 2.34.1, 3–4). The city-ethnic is Mεθαναίος, attested in the full form exclusively on coins of the Roman period, in abbreviated form on C4l/C3e coins (infra). Methana is called a polis in the urban sense (Ps.-Skylax 46), provided that Μεθάνα πόλις καί λυμήν is misplaced by the Argolic section and erroneously listed among the Lakedaimonian periobic poleis (Shipley 1997 226).

The territory of Methana was the volcanic peninsula on the south coast of the Saronic Gulf. The last attested eruption of the volcano was in C3f (Strabo 13.1.18; Paus. 2.34.1; cf. Baladié 1980 158–63). The peninsula is separated from the continent by an istmus 1,200 m long and 300 m wide. It was an ideal military base, and in 425 the Athenians (no. 361) occupied Methana and built a wall across the istmus (Thuc. 4.45.2). The Peace of Nikias stipulated the restitution of the peninsula to the Lakedaimonians (no. 345) (Thuc. 5.18.7).

In C3 and probably C4 Methana was under Troizenian domination (Thuc. 4.118.4; cf. HCT ad loc.; Paus. 2.34.1). The classification of Methana as a polis in Ps.-Skylax (if correctly interpreted supra) and the C4 coins (infra) indicate that Methana was a dependent polis (Mee and Forbes 1997 68–69). In the Hellenistic period Methana was controlled by the Ptolemaic kings (Robert 1960 156–60) and renamed Μεθώνια ἣ ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ (OGIS 102; SNG Cop. Argolis 147).

The town was on the west coast of the peninsula; it covered an area of c.5 ha in the Archaic and c.8 ha in the Classical period. The acropolis was protected by a defence circuit partly in trapezoidal irregular and partly in isodomic ashlar masonry with square towers; it covered an area of c.1 ha. The probable date is C4s. Apart from the urban centre there were two large second-order settlements on the eastern side of the peninsula, one at Oga (c.6 ha) and one at Magoula (c.2 ha), neither of them recorded in Barr. Furthermore, the peninsula is dotted with smaller sites, some of which can be interpreted as farmsteads and some as small hamlets. The number of sites reached its peak in C3l, and there were considerably fewer sites in C4 (Mee and Forbes 1997 57–69).

Methana struck bronze coins in C4l and C3e: obv. head of Hephaistos in conical pilos; rev. ME or ΜΕΘ in corn-wreath (Gill 1997 278–79; SNG Cop. Argolis 146).

353. Mykenai (Mykenaios) Map 58. Lat. 37.45, long. 22.45. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The Doric form of the toponym
is Μυκάνα, α (IG iv 498.11; cf. Mitsos (1949) 74) or, in the plural, Μυκάναι, αι (Pind. Pyth. 4.49). In the Ionic dialect the toponym is Μυκήνη (Hom. II. 4.52, 7.180, 11.46); in later literature, however, the preferred form is Μυκήναι in the plural (Pind. Pyth. 4.49; Eur. Heracl. 85; Thuc. 1.10.1; Diod. 11.65.5; Strabo 8.6.10), first attested in the Catalogue of Ships (Hom. II. 569). The Doric form of the city-ethnic is Μυκανέαθεν (ML 27.7 (479); IGIV 497 (C2e)); in literature it is Μυκηναίος (Hom. II. 15.638; Hdt. 7.202; Eur. Heracl. 187; Thuc. 1.9.2). The collective and external use of the city-ethnic is attested in inscriptions (ML 27.7) and in literature (Hdt. 7.202). The individual use of the adverbial equivalent is attested internally (IG IV 492.1–2: Φαληραίοις Μυκανεύθαι; cf. SEG 40 334 (C3e)).

Mykenai is referred to as being a polis in a bronze plaque of C3e (IG IV 492.3, cf. SEG 40 334: παρ’ Ἀθαναίας ἐς πόλιος ἰκέτας ἐγέντο), where polis is used either in the sense of acropolis (Lambrinoudakis (1990) 180) or in the urban sense (Marcdac apud Lambrinoudakis (1990) 183–85). Mykenai is not called a polis in any other Archaic or Classical source, but retrospectively by Diod. 11.65.5 (1468) and Paus. 5.23.3 (1480). Polis status in the political sense is strongly indicated by the role Mykenai played in the Persian War. At Hdt. 7.202.1 and 204.1 the Mykenaians are listed among the polis that defended Thermopylae, and they are mentioned on the Serpent Column in Delphi (ML 27.7). There is no clue to the problem of whether Mykenai was a dependent polis in the Archaic period (Piéart (1997)). In the Hellenistic period Mykenai was a kome of Argos (no. 347) (IG IV 498.2 (C3–C2)).

After the battle of Sepeia, Mykenai dissociated itself from Argos. It provided 80 men at Thermopylae in 480 (Hdt. 7.202) and, together with Tiryns (no. 356), 400 men at Plataea in 479 (Hdt. 9.28.4). As a result, Mykenai is recorded on the Serpent Column in Delphi (ML 27.7) and in Olympia (Paus. 5.23.2: Ἀργείων οἱ Μυκήναις ἔχουσαι). During this period Mykenai may have been in charge of the Argive Heraion (Kritzas (1992) 232). In c.460, taking advantage of the weakness of Sparta after the earthquake in 464, the Argives and their allies besieged the Mykenaians, who found refuge behind their Cyclopean walls (Diod. 11.65.3; Paus. 7.25.5–6). Mykenai was starved into surrender and exposed to an andrapodismos (Diod. 11.65.5) whereby the surviving Mykenaians were transferred, some to Kleonai (no. 351), some to Keryneia (no. 236), and some to Makedonia (Paus. 7.25.6). The city itself was demolished and its territory divided among Argos, Kleonai and Tenea (Diod. 11.65.2–5; Paus. 2.16.5, 5.23.3, 8.27.1; Strabo 8.6.19, where Teneaiów is a convincing emendation of MS Τενεατῶν; cf. Piéart (1992) 377–82). The walls were probably dismantled on this occasion (Boethius (1921–23) 415).

354. Orneai (Orneates) Map 58. Lat. 37.45, long. 22.35. Size of territory: 1–2. Type: C. The toponym is Ὀρνέα, α (Ar. Av. 399; Thuc. 6.7.1–2) or Ὀρνεάι (Hom. II. 2.571). The city-ethnic is Ὀρνεάτης (Thuc. 5.67.2; Plut. Mor. 401D, quoting a dedication of C44), in Ionic Ὀρνεήτης (Hdt. 8.73.3). The collective and external use is the only one attested in the sources (e.g. Hdt. 8.73.3; Thuc. 5.67.2). The only source in which Orneai is called a polis (in the urban sense) is Diod. 16.34.3 (1352/3) and 39.4 (1352/3: ἐπὶ πόλιν Ὀρνεὰς τῆς Ἀργείας). Paus. 8.27.1 (rC5) calls Orneai a polisma, but, referring to his own time, Strabo classifies Orneai as a kome (8.6.17; cf. Steph. Byz. 496.1). If Diodorus’ classification of Orneai as a polis can be trusted, it must have been a dependent polis lying in Argive territory. Orneai’s status as an ally of Argos (no. 347) (Thuc. 5.67.2) as well as the use of the collective city-ethnic in a C41 communal dedication set up in Delphi (Jacquemin (1999) no. 381, see infia) support the information obtained from Diodorus that Orneai was still a political community and not just an Argive municipality.

Pausanias (8.27.1) cites the Argive synoecism of Tiryns (no. 356), Hysiai, Orneai (no. 354), Mykenai (no. 353) and Midea as a model for the synoecism of Megalopolis (no. 282) decided in 371/70 and carried out in 368. The Argive subjection of the other cities in Argolis, however, was a protracted process, not a proper synoecism, and Pausanias’ information about Orneai is in conflict with other sources testifying to the polis status of Orneai in C4 (Demand (1990) 59–60; Piéart (1997) 334–38).

After the battle of Mantinea in 418, Orneai and Kleonai (no. 351) are described by Thucydides as being allies of Argos (Thuc. 5.67.2, 72.4, 74.3). In 416/15 a Lakedaimonian army invaded the territory of Argos. The Lakedaimoniarchs conquered Orneai, fortified the place, settled it with exiled Argives, and left a garrison when they withdrew. But assisted by an Athenian expeditionary force, the Argive army attacked Orneai, chased the settlers away and demolished their settlement (Thuc. 6.7.1–2; Diod. 12.81.4–5). According to Paus. 2.25.6, the inhabitants were transferred to Argos (Mogg, Sin. 210–13). Subsequently, Orneai was resettled, and in 353/2 the Lakedaimoniarchs defeated an Argive army in a battle near Orneai and conquered the town after a short siege (Diod. 16.34.3 and 39.4, where the same story is told once again, but in reverse order: at 39.4 the conquest of Orneai precedes the battle). According to Diod. 16.39.4, the
Lakedaimonians attacked Orneai because it was allied with Megalopolis (no. 282). In, probably, C4s the Orneatai defeated a Sikyonian invasion army and had their victory commemorated by a communal dedication in Delphi (Jaccquemin (1999) no. 381; Paus. 10.18.5; Plut. Mor. 401D: Ὅρνεάται ἀπὸ Σίκυονιῶν).

Orneai has been located at Palaioakstraki, i.e. modern Lirkia (Paus. 2.25.5). Remains of a defended circuit in polygonal masonry are still visible; it is undated but perhaps of C4s (Pritchett (1980) 25–27; Pikoulas (1995) 267–70).

355. Phleious (Phleiasios) Map 58, Lat. 37.50, long. 22.40. Size of territory: 3. Type: A. The toponym is Φλειαοῦς, -ιώς, οῦ (Simon. 9.4, Maehler; Hdt. 7.202; Thuc. 5.58.1); the adverbial form Φλειαζάτεος is attested in a C5 dedication from Olympia (SEG 11 1212). The city-ethnic is Φλειασίας (Hdt. 8.72; CIDI 11 31.78 (C4m)), or occasionally Φλειαζός (CIDI 4.1.49–53 (C4f)), in late sources often Φλαάς (Diod. 11.32.1). The epichoric form is [Φλειάζ]άς (SEG 26 415 (c.500)). Phleious is called a polis both in the urban sense (Xen. Hell. 4.4.15) and in the political sense (Xen. Hell. 5.3.10–12; IG IV² 1620 (C4–C3), where [α] τόπολις [α] τῶν Φλειασίων is a plausible restoration). Phleious is called an asty at Xen. Hell. 7.2.6 and 15. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on C5 coins (infra) and externally in inscriptions (ML 27.5 (479); IG IV 112.3 (362/1); CIDI 11 10.1.16 (357/6)) and in literature (Hdt. 9.28.4; Thuc. 4.70.1; Pl. Phld. 57A). The individual and internal use is found in SEG 29 415 (c.500), and the external use is found in IG IV² 1.69 = SEG 11 400.5 (C4f) and in Xen. Hell. 7.1.11.

The name of the territory was Ἡ Φλειασία (Thuc. 5.83.3, 115.3, 6.105.3) or Φλειαοῦς (Xen. Hell. 4.4.15). It covered c.135 km² of fertile plain (Meyer (1941) 272) along the upper reach of the river Asopus. The valley is ringed by mountains and it bordered to the south on Argos (no. 347) and Orneai (no. 354) (Xen. Hell. 7.2.1), to the east on Kleonai (no. 351) and the plain of Nemea (Xen. Hell. 7.2.5), to the north on Sikyon (no. 228) (Xen. Hell. 7.2.1) and to the west on Arkadia (Xen. Hell. 7.2.10). The roads through its territory gave access to the other regions of the Peloponnes, and its strategic importance is reflected in the sources.

Phleious provided 200 men at Thermopylai in 480 (Hdt. 7.202), 1,000 men at Platea in 479 (Hdt. 9.28.4), and 400 men to Brasidas’ expedition in 424 (Thuc. 4.70.1). At Hell. 5.3.16 Xenophon quotes the Lakedaimonians for the statement that Phleious had 5,000 adult male citizens, probably an exaggerated figure (= a total population of 20,000 minimum, with 150 persons per km²) and hardly compatible with Prokles of Phleious’ concession that Phleious was one of the small poleis (Xen. Hell. 6.5.44). On the other hand, if Xenophon is right that more than 1,000 pro-Spartan Phleiasians were in exile in 381 (Hell. 5.3.17), Phleious must have been among the most populous Peloponnesian poleis.

Phleious fought on the Greek side in the Persian War (Hdt. 7.202, 8.72, 9.28.4), and is recorded on the Serpent Column in Delphi (ML 27.5) and in Olympia (Paus. 5.23.2). It was a member of the Peloponnesian League (Thuc. 7.57.2; Xen. Hell. 5.2.8). Having Argos (no. 347) as its arch-enemy and being involved in numerous wars with the Argives, Phleious usually sided with Sparta (no. 345) and the members of the Peloponnesian League. Thus, in 435 the Phleiasians supported Corinth (no. 227) against Korkyra (no. 127) (Thuc. 1.27.2); 400 men joined Brasidas in 424 (Thuc. 4.70.1); and in 418, when Agis attacked Argos, the invasion army rallied at Phleious (Thuc. 5.57). After the oligarchic coup d’état in Argos in 417, Phleious sheltered the exiled Argives (Thuc. 5.83.3) and was subsequently exposed to several Argive incursions into its territory (Thuc. 5.83.3, 115.3, 6.105.3). At the beginning of the Corinthian War Phleious remained neutral (Xen. Hell. 4.2.16), but numerous raids by Iphikrates’ mercenaries forced the Phleiasians to ask for and admit a Spartan garrison (Xen. Hell. 4.4.15, 5.3.15). The government imposed by the Spartans (infra) remained loyal to Sparta after Leuktra (Xen. Hell. 7.2.2). Together with Sparta the Phleiasians approached the Athenians in 369 (Xen. Hell. 7.1.1; Staatsverträge 274), and in 362/1 they concluded an alliance with the Athenians (IG II² 112; Staatsverträge 290). Phleious joined the Greek revolt against Makedonia after the death of Alexander the Great (Paus. 1.25.4).

Phleian citizens received grants of prooxeny from Athens (no. 361) (IG I³ 80.14–16 (421/20)) and from Epidaurus (no. 348) (SEG 11 400 (375–350)), Phleious granted prooxeny to a citizen of Pellene (no. 240) and released him without ransom when he was taken prisoner (Xen. Hell. 7.2.16). The Phleiasians sheltered the Argive priestess of Hera who fled Argos after having set the temple on fire (Thuc. 4.133.3).

Information about diplomatic activities is sparse, but we hear about Phleian envoys to Sparta (Xen. Hell. 5.3.14, 24) and Athens (Xen. Hell. 7.1.1). Several Phleiasians served as naupoiioi in Delphi (CIDI 11 74.77 (357/6), 75.11.50 (336/5)). In 498 Timainetos of Phleious won the hoplite race in Nemea (Paus. 10.7.7), and another Nemean victor is celebrated by Bacchyl. 9, Maehler.

The only information we have about the constitution of
The town of Phleious lay on a ridge rising to 4.60 m above the plain. On the top of the ridge was a citadel called akra (Xen. Hell. 7.2.15) or akropolis (Xen. Hell. 5.3.15); it was mostly uninhabited and used for growing grain (Xen. Hell. 7.2.8). An urban survey of the town indicates that it covered an area of 0.60 ha (Alcock 1991) 428 fig. 3). The town was fortified with a defence circuit, 4.4 km long, probably of mudbrick on a stone socle in ashlar masonry and with interval towers. Some stretches of the stone socle can still be seen in the foundations of the “Corinthian Gate” (Xen. Hell. 7.2.11) in the north-east corner of the wall. The acropolis was separately fortified. The wall has tentatively been dated to C4e (Xen. Hell. 7.2.7–8; Alcock 1991 435–37).

An agora has been identified at the western end of the acropolis ridge (Alcock 1991 432). Of the monumental buildings only two antedate the Hellenistic period: the “Hypostyle Hall” tentatively dated to the Archaic period (Blegen 1925 30–31; Biers 1971 445), and the “Palati”, a rectangular “basilica” (c.34 × 26 m) with a courtyard surrounded by columns and open to the sky, probably of C5s. It may have had rows of seats arranged to look out on the central courtyard, and it may have been used as a bouleuterion and/or a dikasterion (Biers 1971, 1973). A polēmērchos stōa of c.500 is attested in literary sources (Ath. 210B; cf. Roux 1958 161–70). A theatre north of the Hypostyle Hall may go back to C4 (TGR ii. 117).

The principal cult was that of Ganymede (Hebe), whose sanctuary on the acropolis is known exclusively from Paus. 2.13.3–4. An extra-urban sanctuary of Hera is mentioned by Xen. Hell. 7.2.1, 6.11–13.

Phleious may have struck silver staters on the Euboic standard in C6, and undoubtedly struck coins of silver and bronze on the Aiginetan standard from c.431 to c.322. (1) Silver, C6; types: obv. Φ between the legs of a triskeles; rev. incuse square divided into eight triangles. (2) Silver and bronze, c.431 to c.322; denominations: drachm, hemidrachm, trihemiobol, obol and fractions in bronze; types: obv. bull or forepart of bull, first walking, then butting and later butting with head facing; rev. wheel, or ivy-wreath, or wavy exergue line (river Asopos). Some C4 bronze coins have obv. head of Asopos. Legends: on C5 drachms: obv. ΦΛΕΙΑ, rev. ΣΙΟΝ. Other denominations: rev. Φ. (Babelon, Traité ii.3, 509–16; Head, HN² 408–9; Kraay (1976) 100; SNG Cap. Phliaia 1–17.)
Classical periods, however, is strongly indicated by the sacred laws of c.600 (SEG 30 380; see infra) and by Tiryns’ participation in the Persian War on a par with communities which were all polis (ML 27.6). In the Archaic period Tiryns was probably a polis dependent on Argos (no. 347) (Piéart (1997) 335–36). After the battle of Sepeia, however, Tiryns was freed from Argive supremacy and, together with Mykenai (no. 353), it provided 400 men at Plataiai in 479 (Hdt. 9.28.4) and is recorded on the Serpent Column in Delphi (ML 27.6) and in Olympia (Paus. 5.23.2: ἐκ δὲ χώρας τῆς Ἀργείας Τιρύνθιοι). In Olympia in 468 a Tirynthian was the winning pugilist in the boys’ category (Olympionikai 244; P. Oxy. 222.1.42). Shortly afterwards Tiryns was taken over by Argive slaves (doulos; cf. supra 605) expelled from Argos by the sons of those who fell at Sepeia; after some years of peaceful relations, war broke out between Argos and the former slaves in Tiryns, who eventually were defeated by the Argives (Hdt. 6.83.1–2). They found refuge in Epidaurus (no. 348) and Hermione (no. 350), and settled Halieis (no. 349) (Hdt. 7.137.2; Strabo 8.6.11). Some of the inhabitants may have been incorporated into the population of Argos (no. 347) (Paus. 8.27.1). Tiryns was demolished, and part of the booty won by the Argives on this occasion could still be seen by Pausanias in the Argive Heraion and in the temple of Apollo Lykeios (2.17.5, 8.46.3).

The sacred laws of c.600, inscribed in “serpentine” style, are the oldest known documents in which haliāia and demos are juxtaposed (SEG 30 380, 1–4, 8–9: ἀλιαία, δῆμος); and magistrates mentioned repeatedly in the laws are the hieromnai and the platiovimarchoi (SEG 30 380 = Nomina 178: ἰαρομναίοι, πλατισφίναρχοι).

In Pausanias’ day only ruins were left of Tiryns, but the acropolis, called Likymna, with its Cyclopean walls was still impressive (Paus. 2.25.8, 9.36.5). The Archaic temple on the top of the acropolis has been attributed sometimes to Hera (Frickenhuis (1912)), sometimes to Athena (Foley (1988) 145–47). An Archaic sanctuary of Heraclès is attested in the serpentine inscriptions (SEG 30 380 n.15). Further C6 architectural spolia from the acropolis include the probable remains of a propylon or stoai (Schwandner (1988)).

So far no remains of an Archaic settlement have been found on the plain below the acropolis. Evidence of a substantial post-Mycenaean settlement on the “Unterburg” is well documented, and although occasional sections of post-Geometric walls have been found, along with a couple of C7 graves on the surrounding plain, the location of the related settlement(s) has yet to be securely established. This has tempted some historians to see Tiryns as a polis without an urban centre (Koerner (1985)). It would, however, be most unwise, given the very limited extent of excavation on the surrounding plain, to draw negative conclusions about an absence of related settlement. The location of graves and settlement traces throughout the Early Iron Age (from LHIIIC onwards) suggests that the inhabitants of Tiryns lived in settlements clustered on the plain immediately surrounding the acropolis (Morgan and Coulton (1997) 93).

357. Troizen (Troizenios) Map 58. Lat. 37.30, long. 23.25. Size of territory: 4. Type: A. The epigraphic form of the toponym is Τροιζάνιος, -ήνος, η (IG IV 748.3 (C4f)). The Ionic form Τροιζήν, -ήνος, η is found in most of the literary sources (Hom. Il. 2.561; Hdt. 8.41.1; Thuc. 1.115.1; Xen. Hell. 6.2.3) and in inscriptions (ML 23.8; Michel 452.1 (C4l); IG IV 798.2 (Imp.)); variant forms are Τροιζήν (Andoc. 3.3) and Τροιζήν (IG IV 619.4 (late?)). Ps.-Skylax 32, 54 uses the toponym Τροϊζήνα, η. The Doric form of the city-ethnic is Τροϊζάνιος (ML 27.5, 95ß; IG IV.1 122.10 (C4j); IG IV 748.6 (C4f)); the Ionic form is Τροϊζήνος (Hdt. 3.59.1; Thuc. 1.27.2; Xen. Hell. 4.2.16); mixed forms are Τροϊζήνος (Dem. Ep. 2.19; IG II1 1425.227 (C4f), Τροϊζάνος (SEG 9 243 (C4j); IG IV 727.2 A (C3j) and Τροϊζήνοι in a C3l Boiotian proxeny decree (SEG 23 286.2).

Troizen is called a polis in the urban sense (Dem. Ep. 2.18; Ps.-Skylax 52), in the political sense (Arist. Pol. 1335ß 15, 20; Hyp. 5.32; Michel 452.6 (C4l)) and in the territorial sense (Hyp. 5.31). In the C4f accounts of the Delphic naopoioi the Troizenioi are recorded as contributors (CID 11 4.1.9) under the heading ταίδε τὰ πολίων ἤνικαν (CID 11 4.1.3–4), where polis is used in the political sense (cf. also Diod. 12.78.2 (1419/18) and IG IV 750.12 = Bielman (1994) 19 (C3e)).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in a citizenship decree of 369(?): ὁ δάμος ὁ Τροϊζάνιος (IG IV 748.6, 17–18 = Syll. 162) and externally on the Serpent Column in Delphi (ML 27.5 (479)) and in Hdt. 3.59.1; Thuc. 8.3.2; Xen. Hell. 4.2.16. The individual and external use is attested in the thank-offering for the victory at Aigos potamoi (Ἀπολλόδωρος Καλλιφῶνος Τροϊζάνιος: ML 95; Paus. 10.9.10 (1405/4)).

The name of the territory is Τροιζήνια (Thuc. 5.45.2) or γῆ Τροιζήνοι (Thuc. 2.65.5); χώρα is found at IG IV 748.4. It covered 354 km² and included the west coast of the Saronic Gulf from Methana (no. 352) to Cape Skyllaion (Jameson et al. (1994) 18). After the death of Alexander the Great, Troizen lost the island of Kalauria (no. 360), which then became an independent polis.

Troizen provided five triremes at Salamis in 480 (Hdt. 3.67.1).
8.43), and 1,000 men at Plataiai in 479 (Hdt. 9.28.4). Assuming that there is no overlap between the two forces, Jameson et al. (1994) 556–59 estimate the military strength of Troizen at 2,000 men, and the total population at c.11,500 minimum and 16,500 maximum. During the grain crisis in 330–326 Troizen received 6,000 medimnoi from Kyrene (no. 1028) (Tod 196.45). IG iv 2.1 102B.11.205 (400–350) records a payment to a κάρωκοι . . . ἐς Τροζάνα.

Troizen presided over the Kalaurian amphiktyony (Strabo 8.6.14; Tausend (1992) 12–19) and was a member of the Peloponnesian League (Diod. 12.78.2 (r.420)). It fought on the Greek side in the Persian War (Hdt. 8.1.2, 43, 9.28.4, 102.3, 105), and is recorded on the Serpent Column in Delphi (ML 27.5) and in Olympia (Paus. 5.23.2). During the Persian occupation of Attika the Athenians' wives and children found refuge in Troizen (Hdt. 8.41.1; Plut. Them. 10.5; ML 23.8, a C3 copy found in Troizen of a C4m text, quoted by Aischines in 348 (Dem. 19.303)). It was occupied by the Athenians in 460/59, but these had to surrender the city again in the peace of 446/5 (Thuc. 1.115.1, 4.21.3). In 435 the Troizenians supported Corinth (no. 227) against Korkyra (no. 123) with two triremes (Thuc. 1.27.2). In 425 the Athenians occupied and fortified Methana (no. 352) and used it as a base for raids against the neighbouring communities. After the Athenian defeat at Syracuse, Troizen took an active part in the mobilisation of a Peloponnesian fleet (Thuc. 8.3.2) and in the naval operations (ML 95 (405)).

Troizen fought on the Spartan side in the battle of Nemea (Xen. Hell. 4.2.16) and remained loyal to the Spartans even after the battle of Leuktra (Xen. Hell. 6.2.3, 7.2.2). In 369 (?) Epaminondas ravaged the territory of Troizen but failed to conquer the city (Diod. 15.69.1). Alongside Sparta and other members of the Peloponnesian League, Troizen concluded an alliance with Athens in 370/69 (IG IV 748 (369); IG II² 1425.227, 230 (368/7); Xen. Hell. 7.2.2; cf. Staatsverträge 274). After the Greek defeat at Chaireoneia, a pro-Makedonian faction came to control Troizen (Hyp. 5.31; Lycurg. 1.42; cf. Whitehead (2000) 340), possibly as the result of a stasis, since a number of citizens were sent into exile and at least some of them obtained citizen rights in Athens (Hyp. 5.31; Osborne (1983) T72). In 325 Demosthenes found refuge in Troizen (Dem. Ep. 2.18–19; Plut. Dem. 26.5), and after the death of Alexander the Great in 323, Troizen joined the revolt against Makedonia (Diod. 18.11.2; Paus. 1.23.3–5).

The Aristotelian collection of politiai included a constitution of the Troizenians (Arist. fr. 613–15). The only preserved psephisma of the Classical period is a citizenship decree proposed by a named citizen and passed by the boule and the demos (IG IV 748 = Syll. III 162 (369?)), apparently in accordance with a probouleumatic procedure (Rhodes, DGS 77–78). Another citizenship decree is referred to at Hyp. 5.31. A decree of C4l or C3e records the name of the proposer and of the prostates of the boule, and refers to a board of damiourgoi (Wilhelm (1974) i. 38). A C4 dedication of fourteen named damiourgoi and pyrtaeneis (δαµιοργοί καὶ πυρτανίες) is consecrated to ταῦ ἡρώσας, i.e. Phaedra (IG IV 764). Public enactments were set up in the sanctuary of Apollo Thearios (IG IV 748.15–16).

The citizens were organised into phylai (IG IV 748), of which there were at least three and presumably four. Of the three Dorian tribes, the Hyleis are attested (IG IV 750.8 (C3e)); the existence of the Dymanes is indicated at Steph. Byz. 74.8, and it is then a fair guess that the Pamphylowi were to be found in Troizen too. The Scheliodai (Σχελιάδαι: IG IV 748.24) constituted another phyle, which, pace Jones, POAG 111, cannot have contained all the non-Dorian citizens, since sortition conducted by a magistrate called δεκαδένος was used when a naturalised citizen was assigned to a phyle (IG IV 748.20–22). In c.390 exiles from Siphnos (no. 519) found refuge in Troizen (Isoc. 19.23). Two Troizenians are attested as Athenian metics in C4s (IG IV 11² 1673 = SEG 34 122.57–58). In C4l a citizen of Troizen was appointed proxenos by Megara (no. 225) (IG VII 7; cf. Rhodes, DGS 111).

Baukis of Troizen is attested as victor in the Olympic Games in 400 (Olympionikai 358), and in C6s Damotimos of Troizen won a race in Thebes (IG IV 801 = LSG 181.2).

The calendar was of the Doric type, to judge from the months attested in Troizen: viz. Geraistios (Ath. 639C; cf. Trümper, Monat. 199), Artemitos (IG IV 840.9 (C3)) and Apellaios (Wilhelm (1908) 73 (C3f)).

The urban centre was situated below Mt. Aderes and dominated a coastal plain c.2 km wide along the Gulf of Poros. The town had an acropolis with a sanctuary of Athena Sthenias (Paus. 2.32.5). In C6m a temple was built on the slopes of the acropolis (Jameson et al. (1994) 72), which Welter (1941) 20 tentatively identified as that of Aphrodite Akraia (Paus. 2.32.6). The agora was situated in the upper part of the habitation area, and the temple of Apollo Thearios in the agora was the oldest of all temples known to Paus. 2.31.6. A pyrtaeion is attested in a decree of C4l/C3e (Wilhelm (1974) i. 38). An extra-urban complex with a stasion, associated with Asklepios and Hippolytos, dates from C4l or C3e (Welter (1941) 35–38; Jameson et al. (1994) 83).

Troizen was apparently fortified in 369 (Diod. 15.69.1) but the sparse remains of a defence circuit in polygonal mason-
ry are tentatively dated to C3e (Welter [1941] 12), a date which, according to Maier (1959) no. 32, is pure guesswork. For the construction of a diateichismos in 146, see IG IV 757 = Maier (1959) no. 32.

At Ps.-Skylax 52 Troizen is classified as a πόλις καὶ λιμήν. The name of the harbour was Πώλης, and the Greek fleet rallied there before the battle of Salamis (Hdt. 8.42.1; Strabo 8.6.14).

The foundation myth, like that of Athens, involved both Athena and Poseidon. According to Paus. 2.30.6, the myth was reflected in the oldest types of Troizenian coins, which combined the head of Athena with the trident of Poseidon. Troizen struck silver coins on the Attic standard from c.460 onwards. Denominations: drachm, pentobol, triobol, diobol, obol. Types: obv. head of Athena facing, or head of Apollo (Thearios?); rev. trident, sometimes in incuse square; legend: TPO (Head, HN 443; SNG Cap. Argolis 156–59).

Troizen was the metropolis of Halikarnassos (no. 886) (Hdt. 7.99.3; IG IV 750 = Bielman [1994] 19.27–28), Myndon (no. 9.14) (Paus. 2.30.9) and Theangela (no. 931) (Robert, Coll. Froehner 53 = Bielman [1994] 40.5–6 (c.200)). Continued close relations between the colonies and their metropolis are attested in several inscriptions (Wilhelm [1974] i. 39; Rostovtzeff [1931]; Bielman [1994] 19, 40, 43). Furthermore, in collaboration with Achaians from Helike (no. 235), the Troizenians colonised Sybaris (no. 70), but were soon expelled (Arist. Pol. 1303*29–30) and founded Poseidonia (no. 66) instead (Bérard [1957] 215–17).
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THE SARONIC GULF

THOMAS J. FIGUEIRA

I. The Region

Enumeration of the Saronic Gulf islands was incorporated into ancient geographical surveys. Pliny, who does not distinguish the Saronic Gulf from the Gulf of Nauplia, mentions Calauria, Plateis, Belbina, Lasia and Baucidias as opposite Troizen (no. 357), and, opposite Epidauros (no. 348), Cecryphalos, Pityonesos and Aegina (HN 4.56–57). Moreover, off Cape Speiraion, lay Eleusa, Adendros, the two Craugiae, the two Caeciae and Selacosa (Plin. HN 4.57); Aspis (Steph. Byz. 134.17) was off Cenchreae (Plin. HN 4.57), and the Methouriades (Steph. Byz. 440.12; Methurides, Plin.) in the bay of Megara (Plin.). Pomponius Mela notes Pitynussa and Aegina, adjoining the Epidauran coast, and Calauria near the Troizenian shore (Chor. 2.109). Tiny size, lack of attestations, and a nomenclature in which naming after gross features predominates indicate the insignificance of these islands (Philippon and Kirsten (1959) 42–46). Kekryphaleia was the largest of the Saronic islands lying between Aigina and Epidauros, and in 459 it was the site of a naval battle of the First Peloponnesian War in which Athens (no. 361) defeated Corinth (no. 227) and its allies (Thuc. 1.105.1; Diod. 11.78.2; Steph. Byz. 321–3). There is no evidence regarding its political status and history, which were probably linked with those of Aigina (Bürchner (1921)).

II. The Poleis

358. Aigina (Aiginatas) Map. 57. Lat. 37.45, long. 23.30. Size of territory: 2 (85.9 km²). Type: A. The toponym is Αἴγινα, η (Hom. II. 2.562; Thuc. 1.105.2; IG 1⁴.1 102.270 (C4f)). The city-ethnic is Αἴγινητες (IG 1² 259.v1.18), in Doric Αἴγινατας (IVO 143.2 (488); SEG 46 474 (C5e)). Aigina is attested as a polis in the political sense (εἰσομοσ; Pind. Isthm. 5.22; Bacchyl. 13.185; Hdt. 2.178.3), in the urban sense (Hdt. 6.88.1; Dem. 23.211; Ps.-Skylax 53) and as totality of territory = asty + chora (Xen. Hell. 2.2.9). At Bacchyl. 13.71 (πόλιν ὑψιάγυιν) the reference is presumably to the acropolis. For a reference to Aigina as asty, see Bacchyl. 13.188. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on C4 coins (abbreviated as AIGI (Head, HN² 397)) and externally in inscriptions (ML 27.3 (479–478); ATL (IG 1² 259.v1.18); the Spartan War Contribution Accounts (SEG 39 370.A3 (C5 or C4)), and in literature (Hdt. 3.59.4, 8.93.1; Thuc. 1.14.3; Xen. Hell. 5.1.2). The external individual use is found in Hdt. 4.152.3, 8.93.1; IVO 143.2 (488); SEG 46 474 (C5e); CID 11 31.78 (345). Πατρα (= patris) is attested in Pind. Ol. 8.20 and IG 1² 7965 (C4m).

Aigina was structurally atypical because of high economic output from commerce (Arist. Pol. 1291b24). It had two or three harbours (cf. Ps.-Skylax 53) and a flourishing emporion (Dem. 23.211; Ephor. fr. 176). Demographic indicators derive from fleet mobilisations. During the C5e acme, the total population was 35,000–45,000, with 7,000–10,000 slaves/freedmen and 1,500–2,500 males of or above hoplite rank (Figueira (1981) 22–52). This level was attained through assimilation of mainly servile immigrants. In spite of serious exaggeration, Arist. fr. 475.1 testifies to an exceptionally high number of slaves, and fr. 475.2 may imply a high number of foreigners (Figueira (1991) 84–86, (1993) 206–8). Naturalisation was limited or protracted. Even an euerges, the naukleros Lampis (C4m), only achieved ateleia as a metic (Dem. 23.211). Refounded Aigina (C4) had a substantially lower population. Inscriptions attest to foreigners in residence (e.g. IG 1V 50). For Aigina, geographical perceptions reinforced cultural affinities. On social structure, cf. Winterscheidt (1938).

For Aiginetan history, see the chronological table in Figueira (1993) 409–18 with refs.; also Amit (1973) 9–60. In C8m–C7, Aigina had sub-political status under foreign hegemony. Hegemony by Argos (no. 347) was mediated through the cult league of Apollo Pythaeus (Hdt. 6.92.1–2; cf. Pheidon’s apocryphal minting; Ephor. fr. 115). Aigina participated in the Kalaurian Amphiktyony (Strabo 8.6.14). In C7l, Aigina was controlled by Epidauros (no. 348) and became independent in a violent secession (Hdt. 5.83.1–2).
Hellenistic inscriptions mention a pentapolis that might indicate a synoecism (Felten 1975 42–52). Subsequent Aiginetan membership in the Peloponnesian League is unlikely. In 506, the “Heraldless War” began with the Athenians (no. 361) (Hdt. 5.80.2). Aigina submitted to Persia before Marathon (Hdt. 6.49.1). Effective medizing was precluded by a hostage taking by Kleomenes I (Hdt. 6.73.2). In the early 480s, stasis flared in an Athenian-inspired populist uprising under Nikodromos (an aristocratic exile). After brutal suppression, fugitives became Athenians, later assisting against Aigina (Hdt. 6.88–91); see Gehre, Stasis 15–16. In 481, the Aiginetans joined the Hellenic League (Hdt. 7.145.1; ML 27.3), winning the aristeia at Salamis (Hdt. 8.93.1).

Remaining aloof from the Delian League until 457–456, Aigina was reduced to tributary status (Thuc. 1.108.4). It belonged to the Island district (IG 1° 270.v.37) and is registered in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG 1° 259.vii.18) to 432/1 (IG 1° 279.1.88) a total of ten times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 30 tal. in all years except 450/49, when the payment was 26 tal., 1,200 dr. (IG 1° 263.iv.39, ethnical restored), and 432/1, when it was either 9 or 14 tal. Returning fugitives and pro-Athens promoters aided a cult of Athena Polias (IG 4° 29–32). Tributary status ended with an expulsion in 431. Aiginetans scattered, fled to Kydonia (no. 968), or were harboured in the Thyreatis (as a Spartan dependency: Thuc. 2.27.2); some assisted Spartan campaigning (4.57.1–4). An Attic apoikia, in which a remnant population was supplemented by reinforcing settlers, occupied Aigina, claiming to represent the Aiginetan polis (Thuc. 2.27.11; 8.69.3); the 5 per cent import/export tax was levied there (Arr. Ran. 362–64, 380–81 with schol). See also Figueira (1991) 79–128.

In 405, Lysander refounded Aigina (Xen. Hell. 2.2.9). Under Spartan harmostai, Aigina fought in the Corinthian War (Hell. 5.1.1–24), causing damage that helped motivate Athens toward the King’s Peace (Hell. 5.1.29). When fighting flared up in 378, the Aiginetans resumed raiding (Hell. 5.4.61, 6.2.1) that is unclearly demarcated from later attacks (350–340) probably taken in conjunction with Makedonia (Demades fr. 67).

Except for the Attic apoikia, politics was dominated by aristocratic clans or phratries (patrai), celebrated by Pindar (Pyth. 8.38), the status of whose members (pakhees: Hdt. 6.91.1; dynatoi: Paus. 3.4.2) is also witnessed by chamber tombs (see Jeffery (1974)). An Aristotelean politeia is attested (Arist. fr. 475). Two outstanding figures were Krios, who resisted Kleomenes (Hdt. 6.50.2–3), and his son Polykritos, a leader at Salamis (8.92.1–2). Aigna’s fleet was the predominant military instrument (Thuc. 1.14.3), supposedly mak-

ing the Aiginetans thalassocrats 490–480 (Diod. 7 fr. 11). An agreement with Athens (450–446) makes security arrangements (IG 1° 38). A notable Caenact enactment mandated execution for Athenians taken on Aigina (Diog. Laert. 3.19 (1390)). Significant Aiginetan diplomacy included the message of Polyarchos, probably a Spartan proxenos, that the walls of Athens were being reconstructed in 478 (Plut. Them. 19.2) and covert agitation at Sparta (no. 345) on the eve of the Peloponnesian War (Thuc. 1.67.2). In the 480s and later, Aigina was again an Athenian-sponsored (Dem. 26.6; Adespota Conica 3.40, Kock). Likely Aiginetan proxenoi at Athens were Aristeides and Thousydides Melesiou. A proxenos at Plataia is attested (Hdt. 9.85.3). For a possible Aiginetan proxenos for Rhodos at Naukratis (no. 1023), see Syll. 3.110.

The epinicia of Pindar and the status of Aiakos as a judge of souls attest to the quality of the legal system (especially toward xenoi). The Aegeiticus of Isokrates (19) was delivered in an Aiginetan court by a Siphonian exile. The boule and demos are attested in post-Classical inscriptions only (e.g. IG 1v 1.1). The theaoroi were a prestigious board, whose duties probably transcended cult supervision (schol. Pind. Nem. 3.122a–b with Figueira (1981) 314–21). A doubtful civic eponymous is the priest of Aphaia used to date Archaic construction at the sanctuary (IG 1v 1580). Tribes and demes are attested in an inscription of 159–144 (IG 1v 1.43–44).

Additional cults (with attested festival: *): Athena, Aiakos*, Aiakidai, Aphaia*, Aphrodite*, Apollo Pythios/Delphinios*, Apollo and Poseidon, Damia and Auxesia*, Poseidon Hippourios* and Zeus Hellanios*. The Hydrophoria was celebrated in the month Delphinios to Apollo Delphinios as oikistes (schol. Pind. Nem. 5.81a–b). At Salamis the Aiakidai were ritually summoned (Hdt. 8.64.2, 83–84). A doubtful Delphic consultation by the Aiginetans exiles none the less became proverbial (CPG 1.22–23). Gold stars were dedicated for the theaoroi at Aigina (Hdt. 8.122). A polyandron, commemorating casualties at Plataia, was dedicated in 469 (Hdt. 9.85.3). Aiginetans were prominent at Delphi after the Third Sacred War (Figueira (1993) 356–58). IG 1v 39 and 1588 are inventories of dedications inscribed under the apoikia. Aiginetans are attested as victors at all the major Panhellenic games: the Olympic (Pind. Ol. 8), the Pythian (Pind. Pyth. 8), the Nemean (Pind. Nem. 3–8; Bacchyl. 12–13) and the Isthmian (Pind. Isthm. 5–6, 8–9). Aiginetans won altogether twenty-eight attested major victories (e.g. SEG 39 255). Note Praxidamas Olympiakes in 544, victorious in the Nemean and Isthmian Games as well, and the first to have his statue set up at Olympia (Pind. Nem. 6.15–18; Paus. 6.18.7); see further Mann (2001) 192–235.
Public architecture and art (on which Aigina lavished its wealth) can only be summarised. See Welter (1938b) and Walter (1993). Pausanias mentions a temple of Aphrodite, Aiakeion, Phokeion, *kryptos limen* and its mole, theatre, *stadion* (C5–C4 according to Krinzinger (1968)), temples of Apollo, Artemis and Dionysos, Asklepieion, a temple of Hekate, and extra-urban sanctuaries of Aphaia and Damia/Auxesia (2.29.6–30.5). The acropolis on Cape Colonna was impressive as excavaeions of (e.g.) the C6l Apollo temple(s) and Thearion have confirmed (published in the series Alt-Ägina). The *temenos* and temple of Aphaia have had a long history of excavation, since the recovery of sculptures by the Dilettanti in 1811 (Ohly (1976) pp. xi–xiii; Bankel (1993)). The Hellanion on Mt. Oros is demonstrated by excavation to have been another important sanctuary. The military harbour with its ship sheds (480s) was a “state of the art” facility (see Knoblauch (1972)). Remains have been found of the circuit of fortifications of the city, extend- ed in C3c against the Attic threat (Welter (1938a) 480–85). The walls enclosed an area of c.52 ha (Figueira (1981) 39–40. Aigina was besieged in 460/59 (Thuc. 1.105.2; Lys. 2.49), and the walls demolished in 457 (Thuc. 1.108.4). Aigina is attest- ed as a walled city in 389 (Xen. *Hell.* 5.1.2; cf. Aen. Tact. 20.5).

The mint was the earliest producer of silver (from 560 to 540). The Aiginetan standard was much imitated. Its “turtles”, the coins *par excellence* of the Peloponnesos (Poll. 9.74), minted in huge numbers and with high purity, were widely disseminated, dominating circulation in several regions (*IGCH* (1974) 394; Figueira (1998) 36–41, 116–27). Aiginetan money was critical in the monetisation of the Archaic econ- omy. In C5m, the obverse design became a tortoise, while the reverse type remained a conventional incuse square. In C4, the city-ethnic in abbreviation (e.g. *AITI*) was affixed to the reverse. Denominations: didrachm stater, drachm, triobol, obol, hemiobol (C6–456); stater, drachm, triobol, obol, hemiobol (from C4e). Bronze coins were struck in C4l or C3: *obv.* two or three dolphins circling around the letter Α; *rev.* incuse square divided into five compartments, sometimes with legend *AI* in upper compartments (Head, *HN* 394–98; *SNG Cop.* *Attica-Aegina* 501–39; *SNG München*, Attika, Megaris, *Aigina*).

As a long-distance trading community, Aigina was not an active coloniser, but colonised Kydonia (no. 968) in 519, Adria (no. 75) C6l, and Damastion in Illyria after 431 (Strabo 8.6.16). With Miletos (no. 854) and Samos (no. 864), Aigina was significant at Naukratis (no. 1023) (Hdt. 2.178.3).

The Aiginetan claim to autochthony (Hellan. fr. 27) rested on their identity as the Myrmidons metamorphosed from ants by Zeus at the behest of his son Aiakos (Hes. fr. 205, MW; hence the toponym *Myrmidonía*: Steph. *Byz.* s.v. *Myrmidonía*). Historiography suggests successive waves of settlers (Paus. 2.29.5).

359. Belbina (Belbinites) Map. 58. Lat. 37.30, long. 23.55. Size of territory: 1 (c.7 km²). Type: A. The toponym is *Βέλβινα, ἡ* the name of the island being identical with that of its *polis* (Ps.-Skylnax 51; Strabo 8.6.16). The city-ethnic is *Βέλβινητης* (Hdt. 8.125.2) or *Βελβίνητης* (Teles, *Peri Phyges* p. 27, Hense (C3f)). Belbina is called a *polis* in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylnax 51. Its status as a *polis* in the polit- ical sense is indicated by its appearance among the members of the Delian League in the assessment decree of 425/4 (*IG* 71.1.88), where the city-ethnic is used in the external and collective sense. For the individual sense, see the ancedote in Hdt. 8.125.2, where Themistokles admits that he would never have come to fame if he had been a Belbinites. For Belbina’s proverbial insignificance see also Teles (*supra*).

In the decree of 425/4 (*supra*) Belbina was assessed at the modest sum of 300 drachms. Poor and sparsely populated, Belbina may not have seemed worth assessing before, in which case 425 may be its first actual assessment. Or Belbina may have been assessed in an *apotaxis* from a larger neighbour, in which an overarching dependency on Athens weakened an earlier regional subordination. Remains of a nucleated settlement have not been excavated (Ross (1840–43) i. 4, ii. 172–73).

360. Kalauria (Kalaureates) Map. 58. Lat. 37.30, long. 23.30. Size of territory: 2 (31 km²). Type: A. The toponym is *Καλαύρεα, ἡ* (*Syll.* 359.1–2 (*C4l)) or *Καλαύρεα* (*Dem.* 49.13) or *Καλαυρία* (Ps.-Skylnax 52). According to the C3 historian Antikleides (*FGHist* 140 fr. 9) the island was originally called *Εἴρηνη, but Καλαύρεα* is attested as early as Hecat. fr. 125. The city-ethnic is *Καλαυρεάτας* (*Syll.* 359.4–5). Kalauria is called a *polis* in the urban sense at Ps.-Skylnax 52 and in the political sense in a C4s decree: *ἔδοξε τᾶι πόλι τῆν Καλαυρεάταν* (*Syll.* 359.3–5) where the city-ethnic is used in the collective and internal sense. The external individual use is attested in C3 honorary decrees from Epidaurus (no. 348) (*IG* 1ν 96.43) and Delphi (no. 177) (*SEG* 14.402).

From possibly C6l (Hdt. 3.59.1) and during C5–C4l Kalauria was a possession of Troizen (no. 357); the Aristotelian constitution of the Troizenians treated Kalauria (Arist. fr. 614), and the C5l sculptor Pison could be described as “from Kalauria of the Troizenians” (*ἐκ Καλαυρείας τῆς Τροιζηνίων*) (Paus. 10.9.8; cf. 6.3.5). The island served as a naval station: a fleet of Timotheos used it
in 374 (Dem. 49). After the Lamian War, the polis is presented as the political authority for a grant of ateleia to Siphnos in IG iv 839 = Syll. 359 (C4I). The eponymous magistrate was a tamias (IG iv 839, 841). [Plut.] Mor. 846F has been taken to imply the authority of local officials at Kalaureia just before the death of Demosthenes. In general, see Welter (1941) 53–57.

According to Ps.-Skylax 52, Kalaureia had a harbour (limen) and its urban centre contained an agora in which a (Hellenistic?) bouleuterion has been excavated (cf. IG iv 841.24). The nearby Heroon may be connected with both Asklepios and/or Demosthenes (IG iv 847; see Welter (1941) 51–52). At Kalaureia was located the sanctuary of Poseidon Kalauros, known from C8 with a temple from C6I, expanded in C5I–C4I (ibid. 45–50) and four stoas of C5I–C4I (Coulton (1976) 242–43). The sanctuary served as an asylum (Ephor. fr. 150), hence the alternative toponym Eirene. In refuge there, Demosthenes committed suicide; and his μνήμα stood within the sanctuary, perhaps represented by a circular foundation west of the temple (Attic decree cited in [Plut.] Mor. 851C; [Dem.] Ep. 2.20; Plut. Dem. 29.1–30.6). At some point, probably during the First Peloponnesian War, a cult of Ποσείδων Καλαυρεάτης was begun in Attica or cult treasures were transferred there from Kalaureia (note IG13 369.74; cf. Thuc. 1.115.1, 4.21.3; in general, see Wide and Kjellberg (1895); Welter (1941) 43–50.

The Kalaurian Amphiktyony centred on the sanctuary of Poseidon, having a membership of Hermon (no. 350), Epidauros (no. 348), Aigina (no. 358), Nauplia, Athens (no. 361), Prasiai (no. 342) and Minyan (Boiotian) Orchomenos (no. 213); cf. Strabo 8.6.14. Argos (no. 347) later participated for Nauplia, and Sparta (no. 345) for Prasiai. It may have originated c.700 (before the synoecism of Troizen) as a sacralized site for the ransoming of captives, redemption of property, and protected interaction. The amphiktyony existed in the Hellenistic period (IG iv 842 (C3 or C2)). See Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1896); Harland (1925); Kelly (1966); Figueira (1981) 185–88, 219–20; Tausend (1992) 12–19; Hall (1995) 584–85. Cults of Aphrodite, Artemis, Asklepios, Athena Apaturia and Zeus Soter are also attested (Welter (1941) 62).
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ATTIKA

MOGENS HERMAN HANSEN

I. The Region

The region is usually called ἡ Ἀττική (SEG 21 644.13 (C48); Thuc. 1.2.5; Xen. Hell. 1.7.22; Lycurg. 1.115; Arist. Ath. Pol. 33.1; Men. Disc. 1), to which γῆ (Hdt. 6.102) or χώρη (Hdt. 5.64.2) is sometimes added. But, seen as the territory of the Athenian polis, Attika is also called ἡ γῆ Ἡθναίων (Thuc. 2.57). To the north, Attika bordered on Boiotia (Dem. 18.96; Xen. Mem. 3.5.25), and to the west on Megaris (Ps.-Skylax 57). Including the small islands but excluding Oropos, Attika covered c.2,550 km² (Busolt and Swoboda (1926) 758). Oropos covered some 110 km² and was contiguous to Attika (Thuc. 4.99.1); it was under Athenian domination in the years 500–411, c.375–366 and 338–322, but never integrated into Attika (see supra 449). Moving westward from Oropos (Herac. Cret. 7–8; GGM 101), the Boiotian poleis bordering on Attika were Tanagra (Dem. 18.96), Hysiai (Hdt. 6.108.6) and Plataiai (Hdt. 6.108.3). In the years around 500, Hysiai was an Attic “deme” (Hdt. 5.74.2), and Plataiai may have been part of Attika as well (see supra 450). The northernmost Attic demes were Rhamnous (Paus. 1.3.3), Aphidna (Herac. Cret. 6, GGM 1 101), Dekeleia (Thuc. 7.19.2; Hdt. 9.15.1), Phyle (Strabo 9.2.11), Oinoe (Hdt. 5.74.2; Thuc. 2.18.1–2) and Eleusis (Thuc. 1.114.2; Ps.-Skylax 57). North of these demes, in the western part of Attika, lay three strongholds: Drymos, Panakton and Eleutherai. Drymos, still unlocated, was divided between Boiotia and Attika (Arist. fr. 405 = Harp. Δ81; cf. Dem. 19.326; IG II² 1672.271 (329/8)). Panakton was at first a bone of contention (Hellan. fr. 126), but in the Classical period it belonged to Attika (Thuc. 5.3.5, 42.1; cf. Rocchi (1988) 180–81). Eleutherai was originally a Boiotian settlement (Polemon fr. 2; Steph. Byz. 265.10) incorporated into Attika (Paus. 1.38.8) in, probably, 506 (Connor (1990) 8–16). It is a moot point whether it belonged to Boiotia once again in C4 (for: Camp (1991); against: Munn (1993) 8–9). On the roads leading from Attika into Boiotia, see Ober (1985) 111–29; Funke (2000).

Towards the Isthmus, the frontier with Megara ran along the ridge of Mt. Kerata (Van de Maele (1992)). Between Attika and Megaris there was an untilled borderland, called Ἱερὰ Ὀρύσα, which was sacred to the Eleusinian goddesses. After a dispute between the two poleis settled by arbitration, the Hiera Orgas was defined and marked with stone stelai in the years 352/1–350/49 (Dem. 13.32; Didymus, In Dem. Comm. 14.31–15.10 = Androtion (FGrHist 324) fr. 30; IG II² 204; cf. Rocchi (1988) 188–94).

Along the northern frontier major forts were placed at Rhamnous (Ober (1985) 7.1d), Aphidna (2a), Dekeleia (2b), Phyle (3a), Panakton (4a), Oinoe (4b) and Eleusis (8f). Dekeleia was conquered and garrisoned by the Peloponnesians during the second part of the Peloponnesian War, from 413 to 404 (Thuc. 7.18.1, 19.1–2; Xen. Hell. 1.1.33–35, 2.3.3). In the 370s a long wall (the so-called Dema wall) was built in north-west Attika to close the gap between Mt. Parnes and Mt. Aigaleos (Munn (1993)). In southern Attika, major forts were placed along the coast at Anaphylastos (Ps.-Skylax 57), Sounion (Thuc. 8.4; Ps.-Skylax 57) and Thorikos (Xen. Hell. 1.2.1; Ps.-Skylax 57).

The sources for the unification of Attika are conveniently collected and carefully discussed in Moggi, Sin. 44–81, who also gives a copious literature survey. For a recent judicious account, see Parker (1996) 11–17. The local myth was that, alongside Athens, there were eleven (Steph. Byz. 33.18–20; Etym. Mag. 352.53) or twelve (Philoch. fr. 94) other poleis in Attika which, eventually, were incorporated into Athens by Theseus. The other poleis included Tetrapolis (sic), Dekeleia, Eleusis, Aphidna, Brauron and Thorikos (Philoch. fr. 94). This tradition can be traced back to Hekataios (fr. 126; cf. Hansen (1997) 25–26); the unification of Attika is presupposed in the Homeric Catalogue of Ships (I. 2.546–56), and it is described in Thucydides 2.15.1–2: originally Attika was divided between a number of poleis; but Theseus closed down the prytaneia and bouleuteria of all the other poleis, had their magistracies discontinued and created instead one centralised polis with one bouleuterion and one prytaneion. The settlement pattern continued unchanged, and Theseus’ alleged unification of Attika is in fact the only example in our sources of a political synoecism which was not
accompanied by a relocation of (part of) the population. In other sources the unification of Attika is described as a proper physical synoecism (Iloc. 10.35; Diod. 4.61.8; Plut. Thes. 24.1). In Classical Athens Theseus’ synoecism of Attika was celebrated at a festival called Synoikia (Thuc. 2.15.2; IG 13 244.C.16; Deubner (1966) 36–38; Parker (1996) 14). Thucydides seems to have shared the Athenians’ belief that the political unification of Attika took place almost a thousand years before the Peloponnesian War (in 1259 according to Marm. Par. A 20).

Modern historians are divided over the issue, and, by and large, there are three different positions. (1) There was a once-and-for-all synoecism in the Mycenaean period, and the core of Thucydides’ account can be accepted, if stripped of its mythological dress (Padgug (1972)); (2) the unification of Attika was a piecemeal process that took place in C9 and C8 (Snodgrass (1982) 668; Whitehead (1986) 9; Hornblower (1991) 263–64); (3) the unification was an even more protracted process, and the subjection of Eleusis and the Tetrapolis took place in C7 (Hignett (1952) 35–37; Moggi, Sin. 68).

Re (1) The archaeological evidence does not lend much support to the idea of a C14 unification of Attika (Diamant (1982) 43; cf. Parker (1996) 11). And, if there was a unified Mycenaen kingdom of Attika, it probably collapsed towards the end of the Bronze Age (Andrewes (1982a) 362). Moreover, from the late Protogeometric through the Middle Geometric period, i.e. c. 950–800, Athens seems to have been the only nucleated settlement in Attika, and the rest of the region may even have been uninhabited (Mersch (1996) 83).

Re (3) The evidence for a late incorporation of Eleusis and the Tetrapolis is thin. (a) The reference to a king of Eleusis in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter 96–97 concerns the Heroic period and is probably part of the later foundation myth; and Herodotos’ story about a battle at Eleusis in which Tellos was killed need not refer to a battle against the Eleusinians (Padgug (1972) 136–40); (b) in the prevailing version of the Athenian foundation myth τετράπολις is used not as an adjective meaning “with four polis”, but as a proper name denoting one polis, allegedly created by some kind of sympolitia between its four constituent parts: Marathon, Trikorinthos, Oinoe and Probainthos (cf. Syll.3 930 (C4m)). Tetrapolis is recorded as one only of the twelve original Attic polis (Philoch. fr. 94). The citizens had their own city-ethnic *Τέτραπολείς, of which (so far) only the plural form is attested (IG II2 1358.I1.40 (C4m)). Tetrapolis had its own archon (ibid.), and its own representation in Delphi (Syll.3 541 = F.Delphes 111.2 18 (C3l)) and on Delos (Philoch. fr. 75). This foundation myth can be traced back to C5s (Eur. Heracl. 80). The Athenians obviously believed that the rites practised in the Classical period were the last vestiges of what had once been a polis in the proper sense, i.e. a self-governing polity. But we must not infer from the foundation myth that it reflects a historical fact and that Tetrapolis was an independent community in the Dark Ages. The absence of remains of settlements in north-east Attika before c.800 indicates that the tradition about the polis of Tetrapolis is an invention of C7–C6. The cooperation between the four communities and their common institutions may have been a result of the stasis in C7s and C6f (infra 628–29). Also, a modified version of Tetrapolis was an administrative unit in the Classical and Hellenistic periods, being the coastal trittys of Aiantis (IG 13 1131 (C5m)), but Probainthos was transferred to Pandionis. And the old unit of all four communities persisted as a cult organisation (Syll.3 930 (C4m)).

Re (2) We are left with a piecemeal unification in C9–C8 as the most likely solution to the problem: the population of Attika, living in and around Athens in C10 and C9, grew rapidly in the course of C8–C7, and step by step it occupied the hitherto thinly populated or even uninhabited parts of Attika (Mersch (1996) 83–84). But then Athens must have been the only community in Attika in the Early and Middle Geometric period, and the unification of the region cannot have consisted in the incorporation into Athens of communities which were poleis with their own bouleuteria and prytyeia. An acceptance of the archaeological evidence as it stands today implies not just a downdating, but a rejection of Thucydides’ account of the unification of Attika and of the Athenian foundation myth. It follows that there is no reason in this inventory to include separate entries for an Archaic Eleusis or an Archaic Tetrapolis.

The prevailing view of the settlement pattern of Attika in the late Archaic and Classical periods has been that each of the 139 Kleisthenic demes was centred on a nucleated settlement, either a village or in some cases a township (Whitehead (1986) 9–10, 29), and that there is no clear evidence of anyone living and farming out on his own in the country (R. Osborne (1985) 15–22: literary evidence; 22–36: archaeological evidence). An alternative view is that only a part of the population was settled in the nucleated centre and that a significant part of the population of a deme lived in isolated farmsteads (Langdon (1991)).

The latter view is supported (a) by the rapidly growing archaeological evidence, e.g. the isolated houses found during the excavations conducted at the new airport
(Steinhauer (2001)); (b) by a growing consensus that the towers and houses found in great numbers all over Attika must have been the homes of the cultivators and not just used for bivouacking (Hoepfner (1999) 247, 253, 259–60); (c) by a new study of the epigraphical evidence which shows that an oikia situated in rural Attika often denotes a residential house, and that both leases and security horoi provide us with ample evidence of isolated farmsteads (Jones (2000)); (d) by the hypothesis of alternating residence in town and countryside according to the seasons. Ownership of one oikia in Athens and one in the countryside is well attested, at least for wealthy Athenians, and double residence (cf. Pl. Leg. 745E) is an important but neglected problem (Hansen (1987a) 64).

The evidence for nucleated settlements in Attika is, in fact, more problematic than the evidence for dispersed settlement. In spite of intensive archaeological fieldwork conducted in all parts of Attika, only two other nucleated settlements of the Classical period, apart from Athens and the Peiraeus, have been found so far: Thorikos and Halai Aixonides (Hoepfner (1999) 247–56; Goette (1999) 162–64). The houses found in Rhamnous postdate the Classical period, and the houses found in Sounion are supposed to be directly connected with the administration of the sanctuary (Travlos (1988) 405; contra Goette (1999) 165–66). Remains of other nucleated centres of any importance are conspicuous by their absence. Conversely, the survey of one small coastal deme, Atene, seems to show that this deme cannot have had a nucleated centre (Lohmann (1993) 126–36); and Dem. 57.10 indicates that in C8m most members of the deme Halimous lived dispersed on their farms (Hansen (1997) 71 n. 111).

On the other hand, the written sources show that the typical Attic deme had a nucleated centre. Admittedly, no literary source refers to or describes the urban centre of any of the demes; and the ten relevant occurrences in Herodotos (Powell (1938) 85) do not substantiate the claim that demos in Herodotos is best translated as “village” (Whitehead (1986) 48); but Aristotle states that the Athenians used the word demos to denote what the Dorians call a kome, i.e. a village (Poet. 14.4825–35; Hansen (1995) 71); a C4 demos decree about the demarcation of the agora of Sounion forbids the erection of houses inside the boundaries (IG ii² 1180), and archontes komes are attested for Phaleron in the rationes centessimarinum (IG ii² 1598A.9, 18; cf. IG ii² 3105). This piece of evidence fits what we know from a late source: that Peiraius, Phaleron, Xypete and Thymaitadai formed what was called the Tetrakomos (Pollux 4.105: τετράκωµος; cf. Lewis (1963) 33). Thus, in spite of the absence of physical remains, most Attic demes must have been centred on a nucleated settlement. It is superfluous in this publication to provide a list of the 139 Attic demes, for which see Traill’s directory to Barr. map 59, based on Traill (1986). According to Traill (Barr. 59) there were no settlements in Classical Attika other than the centres of the demes. Other sites of the Archaic and Classical periods are classified as forts, sanctuaries, tumuli, etc. On forts, see supra. The major extra-urban sanctuaries were those of Artemis at Brauron (Travlos (1988) 55–80), of Poseidon at Sounion (ibid. 404–29), and of Demeter and Persephone at Eleusis (ibid. 91–169). Theatres of the Classical period are found and/or attested outside Athens–Peiraeus in six demes: viz. Acharnai (IG ii² 1206.6–7 (C4l)), Aixone (IG ii² 1197.21 (c.300); Isler (1994) 311–12 (C5l)), Eleusis (IG ii² 1187.10–11 (C4m)), Ilakia (Isler (1994) 199 (C4)), Spheitos (SEG 36 187.10 (C4s)) and Thorikes (Isler (1994) 308–9 (C5e)).

II. The Poleis

361. Athenai (Athenaioi)  Map 59. Lat. 38.00, long. 23.45.

Size of territory: 5. Type: A. The toponym is Ἀθήναι, aion (Hom. II. 2.546; Ar. Nub. 207; Lys. 6.25; Pl. Leg. 753A; IG i³ 1178.1 (433/2)), in Doric Ἀθῆναι (IG iv² 1 94.3 (359)). The toponym usually denotes the town (Dem. 56.9; Ps.-Skylax 57), but sometimes the town plus its hinterland (ML 23.4; Din. 2.25) and sometimes the political community (Thuc. 1.44.2; Pl. Leg. 753A; Arist. Ath. Pol. 19.4). The city-ethnic is Ἀθηναῖος (Solon fr. 4.30, West; Dem. 1.1; ML 15 (506), 27.2 (479/8); CID 11 32.33 (C4m)), in the Doric dialect Ἀθαναῖος (IV O 30 (C5s)).

Athens is called a polis in the territorial sense (Thuc. 2.48; Dem. 10.63; Din. 1.77; ML 23.4 (C4m)), in the urban sense (Hdt. 7.133.2; Thuc. 2.57; Dem. 18.204, 230; IG iv 1 136.4 (413/12)), and in the political sense (Hdt. 6.106.2; Thuc. 1.70.6; Hell. Oxy. 9.3; Theopomp. fr. 88; Arist. Pol. 1304¹0; IG iv 92.8 (416/5)). Polis in the sense of akropolis is used in fixed idioms down to C4e (IG iv 1 48.3 (485/4); IG iv² 17.10 (394/3), see Henry (1982); Thuc. 2.15.6). The urban centre is called asty (Pl. Phdr. 230D; Dem. 42.7; Hesperia suppl. 29 p. 4.13), and during the civil war of 404/3 the oligarchs residing in Athens are frequently referred to as οἱ ἐξ ἄστεως (Lys. 12.55; Xen. Hell. 2.4.7; Dem. 20.12); the term polisma is found at Hdt. 1.143.2 and Aesch. Eum. 668. For Athens as the patris of the Athenians, see Solon fr. 36.8, West; Plato Com. fr. 217,

The collective sense of the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form on coins (infra), in inscriptions (IG I1 14.22–24 (C5m); IG II2 1.3–4 (403/2)) and in literary sources (Solon fr. 4.30; West; Pl. Euthypfr. 2A; Dem. 1.1) and externally in inscriptions (ML 25 (479); SEG 33 440A (375/4)) and literary sources (Pind. Pyth. 1.76; Hdt. 1.29.1; Hell. Oxy. 1.2). The individual use is in a few cases attested internally (Thuc. 1.1.1; Pl. Prt. 311C), whereas attestations of the external use abound (ML 27.2 (479/8); CID II 41.67 (361/60); IG X1.5 542.36–41 (C4m); Tod 196.5 (330–326)). Kleisthenes wanted membership of a demos (infra) to become part of an Athenian citizen's full name (Arist. Ath. Pol. 21.4), and in C4 this reform had caught on so that, inside Attika, a citizen was called by name, patronymic and demotic (IG X11.5 252–76; Samos (366–322)), attestations of the demotic used outside Athens and Attika are rare (IG II11.3 (C4s from Paros)).

In the Classical period, Athens was probably the most populous of all the Hellenic poleis. In the Persian War, Athens provided 9,000 hoplites at Marathon (Nep. Milt. 5; Suda Ἰ545; cf. Paus. 10.20.2) and 8,000 at Platea (Hdt. 9.28.6). At Artemision they provided 127 ships (Hdt. 8.1.1), and 180 at Salamis (Hdt. 8.44.1). In 431 Athens had a field army of 15,800 men, of whom 13,000 were citizen hoplites; a defence force of 16,000, of whom 3,000 were metic hoplites, and a navy of 300 triremes (Thuc. 2.13.6–7; Hansen (1981)). There were altogether some 50,000–60,000 adult male citizens (Rhodes (1988) 271–77; Hansen (1988) 23–25). Due to the plague in 430–426, war casualties during the Peloponnesian War, and the siege of 405/4, the number of citizens dropped to some 25,000–30,000 in C4 (Hansen (1988) 14–28). During C4 the number of Athenian citizens living in Attika must have been in the range of 30,000, ± a few thousand (Hansen (1985) 65–69; (1994)). The war effort in the Lamanian War of 323/2 (Diod. 18.10.2, 11.3; IG II1 1631.167–74) presupposes that there must have been no fewer than 30,000 full citizens living in Attika (Hansen (1985) 37–40; (1994) 308–10). The result of a census conducted by Demetrios of Phaleron during the decade 317–307 was 21,000 Athenians and 10,000 metics (Ath. 272C). The census, called extasmos, was probably a military review of able-bodied citizens of military age (Hansen (1985) 29–35; (1994) 301–2). For lower population figures, see Gomme (1933) 27: 43,000 in 431; Ruschenbusch (1984) and Sekunda (1992): ca.21,000 in C4. Numbers of free foreigners and slaves fluctuated constantly in accordance with trade and prosperity (Xen. Vét. 2.1–7; Hansen (1988) 10–12). Ten thousand metics were counted in Demetrios' census (Ath. 272C), perhaps an army figure rather than a population figure (Hansen (1985) 31–32), and comparing the number of C4 tombstones commemorating metics (650, of whom 40 per cent are women) with those commemorating citizens (2,110, of whom 35 per cent are women), we can infer that there must have been a sizeable population of metics (Nielsen et al. (1989) 49; Hansen et al. (1990) 26). Down to the end of C4, c.875 citizens of 149 different poleis (Abdera, Abydos, etc.) and c.150 persons from forty different regions and islands (Achaia, Aitolia, etc.) are attested as foreign residents of Athens (Osborne and Byrne (1996)). Classical sources testify to more than 100 citizenship decrees (Osborne (1981–83) D 1–25 and T 1–82), in most cases individual and purely honorific grants of citizenship to foreign notables, but foreign residents were naturalised too (T 30–31), and especially in C5 there were also some block grants to, for example, the Plataians in 427 (Dem. 59.104–5; D 1) and to the Samians in 405/4 (IG II1 151–5; D 4). We have no reliable evidence for the number of slaves, but rough, exaggerated estimates indicate that the number of slaves may even have equalled the number of free (Hyp. fr. 33, Sauppe; Ath. 272C; Isager and Hansen (1975) 15–18). However, the estimate of 30,000 slaves working in the silver mines in C4 is on the high side (Lauffer (1979) 155–62). Sallaeres (1991) 57 suggests 11,000 max. in C5.

This is not the place to survey the history of Athens, and the rest of this entry comprises (A) the relations with other poleis; (B) the constitution, including the civic subdivisions; (C) the Athenian religion; (D) the urban centre of Athens, including Peiraeus; and (E) the Athenian coinage.

(A) Athenian membership of leagues and large alliances starts with the Hellenic League, formed in 481 against Persia (Hdt. 7.132.2, 145.1; Staatsverträge 130) and the Athenians are recorded among the victors on the Serpent Column in Delphi (ML 27.2) and in Olympia (Paus. 5.23.1). The Athenians were the hegemonic leaders of the Delian League, 478–404 (Arist. Ath. Pol. 23.5; Thuc. 1.95–97; Staatsverträge 132; Meiggs (1972); Schuller (1974)). In the years 404–395 they were members of the Peloponnesian League (Xen. Hell. 2.2.20; Staatsverträge 211). Between 378/7 and 338 they were the hegemonic leaders of the Second Athenian Naval League (IG II1 43; Paus. 1.25.3; Staatsverträge 257; Cargill (1981); Dreher (1995)), and in 338/7 they joined the Corinthian League (IG II1 236; Staatsverträge 403). Athens was a
member of the Delphic amphiktyony and provided *ex officio* one of the two Ionic hieromnemones (Aeschin. 2.116; *CID* 11.94.4 (328/7); Lefèvre (1998) 63–69). The Athenians possessed a treasury in Delphi (Partida (2000) 48–70), and eight communal dedications by the Athenians have been found (Jacquemin (1999) 315–16). *SEG* 14 350 is a c.500 dedication at Olympia (Ἀθεναίοι γύνι ἄμυ[ν]) full of Persian spoil.

The Athenians sent out heralds (κηρυκεῖς, *ML* 45.9 (C55)) and envoy-calls, a first attested *πρόσελθε* (Hdt. 5.73.1), from C55 mostly πρέσβεις (*IG II²* 43.72–77 (*3787*)) and the prytaneis (IG II² 116, 176: Thessaly in 361/60) or to international peace conferences (Xen. *Hell.* 6.3.1–3 (*3721/1)). Mostly boards of envoys were sent out, often ten at a time (Aeschin. 2.18 (347/6); Mosley (1973) 55–63). For an (incomplete) list of ninety-two attested embassies sent out from Athens in the Archaic and Classical periods, see Kienast (1973) 595–611. Conversely, foreign embassies were received in Athens by the prytaneis and admitted to the boule and the ekklesia (*IG i²* 40.12–14 (*4465/3); Mosley (1973) 78–79). Two examples are envoy-calls from Leontini in 433/2 (*IG i² 54*) and envoy-conferences in Dionysios I of Syracuse in 668/7 (*IG II² 105*). Athenian *θεοροδόκου* sent hostoi from Delphi in C51 (*Syll.²* 90.16–17) and from Epidaurus in 359 (*IG iV² 94.14.3*).

Athenian had προξενοί in most to Greek poleis. To the end of the Classical period close to 100 are attested in inscriptions. These προξενοί are citizens of sixty-three different Hellenic poleis, of two Phoenician city-states—Sidon (*IG II²* 141, 343) and Tyros (*IG II² 342*)—and the three kings of Makedon (Walbank (1978) 1), of the Pelagonians (*IG II²* 190) and of the Messapians (Walbank (1978) 70; Marek (1984), excluding 5, 8, 14, 21, 42, 53, 59, 65, 68, 72, 76 and 80, but adding SEG 40 57, 72; *SEG* 45 59, 76). To these προξενοί must be added all those mentioned in literary sources (*Thuc.* 3.2.3; *Dem.* 7.38, etc.; Monceaux (1886) 321–23, fourteen attestations). Conversely, in the same period, Athenian citizens are attested as προξενοῖ appointed by different Hellenic poleis. Thus, in C4m, Karthaia on Keos lists a minimum of fifteen and perhaps twenty different Athenians as their προξενοῖ in Athens (*IG XIX²* 542.35–45). For attestations in literary sources, cf. Aeschin. 3.138 and Monceaux (1886) 323–25, fourteen attestations.

Athenians were victorious in all the Panhellenic games. In the Olympic Games, thirty-five victories are attested covering the period 696–328. Victors include Kylon (640?) (*Hdt.* 5.71.1), Miltiades (560) (*Hdt.* 6.36.1), Peisistratos (532) (*Hdt.* 6.103.2), Alkibiades (416) (*Thuc.* 6.16.2) and, perhaps, Demades (328) (*Suda* Δ414); see *Olympionikai* 56, 106, 124, 345, 467. In the Pythian Games, twenty victories from c.542 to 374. Victors include Chabrias in 374 (*Dem.* 59.34); see Kyle (1987) A3, 4, 15, 17, 29, 30, 42, 43, 58, 71, P95, 107; Krause (1841) 105–6. In the Nemean Games, thirty victories from Cöl to C4e. Victors include Alkibiades (Paus. 1.22.6) and Lysis (*Pl. Lysis* 203C); see Kyle (1987) A1, 4, 15, 29, 42, 45, 57, 58, 64, 74, 78. In the Isthmian Games, twenty-four victories from C5e to C4f. Victors include, perhaps, Plato (*Proleg. Plat. Phil.* 2, p. 198, Hermann); see Kyle (1987) A1, 15, 18, 29, 42, 57, 74, 78, P86, P107 (Plato); Krause (1841) 222. The Athenians organised the Panathenaic Games, which were Panhellenic (*IG II²* 2311 (*C4f*); *Pl. Leg.* 833A–B; *Arist. Ath. Pol.* 54.7, 60.3; Kyle (1987) 33–39). In addition to Athenians, many foreigners are attested as victors (*IG II²* 2312 (*C4*); *Kyle* (1987) 38 n. 28.

(B) The *Constitution of the Athenians* is the only surviving one of the 158 Aristotelian politeiai (Rhodes (1981); Chambers (1990); Keany (1992)), and since its rediscovery in 1890 it has been the backbone of any reconstruction of the history of the Athenian constitution, starting with Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1893).

According to the local traditions, Athens was originally ruled by hereditary *basileis* (*Arist. Ath. Pol.* 41.2, frr. 1–2; *Hellan. (FrHist* 332A) fr. 23), and these traditions are usually believed to contain a core of truth (Carlier (1984) 359–72). Kingship was replaced by government by magistrates appointed from the rich and well-born (*Arist. Ath. Pol.* 3.1: ἄριστον καὶ σπουδὰς). The most powerful magistrates were the nine archontes (*Thuc.* 1.116.8; *Arist. Ath. Pol.* 13.3), of whom the chief was the eponymous official (*IG i²* 44.14–175 (*485/4*)). The Athenian list of archontes, published in C51 (*ML* 6), went back to the archonship of Kreon in 683/2 (Hieronymus p. 93, Helm), or 684/3 (Develin (1989) 27–28). According to Herodotos (5.71.2), an important political assembly was the prytaneis of the forty-eight naukrarai; but we do not know what a naukrariai was, nor even whether the word is connected with nau (*"ship"*) or naos ("temple") (Billigmeier and Dusing (1981)). That Athens had an Assembly of the People is extrapolated from later evidence (Solon fr. 36.1–2; Andrews (1982) 387). And the Athenians did not themselves know whether the Council of the Areopagos—composed of all ex-archontes—had been instituted by Solon (*Plut. Sol.* 19; *Arist. Pol.* 1273¾–41) or had existed long before his time (*Arist. Ath. Pol.* 1273¾–74); see Wallace (1989) 3–47.

During C7 growing social and economic tensions produced a series of political crises from about 650 to 530, of
which the most important resulted in the coup of Kylon, the laws of Drakon, the reforms of Solon, and the tyranny of Peisistratos. In 636 or 632 an Athenian called Kylon attempted to set himself up as tyrannos of the city. The coup failed, Kylon fled, and his followers were put to death (Hdt. 5.71; Thuc. 1.126.3–12; Welwei (1992) 133–37). A few years later, in 621 (Develin (1989) 31), Athens acquired its first written code of laws, compiled by Drakon (Arist. Ath. Pol. 7.3; Arist. Pol. 1274b15–16). His law of homicide remained in force, with modifications (IG i2 104; Tulin (1996) 3–19), right down to the time of Demosthenes (Dem. 23.51); but the rest of his laws, whose penalties were “written not in ink but in blood” (Plut. Sol. 17.3; Arist. Pol. 1274b15–18), were superseded in the very next generation by those of Solon (Arist. Ath. Pol. 7.1).

In 594, rich and poor united to give the archon Solon plenary power to dictate a compromise (Welwei (1992) 161–206). He began with a general amnesty (Plut. Sol. 19.4), then abolished enslavement for debt (Arist. Ath. Pol. 6.1) and gave freedom to those so enslaved, even those who had been sold abroad (Solon fr. 36.8–15). Next, he freed the indebted tenants, the hektemoroi, from the sixth-parts they paid to their landlords and allowed them to hold their land free of obligations (Arist. Ath. Pol. 6.1; Solon fr. 36.3–6); but he set himself against a redistribution of the land (Solon fr. 34; Arist. Ath. Pol. 11.2). Besides his economic reforms, Solon also reformed the administration of justice. According to later tradition he set up a People’s Court, called the Heliaia (Arist. Pol. 1273b35–43; Arist. Ath. Pol. 7.3, 9.1), manned by sworn jurors (Arist. Pol. 1274b3; Hansen (1983) 153–55, (1989) 242–49, 258–61 contra Ostwald (1986) 10–11) and gave every party to any lawsuit the right to appeal to the Heliaia against the award of the magistrates (Lys. 10.16; Arist. Ath. Pol. 9.1). Since Solon’s time the Athenians were divided into four property classes: pentakosioi meidimnoi (men worth 500 meidimnai “measures” of natural produce), hippeis (knights), zeugitai (owners of a yoke of oxen) and thetai (literally “menials”, day-labourers) (Arist. Ath. Pol. 7.3). The thetai were excluded from all state offices (Arist. Ath. Pol. 7.3–4), and to the most important offices the electors—probably the People’s Assembly (Solon fr. 5.1–2)—could appoint only citizens from the top two classes (Arist. Ath. Pol. 8.1, 26.2, 47.1; Hignett (1952) 101–2). However, of Solon’s constitutional reforms the most important, according to the tradition, was his creation of a Council of Four Hundred, 100 from each of the four tribes (Arist. Ath. Pol. 8.4). Solon carried out a new codification of the laws (Solon fr. 36.18–20; Hdt. 1.29.1; Arist. Ath. Pol. 7.1; Rhodes (1981) 130–35; fragments in Ruschenbusch (1966)), and “the Laws of Solon” were not revised till 410–399, when they were recodified.

Neither side was satisfied with Solon’s compromise (Solon fr. 34, 37), and the citizen body was soon split into three competing factions (staseis): the “Men of the Plain” (i.e. the plain around Athens) led by Lykourgos, the “Men beyond the Mountains” (i.e. beyond Hymettos and Pentelikon) led by Peisistratos, and the “Men of the Coast” led by the Alkmaionid Megakles (Hdt. 1.59.3; Arist. Ath. Pol. 13.4; Andrews (1982b) 393–98). In 561 Peisistratos became tyrant in a coup (Hdt. 1.59.4–6; Arist. Ath. Pol. 14.1). Apart from two long periods of exile, he ruled Athens until 527 (Hdt. 1.59.3–64.3; Arist. Ath. Pol. 14.1–17.2). He was succeeded by his son Hippias (527–510), who met gradually increasing opposition from the aristocrats, many of whom were forced into exile (Hdt. 5.62.2; Thuc. 6.59.4; Arist. Ath. Pol. 19.3). Two of those who remained attempted a coup in 514: the young Harmodios and his lover Aristogeiton tried to murder Hippias at the Panathenaia festival, but succeeded only in killing Hippias’ younger brother, Hipparchos. They were instantly put to death (Hdt. 5.55–57; Thuc. 6.54–58; Arist. Ath. Pol. 18), and were later regarded as democratic heroes (Thuc. 1.20.2, 6.53.3; Ath. 695B). Statues of the tyrantslayers were put up in 509 and again in 477 (Plin. HN. 34.17 (509); Marm. Par. (FRHist 239) A54 (477)), and a cult for Harmodios and Aristogeiton was instituted (Arist. Ath. Pol. 58.1).

In 510 the Peisistratid tyrants were expelled from Athens, but the revolution ended in a power struggle between the returning aristocrats, led by Kleisthenes, and those who had stayed behind, led by Isagoras. With the help of the ordinary people (the demos), Kleisthenes successfully opposed Isagoras (Hdt. 5.66–73), and, reforming the Solonian institutions of 594, he made Athens a democracy. The term demokratia can be traced back to c.470 (SEG 34 199; Aesch. Supp. 604; Hansen (1986); contra Raafflaub (1998) 37) and may go back to Kleisthenes’ reforms of 508/7 (Hdt. 6.131.1). Kleisthenes’ major reforms were to divide Attika into 139 municipalities (demos), which in turn were distributed among ten tribes (phyllai). Citizen rights were linked to membership of a deme, and a Council of Five Hundred was introduced, with fifty representatives from each of the ten tribes and a fixed number of seats assigned to each of the demos (Arist. Ath. Pol. 21.2–6). Finally, to avoid a new tyranny (Arist. Ath. Pol. 22.3) or, rather, to avoid a repeat of the power struggle of 510–507, Kleisthenes introduced ostracism (Arist. Ath. Pol. 22.1, 3–4; Brenne (2001); Siewert (2002)).
During the next century the new democracy was buttressed by other reforms: in 501, command of the army and the navy was transferred from the polemarch to a board of ten popularly elected generals (strategoi) (Arist. Ath. Pol. 22.2). In 487/6 the method of selection of the nine archons was changed from election to selection by lot from an elected short list (Arist. Ath. Pol. 22.5). Ephialtes’ reforms of 462 deprived the Council of the Areopagos of its political powers, which were divided between the Assembly (ekklesia), the Council of Five Hundred (boule) and the People’s Court (dikasterion) (Arist. Ath. Pol. 25.2). Shortly afterwards, on the initiative of Perikles, political pay was introduced for the People’s Court (Arist. Pol. 1274/8–9) and the Council (IG I 1985 630), so that even poor citizens could exercise their political rights. Athenian citizenship became a much-coveted privilege, and in 451 Perikles had a law passed confining citizenship to the legitimate sons of an Athenian mother as well as father (Arist. Ath. Pol. 26.4; Patterson 1981; Hansen 1985 73–76).

The defeats in the Peloponnesian War resulted in a growing opposition to democracy, and twice the anti-democratic factions succeeded for some months in establishing an oligarchy: in 411 an oligarchy led by a Council of Four Hundred (Thuc. 8.47–98; Arist. Ath. Pol. 29–33; Gomme, Andrewes and Dover 1981 153–256), followed by an equally short-lived mixed constitution in 411/10 based on 5,000 enfranchised citizens (Thuc. 8.97.1–2; Arist. Ath. Pol. 33.1–2); and in 404/3 a radical oligarchy under a junta which fully earned the name “the Thirty Tyrants” (Xen. Hell. 2.2–4; Arist. Ath. Pol. 35–38; Diod. 14.3.7). In 403/2 democracy was restored in a modified form (Hansen 1999 300–4; contra Bleicken 1994 64–66). Legislation (in 403) and all jurisdiction in political trials (c.355) were transferred from the people in assembly to the panel of 6,000 jurors acting as both legislators (nomothetai) and judges (dikastai) (Hansen 1999 167–68, 181–83). In the 330s a kind of minister of finance was introduced (ho epi te dioikesi) (SEG 19 119). He was elected for a four-year period and could be re-elected, and for twelve consecutive years the administration of Athens was entrusted to Lykourgos (Hyp. fr. 139, Sauppe; Burke 1985)). Most of these reforms were allegedly a return to the “ancestral” or “Solonian” democracy (Andoc. 1.83; Aesch. 3.257; Hansen 1999 296–300), but the gradual and moderate transformation of the democratic institutions came to an abrupt end in 322/1 when the Macedonians after their victory in the Lamian War abolished the democracy and had it replaced by a “Solonian” oligarchy (Diod. 18.18.4–5).

After the restoration of democracy in 403/2, more specifically in the age of Demosthenes (355–322), the Athenian democracy was organised as follows (Hansen 1999 55–295). Political rights were restricted to adult male Athenians. Women, foreigners and slaves were excluded (Dem. 9.3). An Athenian was inscribed into his father’s phratría (infra 632) at the age of 3 or 4 (P. Oxy. 2538.11.24–28), and at the age of 18 he became a member of his father’s dème (Arist. Ath. Pol. 42.1; Dem. 30.15, 39.29), with his name inscribed in the dème’s roster (the lexarchikon grammatikon: Aeschin. 1.103; Harp. A17); but as ephebes, most young Athenians (Lycurg. 1.76; Hansen 1988 3–6, 1994 302–4; contra Rhodes 1981 503) were liable for military service for two years (Arist. Ath. Pol. 42; Burckhardt 1996 26–75) before, at the age of 20, they could be inscribed in the roster of citizens who had access to the Assembly (the pinax ekklesiastikos: Dem. 44.35). Full political rights were obtained only at the age of 30, when a citizen was allowed to present himself as a candidate at the annual sortition of magistrates (Xen. Mem. 1.2.35) and of jurors (Arist. Ath. Pol. 63.3) (who served both as legislators and as judges).

In the People’s Assembly (Hansen 1987a), called he ekklesia, any citizen over 20 years of age had the right to speak and to vote (Xen. Mem. 3.6.1). The people (demos) met forty times a year (Arist. Ath. Pol. 43.3), mostly on the Pnyx hill (Aeschin. 3.34); a meeting was normally attended by at least 6,000 citizens, the quorum required for, among other things, ratification of citizenship decrees (Dem. 59.89), and a session lasted only a couple of hours (Aeschin. 1.112). The Assembly was summoned by the fifty proedroi and chaired by the nine proedroi (Arist. Ath. Pol. 44.2–3). Apart from some obligatory items on the agenda, all matters debated by the people had to be debated first in the Council of Five Hundred and passed in the form of a proboleuma (Arist. Ath. Pol. 45.4). The debate consisted of a number of speeches made by the politically active citizens (Dem. 1–10, 13–16), and all votes were taken by a show of hands (cheirotonia), assessed by the proedroi without any exact count of the hands (Arist. Ath. Pol. 44.3). The Athenians distinguished between laws (general and permanent rules, called nomoi) and decrees (temporary and/or individual rules, called psephismata: Andoc. 1.87, SEG 26 72.55–56 (375/4)). The Assembly was not allowed to pass nomoi (Dem. 1.19, 3.10–11) but did, by decree, make decisions on foreign policy and on major issues of domestic policy (Arist. Ath. Pol. 43.6).

Furthermore, the Assembly was empowered (a) to elect the military and financial magistrates (Arist. Ath. Pol. 43.1, 44.4), (b) to initiate legislation (nomothetia) by appointing a panel of legislators (nomothetai, Dem. 3.10–13), and (c) to initiate a political trial (eisangelia eis ton demon) by appointing a
panel of judges (a dikasterion: Arist. Ath. Pol. 43.4; Dem. 19.116).

Citizens over 30 years of age were eligible to participate in the annual sortition of a panel of 6,000 jurors (hoi omomoktes: Ar. Vesp. 662) who for one year served both as legislators (Dem. 24.21) and as judges (Dem. 24.148–51). When a nomos to be enacted was to be named, the Assembly decreed to appoint for one day a board of, e.g., 1,000 legislators (nomo-thetai) selected by lot from the 6,000 jurors (Dem. 24.20–38; Aeschin. 3.38–40). Having listened to a debate, the nomo-thetai decided by show of hands about all amendments of “Solon’s laws”, i.e. the Solonian law code of 594/3 as revised and codified in 403/2 (Andoc. 1.82–85). Boards of nomo-thetai were appointed only infrequently, and to legislate once in a month was considered excessive (Dem. 24.142) (Hansen (1999) 161–77).

Jurisdiction was much more time-consuming (Hansen (1999) 178–224; Todd (1993)). The People’s Court (dikasterion) met c. 200 days in a year. On a court day, members of the panel of 6,000 jurors came to the agora in the morning, and by sortition from among those who presented themselves were appointed a number of courts, made up of 201 or 401 judges each in private actions and 501 or more in public actions. Each court was presided over by a magistrate, and in a session of some eight hours the judges had to hear and decide either one public action or a number of private actions (Arist. Ath. Pol. 63–69). The two most important types of political trial were the public action against unconstitutional proposals (graphe paranomon), against proposers of decrees (Aeschin. 3.3–8), and the denunciation to the people in assembly (eisangelia eis ton demon: Hyp. 3.7–8), used most frequently against generals charged with treason and corruption (Dem. 13.5).

In addition to the decision-making organs of government (ekklesia—nomo-thetai—dikasterion), Athens had about 1,200 magistrates, called archai (Hansen (1999) 225–45; Develin (1989)). They were appointed from among citizens over 30 who presented themselves as candidates (Lys. 6.4). About 100 were elected by the ekklesia (Aeschin. 3.14), whereas the other 1,100 were picked by lot (Dem. 39.12): viz. 500 councilors and 600 other magistrates, often organised in boards of ten with one representative from each tribe (IG II² 1388.1–12). The period of office was restricted to one year, and magistrates selected by lot could not hold the same office more than once (Arist. Ath. Pol. 62.3). Prior to entering office, magistrates had to undergo an examination (dokimasia) before a dikasterion (Arist. Ath. Pol. 55.2–5) and, when their term of office expired, they had to render accounts (euthynai) before another dikasterion (Arist. Ath. Pol. 54.2, 48.4–5).

The magistrates’ principal tasks were to summon and preside over the decision-making bodies and to see to the execution of the decisions made (Arist. Pol. 1322b12–17). Apart from routine matters, the magistrates could not decide anything but only prepare the decisions (Arist. Pol. 1298a28–32). The Council of Five Hundred prepared business for the ekklesia (Arist. Ath. Pol. 45.4) and the nomo-thetai (Dem. 24.48), the other magistrates for the dikasteria (Aeschin. 3.29).

By far the most important board of magistrates was the Council of Five Hundred, called he boule hoi pentakosoi (Andoc. 1.96; Rhodes (1972)). It was composed of fifty persons from each of the ten phyloi, who for a tenth of the year (a prytany of 36 or 35 days) served as prytaneis, i.e. as an executive committee of the Council, which in turn served as an executive committee of the Assembly. The Council met every day except holidays in the bouleuterion on the agora to run the financial administration of Athens and to consider in advance every matter to be put before the demos (Arist. Ath. Pol. 43.2–49.5).

Of the other boards of magistrates, the most important were the ten generals (strategoi) who commanded the Athenian army and navy (Arist. Ath. Pol. 61.1–2; Hamel (1998)); the Board for the Theoric Fund (hoi epi to theorikon), who in the 350s under Euboulos supervised the Athenian financial administration (Aeschin. 3.24–25); and the nine archons who in most public and private actions had to summon and preside over the People’s Court and supervised the major festivals, e.g. the Panathenaia and the Dionysia (Arist. Ath. Pol. 55–59).

In all matters the initiative was left to the individual citizen, in this capacity called ton Athenaion ho bouomenos hoi exestin (SEG 26 72.34; Hansen (1999) 266–68). At any time about 1,000 citizens must have been active as speakers and proposers of nomoi and psephismata or as prosecutors and synegoroi before the People’s Court. But it was always a small group of about a score of citizens who more or less professionally initiated Athenian policy (Hansen (1999) 268–72). They were called rhetores (Hyp. 3.4, 8) or politwmenoi (Dem. 3.29–31), whereas the ordinary politically active citizen is referred to as an idiotes (Dem. Prooem. 13). There were no political parties, and the people did not vote according to the crack of their leaders’ whip (Hansen (1999) 277–87). But by persuasion and charisma major political leaders sometimes succeeded in dominating the political assemblies for a longer period, as did Perikles from 443 to his
death in 429 (Thuc. 2.65.10), and Demosthenes in the period 341–338 (Dem. 18.320).

The ordinary citizens were reimbursed for their political activity as ἐκκλησιαται or nonothetai or dikastai or bouleutai (Arist. Ath. Pol. 62.2; Dem. 24.21). Very few of the magistrates were paid on a regular basis (Hansen (1979); contra Gabrielsen (1981)), but many obtained perquisites instead (Isoc. 7.24–27; Hansen (1980a)). Speakers and proposers in the political assemblies were unpaid, and those who attempted to make a profit out of politics were regarded as sycophants and liable to punishment (Dem. 59.43).

The Council of the Areopagos was a survival of the Archaic period (Wallace (1989)), and in the period 461–404 mainly a court for cases of homicide (Philoch. fr. 64). In C4, however, the activity of the Areopagos was again progressively enlarged in connection with the attempts to revive the “ancestral” or “Solonian” democracy (Din. 1.62–65; Lycurg. 1.52; Hansen (1989)).

 Athenian civic subdivisions comprise phylai, trittyes, demois and phratriai (Jones (1999) 51–220). During the periods covered by our sources neither the genos (Parker (1996) 59–65) nor the oikos (Hansen (1998) 135–37) was a civic subdivision in the proper sense. In the Archaic period the Athenian citizens were organised into four phylai: viz. Geleontes, Argadeis, Aigikoreis and Hopletes (Hdt. 1996 59 and twelve trittyes divided into three sycophants and liable to punishment (Dem. 1979)).

This organisation was still maintained in C4 for religious purposes (Hesperia 4 (1935) 19–32 no. 2.23–35). In the years after 508/7 Kleisthenes implemented a new organisation whereby Attika was divided partly into three districts—the town of Athens with its immediate hinterland (asty), the coast (paralia), and the inland (mesogeia)—and partly into 139 municipalities of varying size, called demois. Each demos was headed by a demarchos, and many had a nucleated centre where the members held their meetings, called agorai (Osborne (1985); Whitehead (1986)). Next, the 139 demois were distributed over thirty trittyes, with ten trittyes in each of the three districts. Each trittyt consisted of from one to ten demois (Siewert (1982)). Finally, ten phylai were formed, each consisting of three trittyes, one picked by lot (Hansen (1987 b)) from each of the three districts. The ten phylai were named after local heroes and called Erechtheis, Aigeis, Pandionis, Leontis, Akamantis, Oineis, Kekropis, Hippothontis, Aiantis and Antiochis (Jones (1999) 151–94). All these civic subdivisions were basically territorial, but membership was hereditary (Hdt. 5.69; Arist. Ath. Pol. 21.2–4; Arist. Pol. 1319 b 19–27; Traill (1975); (1986)). According to Traill (1986) 123, there were 140 demois, Acharnai being a divided deme, but see Whitehead (1987) 443. In the Archaic period, all Athenians were organised into phratriai (IG i² 104.18, 23 (C 271)), gentilic groups with hereditary membership, but also locally based (Lambert (1993); Jones (1999) 195–220). This system persisted in the Classical period and was not co-ordinated with the distribution into demois. Thus, Theodoros of Dekeleia (LGPN no. 96) and Pantakes of Oion (LGPN no. 19) both belonged to the phratria of the Demotionidai (IG i² 1237.2, 11 (396/5)).

(C) The patron divinity of Athens was Athena, in this function called “Athena who watches over Athens” (Ἀθηνᾶ ἡ Ἀθηνῶν μεδέουσα: ML 23.4–5 (C 471 but r 480)), or Athena Poliouchos (Ar. Eq. 581–85) or Athena Polias (Aesch. 2.147), an epithet which originally denoted the akropolis rather than the polis (Cole (1995) 301–2). Athena was worshipped under many different forms, each specified by an epithet denoting function or origin, and each manifestation of Athena had its own sanctuary, its own personnel and its own rites. In the Archaic and Classical periods at least seventeen different manifestations are attested: viz. Athena Areia (Paus. 1.28.5), Boulia (Ant. 6.45), Evoi Palladio (IG i² 369.71 (423/2)), Ergane (IG i² 561 (C 44)), Hephastia (IG i² 233B.4 (343/2)), Hippi (Paus. 1.30.4; cf. Thuc. 8.67.2), Hygieia (IG i³ 506 (C 54)), Itonia (IG i³ 151–52 (429/8)), Lemnia (Paus. 1.28.3), Nike (IG i³ 36.5–6 (424/3)), Pallias (IG i³ 647 (C 61)), Pallenis (IG i³ 383.121–22 (429/8)), Parthenos (IG i³ 850 (C 55)), Phratra (IG i³ 2344.1 (C 44)), Polias (IG i³ 375.6 (410/9)), Poliouchos (IG i³ 775 (C 55)) and Zosteria (IG i³ 369.92 (423/2)). For the other gods, see Nilsson (1967) 383–601.

In addition to the cults of all the gods, there were cults of heroes, of whom some 300 are attested in the sources (Kearns (1989) 139–207), ranging from Herakles (Dem. 19.125; Harp. H14; Woodford (1971)) to the poet Sophokles under the name of Dexion (Etym. Magn. 256.6–12; Kearns (1989) 154).

During the democracy many new cults were introduced. Some of them were purely or primarily political, viz. the cults of the tyrannicides Harmodios and Aristogeiton (Arist. Ath. Pol. 58.1), of the ten eponymous heroes (IG i² 1140 (C 44); Kron (1976)), of Zeus Boulaios and Athena Boulaia in the bouleuteron (Ant. 6.45), of Zeus Eleutherios, connected with the victory over the Persians at Plataiai (Thuc. 27.12; Raaffa 65 (1985) 125–47), of Theseus in the (still unlocated) Theseion (Aesch. 3.1), reformed c.475 with the recovery of his bones (Plut. Theo. 36.2) and culminating in
C4 with Theseus seen as the father of Athenian democracy (Dem. 59.75; Paus. 1.3.3–4; Garland (1992) 82–98), and in C4 of Demokratia, democracy personified (IG II² 1496.131–41 (332/1); Alexandri-Zahou (1986)). Other new cults were those of foreign gods, such as Thracian Bendis (Pl. Resp. 327A–28A; Simms (1988)), or cults of gods of foreigners, such as Phoenician Aphrodite worshipped by Kitians, or Isis worshipped by Egyptians (IG II² 337 = RO 91 (333/2)).

A substantial part of the Athenian law code consisted of a sacrificial calendar regulating all public sacrifices (Hesperia 4 (1935) 5–32; Lys. 30.18; Clinton (1982)), and of the c.600 civilian archai, some 200 were exclusively or principally engaged in the administration of the sanctuaries and organisation of the sacrifices and festivals in honour of the divinity of the sanctuary in question (Hansen (1980b) 155, 162–63). The rites were performed by priests (hiereis) and priestesses (hiereiain) who were not themselves archai (Dem. Prooem. 55.2; Busolt and Swoboda (1926) 171). In the Archaic period, all public priesthoods were filled for life from among members of the gene, hereditary groups of upper-class Athenians, based on descent in the male line and apparently subdivisions of the phratriai (Aeschin. 2.147; IG I² 6 (C3f); Parker (1996) 56–66, 284–327). In the course of the Classical period the democratic polis took over, and an increasing number of priesthoods were filled from among all Athenians. The first attested example is the priestess of Athena Nike (IG I² 35 = ML 44 (C5m)).

In a year of 354 days, some 60 days were devoted to annual festivals (Mikalson (1975)) paid for by the polis and organised by polis officials (Deubner (1966)). The Athenian festival calendar is different from, but closely related to, the Ionian calendar: the Athenian months of Poseideon and Thesimeron are found in many Ionian poleis, but Mounychion is peculiar to Athens, and the common Ionian months of Artemision and Apaturion are not found in Athens (Triumpy, Monat. 6–18).

The major Athenian festivals were: (a) Panathenaia: a festival of the goddess Athena, celebrated in the days around her birthday on 28 Hekatombaion (schol. Pl. Resp. 327A). The Athenians distinguished between the Greater Panathenaia, introduced in 666/5 and held every four years (Arist. Ath. Pol. 18.2–3, 60.1–3; IG II² 2311–12 (C4f)), and the Lesser Panathenaia, celebrated in the other three years (Agora xv 175 (C4s)). At the Greater Panathenaia Athena was honoured with a grand procession, Panhellenic athletic competitions (IG II² 2311–12 (C4f); Neils (1992)), and recitation of the Homeric poems (Lycurg. 1.102; Jensen (1980) 145–49). (b) The Eleusinian Mysteries: a festival of Demeter and Persephone, celebrated in Athens and Eleusis in the month of Boedromion and restricted to those who had been, or wished to be, initiated into the Mysteries (with no distinction drawn between citizens, foreigners and slaves) (SEG 30 61 (C4m); Arist. Ath. Pol. 57.1; Andoc. 1.110ff; Clinton (1974)). (c) Thesmophoria: a fertility festival, celebrated in the month of Pyanopsion on the Pnyx by married women of citizen status in honour of Demeter (schol. Ar. Thesm. 80; Brumfield (1985) 70–103). (d) Apatouria: a festival celebrated in the phratriai in the month of Pyanopsion (schol. Ar. Ach. 146). On the third day of the festival citizens had their sons registered in their phratries (Dem. 39.4), and their daughters were presented to the members (Isae. 3.73, 76, 79; Cole (1984) 233–37). (e) Ta kat’ aroous Dionysia: the rural Dionysia were celebrated in the month of Poseideon in all the demes (SEG 33 147.31 (C4f)). The principal ceremony was a phallic procession (Ar. Ach. 241–83; Whitehead (1986) 212–22). (f) Anthesteraia: a festival of Dionysos celebrated in the month of Anthesterion when the Athenians opened and drank the new wine (Plut. Mor. 655E) and celebrated a ceremonial wedding between Dionysos and the wife of the archon basileus (Dem. 59.74–84; Hamilton (1992)). (g) Ta en astei Dionysia: the Greater Dionysia, celebrated in the month of Elaphebolion for Dionysos Eleuthereus, whose sanctuary was situated on the south slope of the Acropolis. In addition to phallic and otherprocessions, the Greater Dionysia were the setting for performances of tragedies, comedies, satyr plays and dithyrambs (IG II² 2319–23 (C3e, rC4); Pickard-Cambridge (1968)). (h) Thargelia: a festival of Apollo, celebrated in the month of Thargelion. Two scapegoats (pharmakoi) were driven out of the city. The festival included a procession and choral competitions for choirs of men and boys (Ant. 6.11–13; Hesp. 55; Bremmer (1983)). (i) Dipoliaea: a festival of Zeus Polies, celebrated in the month of Skirophorion. The sacrifice of a bull with an axe was followed by a ceremonial homicide trial of the axe, conducted before the Court of the Prytaneion (Paus. 1.24.4, 28.10; Parke (1977) 162–67).

(D) Settlements beneath the Acropolis can be traced back to C8 (Lang (1996) 152–63), and Snodgrass (1987–89) 60–62 has classified Athens as an instance of his “Model B” (56), viz. “a sprawling loose-knit group of settlements” which over time grew to form a conurbation. The change from a group of small villages to a conurbation took place when the lower town was enclosed with a defence circuit (infra). The agora of the Archaic town with the prytaenion and the Theseion (Paus. 1.17–18) lay north-east of the Acropolis (Dontas
(1983)). Both the Acropolis and the lower town were sacked and burnt down by the Persians in 480 (Hdt. 8.53.2) and again in 479 (Hdt. 9.13.2). For archaeological remains of the Persian destruction of the Akropolis, see Hurwit (1999) 136.

During the Dark Ages and the early Archaic period the only fortification was the C31 cyclopean walls of the Acropolis (Hurwit 1999) 74–80). In C6l, however, the town had a separate defence circuit (Thuc. 6.57.1–3), demolished by the Persians in 480/79 (Hdt. 9.13.2; Thuc. 1.89.3, 93.2). This wall may have been constructed in C6f (Vanderpool 1974; Weir (1995)), but no traces have yet been found. In spite of Spartan protests, a new larger wall was built in 479/8 (Thuc. 1.89.3–93.2). This so-called Themistoklean wall was built of mudbrick on a stone socle with seventeen gates and numerous interval towers (Wycherley (1978) 11–18; Judeich (1931) 124–44). It was repaired twice in the Classical period: in the years 395/4–392/1 at the instigation of Konon (Xen. Hell. 4.8.9–10) and again in 338/7 at the instigation of Demosthenes (Aeschin. 3.27; Dem. 18.3000); both repairs are visible in the preserved part of the wall at Kerameikos (Ohly (1965) 360–76). The line of the Themistoklean wall has been accurately traced, and it can be established that it enclosed an area of almost 211 ha. The walls of Peiraeus were first built by Themistokles during his archonship in 493/2 (Thuc. 1.93.3), but demolished in 480/79 (supra), then rebuilt in 479/8 (Thuc. 1.93.3–8). The walls, of polygonal masonry (Garland (1987) 163–65), were 60 stades long (Thuc. 2.13.7) and enclosed an area of 305 ha. The Long Walls were built in the years 458–457. The northern wall ran from Athens to Peiraeus, the southern wall from Athens to Phaleron (Thuc. 1.107.1 and 108.2). A new wall, running parallel to the northern wall, c.184 m to the south, was built c.445 (Harp. Λ.44; Pl. Grg. 455E; Judeich (1931) 155–60). The Long Walls and the walls of Peiraeus were demolished in 404 (Xen. Hell. 2.2.20, 23), but rebuilt, in ashlars masonry (Garland (1987) 165–67), in the years 395/4–392/1 (Xen. Hell. 4.8.9–10; IG II 1566–64) and repaired in the years after 338/7 (IG I1 244; Maier (1961) nos. 1–10). For a preserved section of the Long Walls, see AAA 5 (1972) 339–46. The Acropolis was besieged by the Athenians opposing Kylon c.636 (Thuc. 1.126.9), by the Lakedaimonians and the Athenians opposing Hippias in 510 (Hdt. 5.64.2), by the Athenians opposing Pisistratus in 508 (Hdt. 5.72.2), and by the Persians in 480 (Hdt. 8.52). Athens with Peiraeus was besieged by the Lakedaimonians and their allies in 405/4 (Xen. Hell. 2.2.4, 10–20).

Most of the buildings serving the major Athenian political institutions have been located, and of several, substantial remains are still visible. The Prytaneion lay somewhere north-east of the Acropolis (Plut. Sol. 19.4, quoting a Solonian law of C6e; SEG 33 115 (C3m); Donas (1983) 60–62). The bouleuterion has been found on the west side of the agora (Arist. Ath. Pol. 48.11; Wycherley (1957) 128–37; Thompson and Wycherley (1972) 29–38). The “Old Bouleuterion” of c.500 (Shear (1995); contra Miller (1995)) was from c.400 used as a Metronom and housed the public archives (Dem. 19.129; Sickinger (1999)) and was replaced by the new bouleuterion (Thompson and Wycherley (1972) 31–34). South of the bouleuterion was a building called thalos (Andoc. 1.45) or prytanikon (Agora xv 84.40 (C3m)) where the fifty prytaneis resided (Wycherley (1957) 179–84; Thompson and Wycherley (1972) 41–46). In front of this complex lay the monument of the ten eponymous heroes where bills and some public enactments were set up (Isae. 5.38; Wycherley (1957) 85–90; Thompson and Wycherley (1972) 41–46).

Athens was one of the few poleis that had a separate meeting-place of the popular assembly. Since c.500 or perhaps c.460 it was placed on the hill of the Pnyx (Pnyx I), and it was twice reconstructed: c.400 (Pnyx II) and again in the 330s (Pnyx III) (Thompson (1982); Hansen (1989) 129–65; Forsén and Stanton (1996)).

No remains have been found of the homicide courts (Arist. Ath. Pol. 57.3). The most important was the Areopagos, meeting on the Hill of Ares (Dem. 23.65–66), the Palladion, presumably in Phaleron (schol. Aeschin. 2.87), the Delphinion near the Olympieion (Paus. 1.19.1), and a court en Phreatto near the Zea harbour in Peiraeus (Boegehold (1995) 43–50). The People’s Court had its principal rooms in the agora (Ant. 5.11–11; Lys. 19.55). In the north-east corner of the agora beneath the stoa of Attalos have been found the foundations of a large square peristyle of c.300, and beneath that the foundations of five buildings (A–E). Building A of C5l had a floor area of 900 m2 and may have been the so-called Heliaia (Dem. 47.12), i.e. the Heliaia of the Thesmothetai (IG IV 75.6) (Hansen (1989) 232–37; Boegehold (1995) 11–15). In the Lykourgan period there was a central law court (Arist. Ath. Pol. 63.2), probably a predecessor of the square peristyle (Boegehold (1995) 15–16, 108–13). Other public buildings used as court-rooms were the Stoa Poikile (IG II 11 1641 B.38–40 (C4m)) and the Periklean Odeion (Dem. 59.52), which is in fact the only known building large enough to accommodate the occasional panels of 2,000 or even 2,500 dikastai (Lys. 13.35; Din. 1.52). Associated with the lawcourts was the prison (desmoterion) (Pl. Phd. 59 D; Hunter (1997)), perhaps to be identified with a building of C5m in the south-west corner of the
agora (Camp (1986) 113–16). Some of the offices serving (boards of) magistrates are known from written sources (Wycherley (1957) 20–25, 126–84) and/or from archaeological evidence (Camp (1986) 100–35), viz. the Stoa Basileios (Dem. 25.23), the Thesmothetion (Arist. Ath. Pol. 3.5), the Strategion (Dem. 42.14), the Poteletion (Dem. 25.57) and the Argyrokopion (IG Ι 1543.5, 8.11).

Apart from the walls and the purely political architecture, Athens had an abundance of monumental buildings erected by the polis, including temples and shrines and elaborate edifices serving the navy. In this context it suffices to single out three peaks of building activity: the first under Peisistratos and his sons in C6s, the second under Perikles in C5s, and the third under Lykourgos in C4s.

(1) On the Acropolis the Peisistratids’ principal activity was the renovation of the temple of Athena Polias (Boersma (1970) no. 48); in the agora they were responsible for the altar of the Twelve Gods (Thuc. 6.54.6–7; Gadbery (1992)), the enneakrounos which was the most famous fountain of Athens (Thuc. 2.15.5; Boersma (1970) no. 100) and, on the west side, a trapezoidal building with a columned courtyard (Building F, Boersma (1970) no. 144), believed by some to have served the Solonian boule (Rhodes (1972) 18–19), by others to have housed the Peisistratid family (Camp (1986) 45). East of the Acropolis they laid the foundations of a giant dipteral temple for Zeus Olympios (Arist. Pol. 1313b23; Boersma (1970) no. 70).

(2) The monuments invariably associated with Perikles are the temples on the Acropolis (Thuc. 2.13.3; Lycurg. fr. 58; Hurwit (1999) 154–221, 313–18); the Parthenon (447–432), the Propylaia (437–432) and, after his death, the temple of Athena Nike (427–422) and the Erechtheion (421–407). Furthermore, the Odeion south of the Acropolis (c. 440–430; Hurwit (1999) 216–217, 317), and the Hephaisteion, west of the agora (450–440?: Boersma (1970) 59–61, no. 58). The most expensive single item of Perikles’ building programme, however, was the construction of ship sheds for the triremes in Peiraeus (neosoikoi: Dem. 22.76), which presumably cost 1,000 tal. but were demolished under the Thirty in 404/3 (Isoc. 7.66).

(3) A building programme begun under Euboulos was interrupted by the war against Makedon, but resumed and finished under Lykourgos during the twelve years he was in charge of the Athenian finances (Hintzen-Bohlen (1997)). The programme is attested in a posthumous honorary decree for Lykourgos of 307/6 which singles out, in the Peiraeus, the completion of altogether 372 ship sheds, neosoikoi (IG Ι 11 1627.398–405) and the Arsenal, skueothike (IG Ι 11 2 1668 (347/6)); in Athens, the erection of a Panathenaic stADIOn, the furnishing of the theatre of Dionysos with a grand auditorium (koilON) in marble, the gymnasiwn at the Lykeion (IG Ι 11 2 457.5–9; Plut. Mor. 852C), and, we can add, the rebuilding and extension of the assembly place on the Pnyx (= Pnyx III, supra).

C.600 the agora was moved to its later place, and c.500 it was marked with horoi (IG Ι 1 1087–89; Camp (1986) 38). In addition to sanctuaries and buildings serving the Council and the courts, the agora was adorned with a number of stoas: the Stoa Basileios from perhaps C6m (Lang (1996) 152–53), the Stoa Poikile from C5f (Camp (1986) 68–72), the Stoa of Zeus Eleutherios from c.430–420 (Camp (1986) 105–7), and the South Stoa from c.430–420 (Camp (1986) 122–28). Finally, the large square building formerly called the Heliaia was probably a shrine of Aiax and in C4f was used as storeroom for large quantities of imported grain (Stroud (1998) 85–108).

In Athens and Peiraiaeus there were at least three theatres: the famous theatre of Dionysos on the south slope of the Acropolis (IG Ι 11 2 410.39 (335/4); Pickard-Cambridge (1946)), an unlocated theatre known exclusively from a C4s account of leases (Agora xix L.6.147–48), and the theatre in Mounichia (Lys. 13.32; McDonald (1943) 51–54; Garland (1987) 161).

In addition to private gymnasias (Xen. Ath. Pol. 2.10), Athens had three major public gymnasias (Dem. 24.11.4; Hyp. 1.26.22–4), all placed outside the walls in the suburbs of Athens (Kyle (1987) 71–92): Akademeia (IG Ι 1 1091; Harp. A56), where Plato had his school (Diog. Laert. 3.5–7), Lykeion (IG Ι 11 2 457B.7–8 (307/6); Harp. A30) where Aristotle taught (Diog. Laert. 5.2, 10) recently found in the excavations of Odos Rigilles (AR (2001–2) 8), and Kynosarges (IG Ι 1 134; Plut. Them. 1.3) frequented by Antisthenes (Diog. Laert. 6.13). There was no monumental stADION in Athens until Lykourgos had one built near the river Ilissos for the Great Panathenaia of 330 (IG Ι 11 2 351.16–20 (330/29); Plut. Mor. 841D; Kyle (1987) 92–95). There was also a hippodrome (Dem. 47.53; Xen. Hipparch. 3.14) which lay outside the city near Echelidai (Etym. Magn. 340.53) and was not necessarily a monumental building (Kyle (1987) 95–97).

Very little is known about the residential quarters of Athens in the Classical period (Hoepfner (1999) 239–45), and the best evidence is still part of an industrial quarter between the agora and the Pnyx, excavated in the 1950s (Thompson and Wycherley (1972) 173–82).

The inhabitants of Athens were buried outside the walls. Graves lined all the major roads, and several large cemeteries.
were placed along the northern part of the walls stretching from the Sacred Gate in the north-west to the Diocharian Gate in the north-east (Kurtz and Boardman (1971) 91–96). From C6 onwards the main cemetery was at Kerameikos (Knigge (1988)).

In the Archaic period, the Athenian harbour was at Phaleron (Hdt. 6.116). In the Classical period, Athens had three harbours, all in Peiraeus (Ps.-Skylax 57): two smaller ones, Zea (SEG 19 80.10 (C35)) and Mounichia (SEG 41 13 (C57)), both east of the Akte peninsula, and a larger one, Kantharos (schol. Ar. Pax145), west of the peninsula (map in Travlos (1988) 347). Zea, Mounichia and the southern side of Kantharos were military harbours (IG ii² 1627.401–5 (330/29)). The commercial harbour, the emporion, (SEG 26 72.21; IG i² 1101.A–B (C57m)) stretched along the eastern and northern sides of Kantharos (Garland (1987) 83–95). The emporion was reserved for overseas commerce (Dem. 34.26–28, 42–44; Arist. Ath. Pol. 51.4; Gauthier (1981) 7–13). The emporion included five large pillared halls (schol. Ar. Pax 145). The Great Stoa, or Barley Hall, was the storage place for imported grain (schol. Ar. Ach. 548). The second, called Deigma, was a market-hall for merchants and bankers (Xen. Hell. 5.1.21). The urban centre of Peiraeus was laid out by Hippodamos of Miletos in C57 (Arist. Pol. 1267b22–23). The residential area was laid out on a grid plan with insulae subdivided into plots of equal size, on which were built roughly similar terrace houses (Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994) 22–50).

Only a very rough guesstimate can give us an idea of the size of the urban population. The walls of Athens and Peiraeus enclosed altogether 600 ha (Athens: 211 ha, Peiraeus: 300 ha; the space between the Long Walls: 100 ha). The space between the Long Walls was probably uninhabited except during the Peloponnesian War (Thuc. 2.17.3). If we assume that half of the remaining 500 ha were inhabited, and that the population density was 250 persons per ha (Jameson et al. (1994) 549–51), the result is an urban population of c.62,500 persons to which must be added the population of the suburbs (Isoc. 16.13). Now, tombstones and bouleutic quotas indicate that in C4 c.7.5–9 per cent of the citizens belonged to the six urban demes (Hansen et al. (1990) 32–35). Let us assume that they lived in the urban area; that, say, twice as many had migrated from Attica into Athens (Hansen (1989) 87–90); and that the number of metics and slaves living in Athens-Peiraeus equalled the number of citizens. The result is an urban population of between 47,000 and 56,000 persons in the age of Demosthenes.

(E) Athens had its own mint from c.550. The first series of coins, the so-called Wappenmünzen, may have been struck from silver imported from Thrace (Kraay (1962) 33); the silver used for the so-called owls came from the Laurion mines (Ar. Av. 1106: γλαύκες Λουρειωτικαί). (1) Silver coins on the Euboic standard c.550–525, the so-called Wappenmünzen. Denominations: mostly didrachm, but in the later phase also tetradrachm, drachm and obol. Types: obv. a great variety of types including triskeles, amphora, owl, wheel, Gorgoneion, etc.; rev. incuse square, sometimes diagonally quartered and sometimes with head of panther. (2) Silver coins on the Attic standard c.520 onwards, the so-called owls. Denominations: decadrachm (only in C57), tetradrachm, didrachm, drachm, triobol, diobol, obol and (in C4) fractions down to hemitartemorion. Types: obv. head of Athena in helmet adorned with three olive leaves; rev. owl in incuse square with olive branch in top left corner. Legend: ΑΘΕ. The minting of silver coins was interrupted during the Declean War and resumed not later than c.393 (Ar. Eccl. 819). During this period the Athenians struck coins of gold and bronze with similar types, the gold coins probably in 407/6, the bronze coins down to 393. The minting of silver coins was resumed in C4e, and the C5 types were used with small stylistic changes, the most important being that Athena’s full face eye was replaced by a profile representation. (3) In C4e the small fractions were replaced by bronze coins with similar types (Starr (1970); Kraay (1976) 55–77; Kroll and Walker (1993); SNG Cop. Attica 1–82). In C5–C4 imitations of Athenian silver coins were struck in Egypt, in Phoenicia, in Asia Minor and in India (Mørkholm (1974); Kraay (1976) 73–74, 76–77, 292–93; Buttrey (1982); SNG Cop. Attica 105–10; Suppl. 1244–45). Athenian coins and imitations in great numbers have been found in Sicily, in Egypt, along the Syrian coast, and in southern Asia Minor. None has been found in the Pontic region and in the Propontis, and very few in Thrace and along the west coast of Asia Minor (Isager and Hansen (1975) 46–49, 215–17, 222).

That Athens did not take part in the Archaic colonisation is a widespread but seriously misleading belief. In the Archaic period Athens colonised Sigeion (no. 791) (C71); Elaious (no. 663) (C71 and C6m); Chersonesos (no. 661) (C6m); Paktye (no. 671) (C6m); Sestos (no. 672) (C6m); Kardia (no. 665) (C6m); Lemnos (nos. 502–3) (c.500); Imbros (no. 481) (c.500), and sent klerouchs (?) to Chalkis (no. 365) (506–C5e). In C5 Athens sent colonists and/or klerouchs to Skyros (no. 521) (476/5); Eion (no. 630) (476); Neapolis (no. 677) (C5?); Neapolis (no. 63) (C5m); Andros (no. 475) (C5m); Sybaris 3 (no. 70) (446/5); Thourioi (no.74)
in Poteidaiæ were called self-governing (Συνοικεῖν (καὶ τὰ έαυτῶν καρπουµένους)). They were explicitly banned from holding office in Athens, unless they left Eleusis and registered as ordinary Athenian citizens once again. Eleusis was to be a member of the Peloponnesian League like Athens, and the Eleusinians and Athenians were to share the Eleusinian sanctuary and the mysteries (Arist. Ath. Pol. 39.1–5; Diod. 14.35.6; Cloché (1915) 256–59, 278–95; Loening (1987)).

Soon afterwards it was reported to Athens that the oligarchs in Eleusis had begun to hire mercenaries (Xen. Hell. 2.4.43), and, according to a late source (Just. Epit. 5.10.8–11), they even attacked Athens. In 401/0 (Arist. Ath. Pol. 40.4) the Athenians marched out in full force (Xen. Hell. 2.4.43) and laid siege to Eleusis (Lys. 25.9). Some of the oligarchs deserted and joined the Athenian democrats (ibid.). During a meeting between the two sides, the Athenians killed the Eleusinian strategoi and persuaded the Eleusinians to give up Eleusis and move back to Athens, where a new amnesty was declared (Xen. Hell. 2.4.43; Arist. Ath. Pol. 40.4).

The bronze coins struck in C4–C3 and inscribed ΕΛΕΥΣΙ were for the requirements of the Eleusinian festivals and have no relation to the oligarchic polis of 403–401. Types: obv. Tripodemos in winged car drawn by snakes; rev. pig standing on bacchos. Legend: ΕΛΕΥΣΙ and, on one, ΑΘΕ (Head, HN² 391; SNG Cap. Attica 414–19). The legend is probably an abbreviated form not of the ethnic ΕΛΕΥΣΙ (ΝΙΩΝ) but of the ktetikòn ΕΛΕΥΣΙ (ΝΙΑΚΩΝ), and the coin inscribed ΑΘΕ reveals that such coins were struck by the Athenian mint for the festival of the Mysteries, not by the Eleusinians (Kroll and Walker (1993) 26–28).

362. Eleusis Map 59. Lat. 38.05, long. 23.35. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: B. The toponym is Ἑλευσία, -ίας, η (Arist. Ath. Pol. 39.1; Xen. Hell. 2.4.43; Diod. 14.35.6). No city-ethnic is attested, but the official name of the polity seems to have been οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι οἱ Ἑλευσινοὶ κατοικοῦντες (Arist. Ath. Pol. 39.2, 5, 40.4). There is no reason to assume that Eleusis was a polis in the early Archaic period, but in the years 403–401 it was a self-governing polity settled with the core of the oligarchic faction in the civil war 404/3. It is not called a polis in any source, but it seems to have had the same status as a klerouchy. The Eleusinians remained Athenian citizens and are described as epittimoi and Athenaioi. The official name of the polity seems to have been οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι οἱ Ἑλευσινοὶ κατοικοῦντες (supra), just as the C4 klerouchs in Poteidaiæ were called οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι οἱ ἐν Ποτειδαιᾳ κατοικοῦντες (Dem. 7.10). Like klerouchs, they could return to Athens and reactivate their full Athenian citizenship. Considering the full self-government enjoyed by the community, Eleusis in 403–401 must be included in this inventory as a polis type B.

During the oligarchic regime in 404/3, the Thirty wanted to secure Eleusis for themselves as a possible refuge and had many of the Eleusinians executed (Xen. Hell. 2.4.8–10). In connection with the restoration of the democracy in 403, it was decided that those of the oligarchs from Athens who so wished could leave Athens and have Eleusis as their residence alongside those of the Eleusinians whom they wanted to retain. Thus, the new polis was created by a synoecism of oligarchs from both communities (Arist. Ath. Pol. 39.3: σωνοικεῖν). The oligarchs in Eleusis were banned from Athens, and the democrats in Athens from Eleusis. The Eleusinian oligarchs were still Athenian citizens (ἐπίτιµοι), but self-governing (κυρίους καὶ αὐτοκράτορας ἑαυτῶν kai τα ἐαυτῶν καρπουµένους). They were explicitly banned from holding office in Athens, unless they left Eleusis and registered as ordinary Athenian citizens once again. Eleusis was to be a member of the Peloponnesian League like Athens, and the Eleusinians and Athenians were to share the Eleusinian sanctuary and the mysteries (Arist. Ath. Pol. 39.1–5; Diod. 14.35.6; Cloché (1915) 256–59, 278–95; Loening (1987)).

363. Salamis (Salaminios) Map 59. Lat. 38.00, long. 23.35. Size of territory: 2 (93 km²). Type: A. The toponym is Σαλαµής, -ίας, η (Hom. II. 2.557; Aesch. Pers. 273; Thuc. 2.93.4; IG1 1.2 (C61)), denoting both the island (Hdt. 8.76.2) and the town (Ps.-Skylax 57; cf. Strabo 9.1.9). An older toponym is Κυρχεία (Aesch. Pers. 570; SEG 26 121.32 (C1)); Strabo 9.1.9). The city-ethnic is Σαλαµίνης (IG 11 748 (C5e); Dem. 19.251). Salamis is called a polis in the urban sense at Ps.-Skylax 57, and in the territorial sense (but in a mythological context) at Cratinus fr. 246. Salamis is called the metropolis of Cypriote Salamis at Aesch. Pers. 894. The collective use of the city-ethnic is probably attested internally in abbreviated form on coins (infra) and externally in an Athenian decree of C4 (IG 11 1260.19) and in literature (Aeschin. 1.25; Dem. 19.251). The individual use is attested internally in sepulchral monuments found on Salamis (IG 11 1073, undated) and externally in those found in Attika
In a war between Athens and Megara over Salamis (Solon frs. 1–3, West; Plut. Sol. 8) ended with an Athenian victory and the conquest of Salamis. The credit for the victory goes in some sources to Solon (Plut. Sol. 9; Dem. 19.251; Arist. Ath. Pol. 17.2), in others to Peisistratos (Aen. Tact. 4.8–12). During the *stasis* in C6f Athens seems to have lost Salamis once again to the Megarians (Plut. Sol. 12.5), and the dispute over Salamis was eventually submitted to Lakedaimonian arbitration. The Athenians seem to have invoked an allegedly interpolated line about the Athenians who were liable to pay taxes and give military service to Athens (IG ii² 1). The commonly accepted view is that these Athenians were klerouchs, although perhaps of a peculiar kind (Cargill 1995) pp. xxiv, 60; for a different view see Taylor (1997) 63–74. The only explicit evidence is schol. Pind. Nem. 2.19. In the C6f Athenian decree concerning Salamis, “τοίς ἐξ Ἔλευσιν κλερούσι” has been restored by most editors (IG ii² 1.1 = ML 14; Koerner (1993) 1). More important is that a lease of confiscated property on Lemnos of 387/6 compares “klerouchs on Lemnos” to “those on Salamis” (Agora xix L.33–34: γῆν τοῖς κλεροῦσι καὶ τοῖς ἐκ Σαλαμίνια. And in an honorary inscription of c.325, Ἀθηναίων ὁ δήμος ὁ ἐν Σαλαμίνι appears alongside Ἀθηναίων ὁ δήμος ὁ ἐν Πεισίστρωτον (IG ii² 3206; SEG 46 261; cf., however, Salomon (1997) 96–101).

The epigraphic evidence, principally sepulchral monuments, shows that, in addition to metics and slaves (IG ii² 1570.11.42 (C330)), the population of Salamis consisted partly of Athenians registered with their demotics and partly of so-called Salaminioi. A good many tombstones found on Salamis commemorate Athenians with ordinary demotics (IG ii² 7101 (C4, etc.); Lys. 13.44; see Taylor (1997) 267–316, nos. 9, 10, 16, 18, 29, etc.). Some two score tombstones with known provenance were set over Salaminioi; a few were found on Salamis, but the majority in Attika (IG ii² 10171–215 with addenda in Taylor (1997) 263–316). Who these Salaminioi were is still a moot point. No link can be established between the *genos* of the Salaminioi attested in Athens in C4 (IG ii² 1232 (C41); Agora xix L.44 (363/2)) and the Salaminioi who were named after the island of Salamis (Taylor (1997) 47–63; Parker (1996) 312). Salaminioi named after the island of Salamis must be distinguished from Salaminioi from the polis on Cyprus. The latter are sometimes specified as being Ἀθηναίοι ἀπὸ Κύπρου (IG ii² 10237–18 (C4)). Pace Taylor (1997) 136, 264, it is unbelievable that all the tombstones found in Attika commemorate Salaminioi from Cypriot Salamis. Most of them, perhaps all, are probably Salaminioi from the island in the Saronic Gulf (so also Osborne and Byrne (1996) 272–76). Finally, in spite of all the prosopographical information we possess, there is not one single attestation of a person who is recorded both as a Salaminian and as belonging to one of the Athenian demes. The only evidence of an Athenian who is both a Salaminian and a member of a deme is Moiroskos of Eleusis (SEG 28 103.6–7 (332/1); cf. SEG 31 199A), who is presumably identical with Μοιροκός ὁ Σαλαμίνιος at Harp. My. He may be a Salaminioi naturalised by the Athenians, like Ἑρακλείδης ὁ Κλαζόμενος (Arist. Ath. Pol. 41.3), or he may be one of the Athenians living on Salamis. The sources do not support Taylor’s view that the ethnic Salaminioi designates a full Athenian citizen who happens to reside on Salamis and that all Salaminioi were inscribed in the 139 demes (1997) 123–58. The population of Salamis was probably divided into Salaminioi and Athenians (for a parallel, see IG xii.8 668, a decree mentioning side by side the Athenian *demos* (sc. on Skyros) and those who live on Skyros, *infra* 774). The presumption is that the so-called Salaminioi were never integrated into the Athenian state. They had no representation in the Council of Five Hundred, and never filled any other Athenian office (Develin (1989)); they are not attested as jurors in the People’s Court (Kroll (1972)), and were presumably excluded from the *ekklesia* as well. Both groups were entitled to pass decrees, both the *demos* of the Athenians on Salamis (IG ii² 3206 (C325)) and the *demos* of the Salaminioi (IG ii² 1260.19 (C41); IG ii² 1225.4 (C3m)). The eponymous official was the ἄρχων ἐν Σαλαμίνι (IG i³ 1.7–12 (C6f); IG ii² 3093 (C4e); IG ii² 1227.1 (C2s)), who was an Athenian magistrate, selected by lot (Arist. Ath. Pol. 54.8) and paid by the Athenians (Ath. Pol. 62.2) like other overseas magistrates.

The rural Dionysia were celebrated on Salamis (Arist. Ath. Pol. 54.8; IG ii² 3093 (C4e)), and there were cults of the nymph Salamis (IG ii² 1955 (C320); obv. of C4 coins (*infra*), of Aias (Hdt. 8.64.2; SEG 26 121.32 (C1l); rev. of C4 coins (*infra*)), and of Athena Skiras (Hdt. 8.94.2).
The town was situated on the eastern side of the island, north of Kynousura. It was fortified, but the C4 circuit wall was rebuilt in C3m (IG ii² 1225.11–12) and later, but today only the faint outline of the walls can be observed (Haider (1989) 596). In the town was an agora with a C4e statue of Solon (Aesch. Pers. 303; Lycurg. 1.73; IG ii² 1228.27–28 (C1)); another was on Kynousura, where remains of it were seen by Stewart and Revett (Hammond (1973) 304–10). On the north–west tip of the island at Boudoron was a fortress mentioned in connection with the Peloponnesian raid on Salamis in 429/8 (Thuc. 2.93.4, 94.3, cf. 3.51.2).

The Salaminians struck bronze coins in C4. Types: obv. female head (nymph Salamis?); rev. Boiotian shield and sword in sheath with strap (shield of Aias?). Legend: \( \Sigma \Lambda \Lambda \Lambda \Lambda \). The beginning of this coinage is now dated 400 (Kroll and Walker (1993) 215). The legend is probably the abbreviated form of the ethnic, \( \Sigma \alpha \lambda \alpha (\mu \nu \iota \iota \omicron \omicron) \), indicating that the coins were struck on Salamis by the Salaminians. Taylor (1997) 193–95 suggests as an alternative that the legend is \( \Sigma \alpha \lambda \alpha (\mu \nu \iota \omicron \omicron \kappa \omicron \omicron) \), and that the coins were struck in Athens (Head, HN² 392; SNG Cop. Attica 455–58).
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I. The Island

The name of the island is Εὔβοια, ἦ (Hom. Il. 2.535–36; Pind. Ol. 13.112; Hdt. 4.33.2; Dem. 19.87; Aeschin. 3.88; IG I² 40.77 (C35); IG xii.9 207.44 (C36)), meaning “rich in cattle”; cf. the obv. types of the coins of Eretria (no. 370) and Karystos (no. 373). Alternative toponyms are Μάκρις, “Long Island”, because it stretched for 1,200 stades from Cape Kenaion to Cape Geraistos (Callim. Ημν. 4.20; Strabo 10.1.2; Steph. Byz. 283.20) or Ἀβαντές (Hes. fr. 296, MW; cf. Hom. Il. 2.536: Ἀβαντεῖς) or Ἑλλοπία, after the people inhabiting the northern part of the island (Strabo 10.1.3; Steph. Byz. 268.17), or Ὀχή, after the mountain near Karystos (Strabo 10.1.3; but see Knoepfler (1997) 353 n. 14).

The ethnic is Εὔβοιος (Hdt. 8.20.1; Thuc. 1.113.2; Hyp. 6.11) or Εὔβοιες (IG I² 149.6 (C4m); IG xii.9 207.72 (C36)). In poetry the term polis is sometimes used about the whole island (Eur. Ion 294; fr. 658; cf. Hansen (1998) 130–31). The collective use of the ethnic is found internally on C4 coins (infra) and in inscriptions (IG xii.9 207.72 (C36)), and externally in inscriptions (CID 11 129A.3 (C3)) and in literary sources (Hdt. 8.4.2; Dem. 22.72). The individual and external use is found in inscriptions (CID 11 74.11.26 (337/6)).

In the Homeric Catalogue of Ships (Il. 2.536–39) Euboia is inhabited by the Abantes, and they are settled in seven cities: Chalkis (no. 365), Eretria (no. 370), Histiaia (no. 372), Kerinthos, Dion (no. 368), Karystos (no. 373) and Styra (no. 377). Five others are recorded in the Athenian tribute lists: viz. Athenai Diades (no. 364), Gryynchai (no. 371), Posideion (no. 376), the Diakrioi en Euboia (no. 366) and the Diakreis at Chalkis (Διακρήσες ἀπὸ Χαλκείδεων (no. 367)). Kerinthos, on the other hand, is missing from the lists. Two settlements not recorded in the tribute lists are called polis in sources of the Classical period: viz. Orobiai (no. 374) (Thuc. 3.89.2) and Dystos (no. 369) (Theopomp. fr. 149). Altogether thirteen communities deserve inclusion in the inventory as having been poleis, or having possibly been poleis, in the period down to C4m. By then Euboia had become a tetrapolis island (Ps.-Skylax 58; cf. Dem. 23.213), divided between Chalkis, Eretria, Histiaia/Oreos and Karystos (IG ii² 124.8, 16; cf. Knoepfler (1997) 352).

On the basis of some coins issued in Chalkis (no. 365) and inscribed EY or EYB, it is still a widespread belief that there was an Euboian federal state in C4e and perhaps even in C5l (Wallace (1956); Brun (1969); Cawkwell (1978); Picard (1979)). However, following Larsen (1968) 97–103 and Beck (1997) 28, we prefer to believe that, apart from a short-lived or even abortive attempt to organise a koinon in 340, there was no Euboian federation before C2e (Knoepfler (2001) 122 with n. 97).

In addition to these four poleis there were about 100 other settlements, principally attested as demes of Eretria (no. 370) and Histiaia/Oreos (no. 372).

In the Hellenistic period Eretria was subdivided into some fifty-five to sixty demes (infra 652). Most of them are first attested in inscriptions of C3e, but several have a history that stretches back into the Classical period, occasionally even into the Archaic period. Some of them were originally poleis (Dystos (no. 369), Grynychai (no. 371), Peraia (no. 375) and Styra (no. 377)), but others were probably demes from the outset. Of all these demes, some were centred on a nucleated settlement, but we cannot be sure that all had such a settlement; dispersed settlement may have dominated in some of the demes.

In the Hellenistic period Histiaia/Oreos was subdivided into some thirty demes, of which only a few can be traced back to the Classical period (infra 656), principally those which were originally poleis (Athenai Diades (no. 364), Dion (no. 368), Orobiai (no. 378) and Posideion (no. 376)). Herodotus, however, mentions a number of komai (8.23.2), and the presumption is that in the Classical period there were quite a few second-order settlements in Histiaian territory, in addition to the poleis mentioned above.

This chapter is written jointly by Karl Reber and Mogens Herman Hansen, except for the description of Eretria (no. 370), which is by Mogens Herman Hansen (651–54 and 655) and Pierre Ducrey (654–55). We are grateful to Denis Knoepfler for his numerous and very helpful notes on our manuscript.
Only one single deme of Chalkis is known (infra 648), and none of Karystos (infra 658), but the presumption is that these two poleis were organised like Histiaia/Oreos and Eretria.

The inference is that on the island of Euboia there may have been over 100 nucleated settlements, of which only a dozen or so were poleis in the Archaic and early Classical periods, and only four were left by C4m. Thus, like Attika but unlike most other regions, there was in Euboia an astonishing number of second-order settlements compared with poleis. With a few additions and omissions, the following list comprises those listed in Barr. as settlements of the Archaic and/or Classical periods.

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis

**Aidepsos** (Ἀιδηψός or Αἰδηψός) Strabo 10.1.3, 9.4.2; Steph. Byz. 45.13 (πόλις); Plin. *HN* 4.64; Ath. *73C*; Arist. *Mete.* 366ª-369; Plut. *Mor.* 668C; Plut. *Sulla* 26.5. Prehistoric settlement at modern Koumbi. Later moved south to the region near the sulphur springs. Settlement in the territory of Histiaia/Oreos (no. 372) which obtained polis status only after the reign of Gordian III (Papavasiliou (1907); Barr. (1903) 89–91; Gregory (1979)). Barr. AC.


**Aigilea** (Αἴγιλεα) *Hdt.* 6.101.1 (χωρίον). Pace Barr. not an island but a site on the coast of Euboia near Eretria (Knoepfler (1997) 402); the name of the small island west of Styra (no. 377) is Aigilea (Hdt. 6.107.3). Perhaps to be identified with Aigalea (Knoepfler (1997) 425 n. 142), an Eretrian deme belonging to the first district (Knoepfler (1997) 379) and second phyle (IG xii.9 246a.5). Barr. C.

**Aiglepheira** (Αἴγλεφειρα) *IG* xii.9 249B.333. Aiglepheira is attested in C3e as a deme of Eretria (no. 370) belonging to the fourth phyle and the first district, and probably situated near nineteenth-century Aglephira (Knoepfler (1997) 366, 403). Barr. C.

**Amarynths** (Ἀμάρινθος) *IG* xii.9 188.17–18 (c.400); Strabo 10.1.10 (κόμης); Steph. Byz. 83.17 (νήσος (corruption)); Paus. 1.31.5; *Ael.* NA 12.34. A deme of Eretria (no. 370) attested in lists of citizens of C3e (*IG* xii.9 247; Knoepfler (1997) 397). The famous sanctuary of Artemis Amarysa was probably situated somewhere north of the hill of Palaioekkliesias, where there are remains of an ancient settlement (Sapouna-Sakellaraki (1992); Knoepfler (1988), (2001) 139 n. 201). Barr. AC.


**Elymnion** (Ἐλύμων, Ἔλυμων) *Ar.* *Pax* 1126 with schol.; *Sophr.* frt. 437, 888; erroneously described as an island by Steph. Byz. 269.19 (νήσος Ἐλυμωνίας πόλιν ἔχουσα) and Hesych. (Ε2226). Tentatively located at modern Limni (Knoepfler (1997) 418 n. 102). In the Archaic period Elymnion belonged to Chalkis (no. 365), and Elymnians were allegedly among those who colonised Kleonai (no. 580) on Athos (Heracl. *Lemb.* 62), but in the Hellenistic period Elymnion is attested as a deme of Histiaia/Oreos (no. 372) (*IG* xii.9 1187.2 (C3); cf. Gehrke (1994) 339–40; Reber (2002) 42). Barr. AC.
Geraistos (Γεραιστός) Hom. Od. 3.177; Hdt. 8.7.1; Thuc. 3.3.5; Eur. Cyc. 295; Dem. 4.34; Arist. Ath. Pol. 22.8; Strabo 10.1.2, 7 (κατοικίαν ἄξιολόγου); schol. Lucian 21.25 (πόλις). The southern promontory of Euboia (ἄκρωτήριον, Philoch. fr. 30) with a harbour (Thuc. 3.3.5; schol. Hom. Od. 3.177) and a sanctuary of Poseidon (Ps.-Sklax 58; IG xi.9 44.14 = Hesperia 37 (1968) 189.39ff = SEG 44 710 (C38); Schumacher (1993)). Situated in the territory of Karystos (no. 373) (Hdt. 9.105) at modern Kastri (Sampson (1981) 42–45) or the hill of Viglautouri at Oxy lithos (Sapouma-Sakellariak (1998) 59–61). Not in Barr.

Kyrnos (Κύρνος) Hdt. 9.105. Kyrnos lay in the territory of Karystos (no. 373) but is still unlocated. Herodotos connects the toponym with the battle between the Athenians and the Karystians in the years 476–469. Since Kyrnos is not explicitly called a settlement by Herodotos, it is only hesitatingly included in this list (cf. Geyer (1903) 107; Keller (1985) 200). Not in Barr.

Marmarion (Μαρμάριον) Strabo 10.1.6; Steph. Byz. 434.2 (πόλις); Nonnus, Dion. 13.164. Settlement in southern Euboia between Styra (no. 377) and Karystos (no. 373), lying in the territory of Karystos. Renowned for its marble quarries and a sanctuary of Apollo Marmarions. Undated in Barr.

Metropolis (Μητρόπολις) Steph. Byz. 451.8 (πόλις). An unlocated site situated on an eminence in the territory of Histiaia/Oreos (no. 372), fortified and garrisoned by Chabrias in 377/6 (Diod. 15.30.5; see Bakhuijzen (1985) 39). Bakhuijzen's view (1972) 137–38, repeated (1985) 39) that Metropolis was the urban centre of Chalkis (no. 365) is correctly rejected by Picard (1979) 253–55, who takes Metropolis to be a small unlocated fortress. However, the name Metropolis suggests that it was the original urban centre of the polis of Histiaia (no. 372) before the metoikesis to Oreos (Kastri); see infra 657. Undated in Barr. but C attested by Diod.

Oichalia (Οἰχαλία) Hecat. fr. 28 (as emended by Knoepfler (1997) 386–87; Strabo 10.1.10 (κώµη); Steph. Byz. 488.2 (πόλις); Plin. HN 4.64. In the myths Oichalia was a polis ruled by Eurytos and destroyed by Herakles (Soph. Trach. 74–75, 244, 351–65; Strabo 10.1.10). It is attested in C3e as a deme of Eretria (no. 370) belonging to the first phyle (IG xi.9 245.B.12). It also belonged to the fifth district and has tentatively been located near modern Kyme (Knoepfler (1981) 312, (1997) 385–87). Barr. C, but A is attested by Hecat. fr. 28.

Panaktos (Πανάκτος) Knoepfler (2001) 11.1 (C3–C2). It is attested in C3e as a deme of Eretria (no. 370) belonging to the third phyle (IG xi.9 247.1.1). It also belonged to the third district and has tentatively been located in the valley of Prasino (Knoepfler (1997), (2001) 155–58). Undated in Barr.

Parthenion (Παρθένιον) Steph. Byz. 593.19 (πόλις). It is attested in C3e as a deme of Eretria (no. 370) belonging to the fourth phyle (IG xi.9 249.B.18–19). It also belonged to the third or fourth district and has tentatively been located at modern Partheni (Knoepfler (1997) 366, 402). Barr. C.
Porthmos (Πορθμός) Harp. Πθ2 (πόλις); schol. Dem. 9.33, no. 37, Dilts (ἐπίνειον τῆς Ἑρετρίας); Suda Πθ2074 (πόλις). A fortified settlement destroyed by Philip II in 342 (Dem. 9.58, 10.8) situated in the territory of Eretria (no. 370) (Dem. 9.33), but not (yet?) attested as a deme (Knoepfler (1997) 398). On the basis of the similarity with the mediaeval toponym Protimo, a location near modern Aliveri is commonly assumed (Knoepfler (1997) 354, 358); cf. also IG xii.9 99 (C2), found in Aliveri and restored [Πορθμός] in Lauffer and Kirsten (1953) 344. Barr. C.

Tamynai (Ταµύναι) Aeschin. 3.88; Dem. 21.162; Strabo 10.11.0 (πόλις); Harp. T3 (πόλις); Steph. Byz. 600.6 (πόλις); Suda Τ66 (πόλις). Situated in the territory of Eretria (Strabo). In C3e as attested as a deme of Eretria (no. 370) (IG xii.9 245B.87) belonging to the fourth phyle and the fourth district and situated at modern Palaiokastro near modern Avlonari (Knoepfler (1997) 403, 438 n. 236). Strabo mentions a sanctuary of Apollo, and Aischines mentions a hippodrome. In 348 a battle was fought at Tamynai between an Athenian force under Phokion and a faction of the Eretrians under Kleitarchos (Aeschin. 21.169; Plut. Phoc. 12; cf. Knoepfler (1981); Tritle (1992)). Barr. AC.

Teleidai (Τηλείδαι) IG xii suppl. 555.1.21. Teleidai is attested in C3e as a deme of Eretria (no. 370) belonging to the first phyle (IG xii.9 245B.306). It also belonged to the fifth district and has tentatively been located near C9 tilida (Gehrke (1994) 332; Knoepfler (1997) 385). Barr. C.

Zarex (Ζάρητρα, presumably a corruption of Ζάρηκα, Knoepfler (1997) 418 n. 106). Plut. Phoc. 13.4. A deme of Eretria (no. 370) (IG xii.9 191C.7 (C4)) belonging to the first phyle (IG xii.9 245A.7) and the second district (Knoepfler (1997) 403) and situated near modern Zakara/Zarakas (ibid. 357). For recently recovered remains of the Archaic period, see BCH 123 (1999) 793–94. Barr. AC.

1 A number of unlocated and undated settlements, some of them presumably spurious, are attested in late sources only: Akontion (Ἄκοντιον), Steph. Byz. 61.16 (πόλις); Akra (Ἄκρα), Steph. Byz. 62.5 (πόλις); Akragas (Ἀκράγας), Steph. Byz. 62.16 (πόλις); Ares Areos (Ἄρης Ἀρεοῦς), Steph. Byz. 117.18, quoting Theopomp. fr. 148 (χωριόν), cf. Knoepfler (1997) 411 n. 49; Arethousa (Ἀρέθουσα), Steph. Byz. 116.5 (πόλις), erroneously mixed up with the fountain nearchalkis (Knoepfler (1997) 355 n. 13); Chios (Χίος), Steph. Byz. 693.14 (πόλις); Dia (Δία), Steph. Byz. 229.2 (πόλις), erroneously mixed up with Thessalian Dia (Hatzopoulos and Poama (1998–99)); Eteonos (Ἐτεονοῦς), Steph. Byz. 283.8 (πόλις); Kaphereus (Καφηρεύς), Steph. Byz. 370.12 (ἐπίνειον); Methone (Μηθώνη), Steph. Byz. 441.2 (πόλις); Nysa (Νύσα), Steph. Byz. 471.10 (πόλις) and Plin. HN 4.64; Oreste (Ὀρέστη), Steph. Byz. 495.7 (πόλις); Rynchai (Ῥύγχαι), Steph. Byz. 547.14 (χωριόν); cf. no. 371; Siris (Σίρης), Nonnos, Dion. 13.163 (ὀρός); Skia (Σκία), Steph. Byz. 574.15 (πολίδνων); Stygia (Στύγη), Nonnos, Dion. 13.163; Sphakeia (Σφάκεια), Steph. Byz. 591.7 (πόλις); Trychai (Τρύχαια), Steph. Byz. 659.15; cf. no. 371.

2. Unidentified Settlements of the Archaic and Classical Periods

Ag. Ilias Classical sherds at the top of a prominent hill near modern Psachna (Sackett et al. (1966) 54 no. 30). Barr. AC.

Ag. Paraskevi Classical sherds and tombs, walls of monumental building (temple?) (Sackett et al. (1966) 56 no. 33). Barr. AC.

Ag. Triada Sackett et al. (1966) 66 notes a Classical tomb. The modern village of Triada is about 5 km east of Psachna, called Kriezoti in memory of Nikolaus Kriezoti. Barr. C.

Ag. Vasileios Abundant evidence of a Classical fortified settlement (Sackett et al. (1966) 44–45 no. 14). Barr. C.

Arkhampolis The ancient name is not known. M. Wallace (in Keller (1985) 265) suggests Aigai. It is an Archaic and Classical settlement situated in a deep gorge near modern Evangelismos. It covers an area of c.1.6 ha and was fortified with walls and towers. Remains of houses, temples and terrace walls are visible (Keller (1985) 263; Panagopoulou (1995); Reber (2001) 451–53). A large quantity of slag testifies to an iron industry from the Archaic period through late Antiquity. Barr. C.

Helleniko According to Sackett et al. (1966) 42 no. 11, a minor farming settlement, but at Kastradaki there are remains of a fortification wall. Possibly the site of Posideion (no. 376). Barr. AC.

Khironisi A fair-sized Classical site, perhaps to be identified with ancient Dion (no. 378) (Sackett et al. (1966) 38–39 no. 4). Barr. AC.

Lefkandi A very large settlement from the LH III C period through the Geometric period. Deserted c.700 (Popham et al. (1980); Popham et al. (1990–93); Popham and Lemos (1996); see also Morris (2000) 218–56 and Argoura (supra 644).

Palaiochori Classical sherds and remains of walls with blocks in position (Sackett et al. (1966) 48 no. 20). See Orobai (no. 374). Barr. AC.

Philagra A Classical–Hellenistic fortified site on a hill on the east coast of Euboia near modern Giannitsi. Under the walls of the Venetian castle remains of Classical and...
Hellenistic fortification walls are visible, and the surface is scattered with sherds of these two periods. It is either a fort or a settlement of C4l or C3e (Reber (2001) 454–56).

Prokopion, Kastro A substantial settlement in the Classical period (Sackett et al. (1966) 45–46 no. 16). Barr. C.

II. The Poleis

364. Athenai Diades (Athenites) Map 55. Lat. 38.50, long. 23.00. Size of territory: i? Type: [A]. The toponym is Ἀθηναῖοι Διαδεῖς, αἱ (Aesch. fr. 61, Mette; IG i3 268.5.28; Strabo 10.1.5). The city-ethnic is Ἀθηναίοι (IG i3 71.1.79; IG ii2 43.90) or, once, Ἀθηναῖοι (Eratosthenes fr. 111B 102, Berger) or Ἀθηναῖοι (IG i3 264.4.20). Athenai Diades is called a polis in the urban sense by Ephor. fr. 24, but only in a mythological context: Ephoros states that the polis was founded by Dias, the son of Abas. The political sense is attested in IG ii2 43.78 and 90, where the Athenaites under the heading πολείς are listed as members of the Second Athenian Naval League. The collective and external use of the city-ethnic is attested in the Athenian tribute lists (supra). In C3m the ethnic appears as a demotic (IG xi1.9 1186.2).

According to Strabo 10.1.5, Athenai Diades was situated at Cape Kenaion near Oreos. However, the urban centre has not yet been precisely located. Ulrichs (1863) 237 identified Athenai Diades with Dion (no. 368) and suggested a location at modern Lichas. The separate listing of Dion and Athenai Diades in the Athenian tribute lists disproves the identification, and, following Vischer (1857) 661, the prevailing view is that Athenai Diades should be identified with the hill of Kastelli at Gialtra Loutra (Sackett et al. (1966) 37 no. 3). Nothing is known about the size of the territory; but since the Kenaion peninsula accommodated both Athenai Diades and Dion, the territory can hardly have exceeded 25 km². The hill of Kastelli at Gialtra Loutra has never been excavated. It seems appropriate for an acropolis, and remains of walls can be seen at various places. Surface finds indicate that the site was settled continuously from the Neolithic until the Roman period (Sackett et al. (1966) 37 no. 3; Reber (2001) 456 fig. 13).

Athenai Diades was a member of the Delian League and may have been among the original members (ATL iii. 198–99). It belonged to the Island district (IG i3 269.v.26) and is recorded in the tribute lists mostly by toponym (IG i3 263.4.v.32) but sometimes by city-ethnic (IG i3 279.1.85) from 452/1 (IG i3 261.111.26) to 416/15 (IG i3 289.1.12), a total of thirteen times, three times completely restored, paying a phoros of 2,000 dr. (IG i3 264.iv.20) raised to 4,000 dr. (IG i3 268.v.28) in, probably, 445/4 (IG i3 267.iv.28), reduced to 2,000 dr. in 443/2 (IG i3 269.v.26) and raised again to 4,000 dr. in 416/5 (IG i3 289.1.12). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.1.79 (1 tal.)). Athenai Diades (and Dion (no. 368)) are attested as dependencies of Histiaia/Oreos (no. 372) in the last decade of C5 (IG xi1.9 188.18–19 = Staatsverträge 205: post-411; Knoepfler (2001) nn. 338–39: post-404).

Athenai Diades must have recovered its independence in C4e since it is recorded among the original members of the Second Athenian Naval League (IG ii2 43.90), whereas the Histiaians are recorded somewhat later (B18). The Athenaites may have left the League together with Thebes (no. 221) in 371 or shortly afterwards (Dreher (1995) 173).

Thus the presumption is that Athenai Diades was a polis in the political sense down to C4f. In Ps.-Skylax 58, however, Euboea is described as a tetrapolis, cf. Dem. 23.213 and lines 14–15 of IG ii2 124 which seem to presuppose a total of four poleis on Euboea in 357. The inference is that by C4m Athenai Diades must have been incorporated into Histiaia/Oreos (no. 372) (Knoepfler (1997) 352), and in C3m it is duly attested as a Histiaian deme (IG xi1.9 1186.2).

365. Chalkis (Chalkideus) Map 55. Lat. 38.25, long. 23.35. Size of territory: 5. Type: A. The toponym is Χαλκίς, ἰδός, ἡ (Hom. II. 2.537; Hecat. fr. 129; Aeschin. 3.89; IG i3 41.71). In order to distinguish Euboian Chalkis from homonymous cities, it is sometimes called Χαλκίς ἡ ἐν Εὐβοία (Aen. Tact. 4.1). According to Hecat. fr. 129 the toponym was originally Εὔβοια, perhaps to be identified with modern Lefkandi (Bakhuizen (1985) 96). The city-ethnic is Χαλκιδεύς (Aeschin. 3.89; CEG 179.3 (c.505)), sometimes further specified: Χαλκιδεύς τῶν ἀπ’ Ἐβρίστου (IG xi1.6 42.15 (C4l)) or Χαλκιδεύς οἱ ἐξ Εὔβοιας (Xen. Hell. 4.2.17). Chalkis is called a polis both in the political sense (IG i3 40.5; IG ii2 44.14; Philiskos fr. 3, CGF) and in the urban sense (Hecat. fr. 129; Eur. Iph. Aul. 168; Aen. Tact. 4.1; Ps.-Skylax 58). The collective use of the the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form on C6–C5 coins (infra) and externally in inscriptions (CEG179.3; IG i3 40.5, 21) and in literary sources (Hdt. 5.99; Arist. Pol. 1289b39). The individual and external use is attested in inscriptions (CID ii 31.79 (345/4)) and in literary sources (Aeschin. 3.89).

The territory of Chalkis is called ἡ ἐν Εὔβοιᾳ Χαλκιδική (Arist. Hist. an. 496b25–26). To the south Chalkis bordered on Eretria (no. 370), and according to Bakhuizen (1985) 127–31 the frontier followed the mountain

Part of Euboia was called Διακρία (Etym. Magn. 268.3; schol. Lykop. Alex. 374), presumably to be located in Chalkidian territory north-east of Chalkis (Geyer (1903) 45; Knoepfler (1997) 376 with n. 194). This region seems, at least in C5, to have been the home of two different communities, which, in the Athenian tribute lists, are recorded separately from the Χαλκιδεῖς (IG i² 71.1.71), sc. the Διακρίας ἀπὸ Χαλκιδέων (no. 367; IG i² 71.1.85–84) and the Διάκριτοι ἐν Εὔβοια (no. 366) (IG i² 71.1.93–94); see infra 650.

Like most other Euboian poleis, Chalkis was subdivided into demois, of which only one is attested: a Delphian decree of c.315–285 (F.Delphes 111.1 424.1–2) bestows procony on [K]ooches of Chalkis of the deme of Aiagai, (δῆμου Αἰαγαίου ἄρχων, a restoration of ΑΙΑΙΩΝ; cf. Strabo 8.7.4, 9.2.13; see Jones, POAG 73; Knoepfler (1997) 406 n. 11).

Next to nothing is known about the history of Chalkis before 506. Apart from colonisation (infra 649), the only event reported in the sources is the semi-mythical Lelantine War, fought in C8s or C7f between Eretria (no. 370) and Chalkis and their allies over the possession of the Lelantine Plain (Parker (1997); infra 652). In 506 the Chalkidians joined the Peloponnesians and the Boiotians in an abortive attack on Athens (no. 361) (Hdt. 5.74.2). The Athenians then invaded Euboia and inflicted a defeat on the Chalkidians; they confiscated the land belonging to the hippocatai and gave it to 4,000 klerouchs (Hdt. 5.77; CEG 179). In 486 the Athenians handed over twenty hulls of triremes to the Chalkidians on which they fought in the battles of Artemision (Hdt. 8.1.2) and Salamis (Hdt. 8.46.2). They are recorded on the Serpent Column (ML 27.8). Chalkis was a member of the Delian League, and may have been among the original members (ATL iii. 198–99). It belonged to the Island district (IG i² 269.v.31) and is recorded in the tribute lists from 448/7 (IG i² 264.iv.23) to 416/5 (IG i² 289.1.31, partly restored), a total of eleven times, three times completely restored, paying a phoros of 5 tal. in 448/7 (IG i² 264.iv.23), reduced (sic) to 3 tal. after the revolt of 446 (IG i² 270.v.32 (442/1)). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i² 71.1.71, 10 tal.), and in 413 Chalkis was still listed among the paying members (Thuc. 7.57.4). In 446 Chalkis defected from Athens; but the revolt was quenched by an Athenian army under Perikles (Thuc. 1.14.1–3; Plut. Per. 23.4). Chalkis may have defected once again in 424/3 together with other Euboian poleis (Philoch. fr. 130). The treaty between Athens and Chalkis (IG i² 40) by which Chalkis was brought back into the League may belong in either year. It is dated to 446/5 in IG i² but to 424/3 by Mattingly (1996) 53–67, 161–62, 372–77, 391–94. The treaty prescribed that the Chalkidians swear loyalty towards Athens (21–23) and give hostages (47); moreover, their self-government in administration of justice was restricted in matters punishable by death, exile or loss of rights (74–76); cf. Balcer (1978). Chalkis was still loyal to Athens in 411 (Thuc. 8.95.6) but defected after the Athenian defeat at Eretria (Thuc. 8.95.7; Arist. Ath. Pol. 33.1; Diod. 13.47.3). During the rule of the Thirty, many Athenian democrats fled to Chalkis (Lys. 24.25).

Chalkis was among the original members of the Second Athenian Naval League (IG ii 43.80; Diod. 15.30.1), and a treaty between Athens and Chalkis was concluded in 378/7 (IG ii 44.2). But together with Thebes (no. 221) and the other Euboian poleis, Chalkis left the League in 371 (Xen. Hell. 6.5.23; Dreher (1995) 173) and fought against the Athenians at Mantinea in 362 (Diod. 15.85.2, 6). In 357, Chalkis was torn by stasis between a pro-Theban and a pro-Athenian faction (Aesch. 3.85–86; Diod. 16.7.2), and was presumably conquered by exiles operating from Eretria (Aen. Tact. 4.1–4). Both the Thebans and the Athenians invaded Euboia; the Thebans were expelled from Euboia (Dem. 22.14); a new treaty was concluded, and Chalkis rejoined the Naval League (IG ii 124.16, 147; Aesch. 3.85). In 349/8 an Athenian army under Phokion was sent to assist Ploutarchos of Eretria. It landed at Argoura on Chalkidian territory (Dem. 21.132) and was opposed by an Euboian army under Kallias of Chalkis (Aesch. 3.86–87). Phokion won the battle of Tamnai (Aeschin. 2.169–70; Plut. Phoc. 12–13), a peace was concluded, and Chalkis rejoined the Naval League (IG ii 125; Aeschin. 2.12, 3.88). In 340 some kind of short-lived league with a common council was established under the leadership of Kallias of Chalkis (Aeschin. 3.89, 94; Staatsverträge 342); it included Chalkis, Eretria (no. 370) and Histiaia/Oreos (no. 572). Because of the contemporary issue of a common Euboian coinage (supra 643; infra) the union has sometimes been interpreted as a federation (Staatsverträge 342; Picard (1979)), but see Beck (1997) 28.
The constitution of Chalkis (Gehrke, *Stasis* 37–41) was among the 158 *politeiai* described by Aristotle and his pupils (frr. 618–20). In the Archaic period oligarchy alternated with tyranny (Arist. *Pol.* 1316a31–32; Hes. *Op.* 654–57), and in one case a tyranny may even have been followed by what Aristotle classifies as a democracy (Arist. *Pol.* 1304a29–31; see Aubonnet *ad loc.* and LGPN *n.s.* ΦΩΩΦΩΩ). In *C6* Chalkis was an oligarchy governed by a class of *hippobotai* (Arist. *Pol.* 1289b36–39; Hdt. 77.2), in another context described as an aristocracy based on a census requirement (Arist. *fr.* 618). After the Athenian victory in 406, the *hippobotai* were expelled, and their property handed over to 4,000 Athenian klerouchs (Hdt. 5.77.2). A brief democratic interlude may have followed (Thgn. 893–94); but the *hippobotai* returned when the Athenian klerouchs were withdrawn in 490 in connection with the Persian invasion of Euboia (Hdt. 6.100), and they were still in power when Perikles invaded Euboia in 446 (Plut. *Per.* 23.4). After the surrender of Chalkis, the *hippobotai*’s property was confiscated, divided into 2,000 kleroi and given to, probably, the other Chalkidians and some foreigners (Ael. *VH* 6.1). It is unlikely that the Athenians sent klerouchs to Chalkis as they did to Histiaia/Oreos (no. 372) (Figueira (1991) 256–60). There is no direct evidence, but the ensuing treaty between Athens and Chalkis (*IG* 17 ii² 44.40) indicates that from now on Chalkis had a democratic constitution (Gehrke, *Stasis* 40). In 357 there may have been an outbreak of *stasis* in Chalkis as there was in the other Euboian *poleis* (Diod. 16.7.2). In the 340s Chalkis was ruled by Mnesarchos and his sons, Taurosthenes and, especially, Kallias. They were probably democratic leaders, and there is no reason to trust Aischines’ allegation that they were tyrants (3.89, 92). Both obtained Athenian citizenship (Hyp. 1.20; Din 144), probably in 341/40 ( Osborne (1983) T 73).

Together with the other Euboian *poleis*, Chalkis was a member of the Amphictyonic League (Lefèvre (1998) 59–63) and provided in some years one of the two Ionian *hieronomones* (*CID* 11 32.44; 74.1.34–35). Athenian envoy's were sent to Chalkis (*IG* II² 124.16), and Chalkidian envoy's were sent to Athens (*IG* I³ 40.12–17; *IG* II² 44.8; Aeschin. 3.91).

No public enactment antedating the Hellenistic period is preserved and the only attested political institution is a *boule* referred to as a decision-making institution in 446/5 (*IG* I³ 40.62–63).

The only cults attested in classical sources are those of Zeus Olympios (*IG* I³ 40.35, 61–62) and Athena (*IG* II² 44.17). Two Chalkidian citizens are attested as victors in the Olympic Games (*Olympionikai* 121 in 532 and 459 in 332) and one in the Pythian games (Plin. *HN* 35.35 (C5)). In C4m Chalkis was a walled city with an agora (Aen. Tact. 4.1–4; cf. Strabo 10.1.8 (1334)) and, in the agora, a funeral monument of C6? set over Kleomachos of Pharsalos (*Plut. Mor.* 761a; Bakhuizen (1985) 24–25). The acropolis was at Mt. Vathrovounia in the south-east part of the city. The acropolis and part of the city as well were protected by a C4e circuit wall of c.2 km enclosing an area of c.12.5 ha. In 411 the town of Chalkis was connected with the mainland by a bridge, and in 334 a fortress was erected on a hill immediately west of the bridge near Aulis (Diod. 13.47.3–6; Strabo 10.1.8; Bakhuizen (1985) 48–52). The harbour is mentioned at Ps.-Sklayx 58; cf. Thuc. 8.95.6. At Chalkis there are a number of natural harbours, but no ancient remains have been found (Bakhuizen (1985) 54–57). A rock on the Kallimani hill is inscribed ΦΩΙ: ΩΠΟΣ, probably a boundary mark of C4e (*ArchDelt* 31 (1976) 147).

Chalkis struck silver coins c.550–506, c.490–465, and coins of silver and bronze c.337–308. Coins were struck first on the Euboic standard (tridrachm, drachm, hemidrachm), later on the Attic standard (tetradrachm, didrachm and tetrobol). (1) Silver *C6*: *obv.* facing quadriga (tridrachm) or facing horseman and horse (drachm) or facing horseman (hemidrachm); *rev.* incuse of mill-sail pattern. (2) Silver *C6–C5*: *obv.* eagle in flight, sometimes carrying a snake; *rev.* wheel in square or triangular incuse. Legend: ΨΑΛ. (3) A small issue of tridrachms of probably 506 has *obv.* Boiotian shield. Legend: Ψ. *Rev.* wheel of Chalkis (Kraay (1976) 90). (4) Silver (drachm, hemidrachm, obol, hemiobol) and bronze 337–308; *obv.* head of the nymph Chalkis (silver) or bust of Hera (bronze); *rev.* eagle carrying a snake. Legend: ΧΑΛ. (Picard (1979) 16–54). (5) “Federal” issues of C4. Silver (tetradrachm, didrachm, drachm); *obv.* head of nymph Euboia; *rev.* bull. Bronze: *obv.* head of nymph Euboia or bull; *rev.* grapes. Legend: *ΕΥ* or *ΕΠ* (Head, *HN*² 357–59; Kraay (1976) 89–91; SNG Cap. *Aetolia-Euboia* 432–46; for the “federal” issues, see Wallace (1956); Kraay (1976) 93; Picard (1979); Brunner (1998)).

Chalkis was involved in the colonisation of Naxos (no. 41), Zankle (no. 51), Kyme (no. 57), Neapolis (no. 63), Pithekoussai (no. 65), Rhegion (no. 68), Kleonai (no. 580) and possibly Skiathos (no. 520). Furthermore, on the basis primarily of onomastic similarity, Chalkis is often assumed to have been heavily involved in the colonisation of the Chalkidic peninsula; see further Flensted-Jensen (1998) 57–70 with refs. and (2000) 125–31 with refs.

### 366. Diakrioi en Euboia

Map 55. Unlocated, not in *Barr.*

Type: *C. Διακρίτα* (*Etym. Magn.* 268.3) or *Διάκριτα* (schol. *Euboia* 649)
Lycoeph. Alex. 374) denotes the Euboian mountain district north-east of Chalkis (no. 365) (Bakhuisen (1985) 141 n. 49). This region was inhabited by the Διακρίοι (IG i³ 71.1.94; Lycoeph. Alex. 375) and the Διακρεῖς (no. 367) (IG i³ 71.1.83; see supra 643).

The Διακρίοι ἐν Εὔβοιαι were members of the Delian League. They belonged to the Island district (IG i³ 71.93–94) and are recorded twice in the tribute lists, in 425/8 (IG i³ 282.111.24) and in 417/6 (IG i³ 288.1.2–3), in both cases heavily but plausibly restored, paying a phoros of 1 tal. and 2,000 dr. (IG i³ 282.111.24). They were assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.1.94: 1 tal., 2,000 dr.).

Membership of the Delian League indicates that the Diakrioi constituted a self-governing political community, but there is no indication that it was centred on a nucleated settlement. For the possible identification of the Diakrioi en Euboa with the Eretrian deme of Peraia, see no. 375.

367. Diakres apo Chalkideon  Map 55. Unlocated. Type: [A]. On Diakria, see no. 366. The Athenian assessment decree of 425/4 records both the Διακρεῖς ἀπὸ Χαλκιδέον (IG i³ 71.1.83–84) and the Διακρίοι ἐν Εὔβοιαι (no. 366) (IG i³ 71.93–94). The Diakres must accordingly have been different from the Diakrioi, and formed perhaps a short-lived splinter community of Chalkis (no. 365) settled in the Diakria in the northern part of the territory of Chalkis in the years after 446 when Chalkis was controlled by Athens (no. 361) (Geyer (1924) 224). The Diakres are recorded in the tribute lists from 434/3 (IG i³ 278.vi.25–26) to 416/5 (IG i³ 289.1.15–16), a total of six times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of first 800 dr. (IG i³ 278.vi.25) but 3,000 dr. in 416/5 (IG i³ 289.1.15–16). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.1.83–84: 2,000 dr.). In 434/3 the Diakres appear as the fourth of thirteen communities listed under the heading πόλεις (IG i³ 278.vi.18 and 25–26).

Membership of the Delian League indicates that the Diakres constituted a self-governing political community, but there is no indication that it was centred on a nucleated settlement.

368. Dion (Dieus)  Map 55. Lat. 38.50, long. 22.50. Size of territory: 17 Type: [A]. The toponym is Δίον, τό (Hom. II. 2.538; Strabo 10.1.5; Steph. Byz. 232.2). The city-ethnic is Διεύς (IG ii² 43.88). Apart from πτολεμήθρων at Hom.II. 2.538, Steph. Byz. is the only source in which Dion explicitly is called a polis; but the political sense is implicitly attested in IG ii² 43.78 and 88, where the Dios under the heading πόλεις are listed as members of the Second Athenian Naval League; and membership of the Delian League and the Second Athenian Naval League strongly indicates polis status until, at least, 371 (infra). The external use of the city-ethnic/demotic is attested collectively in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i³ 263.iv.31) and individually in Hellenistic inscriptions (IG xi.11.1877.3 (C3m); SEG 34 909.52 (C2–C1)).

According to Strabo 10.1.5, Dion was situated at Cape Kenaion near Chalkis. However, the urban centre has not yet been precisely located. Following Ulrichs ((1863) 237, see supra 647), Geyer (1903) 99 suggested a location at modern Lichas. Sapouna-Sakellaraki (1994–95), followed by Barr, prefers the hill of Kastri on the western shore of the Kenaion peninsula. But Homer describes Dion as an αἰτίον πτολεμήθρων (Hom. Il. 2.538; cf. Nonnus Dion. 13.161: κραναῖον πέδων), and in the Athenian tribute lists the Dians are often specified as Δῖες ἀπὸ Κεναίο (IG i³ 279.1.86). The presumption is that Dion was situated somewhere on Mt. Kenaion. Lichas would fit, but autopsy (Reber) revealed nothing but remains of the Byzantine period. An alternative location is Khironisi, whose position fits the information given by Ptol. Geog. 3.15.25 (cf. Reber (2001) 456–60).

Dion was a member of the Delian League, and may have been among the original members (ATL iii. 198–99). It belonged to the Island district (IG i³ 269.v.25) and is recorded in the tribute lists from 451/50 (IG i³ 262.1.28) to 432/1 (IG i³ 280.1.80), a total of twelve times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of 1,000 dr. in 451/50, but in all subsequent years 2,000 dr. (IG i³ 264.iv.31). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.1.78). From the Athenian regulations for Histiaia/Oreos (no. 372) of Cs it appears that Dion was a deme of Histiaia/Oreos, but was a separate circuit of jurisdiction (IG i³ 41.100–2 = SEG 32 3; Koch (1991) 175, 202). Similarly, Dion (and Athenai Diades (no. 364)) are attested as dependencies of Histiaia/Oreos in the last decade of Cs (IG xi.11.188.18–19 = Staatsverträge 205, post-411; Knoepfler (2001) nn. 338–39, post-404). Thus, in Cs, Dion seems to have had a double status partly as a polis depending on Histiaia/Oreos and partly as a demos of Histiaia/Oreos.

Dion must have recovered its independence in 46, since it is recorded among the original members of the Second Athenian Naval League (IG ii² 43.88), whereas the Histiais are recorded somewhat later (B18). Dion may have left the League together with Thebes (no. 221) in 371 or shortly afterwards (Dreher (1995) 173). The presumption is that Dion was a polis in the political sense down to 46f. In Ps.-Skylax 58, however, Euboa is described as a tetrapolis; cf. Dem. 23.213 and the treaty with Athens of 357 (IG ii² 124.15–16), which testifies to a total of four poleis on Euboa in 357. The inference is that by C4m Dion had been incorporated into
Histaia/Oreos (no. 372) (Moggi, Sin. 290–92). In C3m Dion is attested as a deme of Histaia/Oreos (IG xii.9 1187.3).

369. Dystos  Map 55. Lat. 38.20, long. 24.10. Size of territory: 5. Type: A. The toponym is Δυστωσ, Ὠ (Theopomp. fr. 149; IG xii.9 88.3, Rom.). Steph. Byz. 246.5 suggests an ethnic Δύστιος, but inscriptions invariably record the ablative form of the toponym: Δυστόρθ (θέων) (IG xii.9 191.9; cf. Knoepfler (2001) 357), mostly in an even more abbreviated form: either Δυστορθ or Δυστο (ibid.).

Dystos is called a polis in the urban sense by Theopomp. fr. 149: Θεόσπομπος ἐν Ἀθανάσικοι καὶ ἀποστήμας δὲ τοῖς ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ περιοκίδι τὸν Ἑρετριέων ἐστράτευσεν ἐπὶ πόλιν Δυστοῦ. Since the fragment comes from the fourteenth book of the Philippika, the year must be 349/8. Following Knoepfler (1981) 301, we believe that the subject of the verb is probably Kleitarchos, the exiled political leader who with a contingent of Phokian mercenaries and supported by Eretrian citizens attacked the tyrant Ploutarchos, confirming the verb with the verb form: either Δυστορθ or Δυστο (ibid.).

Dystos is a rock inscription of the valley of Dystos is a rock inscription. 

370. Eretria (Eretria) Map 55. Lat. 38.25, long. 23.50. Size of territory: 5. Type: A. The toponym is Ἐρέτρια, ἃ (IG xii.9 196.10, 12 (C48); Hdt. 1.61.2, Lys. 20.14). The toponym usually denotes the urban centre (Ps.-Skylax 58) but sometimes the city plus hinterland = the territory of Eretria (IG xii.9 197.12–14 (C4); cf. Knoepfler (2001) 53). The city-ethnic is Ἐρετρείας (IvO 248 (C56); ML 27.8 (479); IG xii.9 188.17 (C.400); Xen. An. 7.8.8; Arist. Pol. 1289b39). Variant forms of the city-ethnic are Ἐρέτριος or Ἐρετριαῖς or Ἐρετριάτης. But they are found only in late lexicographers and have no authority (Steph. Byz. 276.8–9; Etym. Magn. 371.7; Phot. Lex.).

Eretria is called a polis both in the urban sense (IG xii.9 196.10–11; Thuc. 8.95.3, 6; Dem. 9.57; Ps.-Skylax 58) and in the political sense (IG xii.9 187.9 = (C40); IG xi 15 16.2 (394/3); Knoepfler (2001) 1.6–7 (C48), 3.7 (330–320); Hdt. 6.106.2; Aeschin. 3.94). In an inscription of C6s, polis denotes the urban centre rather than the acropolis (SEG 41 725B = Nomina 1 91; cf. Flensted-Jensen et al. (2000) 165). The community is described as patriis in one of Plato’s epigrams (AG 7 256 = Diehl fr. 10, but perhaps spurious) and the town as an asty (Thuc. 8.95.4). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in Eretrian citizenship and proxeny decrees (Knoepfler (2001) 1.10–11; IG xii.9 187B.12 (C4f), 195.5 (C48)) and externally in a C6e dedication in Olympia (IvO 248) and on the Serpent Column (ML 27.8). The individual and external use is attested in a casualty list of 424/3 that from Tanagra (IG vii 585,1.16–17), in a Delphic list of tamiai of 337/6 (CID ii 74.47), and in a C4m list of proxenoi of Karthaia (no. 492) (IG xii.5 5428/8).
The territory of Eretria is called ἡ Ἐρετρία (Thuc. 8.60.1, 8.95.6) or ἡ Ἐρετρικῇ χώρῃ (Hdt. 6.101.1; cf. Pl. Leg. 698D). In 4Cm it covered 1500 km² and was subdivided into five districts (Knoepfler (1997) 371–73, map on 402), called χώροι (IG xii.9 189.24–25; Knoepfler (1997) 376). To date, only one district is known by name: viz. Μεσόχώρος (IG xii.9 241.37; Knoepfler (1997) 375–77). Each district was further subdivided into a number of territorial demes (IG xii.9 241; Wallace (1947) 119–24; Knoepfler (1997) 371), actually called δήμοι (SEG 41.723; Knoepfler (1997) 374) and each headed by a demarch (Δήμαρχος, IG xii.9 189.23–24). There were altogether some fifty-five to sixty demes (Knoepfler (1997) 358), of which more than fifty are attested in the preserved inscriptions (Jones, POAG 75–76 with corrigenda in Knoepfler (1997) 355–58). Some of the demes were former poleis which had been incorporated into Eretria and reduced to the status of δημοί. Such were Styra (no. 377), possibly, Glychnai (no. 371) and Dystos (no. 369) and, perhaps, Perai (no. 375).

The Eretrian citizen body was subdivided into, probably, six tribes (Knoepfler (1997) 390–92), called phyli (SEG 45 1141). Two of them are known by name: viz. Μήκοσαρίς (IG xii suppl. 548.4–5 = Nomina 1 39 (C5e)) and Ναρκέττης (REG 108 (1995) p. xxxix). A third was probably called Μελανής (Strabo 10.11.10; Knoepfler (1997) 393). They were named after local heroes and were thus different from the six old Ionic phyli (Knoepfler (1997) 392–93). Each phyle was composed of a number of demes drawn from all five choroi. Therefore, Eretria was the first main target of the Persian punitive expedition against Hellas in 490 (Hdt. 5.97.1). Their crews assisted in the capture of Sardes, and their strategos was killed in the ensuing battle of Ephesos (Hdt. 5.102.1; cf. also Lysanias (FGrHist 426) fr. 1). Therefore, Eretria was the first

According to Strabo 10.1.10, Eretria’s military strength was recorded in an ancient stele set up in the sanctuary of Artemis Amarysia. The figures he reports are 300 hoplites, 600 hippaeis and 60 chariots. For the andrapodismos of 490, see infra. In C4 Eretria had some 6000 adult male citizens, as can be inferred retrospectively from a cluster of lists of names of 2C80 (Knoepfler (1997) 395). (a) From a fragmentary list of ephesbes organised into the five districts (IG xii.9 241 = Wallace (1947) 120 (C4–C3e)) it can be inferred that a year class of ephesbes numbered some 150–200 young Eretrians, both hoplites and psiloi (cf. Knoepfler (1997) 404).

(b) Some large lists of names with patronymics and demotics are probably a roster of Eretrians organised into their phyli (I: IG xii.9 245; II: IG xii.9 246; III: IG xii.9 247 + 252 + unpublished fragment (Knoepfler (1997) 397); IV: unpublished fragment (Knoepfler (1997) n. 318); V–VI: no lists preserved)); see Knoepfler (1997) 395–400. IG xii.9 245 is almost complete and has 869 names preserved, plus about sixty names now lost = a total of 930 names. On the assumption that there were six phyli of equal size, c.5,500 Eretrians were recorded on the lists. A year class of 150–200 ephesbes corresponds to a force of some 4,200–5,000 citizens of military age (18–59) and fit for military service, and to a total adult male citizen population of c.6,750–6,850 minimum, including those over 60 and those unfit for military service (Hansen (1985) 12). Since the army seems to have been organised in accordance with the five districts, the presumption is that the lists organised into phyli were a roster of all adult male Eretrian citizens.

Next to nothing is known about the history of Eretria before c.500. Apart from colonisation (infra), the only event reported in the sources is the semi-mythical Lelantine War, fought in C8s or in C7f (Plut. Mor. 868E; Parker (1997)) between Eretria and Chalkis (no. 365) and their allies over the possession of the Lelantine Plain (Thuc. 1.15.3; Hdt. 5.97.1; Strabo 10.11.12; Has. Op. 654 and Plut. Mor. 153F, 769E–769A; cf. Staatsverträge 102). In 499 Eretria supported the Ionian revolt with five triremes (Hdt. 5.99.1). Their crews assisted in the capture of Sardes, and their strategos was killed in the ensuing battle of Ephesos (Hdt. 5.102.1; cf. also Lysanias (FGrHist 426) fr. 1). Therefore, Eretria was the first main target of the Persian punitive expedition against Hellas in 490 (Hdt. 5.97.1). Having pillaged the countryside, the Persians laid siege to Eretria, and on the seventh day the city was betrayed by two leading citizens and conquered (Hdt. 6.100–1); the sanctuaries were burnt down, and the population exposed to andrapodismos: men, women and children were sent to Sousa and were settled in the neighbourhood where their descendants still lived in C5m (Hdt. 6.106.2, 107.2, 115,118–19; Pl. Menex. 240A; Philostr. VA 1.24, probably based on Ktesias (letter from Knoepfler)). In spite of the andrapodismos the Eretrians were capable of fighting with seven triremes at Artemision (Hdt. 8.1.2) and at Salamis (Hdt. 8.46.2). Together with Styra (no. 377) they provided 600 hoplites at Plateaiai (Hdt.9.28.5) and are duly recorded on the Serpent Column (ML 27.8).

Eretria was a member of the Delian League, and may have been among the original members (ATL iii. 198–99). It belonged to the Island district (IG1 269.v.30) and is recorded in the tribute lists from 448/7 (IG1 3 264.iv.11) to 430/29 (IG 1 3 281.ii.51), a total of nine times, twice completely
restored, paying a *phoros* of, perhaps, 6 tal. (*IG ii² 264.1c.11*) but later 3 tal. (*IG ii² 281.11.51*), perhaps from 441/40 (*IG ii¹ 271.11.97*). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (*IG i² 7.1.67: 15 tal.*), and in 413 Eretria was still listed among the paying members (Thuc. 7.57.4). In 446 Eretria joined Chalkis in defecting from Athens; but the revolt was quenched by an Athenian army under Perikles (Thuc. 1.114.1–3). The conditions imposed on Eretria seem to have been similar to those of Chalkis (*IG ii² 39; 40.40–43; *supra* 648), and no klerouchy is attested (Gehrke, *Stasis* 64 n. 9). On the other hand, a decree of 442/1 ordered that the sons of the richest Eretrians be sent to Athens as hostages (Hesych. *Ε5746*; Phot. *Ε1908*).

The assessment in 425/4 resulted in yet another Euboian revolt, which Eretria probably joined (Philoch. fr. 1247) — improved readings in Knoepfler (*Staatsverträge* 40.3). After initial contacts with Sparta (no. 345) in 413 (Thuc. 8.5.1), Eretria defected from Athens once again in 411 in connection with the Athenian defeat in the naval battle fought outside the harbour of the city (Thuc. 8.95.3–6).

In c.400 Eretria concluded an alliance with Histiaia/Oreos (no. 372) (*IG xii.9 188 = Staatsverträge 205*; cf. Knoepfler (2001) 82), and in 394 one with Athens (no. 361) (*IG ii² 16 = Staatsverträge 229*). In C4 an *syntaxis* agreement was concluded with Keos (*SEG* 14.530 = *Staatsverträge* 232; but see Cargill (1981) 136 n. 14). The Eretrians were among the original members of the Second Athenian Naval League (*IG ii² 43.81*). But they probably left the League together with Thebes (no. 221) in 371 or shortly afterwards (Dreher (1995) 173; Knoepfler (1995) 331–33). In any case, Eretria cannot have been a member of the League when in 366 Themison, the tyrant of Eretria, dispossessed Athens of Oropos (no. 214) (Diod. 15.76.1). Like the other Euboian *poleis*, however, Eretria was torn by *stasis* between a pro-Theban and a pro-Athenian faction (Gehrke, *Stasis* 65). In 357 both Athenian and Theban forces invaded the island and clashed in several battles and skirmishes. The Athenians won, and the Euboian *poleis* rejoined the League (Diod. 16.7.2; Aeschin. 3.85; Dem. 8.74; *IG ii² 124.16 = Tod* 153, improved readings in Knoepfler (1995) 335–37; Brunt (1969) 247–48). In 349/8 an Athenian army under Phokion came to the rescue of Plutarchos, the tyrant of Eretria, who, however, betrayed the Athenians (Plut. *Phoc. 12–13*; Gehrke (1976) 7–11). After the Athenian victory at Tamynai, Eretria joined the League again, as attested in the Athenian decree of, probably, 343 (*IG ii² 125*; cf. *SEG* 34 67, 45 1210). The Eretrians provided *synedroi* for the *synedron* and contributed a *syntaxis* of 5 tal. (Aeschin. 3.94, 100). In the same period Philip of Makedon seems to have infiltrated Euboia (Dem. 9.57, 10.8; Brunt (1969) 251–52), and in 342 he had the leaders of his faction in Eretria installed as tyrants (*infra*). After their expulsion in 341 a new alliance between Athens and Eretria was concluded (*IG ii² 230*; see Knoepfler (1985)).

In 340 some kind of short-lived league with a common council was established under the leadership of Kallias of Chalkis (Aeschin. 3.89, 94; *Staatsverträge* 342); it included Eretria, Chalkis (no. 365) and Histiaia/Oreos (no. 372). Because of the controversial issue of a common Euboian coinage (*supra* 643) the union has sometimes been interpreted as a federation (*Staatsverträge* 342; Picard (1979)), but see Beck (1997) 28.

The Eretrian constitution was one of the 158 *poleiteia* described by Aristotle and his pupils (Heracl. *Lemb. 40 = Arist. no. 45, Gigon; cf. Plut. *Mor.* 293A, 298B). In the Archaic period Eretria was an oligarchy governed by the class of *hippeis* who formed the core of the Eretrian army (Arist. *Pol.* 1289b33–39; 1306b33–39; *Ath. Pol.* 15.2). This constitution was overturned in C6 and perhaps before 510 (*IG xii.9 p. 147.111–24*) at the instigation of a certain Diagonas (Arist. *Pol.* 1306b35–36; Heracl. *Lemb.* 40), and it was replaced by “a democracy” (Gehrke, *Stasis* 63; cf. *IG xii Suppl.* 549A: εδοξε τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι [δήμου] (C5e); cf. Knoepfler (2001) 74 n. 293). The common view that, in 446, a democratic constitution was either maintained or, alternatively, imposed by the Athenians (Balcer (1978) 56; Gehrke, *Stasis* 64) is based on an analogy with a not altogether convincing interpretation of the Athenian regulations for Chalkis (*ATL* iii. 150 no. 15). An honorary decree of c.411, passed by the *boule* alone and not by (the *boule* and) the *demos*, indicates that the defection from Athens in 411 was followed by the introduction of an oligarchic constitution (*IG xii.9 187A*). But a somewhat later honorary decree inscribed on the same *stele* is passed by the *boule* and the *demos*, suggesting a democracy in C4 (*IG xii.9 187B*).

Later in C4 Eretria was ruled by a number of tyrants (Berve (1967) 301–2): Themison from before 366 to 357 (Aeschin. 3.85; Dem. 18.99; Diod 15.76.1), Menestrates in 352 (Dem. 23.124), Plutarchos from before 350 to 348 (Dem. 5.5, 9.57, 21.110, 200; Aeschin. 3.86; Plut. *Phoc.* 12–13). Plutarchos was deposed by the Eretrian *demos* led by Kleitarchos (schol. *Dem.* 5.5), but after a short period of democratic government (Dem. 9.57), Kleitarchos was himself in 342 installed by Philip of Makedon as *tyrannos* of Eretria together with Hipparchos and Automedon (Dem. 9.58; cf. 18.71, 79–81, 295; Aeschin. 3.103; Harp. *Ι5*; Gehrke (1976)). In the following year, however, Eretria was besieged and conquered by an Athenian force (Philoch. fr. 160), and the tyrants were expelled again.
A cavalry of, probably, 1997 manding a regiment provided by one of the five districts and in ii² 230 IG to Athens (Taras (no. 71) 74 (Aeschin. provided in some years one of the two Ionian citizens received (2001) (SEG 36 331 (1982)) (Knoepfler (2001) (2) 330–320) or, once, ἐδὸξεν τεί ἐκκλησίει (Knoepfler (2001) 1.2–3), and bills are often moved by a board of proboulai (IG xi.9 191.35).

The eponymous officials were a board of three archontes (LSAG 84 no. 9; SEG 34 898 (C6l); IG xi.9 191.A.8 (C4l); cf. Sherk (1990) 238). The principal military officials were a board of strategoi (IG xi.9 191.44; Hdt. 5.102.3) and a board of five taxiarchoi (IG ii² 230b.12–17), each presumably commanding a regiment provided by one of the five districts (Knoepfler (1997) 372). Alongside the five (?) taces there was a cavalry of, probably, 500 hippes = 100 per district (IG ii² 230a.3–4 as restored by Knoepfler (1985) = SEG 35 59).

Together with the other Euboian poleis Eretria was a member of the Amphiktyonic League (Lefèvre (1998) 59–63), and provided in some years one of the two Ionian hieromnemones (Aeschin. 2.116; CID 11 102.1.9), in other years a tamias (CID 11 74.47). Athenian envoys were sent to Eretria in 357/6 (IG ii¹ 124.16) and in 340 (Aeschin. 3.100). Eretrian envoys were sent to Athens (IG ii² 230b). Eretria granted citizenship to a man of Sikyon (no. 228) (Knoepfler (2001) i (C4s)) and proexenia to citizens of Opous (no. 386) (Knoepfler (2001) 4 (C4d)) and Taras (no. 71) (IG xi.9 187A and B (C5–C4) = Knoepfler (2001) ii–iii); see also Knoepfler (2001) 2 (330–320). Eretrian citizens received proexenia from Delphi (no. 177) (SEG 16 319 (C4–C3)) and Karthaia (no. 492) (IG xi.5 542.8 (C4m)). In C45 Eretria had a theorodokos to host theorei from Nemea (SEG 36 331.B.41–43 (331/0–331)).

Only one Etruscan citizen is attested as victor in the Olympic Games (Olympionikai 177 (c.492)), and none in any of the other major Panhellenic games.

The Pantheon of Eretria in the Classical period is almost exclusively known from inscriptions and archaeological evidence (Schacht (1992) 18–21; Novaro (1996)). The tutelary god of Eretria was Apollo Daphnephoros (IG xi.9 191.10, 49; Knoepfler (2001) 17), in whose sanctuary public enactments were published (IG xi.9 210.26–29). Divinities worshipped in the town itself were Aphrodite? (Themelis (1982) 179), Asklepios (IG xi.9 194 (C4–C3); LSG 93), Dionysos (IG xi.9 192, 207.45 with SEG 34 896 (C6l)), Hera (IG xi.9 189.27), Poseidon (Knoepfler (2000)) and Demeter, for whom thersmophoria are attested (Plut. Mor. 298B, probably derived from the Aristotelian Politeia; cf. Metzger (1985); Willers (1991)). The two major extra-urban cults were those of Artemis Amyrtia at Amyntos with musical contests (IG xi.9 189 = LSGC 92; IG xi.9 191.57, 59, 195.10–12; Knoepfler (1988) 383–91) and Apollo at Tamynai (Harp. T3; Strabo 10.1.10; IG xi.9 90–92).

The Eretrian calendar is typically Euboian. The month Antestherion is attested in C45 (IG xi.9 189 = LSGC 92), and the months Apatourion, Lenaiion and Heraion in the C3 law concerning the Dionysian artists (IG xi.9 207; see Trumpy, Monat. 39–41).

The city of Eretria is bordered to the south by the sea, to the west by a stream, to the north by a hill which naturally became the acropolis; to the east was an area of marshy ground. The ancient port lay partly in the same vicinity as the modern port.

The urban area of modern Eretria in the 1960s gives some idea of its extent in C4. At that time, it was surrounded by a high city wall which, starting from the sea in the west, followed the western side of the acropolis, then ran along its steepest slope on the north, then turned south to the sea to complete the circuit. The port itself was fortified by a curtain-wall and towers. At intervals along the city wall were posterns, a monumental gate to the west (Krause (1972)) and an eastern gate that has not been found. We know that the city was protected by a wall in 490, since the Persians had to lay siege for six days, and Eretria fell only because of treachery (Hdt. 6.101.2), whereafter the walls were demolished (Strabo 10.1.10). In our current state of knowledge it is impossible to date the first fortifications with any certainty. The existing wall, with its gates, posterns and towers, dates from C4. It was about 4,260 m in length; the total area enclosed by the wall was about 81.5 ha. The top of the acropolis was 123 m from the sea. Eretria was besieged in 341 (Philoch. fr. 160).

The first traces of occupation on the acropolis date to the second millennium (AntK (1994) 94–96, (1995) 108–19, (1996) 107–11). Middle Helladic remains have been found in the plain, not far from the future agora. During the Protogeometric period (C9), only the tombs attest to some sort of human presence (AntK (2000) 134–45). The first evidence of settlement, dating from C8, comes from three areas: near the port, on the site of the later sanctuary of Apollo, and at several places at the foot of the acropolis. The buildings were oval or apsidal in plan, with the entrance on the short side (AntK (1981) 85–86, (2000) 128–30, (2001) 84–87). A group of tombs also dates from C8; their location was marked on the ground by a triangular stone structure, and they contained exceptionally rich grave-goods (bronze
cauldrons, gold jewellery, iron weapons, a bronze spearhead). They have been interpreted as a heroon. The remains of later buildings nearby have been attributed to a heroic cult (Bérard (1970)).

The oldest buildings in the area of the sanctuary of Apollo Daphnephoros, apsidal in plan, were followed at the end of C8 by a longer edifice (a hekatompedon), also with an apse. Because of the altar at its east end and the finds of offerings and pottery, this has been identified as the first temple of Apollo, the city’s chief divinity. A second temple, rectangular in plan, perhaps Ionic, preceded the large Doric hexastyle temple of C6 which was burned down by the Persians in 490 (Hdt. 6.101.3; Auberson (1968)).

To the north of the temple of Apollo, a sacrificial area with a deposit of sacred objects has yielded numerous offerings, the earliest dating from C8; some came from the Middle East, others from Egypt and from the West. The cult celebrated there was perhaps dedicated to a female divinity (Huber (2003)). The foundations of another sanctuary were discovered cut in the rock at the top of the acropolis; they were accompanied by offerings similar to those found in the sacred deposit in the sacrificial area. The divinity honoured is uncertain, but the offerings suggest that it may have been female (AntK (1994) 97–99).

Among the other religious buildings for which there is archaeological evidence, the temple of Dionysos, located next to the theatre (Auberson (1976)), may date from C4e, while the siting of a thesmophorion on the south slope of the acropolis is controversial (Metzger (1985); Muller (1996) 165–68; Willers (1991)). Several clues suggest that a sanctuary of Asklepios was situated in the neighbourhood of the House of the Mosaics. The large sanctuary of Artemis Amarynthia lies outside the city but in the chora, about 10 km to the south. Its approximate location is known, but the temple proper has not yet been found (Knoepfler (1988)).

No public or official buildings have yet come to light. However, we do know the location of the agora from the Archaic and Classical periods, which was near the sanctuary of Apollo Daphnephoros. The porticos along four sides have been located or partially cleared. The function of an elegant circular building (tholos) on the east side of the agora remains unknown. To the north of the agora a large fountain provided a public water-supply; long sections of the conduits have been uncovered. Other conduits for supplying fresh water and carrying away waste have been found under several streets.

The main street linked the west gate to the east gate, passing to the south of the theatre and along the southern flank of the acropolis. Halfway between the two gates, another street branched off towards the agora, skirting the sanctuary of Apollo on the way. Other streets have been found in various parts of the city, the longest in the western quarter (Reber (1998)).

Eretria had a huge theatre (TGR ii. 215–16), and some of the earliest phases may date to C4; cf. IG xii.9 193.6 (C4I), a gymnasium, a palaestra and baths. Although the visible remains of these buildings are no older than the Hellenistic period, it is reasonable to suppose that they were already functioning in C4 or even earlier.

The Classical and Hellenistic areas of the city are well known thanks to the systematic exploration of the vast houses, some of which are particularly luxurious (Reber (1998); Ducrey et al. (1991)).

Eretria struck silver coins on the Aiginetan standard, c.525–446 and c.411–400. Denominations: tetradrachm, didrachm, drachm, diobol, obol, hemiobol. The most common types are obv. cow scratching itself, sometimes with a bird on its back; rev. octopus in incuse square. The legend *ΕΡΕΤΡΙΩΝ is found only on C2 bronze coins (Head, HN² 360–64; Kraay (1976) 91–92; SNG Cap. Aetolia-Euboia 468–96). It is not known whether the C4 and C3 “federal” issues were struck by Eretria (Wallace (1956)) or by Chalkis (no. 365) (Picard (1979)); see also Brunner (1998) and supra 649.

Eretria was involved in the colonisation of Dikaia (no. 568), Mende (no. 584), Methone (541), Okolon (626), Pharbelos (no. 591), Pithekoussai (no. 65) and Skabala (no. 607).
belonged to the Island district (IG i² 270.v.22) and is recorded in the tribute lists from 451/50 (IG i² 262.1.24) to 416/5 (IG i² 289.1.23), a total of thirteen times, three times completely restored, paying a phoros of 1,000 dr. (IG i³ 262.1.24). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.1.81; 2,000 dr.).

In C3 (Knoepfer 1997) 354, Grychial became a deme of Eretria (no. 370), belonging to the third district (Knoepfer 1997) 384, 402. The Grychaei were divided among all six Eretrian phylai (IG xii.9 245A.158, 246A.181ff, 247.1; Knoepfer 1997) 393–400.

372. Histiaia (Histiaeus)/Oreos (Oreites) Map 35, Lat. 38.55, long. 23.05. Size of territory: down to C4m probably 4, in C4m 5. Type: A. The toponym is first ‘Ιστίαια, η (Hom. Il. 2.537; Strabo 10.1.3); or ‘Ιστιαία, η (IG xii.5 594.2; Hdt. 8.661.1); or ‘Εστία, η (Thuc. 7.57.2; Ps.-Skelax 58; Arist. Pol. 1303b33; IG i³ 41.89); later it is Ωρεος (Aeschin. 3.103; Arist. Ath. Pol. 33.1; Dem. 18.79; IG i² 682.14 (C36)), either θ (Thuc. 8.95.7; Paus. 7.26.4) or δ (Xen. Hell. 5.4.56; Strabo 10.1.3, 5). The corresponding city-ethnics are ‘Ιστιαίες (Hdt. 8.23.1; Xen. Hell. 2.2.3; CID ii 75.11.47 (396/5); IG i² 8939 (C4)), ‘Εστιαῖες (Thuc. 7.57.2) and Ωρεῖτης (Xen. Hell. 5.4.56; SEG 27 17.5 (C4m); IG iv 617.3 (C4); CID ii 93.51 (329/8)). The change of name (Robert 1951) 179 n. 2 is explicitly mentioned in several sources (Paus. 7.26.4; schol. Thuc. 1.114), and at Strabo 10.1.3 it is connected with the establishment of an Athenian klereouchy in 446. But the sources testify to a considerable overlap between the two names (cf. Strabo 10.1.4). Both toponyms are attested in Thucydides, Histiaia at 7.57.2 and Oreos at 8.95.7. The earliest attestation of the toponym Oreos is in Ar. Pax 1047, 1057, whereas the toponym Histiaia (in a contemporary context) is attested as late as C4F (IG xii.15 594.12 = Staatsverträge 287), and the city-ethnic Histiaeus in inscriptions of C3 (CID ii 126.2 (C3f); IG xii.9 1186.12 (C3s)) and on coins of C2 (Head, HN² 364–65). Histiaia/Oreos is called a polis both in the urban sense (Hdt. 8.23.2; Ps.-Skelax 58; Dem. 9.61, 62) and in the political sense (Xen. Hell. 5.4.57; Dem. 9.59–60; Aeschin. 3.94; Arist. Pol. 1303b32–3; IG xii.15 594.3 (C4f); IG xii.9 188.6–7 (C4f)). Πολιτισμός is found in Semon. 9.62. The collective sense of the city-ethnic is attested internally on C4 coins (infra) and externally in inscriptions (IG xii.15 594.15 (C4f)) and in literature (Hdt. 8.23.2; Thuc. 7.57.2; Dem. 23.215). The individual and external use is attested in inscriptions (IG xii.9.7.9 (C4m); CID ii 93.51 (329/8)) and in literature (Hdt. 8.23.1; Aeschin. 3.223).

The territory is called η γη ‘Ιστιαιώτης (Hdt. 7.175.2, 8.23.2). From C4m it comprised all of northern Euboea, some 850 km², and bordered on the territory of Chalkis (no. 365). At 23.213 Demosthenes claims that the Oreitans inhabited a quarter of the island (μέρος τέταρτον). The exact frontier is unknown, but it seems to have crossed the island north of Kerinthos but south of Elymnion (Gehrke 1994) 336–41. Down to C4F (no. 368) and Athenai Diades (no. 364), both on the Kenaion peninsula, were self-governing poleis, and so were, probably, Orobaii (no. 374) on the west coast of Euboia and Poseidion (no. 376) on the east coast (infra 660). In the Hellenistic period all four are attested as demes of Oreos: Athenai Diades (IG xii.9 1186.2, Dion (IG xii.11 1187.3), Orobaii (IG xii.9 1186.3) and Poseidion (IG xii.9 1189.20, 28, 39). Some thirty demes are recorded in Hellenistic inscriptions (IG xii.9 1186–89; Jones, POAG 77–78). We hear about Histiaian demes already in C5 (IG i³ 41.100), and in C4m the citizens of Histiaia/Oreos were organised into tribes and demes (IG xii.5 594.10 = Staatsverträge 287). The board of six archontes (infra) indicates that there were six phylai as in Eretria (no. 370) (Knoepfer by letter). Oreos (Theopomp. fr. 387) and Dion (IG i² 41.101) are the only named Hellenistic demes which can be traced back to the Classical period (supra). In 480, however, the core territory of Histiaia/Oreos comprised a number of komai along the coast (Hdt. 8.23.2), of which two may have been Khironisi and Oreos (Sackett et al. 1966) 111; for Khironisi/Dion, see also Reber (2001) 456–60).

After the battle of Artemision in 480 Histiaia/Oreos was conquered by the Persians, and its territory was ravaged (Hdt. 8.23.2). Histiaia/Oreos was a member of the Delian League, and may have been among the original members (ATL iii. 198–99). It is recorded in the tribute lists in 450/49 (IG i³ 263.iv.34), 448/7 (IG i³ 264.i.11.6) and 447/6 (IG i³ 265.i.11.36), paying a phoros of 1,000 dr. (IG i³ 265.i.11.36).

In 446 Histiaia joined the other Euboian poleis and defected from Athens; but the revolt was soon quenched by an Athenian army under Pericles; the Histiaiains were expelled from their city and sent to Makedonia, while Histiaia/Oreos was settled with Athenians (Thuc. 1.114.1–3, 7.57.2, 8.95.7; Theopomp. fr. 387; Philoch. fr. 118; Diod. 12.7.1, 22.2; Plut. Per. 23.4). The Athenians are described as colonists (apoikoi, Thuc. 7.57.2: Figueira (1991) 223) and numbered 2,000 (Theopomp. fr. 387) rather than the 1,000 reported at Diod. 12.22.2, where, probably, κατεκληρούχοις is used in a non-technical sense (cf. Ael. VH 6.1 with Figueira (1991) 258–60). The Athenian regulations for the new colony include references to a Histiaiaen boule, a dikasterion and an archon (IG i³ 41; cf. Koch (1991)
among the Euboians who fought against Sparta (no. Histiaia/Oreos. Two years later he was deposed by a Iason of Pherai had a certain Neogenes set up as tyrant of the battle of the Nemea in euporoi one point a dispute between two brothers belonging to the (Arist. Pol. 33.1). At the end of the Peloponnesian War, the Athenian colonists in Histiaia/Oreos were undoubtedly among those sent back to Athens (Plut. Lys. 13.3), and Histiaia/Oreos was probably given back to the citizens expelled in 446.

In the Corinthian War, the Oreitans must have been among the Euboians who fought against Sparta (no. 345) in the battle of the Nemea in 394 (Xen. Hell. 4.2.17). In c.380 Iason of Pherai had a certain Neogenes set up as tyrant of Histiaia/Oreos. Two years later he was deposed by a Lakedaimonian force (Diod. 15.30.3–4). A Lakedaimonian garrison was placed on the acropolis (Xen. Hell. 5.4.56; Plut. Mor. 773F). In 377 the Athenians ravaged the territory of Histiaia/Oreos (Diod. 15.30.2, 5) and later in the same year the Lakedaimonians were expelled from Oreos (Xen. Hell. 5.4.57). Histiaia/Oreos joined the Second Athenian Naval League in 375 or shortly after (IG ii² 43.B.18). It left the League after the battle of Leuktra (Xen. Hell. 6.5.23), but joined once again in 357 (IG i¹ 12.4.16). The Oreitans provided synedroi for the synedrion and contributed a syntaxis of 5 tal. (Aeschin. 3.94, 100). In 340 some kind of short-lived league with a common council was established under the leadership of Kallias of Chalkis (Aeschin. 3.89, 94; Staatsverträge 342); it included Histiaia/Oreos, Chalkis (no. 365) and Eretria (no. 370). Because of the contemporary issue of a common Euboian coinage (supra 643) the union has sometimes been interpreted as a federation (Staatsverträge 342; Picard (1979)), but see Beck (1997) 28.

After the Persian War Histiaia/Oreos was an oligarchy. At one point a dispute between two brothers belonging to the gnorimoi resulted in a stasis in which one brother rallied the wealthy (eupori), the other the commoners (demotikoi) (Arist. Pol. 1303a31–37; cf. Gehrke, Stasis 73). The Athenian colony of 446 or the 420s (Mattingly (1996) 246–48) was organised as a democracy (IG i¹ 41). After the Peloponnesian War the constitution was an oligarchy, which, in c.395, without any stasis or revolution, was changed into a constitution described by Aristotle as a politeia or a demokratia (Pol. 1303b16–20). Apart from a short period of tyranny in 380–378 under Neogenes (Diod. 15.30.3), the constitution was democratic (Aeschin. 3.103). In 357 Histiaia/Oreos, like the other the Euboian poleis, was torn by stasis between a pro-Theban and a pro-Athenian faction (Diod. 16.7.2), and in the 340s Histiaia/Oreos was split between a pro-Makedonian faction, headed by Philistides and an anti-Makedonian faction, headed by Euphraios, a pupil of Plato (Trampedach (1994) 96–97). The majority of the Oreitan demos supported the pro-Makedonian faction, and Euphraios was imprisoned (Dem. 9.59–62; cf. Ath. 506E, 508D). In 342 Philip of Makedon succeeded in making Philistides tyrant of Histiaia/Oreos (Dem. 9.33, 18.71; Theopomp. fr. 387). But a year later, on the motion of Demosthenes, the Athenians sent a force against Histiaia/Oreos; the city was conquered, Philistides killed, and democracy restored (Dem. 18.73; Charax (FGrHist 103) fr. 19; schol. Aeschin. 3.85). Strabo reports that Philistides during his short reign had the population of Ellopia transferred to Oreos (10.1.3; cf. Moggi, Sin. 351–54).

The only known public enactment of the Classical period is a decree of the people (psephismata tou demou) whereby the Oreitans pledged the public revenue of Histiaia/Oreos as security for 1 tal., which the polis owed to Demosthenes (Aeschin. 2.104 and 105, where the psephismata (now lost) was read out to the jurors; Migeotte (1984) 244–45). The eponymous officials were a board of six archontes (SEG 29 817–8–12 (c.300); IG xi.9 1187–1–5 (C3m)). A Histiaia citizen is recorded as lending money at interest to the city of Karystos (no. 373) (IG xi.9 7.5–11). An isopoliteia treaty was concluded between Histiaia/Oreos and Keos c.364 (IG xi.15 594 = Staatsverträge 287). Athenian envoy’s were sent to Histiaia/Oreos in 357/6 (IG i¹ 12.4.16) and in 341/40 (Aeschin. 3.100). Histiaia/Oreos granted proxenia to Aeschines of Athens (no. 361) (Dem. 18.82) and to Kallikles of Larisa (no. 401) (SEG 29 817 (c.300)), and Oreitan citizens received proxenia from Athens (no. 361) (IG i¹ 149.10 (c.375); Knoepfler (1995) 324F).

Histiaia/Oreos possessed an extra-urban sanctuary of Artemis Proseoea at Artemision (Hdt. 7.176.1; Plut. Them. 8.4; Lolling Symposium 1994, forthcoming); the cult included Pyrrhic games (SEG 33 716, C5f; IG xi.9 1190; Ceccarelli (1998) 94–95); a cult of the nymph Histiaia can be inferred from the C4 coins (infra).

The exact location of the urban centre of Histiaia is unknown, but it was probably in the neighbourhood of modern Histiaia (Xerochori). After 446 the urban centre was moved to Oreos at modern Kastro, and the inhabitants of the two settlements were merged by an synoikismos (Strabo 10.1.4; Moggi, Sin. 114–20). So far, only scanty remains have been found (ArchDelt 29 (1973–74) 487–90). We know from literary sources that the town had an acropolis (Xen. Hell. 5.4.56) and a harbour (Ps.-Skylax 58). In the
earthquake of 426, 700 houses and part of the walls were destroyed (Demetrios of Kallatis (FGrHist 85) fr. 6), but the town was fortified again in C4m (Dem. 9.61). The stronghold called Metropolis which was fortified by Chabrias in 377/6 (Diod. 15.30.2, 5) may have been the original urban centre of Histiaia/Oreos, deserted after the metoikesis in C5m; see supra 657. The prison of Oreos is mentioned at Dem. 9.60.


373. Karystos (Karystios) Map 58. Lat. 38.00, long. 24.25. Size of territory: 4. Type: A. The toponym is Κάρυστος, Ἱ (Hom. Il. 2.539; Hdt. 4.33.2; Ar. Rh. 1.142.7; IG xii.19 207.14 (C3e)). Quoting the C3 poet Theodoridas (fr. 746, Suppl. Hell.), Steph. Byz. lists Χειρονία as an alternative toponym (362.14); yet another alternative toponym is Αἴγαια (Steph. Byz. 363.1; schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.1165). The city-ethnic is Καρύστιοι (Hdt. 4.33.2; Thuc. 1.98.3; Ar. Lys. 1059; IG xii.9 7.20 (C4f)). Karystos is called a polis both in the urban sense (Ps.-Skylax 58: πετράπολις, where the political sense may be a connotation) and in the political sense (IG xii.9 12.1 = ArchDelt 26 (1971) Chron. 262 no. 13 (C5–C4); IG ii² 12.11–12; Hdt. 4.33.2, where the urban sense may be a connotation). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in inscriptions (IG xii.9 7.20 (C4f)) and in abbreviated form on C6–C4 coins (infra), and externally in inscriptions (I.Delos 98B.10 (377–373)) as well as in literary sources (Hdt. 6.99.2; Thuc. 4.42.1). The individual and external use is attested in inscriptions (CID II 4.11.9 (C4f)) as well as in external literary sources (Hdt. 7.214.1; Dem. 35.8–10). Patris is restored in IG ii² 467.21 (366/5).

The territory is called ἦ Καρυστίη χώρη (Hdt. 9.105) or ἦ Καρυστία (Theophr. Hist. pl.8.4.4). In C4 it bordered on that of Styra (no. 377), then an Eretrian deme (infra 660), and comprised the southern part of Euboea, altogether some 450 km². The principal site in the territory of Karystos is the harbour of Geraistos with a sanctuary of Poseidon (Ps.-Skylax 58; Arr. Anab. 2.1.2; Schumacher (1993) 77–80). The only other known Archaic and Classical settlements are Kyros (Hdt. 9.105) and Marmanion (Strabo 10.1.6), which may have existed in C4 (Knoepfler by letter), and the archaeological sites at Arkhompolis (Barr. 55, C, supra 646) and Philagra (Barr. 55, C, supra 646–47).

Coins of C6m (infra) and a Panhellenic victor of C6s (infra) are the only evidence we have for Karystos before the Persian War. In 490 the Persian forces laid siege to Karystos, ravaged its territory and forced the Karystians to surrender (Hdt. 6.99.2). In 480 the Karystians joined the Persian army (Hdt. 8.66.2), and after Salamis they were forced by Themistokles to pay an indemnity (Hdt. 8.112.2) and had their territory ravaged by the Greek army (Hdt. 8.121.1). Nevertheless, the Karystians dedicated a bronze bull in Delphi from spoils taken in the Persian War (Paus.10.16.6). In a war between Athens and Karystos 476–469 (Thuc. 1.98.3; Brock (1996) 359), the Karystians were defeated in a battle at Kyros (Hdt. 9.105) and forced to join the Delian League. Karystos belonged to the Island district (IG ii² 270.v.21) and is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG ii³ 259.11.16) to 416/5 (IG ii³ 289.1.22), a total of eleven times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of 12 tal. in 454/3, reduced to 7½ tal. in 451/0 (IG ii³ 262.1.23), and further reduced to 5 tal. in 450/49 (IG ii³ 263.iv.26). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG ii³ 71.1.70; 5 tal.) and in 410/9 (IG ii³ 100.1.4). In spite of Thuc. 1.114.2, the silence of our sources indicates that Karystos did not join the other Euboian poleis in defecting from the Delian League in 446. But, in addition to the reduction in phoros, there is some archaeological evidence to support the view that one of the C5m Athenian klerouchies on Euboea (Diod. 11.88.5; Paus. 1.27.3; schol. Ar. Nu. 233) was placed in Karystos (Figueira (1991) 225, y; Brock (1996) 365–66; Salomon (1997) 209). In 413 Karystos was still listed among the paying members (Thuc. 7.57.4). The constitution of Karystos seems to have been changed into an oligarchy in consequence of the revolution in Athens in 411 (Thuc. 8.64.1, 65.1, 69.3; cf. Gehrke, Stasis 76).

Karystos was among the original members of the Second Athenian Naval League (IG ii² 43.84), but probably left the League together with Thebes (no. 221) in 371 or shortly afterwards (Xen. Hell. 6.5.23; Dreher (1995) 173). In 357 Karystos, like the other Euboian poleis, was torn by stasis between a pro-Theban and a pro-Athenian faction (Diod. 16.7.2), and when the Thebans had been expelled from Euboea by the Athenians, a new treaty was concluded between Athens (no. 361) and Karystos (IG ii² 12.4; cf. SEG 45 54). It is not known whether Karystos in the 340s was a member of the ephemeral Euboian league or federation. In 323/2 Karystos was the only Euboian polis to support Athens in the Lamian War
In C₄ Karystos had close relations with Histiaia/Oreos (no. 372) and Thebes (no. 221), and had taken up some loans from citizens of these two poleis. Payments on these loans are attested in an inscription of c.370 (IG xii.9 7 = Migeotte (1984) no. 73) which shows that the eponymous official in Karystos was an archon and that there was a board of tamiai. An undated (C₄–C₃?) public enactment mentions a board of strategoi and, probably, a popular assembly (IG xii.9 1). A citizen of Karystos was granted proœxia by Eretria (no. 370) in C₄l (IG xii.9 211; cf. Knoepfler (2001) 212). During the grain crisis of 330–326 Karystos obtained 15,000 medimnoi from Kyrene (no. 1028) (SEG ix 2 = Tod 196.21; cf. SEG 38 1880). Karystos was a member of the Delian amphiktyony (Hdt. 4,33.2; l.Délos 98.120 (377–373)) and had a treasury on Delos (IG x1.2 144,A.88).

In the Archaic period the urban centre was situated on the Plakari hill (Keller (1985) 200–1), and it may have remained there during C₅. In C₄, if not before, it was moved to Palaiochori. From the siege of Karystos in 490 it can be inferred that the city was fortified (Hdt. 6,99.2). There are few remains. There was a fortified acropolis (Livy 32.17) on the Montofoli hill (Keller (1985) 218), and a large cemetery to the south. A temple of Dionysos is attested (Keller (1985) 217).

Karystos had one citizen who distinguished himself in all four major Panhellenic games: viz. Glaucos the pugilist (Simon. fr. 4, PMG; Dem. 18.319) who in 520 won one victory in the Olympic Games (Olympionikai 134), and then two in the Pythian, eight in the Nemean, and eight in the Isthmian Games (Paus. 6,10.1–3).

Karystos struck coins of silver c.550–445 and of silver and bronze c.411–336 (the chronology is based on the traditional date of the Athenian Coinage Decree and on the belief that Greek poleis stopped minting coins during the Macedonian supremacy). (1) Silver: denominations: tetradrachm, didrachm, drachm, hemidrachm and fractions down to trite-morion. Types: obv. ox scratching itself with its horns or cow suckling calf or forefront of bull or bull’s head; or head of Herakles; rev. incuse square or cock in incuse square or bull or palm tree(s). Legend: KAPYΣ or shorter forms down to K. The obv. of one Archaic tetradrachm has KAPYΣΤΙΟ[N]. (2) Bronze in C₄: obv. head of Herakles or head of Athena; rev. bull’s head or palm. Legend: KA (Head, HN² 356–57; Wallace (1968); SNG. Cop. Aeotia-Euboea 414–18).

374. Orobiai (Orobieus) Map 55. Lat. 38.50, long. 23.15. Size of territory: ? Type: A. The toponym is ‘Οροβιεύς, a! (Thuc. 3.89.2; IG i³ 418a.6). The city-ethnic is ‘Οροβίων (IG xii.9 923.2–3). In the notes to the Budé edn. of Dioν. 15, Vial suggests that ‘Ωρωπίων (30.3) and ‘Ωρωπίοις (30.4) may be corruptions of ‘Οροβίων and ‘Οροβίως. It seems better to obelise the MSS readings and to leave the mystery unsolved. Orobiai is called a polis in the urban sense at Thuc. 3.89.2.

Orobiai was situated at modern Rovies and was famous for its oracle of Apollo Selinuntios (Strabo 10.1.3; Steph. Byz. 376.3–4). At Thuc 3.89.2 Orobiai is described as a polis which was partly engulfed by the great seismic sea wave of 426. We know from other sources that a large part of Histiaia/Oreos (no. 372) was destroyed by the same disaster (Demetrias of Kallatis (FGHist 85) fr. 6; Fossey (1990) 183–84).

An Attic inscription of c.430–410 shows that Orobiai was situated in the territory of Histiaia/Oreos (no. 372) (IG i³ 418a.6). The individual use of the ethnic ‘Οροβίων is attested twice in a C₅ inscription (IG xii.9 923.2–3; AE (1963) 5). Histiaia/Oreos was organised into tribes and demes (supra 656); but the stone inscribed with IG xii.9 923 was found in Chalkis (no. 365), not in the Histiaia/Oreos area, which points to the ethnic being a city-ethnic rather than a demotic. Knoepfler (by letter) suggests that it may be a pierre errante, inscribed by the Athenians settled in Histiaia/Oreos. In Hellenistic inscriptions from the Histiaia/Oreos area, however, ‘Οροβίων is attested again, and now indisputably as a demotic (IG xii.9 1186.3, 1189.27, 37). Like Athenai Dades (no. 364), Dion (no. 368), Poseidion (no. 376), and perhaps some others as well, Orobiai may in C₅ have been a dependent polis lying inside the territory of Histiaia/Oreos but transformed into a Histiaian deme in the course of C₄ or C₃ (Hansen (1997) 31, (2000) 209–10).

Some ancient remains have been found in the neighbourhood of Palaiochori, Ag. Iannako, but there are a few traces only of the ancient town. It was probably situated at Ag. Ilias north of Rovies where some sherds of C₄ have been found (Sackett et al. (1966) 46–47, fig. 5).

375. *Peraia (Peraeus) Map 55. Unlocated. Type: C. The toponym *Περαία is not attested in any source but reconstructed from the demotic Περαίας (IG xii.9 249B.138 (C₃)) and the adverbial form Περαοθέν (IG xii.9 249B.445). Peraia was a deme of Eretria (no. 370) and is not called a polis in any source, but an analogy with Grychnai (no. 371) and Styra (no. 377) indicates that it was a polis down to c.400.

The Eretrian C₃ lists of citizens show that the members of three of the demes, viz. Grychnai, Peraia and Styra, did not belong to one phyle but were distributed among all the six phylai (Knoepfler (1997) 396–403). The evidence for Peraia is IG xii.9 245A.11 (phyle 1), 246A.6 (phyle 2), 247.2
(phyle 3), 249B.138–49 (phyle 4). In the case of Styra and Grynchaid the most likely explanation of this anomaly is that both settlements had been poleis which were amalgamated with Eretria in C5–C4 and integrated into the pre-existing organisation of Eretrian citizens into six tribes. By analogy, it seems reasonable to infer that Peraia too was once a polis which had been absorbed by Eretria c.400. By contrast with Grynchaid and Styra, however, Peraia is not recorded in the Athenian tribute lists as a member of the Delian League. By letter, Knoepfler suggests as a possibility that Peraie be identical with the Διάκριοι ἐν Εὔβοιαί (no. 367), attested as members of the Delian League.

376. Posideion (Posideite) Map 55. Lat. 39.00, long. 23.20, but Knoepfler (1999) 230 n. 3 now suggests locating Posideion further north at modern Helleniko. Size of territory: unknown but presumably 1 or 2. Type: C. The toponym is Ποσίδειον, τά (IG i3 71.1.91–92). The city-ethnic is Ποσειδίτης (IG xii.9 1189.20, 28, 39 (C2)). Posideion is not called a polis in any source, but the attestation of the community in the C5 Athenian assessment decrees is an indication of polis status. Posideion, further described as Ποσίδειον ἐν 'Ευβοίαι, was assessed for phoros in 425/4 (IG i3 71.1.91–92: 100 dr.). The only other reference to the polis is in a C2 catalogue of citizens of Histiaia/Oreos (no. 372), in which Ποσειδίτης appears as a demotic (IG xii.9 1189.20, 28, 39 (C2)). The change from polis to deme of Histiaia/Oreos may have taken place in C4f (Moggi, Sin. 236–37; see supra 656). The precise location is unknown. Philippson (1951) 577 n. 1 and Sackett et al. (1966) 42, followed by Barr, suggest Vasilika, Palaiakoastro.

377. Styra (Styreus) Map 58. Lat. 38.10, long. 24.15. Size of territory: unknown but presumably 1 or 2. Type: [A]. The toponym is Στύρα (Hom. II. 2.539; Dem. 21.167; Strabo 10.1.6). The city-ethnic is Συροῦς (ML 27.9, 479; Hdt. 8.46.4; Thuc. 7.57.4). Step. Byz. 588.14 is the only source in which Styra is explicitly called a polis; but at Hdt. 8.46.4 it is subsumed under the heading polis, where polis occurs in the political sense (Hdt. 8.42.1, 49.1). Furthermore, the attestation of the community in the Athenian tribute lists is an indication of polis status, as is the peculiar incorporation of the Styreans into all six phylai of Eretria (no. 370) (infra). The collective and external use of the city-ethnic is attested on the Serpent Column (ML 27.9), in the Athenian tribute lists (infra) and in literature (Hdt. 8.46.4; Thuc. 7.57.4). The individual and external use is attested only as a demotic (infra).

The exact location of Styra is not known, but it must have been situated near modern Nea Styra (Knoepfler 1997) 365; Reber (2002) 43–45. The size of the territory is unknown. The northern frontier towards Zarex and Dystos (no. 369) cannot be determined. The southern frontier, on the other hand, is attested by a boundary stone inscribed on a rock south-east of modern Styra (OPOΣ ΔΗΜΟΥ: Moutsopoulos (1982) 340, where the Δ is misread as a Α; cf. Reber (2002) 45). Styra controlled a small island called Aiglea (Hdt. 6.107.2). At Mt. Ag. Nikolais/Kliosi, east of Styra, are the remains of an ancient fortification wall and a gate, probably a fortress for the defence of the southern frontier of Styra and perhaps of the territory of Eretria (Reber (2002)). Cults of Zeus Hypsistos (IG xii.9 59) and Zeus Soter (IG xii.9 58) are attested, as well as a cult of Asklepios (IG xii.9 57 (C4)) and of the Kytherian goddess, i.e. Aphrodite (Knoepfler 2001) 244–45 with n. 337 (C4)).

In 480 the Styreans provided two triremes at Artemision (Hdt. 8.1.2) and at Salamis (Hdt. 8.46.4). Together with Eretria (no. 371) they provided 600 hoplites at Plataea (Hdt. 9.28.5) and are duly recorded on the Serpent Column (ML 27.9).

Styra was a member of the Delian League, and may have been among the original members (ATL iii. 198–99). It belonged to the Island district (IG i3 269.v.29) and is recorded in the tribute lists from 450/49 (IG i3 263.iv.28) to 429/8 (IG i2 282.111.21), a total of eleven times, three times completely restored, paying a phoros of 1 tal. (IG i3 263.iv.28). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.1.74; 2 tal.), and in 413 Styra was still listed among the paying members (Thuc. 7.57.4).

Some 500 lead tablets were found in 1860 in the territory of Styra (IG xii.9 56 with add. p. 176; cf. SEG 42 794). They were inscribed in C5f with names, mostly in the nominative. Sometimes another name is added (a patronymic in the nominative?) and/or an abbreviation which presumably indicates a kind of civic subdivision (e.g. MA or MAP, nos. 167, 210, 395, 405, 433). There are signs of reuse. The tablets are probably identification cards of Styrean citizens, to be used for sortition and similar purposes (Masson 1992 61–72; Murray (1997) 499).

In the Hellenistic period Styra is attested as a deme of Eretria, belonging to the second district (Knoepfler 1997) 383, 402). The Styreans were divided among all six Eretrian phylai (IG xii.9 245A.36, 246A.36, 247.1.17 (C3e); cf. Knoepfler (1997) 393–400). In the Athenian decree of 378/7 (IG ii2 43) the Styreans are not listed as members of the Second Athenian Naval League, and the presumption is that the change of status from polis to deme took place in C5f or C4e (Knoepfler 1971) 242–44; Moggi, Sin. 227–33). During the Lamian War (332/2) Styra was conquered and destroyed by the Athenians (Strabo 10.1.6; cf. Knoepfler (1971)).
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In order for us to be able to distinguish an individual described as a Λοκρὸς as an East Lokrian in contradiction to a West Lokrian, Λοκρός must be qualified by, e.g., the city-ethnic of an East Lokrian city; such qualifications of the ethnic are fairly frequent: CId 11 43.22: Λοκρῶν: Σμήνοι Όπουντιον (340/39); CId 11 97.24–25: Αγγαία Αληθά Όπουντίων, Άγια Αριστάρχου Λοκρῶν Θρονεί (327/6); see also CId 11 74.1.37, 51, 11.28 (337/6); CId 11 76.11.30 (335); CId 11 82.24 (333/2).

Χώρα is used about the territory at Ps.-Skylax 60 and Diod. 12.65.5 (1424), and γῆ at Diod. 16.25.2 (1353); apart from Ps.-Skylax 60, no Archaic or Classical source applies the term ἔθνος explicitly to the East Lokrians, but they were probably considered an ethnos like the West Lokrians (Hell. Oxy. 21.3, Chambers) and must be included among the Lokrians mentioned at Aesch. 2.116 as an ethnos which was a member of the Delphic Amphiktyony; the Lokrians sent two hieronnomenes to the Amphiktyonic Council (e.g. CId 11 36.1.30–1 (343–340)); of these two, one came from West Lokris, and one from East Lokris (e.g. CId 11 43.22–23 (340/39); CId 11 74.1.37–38, 11.28–29 (337/6); CId 11 76.1.22–23 (335)), and in C4 he came invariably from Oppus (no. 386), the chief city of the region (see further Nielsen (2000)).

According to Hdt. 7.216, Alponos (no. 379) was the first of the Lokrides poleis as one approached from Malis, which means that the border must have run between Anthele (no. 427) and Alponos. There is no explicit evidence for the border with Boiotia, but it must have run north of Boiotian Hyetos (no. 207) and Kopai (no. 209) (cf. 431); Kyrtones, which is treated as Boiotian in the present work (see supra 435; for the proposed sites, see Fossey (1990) 52–57, and Katsonopoulou (1990) 71–86), is indeed described as Boiotian by late sources (Paus. 9.24.4; Steph. Byz. 398.9); but since regional affiliations are known to have been subject to changes in southern East Lokris (Lokrian sites becoming Boiotian: Goldman and Walker (1915) 420–22), Kyrtones may perhaps have been East Lokrian in the Classical period, but certainty is impossible. The same is

I would like to thank Dr. B. Forsén and Dr. M. H. Hansen for commenting on a draft of this inventory; Prof. T. V. Buttery for help with the coins noted under Larymna, and mag. ar. R. Frederiksen for discussing the walls of Halai with me. I dedicate this contribution to my teachers Gorm Torton and Mogens Herman Hansen, the best there are.
true of Korsea, which is counted as East Lokrian here (cf., however, Étienne and Knoepfler (1976) 37–38, 39). In the south-west, Ps.-Skylax 60 lists Larymna (no. 383) as the first East Lokrian polis metà . . . Bourotai; however, Anchoe further south must have belonged to East Lokris as well (Fossey (1990) 27–32). The border with Phokis was Mt. Knemis. On the southern ridge of Mt. Knemis were the sanctuaries of Athena Kranai and of Artemis Elaphobia; the former belonged to Phokian Elateia (no. 180) (Philipsson (1951) 351), the latter to Phokian Hyampolis (no. 182) (SEG 37 422–23). According to Strabo (9.3.1, 3.17), Daphnous, a coastal site in East Lokris, once belonged to Phokis. Unfortunately, the Phokian seizure of Daphnous cannot be dated (cf. RE suppl. iii, s.v. Daphnus col. 326). It should, however, be noted that Ps.-Skylax 61 gives the following list of Phokian (sic) polis: Θρόνον, Κψήμος, 'Ελάτεια, Παναπές. Since Thronion (no. 388) is commonly regarded as East Lokrian (Thuc. 2.26.2), but is here treated as Phokian, it is possible that Phokis at the time of composition controlled Thronion, and thus presumably Daphnous, etc., at the same time and then in C4. Another possibility is that the transmitted text of Ps.-Skylax is not sound, and that Θρόνον is a corruption of Τηθρόνον (cf. Nielsen (2000) 108); if that is accepted, we will have a list of exclusively Phokian localities, opening with a polis (Teithronion (no. 194)), going on to a mountain (Knemis), and ending with two polis (Elateia (no. 180) and Panopeus (no. 190)), a list which then resembles, e.g., the one found in Ps.-Skylax 62: Thermopylae (a pass), Trachis (a polis (no. 432)), Oite (a mountain), Herakleia (a polis (no. 430)), Spercheios (a river); see further Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 141. This emendation will remove the only scrap of (indirect) evidence for the date of the Phokian seizure of Daphnous.

Our written sources provide us with information about eighteen¹ East Lokrian settlements of the Archaic and Classical periods.² Of these, seventeen have been identified, with very varying degrees of certainty (Buckler (1989) 93; Fossey (1990) 94–95; Pritchett (1982) 123–75, (1985) 166–89, (1992) 145–55; Dakoronia (1993); Coleman (1998)), the topography of the area being far from completely clear. One ancient toponym is still unlocated,³ whereas we have remains of a Classical settlement⁴ that cannot be convincingly matched with any ancient toponym.⁵ Thus we know of nineteen Archaic and Classical settlements altogether.⁶ Eleven are described in the Inventory below, which comprises every East Lokrian settlement that was certainly (type A), probably (type B), or possibly (type C) a polis. The other eight settlements are as follows.

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis

Anastasis (AC toponym unknown, late toponym perhaps Ἀνάστασις) Hierokles Synekdesmos (πόλις; Fossey (1990) 62–65, but see also Coleman (1998); cf. also Blegen (1926) and Dakoronia (1993) 117. Barr. AC.

Anchoe (Ἄγχος) Strabo 9.2.18 (τόπος); Fossey (1990) 27–32. C.


Addition, Lyco ph. Alex. at 1147 mentions Φαλορίας (= Steph. Byz. 657.3: Φαλορίας, πόλεις Λοκρίδος) and at 1149 Πορωναία (= Steph. Byz. 541.13: Πορωναία, πόλεις Λοκρίδος, and 541.2: Πορωναία, πόλεις Λοκρίδος, “an obvious doublet” (Fossey (1990) 172)). Since neither of these can be matched with a known site (Fossey (1990) 168), it is impossible to know whether they existed in our period, or whether they are legendary.

³ This is Skarpeia, probably in the plain of Molos; Barr. 54 has tentatively placed Skarpeia at modern Molos, a site with AC remains. See, however, Buckler (1986) 94–95; cf. Pritchett (1992) 145–48.

⁴ At Roustantia, see Dakoronia (1993) 126, who thinks it may be Homeric Bessa. This may be Fossey’s Golemi (Fossey (1990) 80–82).

⁵ Fossey (1990) discusses several sites which have not made it on to Barr. map 55. Some of these are probably left out because their toponym is unknown or because they formed part of a larger settlement; see e.g. the discussion of the site at Martinon (Fossey (1990) 33–35), believed to be a part of Larymna; such sites I have not counted here, though they are mentioned in the inventory if appropriate. See further Fossey (1990) 49 (Traganà), 50 (Mitro peninsula: C), 51 (Anderas), 76–78 (Megaloplatusanoi), 79–80 (Skanderaga: AC), 85–86 (Villove: AC), 87 (PalioKastron Livinganot), 88–90 (Arkétsa).

⁶ In addition to settlements, we have some information on military installations, e.g. Οἰστι (Oisit): Strabo 1.3.20 (φρούριον (1426); C Fossey (1990) 66–67; Prophitis Elias at Megaloplatusanoi (ancient toponym unknown): C (Fossey (1990) 78); Fossey (ibid.) calls the site an “obviously temporary and essentially military” one. On military installations etc. in the southern part of the region, see Fossey (1990) 138–50.

---

¹ Pritchett (1985) 171 suggests “that Homeric Tarpe and Classical Naraka are the same, and that Pharygai did not exist as a Lokrian city”. But see Buckler (1989) 95–96, who also denies Pharygai to East Lokris, and doubts the existence of Tarpe in historical times. The number eighteen for known settlements includes Mendenitsa, tentatively identified as Argolos, following Buckler (1989) 41–42. D.Delphes III.1.102 is a Delphic proxeny decree of c.335–280 for a man described as Λοκρίδος Άγχος. It is uncertain whether Boumatos was West or East Lorkian; cf. Larat (1923) 172. In Certamen Homer i et Heiodi (1992) 126–32 an Οἰνόη is ascribed to East Lokris, certainly by mistake; cf. Larat (1923) 145.

² Two sites mentioned in the Homeric Catalogue of Ships are not mentioned by other Archaic or Classical sources and have not been located: (1) Augeiai (Ἀγγειαί); it is believed that this site may be referred to in C4 in BCH 19 (1895) p. 401 l. 16, but the toponym is heavily restored; (2) Bessa (Βησσα) (Hom. Il. 2.532); for a possible candidate with C remains, see Dakoronia (1993) 126.
Daphnous (Δαφνοῖς) Strabo 9.3.1 (πόλεις), 9.3.17 (πόλις); Steph. Byz. 222.14 (πόλις). Barr. AC.


Korseia (Κόρσεια) Taken to be East Lokrian by Oldfather in RE xi. 1438; see also Coleman (1998); cf., however, Étienne and Knoepfler (1976) 37–38, 39; Paus. 9.24.5 calls it a πόλεις, but presumably takes it to be Boiotian; see the remarks about Kyrtones above. For Dem. 19.141, see Hansen (1996) 83, Fossey (1990) 58–61; Katsonopoulou (1990) 86–99. Barr. C.

2. Unidentified Settlements


It is difficult to say whether any of these sites were poleis; the site identified as Anastasis is perhaps a candidate, since it was clearly a substantial town (Dakoronia (1993) 117), but it must be emphasised that it is extremely difficult to deduce polis status from archaeological evidence. On the other hand, some of the communities described as poleis in the Inventory below might perhaps be omitted: viz. Knemides (no. 381) and Nikaia (no. 385). But even allowing for some uncertainty, the Inventory points to the conclusion that more than two-thirds of all known East Lokrian settlements were organised as poleis either throughout the Classical period or at least for some time within that period.

The plurality of poleis in East Lokris is acknowledged by several sources (ML 20 with Larsen (1968) 51–52; Hdt. 7.216; Ps.-Skylax 60; Diod. 16.38.3 (1352); see also Ap. Rhod. 4.1780: Ὀσπούντια τε ἄστεα Λοκρῶν). It is commonly assumed that these poleis were united in a confederacy (on which see Larsen (1968) 48–58) that probably comprised the whole region (Nielsen (2000) 117, although pointing out that the nature of the organisation attested in ML 20 is not clear (115)). ML 20 shows that this “confederacy” was in existence by 500–450, and Fossey (1990) 161 thinks that this unit possibly existed by the later Archaic period, which is clearly the implication of SEG 41 506 (C6–C5) if the Lokrians who concluded that treaty with the Boiotians were the East Lokrians. The leading polis of the region and of the “confederacy” was without doubt Opous (no. 386), and this city may have turned (some of) the other poleis into its dependencies (Nielsen (2000) 111–14; infras. s.v. Alponos (no. 379)).

During the Persian Wars the attitude of the East Lokrians was ambiguous: according to Hdt. 7.332 the East Lokrians gave earth and water to Xerxes, but they nevertheless fought παντοπαρτία at Thermopylae (Hdt. 7.203.1) and supplied seven pentekontoi for the Artemision campaign (Hdt. 8.1.2); after Thermopylae they joined the Persians (Hdt. 8.66.2). During the Peloponnesian War the East Lokrians were allied to Sparta (no. 345) (Thuc. 2.9.2–3, on which see HCT), but they joined the anti-Spartan side in the Corinthian War (Xen. Hell. 4.2.17, 3.15). In the Third Sacred War the East Lokrians opposed the Phokians, and their territory saw much hard fighting (Diod. 16.29.1; Buckler (1989), e.g. at 93–97). On the status of those settlements which were not poleis we can only hypothesise. A fair hypothesis would be that they were koma kome is actually applied to Alponos (no. 379) by Herodotos (7.176.5), and though Alponos was probably a polis (see Inventory), other settlements may well have been koma, although no individual settlement is so described; however, Lerat (1952) 11.44 and Tuplin (1993) 69 n. 13 take the general reference to Lokrian koma at Xen. Hell. 4.3.22 to refer to East Lokris.

II. The Poleis

378. Alope (Alopaios) Map 55. Lat. 38.45, long. 22.55 (Fossey (1990) 91–92). Size of territory: probably 1, perhaps 2. Type: [A]. The toponym is Ἀλόπη, ᾽ (Thuc. 2.26.2). The city-ethnic is Ἀλοπαῖος (IG ix.1 222 (C3–C2); cf. Lerat (1952) 11.5 n. 1).

At Ps.-Skylax 60, where polis is used in the urban sense, Alope is the last of four toponyms listed between the heading πόλεις αἵδε (ibid.), but apart from that we have no evidence about the territory and only a little about the city. According to Demetrios of Kallatis (FrHist 85) fr. 6 = Strabo 1.3.20, Alope suffered seriously from the earthquake of 426 (Fossey (1990) 183–84). The city was centred on
379. **Alponos** (Alponios) Map 55. Lat. 38.50, long. 22.35. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A. Herodotos gives the toponym as Ἀλπηνός, of at 7.176,2, but as Ἀλπηνώς, ἡ at 7.216; Ἀλπηνώς is found in Aeschin. 2.132, 138, and was possibly used by Hellan. fr. 12 (= Steph. Byz. 7.8.15–16) and Demetrios of Kallatis (FGHist 85) fr. 6 = Strabo 1.3.20. An ethnic derived from the latter toponym, Ἀλπῶνιος, is found in CDid II 126.1 (C3) and Syll.² 419 (C3f), both external and individual uses.

Alponos is described as a polis at Hdt. 7.216.2, but as a kome at Hdt. 7.176.5, an inconsistency which is difficult to explain. Another site in the same general area, Anthele (no. 427), is similarly described both as a polis (Hdt. 7.176.2) and a kome (Hdt. 7.200.2). So, if there is an explanation, it may be one that is peculiar to this general area, such as the modest size of the settlements. In the case of Alponos, it is also possible that its classification as a kome is a reflection of dependant status (cf. Hansen (1995a) 73–75), and it may be suggested that the city was dependent on Opous (no. 386), the leading city of the East Lokrian “confederacy” (see infra). Strangely, though, Steph. Byz. 7.8.12–13 reports (without source reference) that Alponos was μητρόπολις Λοκρῶν. The city served as a base for the Greeks during the Thermopylae campaign (Hdt. 7.176.5, 229.1).

Alponos is poorly attested: there is no evidence about its territory, and only a little about the city. According to Demetrios of Kallatis (FGHist 85) fr. 6, as reported by Strabo 1.3.20, Alponos suffered seriously from the earthquake of 426 (Fossey (1990) 183–84). The fragment, moreover, refers to a pyrgos, which was one of several such constructions at the harbour of Alponos (πύργον τῶν ἑλλημενίων). The reference may indicate that the city was walled (Pritchett (1982) 160). In C5 Alponos was probably centred on a walled acropolis to the east of Thermopylae (for which see Pritchett (1982) 160–61 and (1992) 148–50), but the city was possibly relocated uphill to a new site after the earthquake of 426 (Pritchett (1982) 164; but see Buckler (1989) 93–94); Pritchett (1982) 164–66 describes the probable new site as a walled city.

The celebration of *Themisphoria* is attested in Demetrios of Kallatis (FGHist 85) fr. 6 = Strabo 1.3.20 (1426).

380. **Halai** (Haleeus) Map 55. Lat. 35.40, long. 23.10. Size of territory: probably 2. Type: B. The toponym is not found in Archaic or Classical sources, but Strabo 9.2.13 and 4.2 (Μάλας) has been emended to read Ἀλαι, ἀ (cf. Plut. Sull. 26.3–4; Paus. 9.2.45; Steph. Byz. 68.5). The ethnic is Ἀλαίεσ (AJA 19 (1915) 442–44 no. 2 (C5f)).

The earliest sources to classify Halai as a polis are two Hellenistic inscriptions: AJA 19 (1915) no. 3.2 (206/5) and no. 4.2 (208/7, restored), where the term is used in the political sense; however, the city deserves inclusion in this Inventory as a type B since (i) AJA 19 (1915) 442–44 no. 2 (C5f) testifies to the existence of a board of three eponymous archontes (cf. Sherk (1990) 244); (ii) the internal collective use of the ethnic is attested in the same inscription and sub-ethnicities are unknown in East Lokris; (iii) the city had a cult of Athena Poliouchos in C6s (AJA 19 (1915) 439–42 no. 1); though the polis element of this (and similar) epithet(s) may originally have meant akropolis (Cole (1995) 301–5), the absence of a proper acropolis at Halai (see infra) indicates that Poliouchos should here be taken as the “Possessor of the polis”, not of the akropolis (Hansen (1995b) 32–33).

Halai must originally have formed part of East Lokris, but in C3 the city was part of Boiotia (cf. AJA 19 (1915) no. 3); exactly when the regional affiliation changed is unknown, but it may have been as early as 404m (so Goldman and Walker (1915) 420–21; cf. Argoud (1997) 254). The evidence on Halai relates mostly to the city, not the territory. The “acropolis” of Halai “hardly deserves the name of acropolis, for at no point does it rise more than four metres above the level of the bay” (Goldman (1940) 382; cf. Argoud (1997) 255–56). This “acropolis” was fortified, and the preserved remains belong to two main periods of construction. The earlier fortification was built c.600 or slightly earlier (Goldman (1940) 430; cf. Fossey (1990) 40) at the “foundation” of the site. Constructed in large rough polygonal blocks of limestone, the wall had an average width of 3.10 m and had at least three circular towers. It enclosed c.0.7 ha (calculated on the basis of fig. 6 in Fossey (1990)). This initial fortification was repaired in C5 (McFadden (2001) 62), and the second main period of construction, dating to c.350–330 (Goldman (1940) 396; McFadden (2001) 68) or

7 This is generally (and rightly) assumed, though no Archaic or Classical source states so explicitly; it can, however, be deduced from Ps.-Skylax 60, which enumerates the cities of the (East) Lokrians from south to north, beginning with Larymna and ending with Alope; if Larymna was Lokrian, so must Halai, situated between Larymna and Alope, have been.

---

The flat-topped, fortified hill; the polygonal circuit wall has not been dated, but may belong to C6 (ibid. 140–41); it enclosed an area measuring 1.165 × 70 m, within which building remains and Archaic and Classical sherds as well as tiles attest to activity (Pritchett (1982) 148–49; Fossey (1990) 91–92). The lower city lay at the northern foot of the hill and shows extensive Archaic and Classical structures (Haas (1998) 110–12).

---

The earliest sources to classify Halai as a polis are two Hellenistic inscriptions: AJA 19 (1915) no. 3.2 (206/5) and no. 4.2 (208/7, restored), where the term is used in the political sense; however, the city deserves inclusion in this Inventory as a type B since (i) AJA 19 (1915) 442–44 no. 2 (C5f) testifies to the existence of a board of three eponymous archontes (cf. Sherk (1990) 244); (ii) the internal collective use of the ethnic is attested in the same inscription and sub-ethnicities are unknown in East Lokris; (iii) the city had a cult of Athena Poliouchos in C6s (AJA 19 (1915) 439–42 no. 1); though the polis element of this (and similar) epithet(s) may originally have meant acropolis (Cole (1995) 301–5), the absence of a proper acropolis at Halai (see infra) indicates that Poliouchos should here be taken as the “Possessor of the polis”, not of the akropolis (Hansen (1995b) 32–33).

Halai must originally have formed part of East Lokris, but in C3 the city was part of Boiotia (cf. AJA 19 (1915) no. 3); exactly when the regional affiliation changed is unknown, but it may have been as early as 404m (so Goldman and Walker (1915) 420–21; cf. Argoud (1997) 254). The evidence on Halai relates mostly to the city, not the territory. The “acropolis” of Halai “hardly deserves the name of acropolis, for at no point does it rise more than four metres above the level of the bay” (Goldman (1940) 382; cf. Argoud (1997) 255–56). This “acropolis” was fortified, and the preserved remains belong to two main periods of construction. The earlier fortification was built c.600 or slightly earlier (Goldman (1940) 430; cf. Fossey (1990) 40) at the “foundation” of the site. Constructed in large rough polygonal blocks of limestone, the wall had an average width of 3.10 m and had at least three circular towers. It enclosed c.0.7 ha (calculated on the basis of fig. 6 in Fossey (1990)). This initial fortification was repaired in C5 (McFadden (2001) 62), and the second main period of construction, dating to c.350–330 (Goldman (1940) 396; McFadden (2001) 68) or
C4l (Fossey (1990) 41; McFadden (2001) 62, 68) enlarged the enclosed area to c.0.85 ha (Goldman (1940) 388), the new sections being constructed in isodomic ashlar in emplektron. The acropolis was bisected by a street running from north-west to south-east in the Archaic period. Buildings aligned with both the main street and the Archaic fortification wall have been found, suggesting the existence of a substantial Archaic community within the acropolis circuit (Coleman (1992) 274–75). cf., however, AR (1992–93) 49–50. No Classical remains have yet been found on the acropolis (Coleman (1992) 275). The surface survey carried out by the Cornell Halai East Lokris Project team revealed traces of a C4 or Hellenistic circuit wall surrounding a lower town and enclosing an area of c.12–13 ha (Coleman (1992) 268 with fig. 2). The cemetery was situated to the north and east of the acropolis, probably along the main route to the site; here more than 280 graves have been found, with the earliest dating to C6m and several to C5 (Goldman and Walker (1915) 424, 429; cf. also ArchDelt (1987) B.1 Chron. 228–31).

The epigraph [Πολιδώχος] is found in a C6s inscription (Goldman (1940) 401 = AJA 19 (1915) 439–42 no. 1), from a C6e precinct of Athena on the acropolis that included a small C6e temple. This sanctuary was completely reconstructed in C6l–C5e, and a new splendidly decorated temple was erected on a bastion engaging the western part of the circuit (Goldman (1940) 452–54; cf. Wren (1996) 16–59, arguing that the temple was destroyed c.480, possibly by the Persians); the dedication of the temple is commemorated by AJA 19 (1915) 442–44 no. 2: Ἡλείης ἄνεθες τ’ Ἀθήναι (C5f). For the possibility of a hero cult of the city-founder on the acropolis, see Wren (1996) 60–84.

382. Kynos (Kynos) Map 55. Lat. 38.45, long. 23.05. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A. Location: see infra. The toponym is Κύνος, ἳ (Hom. Il. 2.531). According to Steph. Byz. 393.22–23, the city-ethnic was Κύνοις or Κυναῖος, attested only in a Roman-date epitaph from Attika commemorating Ἀρμοδία Κυνία (IG ii² 9118).

Kynos is called a polis in the urban sense by Hecat. fr. 131 (for which see Hansen (1997) 17, 23–24) and by Ps.-Skylax 60, where, reading Κύνος, Ὁποίες for ΜΣ Κυνοσσούρος, Kynos then appears as the second of four toponyms listed between the heading πόλεις αἰδε and the addendum εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλαι πολλαὶ Λοκροῖς.

Kynos is poorly documented, and its location is debated. According to Fossey (1990) 81, the focus of ancient Kynos was the Pyrgos hill 2 km north of modern Livanates (and the city may have included the sites at Arkitsa and Villovo; cf. Fossey (1990) 85–90). The Pyrgos hill-top measures 200 × 70 m and is crowned by a Hellenistic fortification wall; a harbour lies just north of Pyrgos and may have included a temple (Fossey (1990) 81–83). Hope Simpson and Lazenby (1970) 47 reported Archaic and Classical sherds from the Pyrgos area. However, Dakoronia (1993) 125–26 suggests that Pyrgos was simply the harbour site of Kynos, while the city proper was at Palaiokastro, 2.5 km south-east of Pyrgos: here are “many rich graves of the Classical period” and an extensive and fortified acropolis which was the centre “of a large and important town”. According to Demetrios of Kallatis (FGrHist 585) fr. 6 apud Strabo 13.1.20, Kynos suffered seriously from the earthquake of 426 (Fossey (1990) 183–84).

Late sources such as Strabo 9.4.2 and Paus. 10.1.2 describe Kynos as merely the harbour of Opous (no. 386), but Oldfather (1925) 32 believes that Kynos was originally more than that. According to a tradition preserved in Strabo 13.1.68, Kanai on Lesbos was a πολίχνιον Λοκρῶν τῶν ἐκ Κύνου.

383. Larymna (Larymnaios) Map 55. Lat. 38.35, long. 23.15. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: [A]. The toponym is Λάρυμνα, ἳ (Ps.-Skylax 60; SGDI 2593 (275)). The city-ethnic is Λαρυμναῖος in CIG 11396 (Hell.) and Λαρυμναῖος in IG ix.1 235.4 (C2–C1).

In Ps.-Skylax 60, where polis is used in the urban sense, Larymna is the first of four toponyms listed between the heading πόλεις αἰδε and the addendum εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλαι πολλαὶ Λοκροῖς. IG ix.1 235.6 (Hell.) uses polis in the
personal sense; ἀστός is used about the citizens in IG ix.1 235.3 (Hell.), and πατρίς is applied to the city in BCH 26 (1902) 330 no. 35c.16 (Hell.). The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found abbreviated as ΛΑ on a C4 coin (infra).

The name and size of the territory are unknown, but it must have included the plain at the bay of Larmes (Fossey (1990) 22). Fossey (1990) 35 argues that the Classical sites at Bazaraki, probably ancient Λυχνη (for which see Fossey (1990) 27–32) and Ps-2,000000khōri (for which see ibid. 33–35) situated 2.5 km south and 6 km west of Larymna respectively, were “satellites” of Larymna; in that case, Larymna had a territory measuring at least 20 km², although it was probably larger. A Hellenistic metric epitaph includes the expression [ἐ]γ χθονι / Ἀλύτωνας (BCH 26 (1902) 330 no. 35c.1–2).

Larymna was originally a part of East Lokris (Ps.-Sklax 60; SGDI 2593 (273)), but later it ranked as Boiotian (Paus. 9.23.7); exactly when the regional affiliation changed is unknown, but Goldman and Walker (1915) 420–21 assume it occurred in C4m; however, SGDI 2593 is a Delphic grant of proxeny from 273 to Εὐβοιος Ἀλύτου Λοκρος ἐν Λυχνην.

The pantheon of Larymna is unknown, but Fossey (1990) 154 suggests that Dionysos was an important divinity here.

Larymna is situated in the bay of Larmes and is centred on a small peninsula with a harbour on its south-east (cf. Schäfer (1967) 540; Lawrence (1979) 472; Haas (1998) 101–2). An elevation of a few metres height on the peninsula served as "acropolis" (Schäfer (1967) 530). Fortifications and ancient remains indicate the existence of the ancient settlement on the peninsula and on the mainland, but modern constructions impede observation of the degree of urbanisation; there are both Archaic and Classical sherds at the site (Fossey (1990) 22–24; see fig. 4 for a plan of the site), enough to indicate "significant Classical period habitation" (Haas (1998) 106). Schäfer (1967) 533 suggests that originally the town occupied only the peninsula (i.e. slightly more than 1 ha). This peninsula was fortified, and the remains of fortification date to two different periods. The oldest remains, in "Cyclopean" and polygonal styles, are possibly late Archaic (ibid. 542). The second phase was in isodomic style and probably dates to C4 (ibid.). It seems that the enclosed area was now enlarged to cover land outside the peninsula (see the probable line of the circuit in Schäfer (1967) Abb. 1 at 528, indicating that the enclosed area grew to c.6.5 ha). The fortifications at Larymna were all constructed in local breccia stone (Schäfer (1967) 530–31).

The J. Hirsch auction catalogue of 15 May 1905 mentions that the collector attributed two silver coins (nos. 1628–29) to Larymna; no. 1628 is a hemiobol: obv. bearded male; rev. grapes; legend: KP, which rather suggests [ΑΟ]ΚΡ(ι) [Ων]; but no. 1629, likewise a hemiobol: obv. beardless youth; rev. grapes, has the rev. legend ΛΑ, which may possibly abbreviate the ethnic of Larymna; Oldfather (1908) 470 accepts the attribution without discussion and assigns no. 1628 to C4, and no. 1629 be contemporary with it.

384. Narya (Narykaios) Map 55. Lat. 38.45, long. 22.45. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: B. The toponym is Νάρυκα, ἦ in IG ix.1.3 3 706A.1 (C3f); Steph. Byz. 470.4–5 gives Νάρυξ, Ναρύκη and Ναρύκιον, but without source reference (see further Oldfather (1935) 1773); Pritchett (1985) 169–71 suggests that Narya is the descendant of Homeric Tarphe (Hom. II. 2.533). The ethnic is Ναρυκαιος (IG ix.1.3 3 706A.1 (C3f); Diod. 16.38.5 (1352)).

Narya is called a polis in the political sense in IG ix.1.3 3 706A.1 (C3f), and in the urban sense at Diod. 16.38.5 (1352); Lycoph. Alex. 1148 refers to Ναρυκιον ἀστν. The internal collective use of the ethnic is found in IG ix.1.3 3 706A.1 (C3f), the external use at Diod. 16.38.5 (1352).

The name of the territory is unknown, but Diod. 14.82.8 (καταστρατοπεδεύσαντος ... εἰς Νάρυκα (1395)) may suggest that the toponym could designate the territory. According to Pritchett (1985) 168–69, Narya was an extensive and thriving city in C4; he notes that the acropolis “is covered with blocks and sherds”, and furthermore mentions a possible theatre. In 352 the city was besieged (Diod. 16.38.5) and must thus have been walled; a fortification on the acropolis is briefly mentioned in Pritchett (1985) 168–69. In 352 the city was destroyed by the Phokian Phyllidos (Diod. 16.38.5; τὴν δὲ πόλιν ἔλων κατὰ κράτος διῆρησε κατακόπηκεν); however, the city emerges again in C3f in IG ix.1.3 3 706A. This document is the earliest surviving public enactment of the city: it is a law of Narya and the Aianteioi laying down regulations concerning the Lokrian Maiden Tribute which went to Lioin to atone for Lokrian Aias’ outrage of Kassandra (see e.g. Hughes (1991) 166–84); Narya was presumably involved because this city was considered the hometown of Lokrian Aias’ (Diod. 14.82.8; Strabo 9.4.4; cf., however, Eur. IA 263–64, suggesting Thronion (no. 388) as the home of Aias).

Ἀ Λοκρίς Αιαντίς, attested in IG ix.1.3 3 706A (C3f), is possibly Athena in epichoric dress (Oldfather (1937) 1775; but see Letr (1952) ii.157).

385. Nikai (Nikaues) Map 55. Lat. 38.50, long. 22.35. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: C. The toponym is Νίκαια (or possibly Νικάεα, cf. Oldfather (1937) 222), ἦ (Aeschin. 2.132; Dem. 11.4; Diod. 16.59.2). The ethnic is given as Νικαεύς by Memnon (FGHist 343) fr. 28.10 (rC4l).
Nikaia is called a *polis* in the urban sense by the C3 writer Timothenes, *Peri limenon*, quoted verbatim in Didymos *In Dem. Comm.*, Pearson and Stephens, col. 11.33; *παρτίς* is used twice in Memnon (*FGrHist* 434) fr. 28.10 (rC4); the same fragment uses the ethnic about survivors of the destruction of the city (see *infra*).

Oldfather (1937) 225–26 argues that Nikaia was founded only after 426 and probably in C4 by Thebes (no. 221) under Epameinondas; schol. Dem. 11.12 calls the city an *ἄστυ* of the Thebans. From Didymos *In Dem. Comm.*, Pearson and Stephens, col. 11.26–51, it appears that in C4 the city was held by Philip II and the Thebans at different points, and Phokian occupation is attested by Diod. 16.59.2 (cf. Pritchett (1982) 162). The site is briefly described in Pritchett (1982) 162–66 and Buckler (1989) 93–94.

The city was destroyed by the Phokians (Memnon (*FGrHist* 434) fr. 28.10: the terms used are *καταστροφή* and *ἀφάνσις*), probably in 333 (Oldfather (1937) 224), but it is referred to again in 339 as held by Thebes (Philoch. fr. 56b) and is mentioned by Timothenes as well (see *infra*); survivors of the destruction seem to have served with Alexander the Great in Asia (Memnon (*FGrHist* 434) fr. 28.9), where they reportedly founded Nikaia in Bithynia (ibid.).

**386. Opous (Opountios)** Map 55. Lat. 38.40, long. 23.00.
Size of territory: 2 or 3. Type: A. Located at modern Atalandi (Fossey (1990) 71–74); but see Dakoronia (1993) 117–20. The toponym is Ὠπούς, ᾨ (Hom. II. 2.53; Pind. *Ol*. 9.14; ML 20 l. 33 (500–450)) or Ὠπούς (Thuc. 2.32.1; Arist. *Hist. an.* 576b.25). The city-ethnic is Ὠπούντιος (*ML* 20 l. 14 (500–450); *SEG* 23 415 (450–425)) or Ὠπούντιος (*SEG* 23 420 (C4)) or Ὠπούντιος (CID II 97.25 (327/6)).

Opous is called a *polis* in the political sense by Pind. *Ol*. 9.21 and in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 60, where, reading Κόνος, Ὠπούς for MS Κωνούσιος, Opous then appears as the third of four toponyms listed between the heading πάλεις αἶδη and the addendum εἰδι δέ καὶ ἄλλαι πολλαὶ Λοκροίς, πόλιται is found in Arist. *fr.* 561, Rose, which Rose believes is a Plutarchean paragraph of a passage in Aristotle’s *Ἤποντιον πολιτεία* (Rose *frr.* 560–64); μητρότοις is applied to Opous in a C5 inscription quoted by Strabo 9.4.2; Klio 15 (1918) 66 no. 94 (cf. AM 67 (1942) 269 (345–310)), and CEGI 651 (C4) use *παρτίς* and ἄκρισις is found in the latter as well. ἄστυ is found Pind. *Ol*. 9.42 (cf. Gerber (2002) *ad loc.*).

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C4 coins (Head, *HN*² 336), whereas the use of Ὠπούντιος in ML 20 (500–450) is ambiguous: it may be used to refer to the East Lokrians in general (Larsen (1968) 5), or it may be the city-ethnic of Opous (Nielsen (2000) 111ff). The external collective use is found in *Ar. Av.* 152; *Tod* 196–25–326; and *IG* ii² 572.6 (C4). The external individual use is found in *SEG* 27 18.5 (352/1), *SEG* 27 18–19 (C4m) and *SEG* 23 420 (C4).

Opous was without doubt the leading city of East Lokris and the centre or “capital” of the East Lokrian “confederacy,” as is clearly borne out by ML 20 (500–450) (Gschnitzer (1958) 56–59; Larsen (1968) 51–54; Nielsen (2000) 109–14, all commenting on the inscription); Opous may even have turned the other East Lokrian *poleis* into dependencies (Nielsen (2000) 111ff, and *infra* under Alponos (no. 379)). Evidence confirming this Opountian predominance is found in an inscription from Thermopylae quoted by Strabo 9.4.2 in which Opous is called μηρόπολις Λοκρῶν; the epi- gram commemorates warriors who died οὐπέρ Ἑλλάδος αὐτία Μήδων, and so probably dates to C5 (see further Lorenz (1976) no. 9 and Molyneux (1992) 182–83); Pindar, too, in *Ol*. 9.20 calls Opous Λοκρῶν ... ματήρ, and the fragments of the Aristotelian Ὠπούντιον πολιτεία likewise point to Opountian predominance within Lokris; thus, fr. 561–62, Rose, relate myths about how West Lokrian cities were founded from Opous. Furthermore, *CIG* II 789 (312–280) closely associates Opous and the Lokrians as if there was no difference between these two entities, and finally, as pointed out *infra*, all C4 *hieronmēnomeṇ*es from East Lokris came from Opous. See also *infra* on coins. It was certainly this predominance that gave rise to the literary expression *Lokroi hoc Opountii* (Nielsen (2000) 102).

At *Ol*. 9.15 Pindar describes Opous as the possession of Θέμης θυγατήρ τε οί σώτειρα ... μεγαλόδοξον Ἑὐνομία (Gerber (2002) 28), thus pointing to an oligarchic or aristocratic constitution in Opous; it is also possible that Aristotle at *Pol*. 1287a–8 refers to Opous as an example of *aristokratia*. Aristotle here points out that πολλοὶ ποιοῦσιν ἕνα κύριον τῆς διοικήσεως, and gives Opous as an example of this; he adds, however, that at Opous this was κατὰ τι μέρος ἔλαττον “to a certain smaller extent” (Newman *ad loc.*). Another official is mentioned by Plutarch: *Quaest. Graecae* 293b11 mentions a κριθόλογος among the Opountians; there is no indication of the date, but the passage may rely on Aristotle’s Ὠπούντιον πολιτεία or Philippos of Opous (C4) *Περὶ Λοκρῶν τῶν Ὠπούντιον* (*RE* xix. 2354–55; Giesen (1901) 465–66 and Lasserre (1987) 600.)

Envos of the city are mentioned in *IG* ii² 572.9 (C4) (an honorary decree for [πρέα]βεις). *SEG* 23 415 (450–425) is a
grant of proxeny by Thessalian Pherai (no. 414) to a citizen of Opous; SEG 23.420 is one of C4. The earliest surviving enactment of the city itself (i.e. apart from ML 20) is IG 11.1.268 (Hell.), a grant of proxeny that refers to an eponymous archon and possibly to the assembly and council.

CEG ii 651 (C4) refers to the ἀκρόπολις; for the poor remains of what is probably the acropolis, see Fossey (1990) 68–70. According to Diod. 19.78.5, Opous was subjected to a poliorkia in 313. The existence of an extensive C4l–C3 fortification wall is now securely established (Dakoronia (1993) 120 with fig. 4 at 122). There are Archaic and Classical sherds at Opous (Fossey (1990) 70). Inside the wall, remains of Classical buildings have been found, enough to establish that the site was “a great city” (Dakoronia (1993) 120). For two kilns that seem to have been producing in C4l, see Lambropoulou (1983). According to Demetrios of Kallatis (FGrHist 85) fr. 6 apud Strabo 1.3.20, Opous suffered seriously from the earthquake of 426 (Fossey (1990) 183–84). The city received grain from Kyrene in 330–326 (Tod 196.26).

On a C4 (IG 11.1.280) statue base, Dionysos and Apollo are mentioned, and presumably they were honoured by the dedication. Opous seems to have celebrated Aianteia; cf. Pind. Ol. 9 with scholia.

Promanteia is granted to a man of Opous by P.Delphes iii.1.1 92 (318–306). An Opountian won the Olympic pankration contest in 536 (Moretti no. 119); Νίκαιας Λοκρός ἐξ Ὀπούντου won the stadion race in 500 (Dion. Hal. AR 5.50.1); and Pind. Ol. 9 was composed for Epharmostos of Opous, who won the Olympic wrestling contest in 468 (FGrHist 415 fr. 1.38) and in addition achieved victories in the three other Panhellenic games: Pythian: Ol. 9.12, 17; Isthmian: Ol. 9.84–86; Nemean: Ol. 9.87; with Gerber (2002) ad locc. citt.) as well as in numerous other games (Pind. Ol. 9.88ff lists victories at Argos, Athens, Mt. Lykaion and Pellene). Also in 468, Menalke of Opous was victorious at Olympia in boxing (FGrHist 415 fr. 1.39). According to the schol. 123c Pind. Ol. 9., the Isthmionician (Pind. Ol. 9.84) athlete Lamphomachos was also proxenos of Thebes (no. 221) at Opous in C5f (Gerber (2002) 57–8 with refs.). Plut. De Pyth. or. 401ff mentions a C4 dedication at Delphi by the Opountians.

Opous struck coins from C5 onwards. From C5 come silver trihemiobols and obols on the Aiginetan standard: obv. amphora; rev. ΟΠΟΥΝ in incuse square (Babelon, Traité ii.3 nos. 423–44). C4 silver coins (obv. amphora with grapes, ΟΠΟΝ; rev. star; Babelon, Traité ii.3 nos. 436, 436 bis) are similar and confirm that the C5 coins belong to Opous. It is interesting that coins of the same appearance are struck, in the name not of the Opountians, but of the Lokrians; thus a coin of, probably, C5 has the amphora on the obv., and Λ(οκρῶν) in a border of dots on the rev. (Babelon, Traité ii.3 no. 425). The legend confirms the impression that there was no real difference between the two entities of “Opous” and “the Lokrians”. Similarly, the C4 coins inscribed ΟΠΟΥΝ (supra) have close parallels in later coins inscribed ΛΟΚΡΩΝ (Babelon, Traité ii.3 nos. 442–43). One coin even has the legend ΟΠΟΥΝ on the obv. and ΛΟΚΡΩΝ on the rev. (Babelon, Traité ii.3 no. 435). In C4 Opous struck a well-known series of silver coins: obv. head of Demeter r. or l.; rev. Lokrian Aias in fighting attitude; legend: ΟΠΟΝΤΙΩΝ (Head, HN² 336 fig. 190). These coins, again, are paralleled later in C4 by coins inscribed ΛΟΚΡΩΝ (Babelon, Traité ii.3 no. 451), or ΛΟΚΡΩΝ ΥΠΟΙ(κνηµιδίων) (Babelon, Traité ii.3 nos. 438, 439–41), again suggesting that “Opous”, “the Lokrians” and “the Hypoknemidian Lokrians” were more or less the same thing. A C4s issue of bronze coins have obv. Athena; rev. grapes; legend: ΟΠΟΝΤΙΩΝ or ΛΟΚΡΩΝ (Head, HN² 336–37; Babelon, Traité ii.3 nos. 362–78; SNG Cop. Aetolia-Euboea 42–58).

The foundation myth of Opous is reinterpreted by Pindar in Ol. 9 (for which see the Introduction in the translation by Nisetic (1980) 122–23).

387. Skarpheia (Skarpheus) Unlocated, but presumably in the plain of Molos (Pritchett (1982) 166–67, (1992) 145–48; Buckler (1989) 94–95). Type: B. The toponym is Σκάρφης, η in Hom. II.2.532; Σκάρφης, η is found in Lycoph. Alex. 1.147. Strabo 1.3.20 and BCH 45 (1921) col. iii.139 (230–210); see further Oldfather (1929) 460–61. Σκάρφης is the ordinary form of the city-ethnic and is found in CID ii 43.65 (340/39) and Syll.² 270 (335/4), and C4 coins carry the legend ΣΚΑΡΦΕΩΝ (Head, HN² 337). On the basis of Steph. Byz. 574.3, [Σκάρφης] has been tentatively restored in IG ii 2.3045 (C4m); Σκάρφης is found in Anth. Pal. 7.639.4.

The earliest source to describe Skarpheia as a polis is IG 11.1.3 750.5 of C2f, but the external individual use of the ethnic is found in CID ii 43.65 (340/39) and Syll.² 270 (335/4), a Delphic grant of proxeny, etc., to citizens of Skarpheia, while the internal collective use is attested on C4 coins, and the external use in C3m (CID ii 130.2).

If Demetrios of Kallatis (FGrHist 85) fr. 6 is correctly reported at Strabo 1.3.20, then 1,700 persons (σώματα χιλίων καὶ ἔπτακοσίων οὐκ ἐλάττω) living in Skarpheia were drowned during the great earthquake of 426 (Fossey (1990) 183–84). It is impossible to know how precise this figure is, and if precise, how many of the victims were of citizen status.
The earliest reference to a public enactment by the city is I. Magnesia 31.3.9 (C3). Skarpheia struck bronze coins in C4: obv. Lokrian Aias, legend: ΣΚΑΡΦΕΩΝ; rev. female head (Head, HN² 337; SNG Cop. Aetolia-Euboea 81). Hsch. E7145.1 mentions Demeter Euryodeia, but that completes the information on the pantheon of Skarpheia.

388. Thronion (Thronieus) Map 55. Lat. 38.45, long. 22.45. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is Θρόνιον, τό (Hom. II. 2.533; Thuc. 2.26.2). The city-ethnic is Θρονειός (CID II 31.79 (C4)), abbreviated to ΘΡΟΝΙ on C5 coins (Head, HN² 337). Steph. 318.12 furthermore gives Θρόνος, which is possibly used in SEG 30 42.2 (ΘΡΟΝΙΟΣ, ΘΡΟΝΙΟΣ, ΘΡΟΝΙΟΣ, ΘΡΟΝΙΟΣ). Thronion is called a polis in the urban sense by Eur. IA 264 (Θρονειός πόλεις) and by Ps.-Skylax 61, where Thronion is the first of four toponyms listed between the heading πόλεις αἱδε and the addendum εἶδος καὶ ἀλλοι πόλεος αὐτοῖς ἐν μεσογείᾳ, but see the remarks supra 665); cf. also Diod. 12.44.1 (1431); the earliest use of polis in the political sense is in a C3l inscription from Tenos, but this is wholly restored (IG XII.1.5 812.9).

The collective internal use of the city-ethnic is found in abbreviated form on C5 coins (Head, HN² 337); the external collective use is possibly attested in SEG 30 42.2 (ΘΡΟΝΙΟΣ, ΘΡΟΝΙΟΣ, ΘΡΟΝΙΟΣ, ΘΡΟΝΙΟΣ). The external individual use is found CID II 31.79, 32.37, 97.25 (C4).

The name of the territory is unknown; it is termed ἡ τῶν Θρονειών χώρα at Polyb. 9.41.11, and a strip of coast belonging to it is referred to at 18.9.3; according to Strabo 9.4.4, there was a limen here. According to Hom. II. 2.533 and Theopomp. fr. 298 (apud Harp. s.v. Θρόνος) and (implicitly) Thuc. 2.26, Thronion was a Lokrian city, but Ps.-Skylax lists it in his Phokian chapter (61), presumably a reflection of the Phokian annihilation of the town in 353 (Diod. 16.33.3); however, see supra 665 for another explanation of this passage.

In 1840 the ruins of Thronion supplied stone material for the building of a factory (Pritchett (1982) 152–53). According to Pritchett (1982) 154, the site is large and has many sherds. The literary sources (Diod. 12.44.1 (1431) and 16.33.3 (1333)) indicate that the city was walled; Oldfather (1936) 612 states that by 1928 the course of the wall could no longer be traced in its entirety; he also mentions foundations of buildings and a temple in the city (ibid.). According to Strabo’s account of Demetrios of Kallatis’ description of an earthquake (FGrHist 85 fr. 6), probably that of 426 (Fossey (1990) 183–84), c.850 people were engulfed (καταδυναί) at Thronion. It is impossible to know how precise this figure is, and if precise, how many of the victims were of citizen status.

In 431 the city was captured by Athens (no. 361) and had to provide hostages (ὁμήρους... ελαβεν αὐτῶν (sc. the people of Thronion)). According to Diod. 12.44.1, the city fell after a siege (ἔξεπολιορκήσε). In 353 Thronion was subject to exandrapismos by the Phokian general Onomarchos (Θρόνιον µὲν ἐκπολιορκήσας ἐξηνδραπίσατο, Diod. 16.33.3), but the city was in existence once again in C4l (CID II 31.79, 32.37).

The earliest preserved public enactments are two Hellenistic decrees (IG IX.1.308–9); the earliest recorded communal action is the giving of hostages to the Athenians in 431 (Thuc. 2.26.2).

The pantheon of Thronion is virtually unknown (Oldfather (1936) 612 sets out the meagre evidence). For speculations that the city was active as coloniser, see Oldfather (1936) 610; see also SEG 15 251 with Paus. 5.22.3.

In C5f Thronion struck silver obols on the Aiginetan standard: obv. bearded male head; rev. greave; legend: ΘΡΟΝΙ (knemis) in incuse square, presumably a reference to Mt. Knemis in Lokris (Rauch (1846) no. 12; BMC Thronium no. 1; Head, HN² 337; Babelon, Traité ii.3 no. 460). The full form of the city-ethnic is attested on C3–C2 bronze coins (SNG Cop. Aetolia-Euboea 82).
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I. The Region

The name of the region is *Dōrīs* (Hdt. 8.31.1), and it is described as a χώρα (Hdt. 8.31.1, 43.1; Diod. 11.14.2 (r.480); 16.33.4 (r.353)). Due to the common belief that the region accommodated the Dorians during their migration to the Peloponnesse, it is often called the Metropolis of the Dorians (Andron (FGrHist 10) fr. 16a) or the Metropolis of the Lakedaimonians (Thuc. 1.107.2, 3.92.3).

The ethnic is *Dōrīoí* (Hdt. 8.66.1; Thuc. 1.107.2; Aeschin. 2.116). The external and individual use is attested in the lists of hieronmennones of the Delphic Amphikttony: *Dōrīoí* ἐν Ματροπόλισι (CID 11 36.1.25 (343)) or Ματροπολίτης (CID 11 74.1.33 (337)). For the external and collective use, see CID 11 7.B.4 (c.357). The internal and collective use is found in a letter of 206/5 (SEG 38 1476.8).

Doris lay west of Phokis in the valley of Kephisos (Hdt. 8.31–2). There is no agreement in the sources about the other neighbouring communities and their frontiers with Doris: Malians (Hdt. 8.31.1), Aitolians, East Lokrians, West Lokrians and Oitaians (Strabo 9.3.1, 4.10; cf. Rousset (1989) 203, 235–6). The frontier between Oitaia and Doris must have changed over time, since the city of Akyphas/Pindos seems to have belonged now with the Oitaians, now with the Dorians (infra). The alternating regional affiliation of Akyphas/Pindos explains the two opposed traditions of describing Doris as being either *tripolis* (Andron (FGrHist 10) fr. 16a; cf. Thuc. 1.107.2) or *tetrapolis* (unnamed historians quoted by Strabo at 9.3.1, 4.10, 10.4.6; see Rousset (1989) 235).

The Dorian *poleis* are hardly ever mentioned in the Archaic and Classical sources and have left very few physical traces of their existence. Only Kythinion has been securely identified thanks to the discovery of some Hellenistic decrees (SEG 40 440–2). The locations of the other *poleis* have to be deduced from the not very precise indications found in the literary sources. Remains of city walls are too scanty to be dated or to provide us with an idea of the extent of the urban centres in the Archaic and Classical periods.

Chlomo is the only site which has substantial remains of fortifications. The masonry is Lesbian with curved joints and may date from the Archaic period. Nevertheless, it has been impossible to identify the site with any of the settlements mentioned in the sources (Rousset (1989) 210–11 and 229). The Dorians of the Metropolis supplied one of the hieronmennones (CID 11 36.1.25 (343) and Aeschin. 2.116), but, apparently, the *poleis* were not amalgamated to form a federation until after the Aitolian domination of the region had come to an end c.165 (Syll. 3 653; cf. Rousset (1989) 239 n. 168; cf. F.Delphes III.1 490 and Rousset (1994) 370 n. 39).

The estimated sizes of the *poleis* territories indicated *infra* are based on the assumptions that the whole region covered c.100 km² and that we know all *poleis* within the region.

II. The Poleis

389. Akyphas/Pindos  Map 55. Lat. 38.40, long. 22.20. Size of territory 1. Type: B. Of the two toponyms, *Πίνδος*, ἦ is the more common (Hdt. 8.43.1; Plin. *HN* 4.28: Pindus; Strabo 9.4.10 adds τινες δ’ *Ακύφαντα λέγουσι* τὴν *Πίνδον*). The toponym *Ακύφας* is attested in Theopompos (FGrHist 115) fr. 364. There is no city-ethnic matching the toponym Pindos, but the city-ethnic *Ακυφάνιος* is attested in Hellenistic inscriptions (SEG 27 123.12 (191/0), restored in IG 1 ix 1 227 (C2f); Rousset (1989) 225).

Pindos is implicitly classified as a *poleis* by the term πετράπολις used by the unnamed historians quoted by Strabo at 10.4.6. Ps.-Skymnos 594 counts Pindos as the fourth Dorian *poleis* and Strabo 9.4.10 lists four *poleis*: Erineos, Boion, Pindos and Kythinion.

Quoting Theopompos (FGrHist 115) fr. 364) Steph. Byz. 66.3–4 classifies Akyphas as a Dorian *poleis*; we cannot be sure, however, that the site-classification *poleis* is part of the quote. At Strabo 9.5.10 Akyphas is placed in Oitaia. The individual and external use of the city-ethnic *Ακυφάνιος* is attested in a Delphic inscription (Rousset (2002) 252.12 (191/0)). It is also
restored in two C2f inscriptions, one from Phokis mentioning some Oitaian magistrates (IG ix 1 227; cf. BCH 113 (1989) 223), the other from Pharsalos (Inscriptions de Thessalie, i: Vallée de l’Énipeus (1995) no. 101).

It seems that the city called sometimes Pindos, sometimes Akphas, changed its regional affiliation a couple of times. It was probably not part of Doris in C5s, when the region had only three cities (Thuc. 1.107.2; Diod. 11.79.4). It became part of Doris in C4 (Theopomp. and Ps.-Skymnos). By C2s it belonged to Oitaia (IG ix 1 227), but may have become Dorian once again at the end of the Hellenistic period (Strabo 9.4.10); see Rousset (1989) 231–3, (1994) 367. The only remains of the urban centre are a section of an undated defence circuit (Rousset 1989) 217.

390. Boion (Boiaios) Map 55. Lat. 38.40, long. 22.25. Size of territory 1. Type: A. The toponym is Boiós, τό (Thuc. 1.107.2; Steph. Byz. 172.18), and some later authors also use the form Boiov (Strabo 9.4.10) or Boiaí (Steph. Byz. 172.19). In inscriptions the toponym, not attested before C1, is Boiaí (CID v 826). The individual and external form of the city-ethnic Boiaios is found from C2e onwards (CID v 6). Boiaios is attested in Ephoros ((FGHist7o fr. 231).

Boion is classified as a polisma at Thuc. 1.107.2, but a few lines further on polis is used synonymously with polisma. Andron (FGHist10) counts Kytinion among the three poleis of the Dorians (fr. 16a: τρίπολις; cf. also Diod. 11.79.4–6 (1457). The earliest mention of a πόλις τῶν Κυτενεῶν in epigraphical sources is in IG ix².1 68 (C3). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in some C2m proxeny decrees (SEG 40 440–2) and externally on a statue base from Thermos (IG ix².1 68 (C3)). The city-ethnic is attested in the individual and external sense at CID ii 123.10 (C2f).

391. Erineos (Erinaios) Map 55. Lat. 38.40, long. 22.25. Size of territory 1. Type: A. The toponym is Εὔρναίος (Hdt. 8.43; Thuc. 1.107.2), δ (Tyrt. fr. 2.13, West) or Ἔριναῖος (Andron (FGHist10) fr. 16a). The oldest epigraphical attestation of the toponym is in CID v 322 (C2f). The city-ethnic Εὔρναίος is attested in the external and individual sense at CID ii 43.19 (341) and 74.1.45 (337).

Erineos is classified as a polisma at Thuc. 1.107.2, but a few lines further on polis is used synonymously with polisma. Andron (FGHist10) counts Erineos among the three poleis of the Dorians (fr. 16a: τρίπολις; cf. also Diod. 11.79.4–6 (1457). Tyrtaios calls it an asty (fr. 2.13). The only remains of the urban centre are a section of an undated defence circuit with a tower (Rousset 1989) 214.

392. Kytinion (Kytinieus) Map 55. Lat. 38.45, long. 22.30. Size of territory 1. Type: A. The toponym is Κυτένιον, τό (Thuc. 1.107.2, 3.95.1, 102.1; Aeschin. 2.116) or, in inscriptions, Κυτένιος, τό (IG VII 3055.12 (C4m)). The city-ethnic is Κυτενιεύς (CID ii 102.1.47 (324)) or Kυτενεύς (CID ii 123.10 (C2f)).

Kytinion is classified as a polisma at Thuc. 1.107.2, but a few lines further on polis is used synonymously with polisma. Andron (FGHist10) counts Kytinion among the three poleis of the Dorians (fr. 16a: τρίπολις; cf. also Diod. 11.79.4–6 (1457). The earliest mention of a πόλις τῶν Κυτενεῶν in epigraphical sources is in IG ix².1 68 (C3). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in some C2m proxeny decrees (SEG 40 440–2) and externally on a statue base from Thermos (IG ix².1 68 (C3)). The city-ethnic is attested in the individual and external sense at CID ii 102.1.7 (324)).

Being mentioned more frequently in the sources than the neighbouring Dorian poleis, Kytinion was probably the most important of the poleis. The only remains of the urban centre are a section of an undated defence circuit with a tower (Rousset 1989) 208. On remains of the urban centre, see Rousset (1999) 73.
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I. The Regions

As a geographical term, *Thessalia* was used with a wide variety of meanings in Antiquity.¹ In the narrow sense it designated simply the four *tetrades* of the Thessalian Confederacy (Pelasgiotis, Hestiaiotis, Thessaliotis and Phthiotis (Arist. fr. 497, Rose; Andron (FGHist 10) fr. 16a)); whereas in a broader sense it came to include areas such as Ainis, which supplied the Thessalian Confederacy of the Roman era with at least one *strategos* (cf. IG IX 2 p. xxv; see also *infra* on Strabo’s conception of the region). It has become common modern practice to use the term in this broader sense; thus Kip’s book of 1910, *Thessalische Studien*, offers basic discussions of the areas of Ainis, Oitaia, Malis, Achaia, Magnesia, Perrhaibia and Dolopia; Stählin’s book of 1924, *Das hellenische Thessalien*, includes chapters on Perrhaibia, Magnesia, Dolopia, Achaia, etc.; and the published proceedings of the 1990 conference Θεσσαλία (= Dekapente Chronia) include contributions on Proerna and Thebai in Achaia, on Magnesia as such and on Demetrias and Meliboia in particular, on Ainis as such and on Sosthenis in particular, as well as on Oloosson in Perrhaibia. The present chapter, again, is devoted to Thessalia in the broader sense. However, both introduction and inventory are subdivided into sections dealing with (1) Thessalia proper and (2) Adjacent regions: (2.1) Dolopia, (2.2) Ainis, (2.3) Oita, (2.4) Malis, (2.5) Achaia, (2.6) Magnesia, (2.7) Perrhaibia and (2.8) Athamania.

This subdivision of the exposition reflects the fact that each adjacent area was in fact considered to be an individual entity and not part of Thessalia in the Classical period, as is readily apparent from Classical authors. *Re* (2.1): the toponym *Dolopia* is found in Thuc. 2.102.3, and the corresponding ethnic *Dolopi* is found in its external collective application in Herodotos’ list of medisers at 7.132.1, where the Dolopians are explicitly distinguished from the *Thessaloi*, who are also listed. *Re* (2.2): again, the Ainianes are found in Herodotos’ list of medisers and are there distinguished from the Thessalians (7.132.1; cf. Ps.-Skylax 62); no Classical source preserves the toponym *Ainis* (IG IX 2 5b.10 (150–125)), but Theopomp. fr. 80 may have used the expression *Aînâdâvov χóra*.* Re* (2.3): the toponym *Oitaia* is not securely attested in a Classical source, but it may have to be restored as *Ôîtaïj* at Hdt. 7.185 (cf. Legrand (1951) 184 app. crit. and 185 n. 3); the collective ethnic occurs at Hdt. 7.217 and Thuc. 3.92.3 and 8.3.1, where it seems to be implicitly distinguished from that of the *Thessaloi*. *Re* (2.4): the toponym *Malis* is found in Hdt. 7.198.3, where it is explicitly distinguished from the toponym *Thessalia*, and the collective ethnic occurs in Herodotos’ list of medisers at 7.132.1, where it is explicitly distinguished from the ethnic *Thessaloi*; Ps.-Skylax devotes a separate chapter to the *Maliions* (62) as well as one to Thessalia proper (64). *Re* (2.5): the toponym *Achaie* is found explicitly distinguished from *Thessalia* in Hdt. 7.173.1 and 7.198.1; the collective ethnic *Achaeloi* is found explicitly distinguished from the ethnic *Thessaloi* in Herodotos’ list of medisers at 7.132.1; Ps.-Skylax devotes a separate chapter to the Achaians (63) as well as one to Thessalia proper (64). *Re* (2.6): the toponym *Magnesia* is

¹ Daux (1936) 673: “Aucun terme géographique n’est, je crois, susceptible d’acceptations aussi diverses que celui-ci. Au sens étroit la Thessalie ne désigne que les ‘tetrades’ (Pelasgiotis, Hestiaiotis, Thessaliotis, et Phthiotis); au sens large elle englobe ou peut englober les Perrhébes, les Magnètes, les Dolopes et l’Achaia Phthiotide, et même la vallée du Sperchios avec les Énianes, l’Oitaia et la Malide.” Hely (2001b) discusses the “ambiguïté de l’appellation ‘Thessalie, thessalien’” and proposes to use (a) the term “Thessalai” (Thessalai) in an exclusively geographical sense, to refer to the extent given to it by ancient sources; (b) the phrase “Thessalian state” (Etat thessalien) to denote “l’espace organisé à l’époque historique sur la base des quatre tetrades”; (c) Thessaliot to designate “le groupe envahisseur de l’époque submycénienne”; (d) and, finally, “Thessaliens” (Thessaliens) to denote the totality of the “habitants de la Thessalie, quelle que soit leur origine ou l’époque considérée” with specifications such as Achaian, Perrhaibian, etc., if necessary.
found explicitly distinguished from *Thetallia* in Aeschin. 3.83; and the collective ethnic *Magnetēs* is explicitly distin-
guished from the ethnic *Thessaloi* in Herodotos’ list of
mediers at 7.132.1; Ps.-Skylax devotes a separate chapter to
the Magnesians (65) as well as one to Thessalia proper (64).
Re (2.7): the toponym *Perrhaibai* is found implicitly distin-
guished from that of Thessalia in Thuc. 4.78.6, a passage
which explicitly distinguishes the *Perrhaibai* from the
*Thessaloi*. Re (2.8): the toponym *Athamanía* is not attested
prior to C3 (Antig. Car. *Mirabilia* 148.1; BCH 45 (1921) 111.34
(230–220)), but the collective ethnic *Athanamēs* is found in
Herac. Lemb, 53, and the existence of an Aristotelian
*Aθαμάνων πολιτεία* (Gigon no. 4) is extremely significant
when contrasted with the *Κοινὴ Θετταλῶν πολιτεία*
(Gigon no. 60). So, for seven of the eight adjacent areas
treated in this chapter a toponym is attested by Classical
sources, and for all eight an ethnic is attested. It may also be
noted that in C4 the Dolopians, the Ainians, the Malians,
the Achaians, the Magnesians and the Perrhaibians were all
separate members of the Amphiktyonic League (cf. Lefèvre
(1998)). Accordingly, there cannot be any doubt that the
adjacent areas were conceived of as individual regions
and were distinct from Thessalia in the Classical period.

1. Thessalia

The name of the region is *Θεσσαλία*, ἦ (Anac. fr. 107, Diehl;2
Pind. *Pyth.* 10.2; Thuc. 1.111.1; CEG ii 637.2 (C5m); F.Delphes
111.4 460.5.2 (337–333)); *Θέτταλα* in Attic (IG ii² 116.19
(361/60); Xen. *Hell.* 2.3.4) and *Θεσσαλία* in Ionic (Hdt.
3.96.1).3 The corresponding ethnic is Θεσσαλός (Alkman
fr. 16.1.3; Simon. fr. 6.1b, Page; Pind. *Pyth.* 10.70; Aesch. *Pers.*
489; SEG 26 475 (C5f); IG i³ 1375 (C5l)), in Attic Θεσσαλός
(IG i³ 92.1 (416/5); IG ii 109.16 (363/2); IG ii² 8850.1
(C4m)). The epichoric form of the ethnic is Πεπόθαλε (AM
59: 57, 15.2 (C4 proxeny decree); C4 bronze coins (Rogers
(1932) 16)), which is found abbreviated as *ΦΕΘΑ, ΦΕΤΑ*
and ΠΕΘΑ on silver coins on the Aiginetan standard dating
to 470–450. The kletic adjective is *Θεσσαλικός* (Hdt. 7.128.1:
*ὅραι τά Θεσσαλικά*; IG ii² 1641.C.47 (C4m)), in Attic
*Θετταλικός* (IG ii² 1421.IV.104 (374/3); Xen. *Hell.* 6.1.3).

2 For which see Helly (1999) 43–44.
3 The toponym is unknown to Homer; it may just possibly have been used by
Hes. fr. 6, MW, though certainty is impossible; no fragment of Hekataios
employs the toponym in a way which proves that he used it (cf. Hector. frs. 2–3, 14,
119, 133–66, 168, 224, 372). The earliest epigraphical evidence for the existence
of the toponym is a Cal/Cše epitaph from Perhaibian Oloosson for a girl named
“Thesalia” (Lorenz (1976) no. 10); the employment of the term as a personal
name presumably presupposes its use for the name of the region.

Thessalia is called *polis* at [Lys.] 6.6 (on which see Hansen
(1998) 126, 131) and in Arist. fr. 498, Rose (on which see
153–54 argues that the text refers to the city of Larisa, not to
Thessalia). The region is called ἦ Θεσσαλῶν ἐγαθριαθαί at Thuc.
4.78.4 and is termed χώρα by Isoc. 8.117 and Simon. *De re
equestri* i; the people are called ἄνδρος at Thuc. 5.51.2 and
in Aeschin. 2.116; as an ethnos, the Thessalians were among
the members of the Amphiktyonic League (Aeschin. 2.116),
and provided two *hieronmēnes* who in C4 were sent by
Pelina, Pharsalos and Pherai (Lefèvre (1998) 24). The internal
collective use of the ethnic is found (abbreviated as ΦΕ,
ΦΕΘΑ, ΦΕΤΑ, ΠΕΘΑ) on C5 silver coins on the
Aiginetan standard (Franke (1970)), on C4 bronze coins
(Rogers (1932) 16), and in AM 59: 57, 15.2 (C4). The external
collective use is found in SEG 26 475 (C5f); IG ii² 116 passim
(361/60); and Hdt. 5.94.1; Xen. *Hell.* 2.3.4. The external
individual use of the ethnic is found in IG ii² 338B.59 (398/7); IG iv.1 121.48 (C4s); Xen. *An.* 1.1.10. In its
external uses the ethnic is very often accompanied by a speci-
fication referring to a local community, both in the collec-
tive use: *Ματροπολίται Θεσσαλοί* (CID ii 5.11.33 (358));
and in the individual use: *Θεσσαλὸς εξ Ατταγοὗs*
(Philologus (1921) 195, 2 (c.345)); *Θεσσαλὸς ἐκ Γόμφου*
(II.749 (Cäl–C3e)); *Θετταλὸς Γυρτώνιος* (IG i³ 92.6
(416/5)); *Θεσσαλὸς ἐγαθριαθαί (F.Delphes iii 1.401.3
(333/2), 31.4 378.4 (342/1); CID ii 25.1.2 (C4m); IG ix.2 60
(C4)); *Θεσσαλὸς εξ Ὄρθου* (CID ii 12.1.67 (341/40);
*Θεσσαλός Σκοτοσσαίος* (IG ii² 8843 (C4f)); *Θεσσαλὸς εξ*
*Σκοτούσης* (F.Delphes iii.5 p. 321 nn. 1–2 (C4l));
*Θεσσαλός ἐκ Φαραλίου* (C4m); *Θεσσαλός ἐκ Φερῶν* (IG v.1 948.2 (C4); F.Delphes iii.4
385.1 (338–320)).

Kritias wrote a work entitled *Πολιτεία Θετταλῶν* (fr. 31,
DK); Hellenikos a *Θετταλικά* (*ΦιλHist* 4 fr. 52); and there
was a *Κοινὴ Θετταλῶν πολιτεία* among the constitutions
described by Aristotle (frs. 495–500, Rose). Thessalia is
absent from Homer. The poet does, however, mention nine
kings occupying the later Thessalia as well as some peri-
oikoi territory; twenty-nine cities are mentioned, of which
some are the direct ancestors of *polis* (e.g. Trikka: *Il.* 2.729);
others may have changed their name (e.g. Asterion: *Il.* 2.735).
Some of these Homeric sites have been located with certainty
(e.g. Pherai: *Il.* 2.711), whereas others remain unlocated
(e.g. Oichali: *Il.* 2.730). In addition, Homer refers to four of
the later periokoi peoples: the Ainians, the Perrhaibians, the
Finally, he mentions *Φθίη* and Ἡλλᾶς; it is debatable
whether these toponyms should be understood as designating towns or regions (Stählin 1924:41 index s.v.; Decourt (1990) 212–14). The earliest geographical sketch of Thessalia is chapter 64 of Ps.-Sklav: Thessalia is there described as consisting of the inland plains above Aenis, Dolopia, Malis, Achaia and Magnesia, and as extending as far as Tempe. The only stretch of coastline is at the Pagasitic Gulf, where the cities of Amphanaios and Pagasai were situated. Ps.-Skmynos 614–19 describes Thessalia as bordered by Athamania, Dolopia, Perrhaibia, Aenis and Makedonia. The most complete ancient description of the region is provided by Strabo; he begins (9.5.1) by placing the borders as they were in his day: to the north, Makedonia; to the east, from Thermopylae to the Peneios delta, the sea; to the south, the mountainous massifs of Oita and Aitolia; to the west, the countries of the Aitolians, the Akarnanians and the Amphilochians, as well as of a number of Epeiritic tribes which he groups under the heading οἱ περὶ Πιδνὸν.

Ps.-Sklav names eight poleis in the mesogeaia but adds ἐξοὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα πόλεις Θεσσαλῶν ἐν μεσογείᾳ. Other sources describing Thessalia as a region settled in poleis are, e.g., Pind. Pyth. 10.72; Aesch. Pers. 489; Thuc. 2.22.3; Xen. Hell. 6.1.14. 19. The Inventory below describes twenty-five poleis of Thessalia in the proper sense. These poleis have been identified with remains on the ground with very varying degrees of certainty: only one city is known from full excavations: Larisa. Moreover, inscriptions with city-ethnics are not very numerous. Under these circumstances, locations often rely on analysis of literary testimonies, in particular descriptions of military campaigns (Helly (1991) 30–31; Decourt (1990)), or on numismatic material (e.g. Orthos: Helly (1992) 78), on epigraphy (e.g. Matropolis: IG 19.1.3 284, found on site), or on employment of models borrowed from human geography (Decourt (1992)).

In addition to the twenty-five poleis, there were in Archaic and Classical Thessalia the following settlements which cannot be shown to have been poleis.4

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis


the reference could possibly be to the present settlement; but see Magnesian Orminion infra 689. Barr. AC.

**Asbotsos (Ἀσβωτός)** Steph. Byz. 130.8 (πόλις); ἐκ Ἀσβωτοῦ is possibly to be restored in IG iv 617.14 (cf. AJA 98 (1986) 211), a list of payments made by Thessalian polities to Argeis theoroi and dating to 316–293 (Perlman (2000) 74–75); Plassart reads ἐν Ἀσβωτοῦ on the basis of BCH 45 (1921) col. vi(b).6 = p. 30. l. 6 (230–220); Euphorion fr. 25.1 (v. Groningen)/31.1, de Cuenca. Unlocated, but in Thessalia (Steph. Byz. s.v.); cf. Stählin (1924a) 227 no. 4. Barr. dates it L, but it probably existed H and perhaps even C (supra); if its name is correctly restored in IG iv 617, then it may even have been a polis in C4/C3e, and so possibly even in C4 prior to 323.

**Boibe (Βοίβη)** Hom. Il. 2.712; Strabo 9.5.15, 5.18: πολίς Ἰωνίας; Steph. Byz. 172.9: πόλις Θεσσαλίας. RE iii. 628. Barr. A, but the fact that it existed in 293 (Strabo 9.5.15) indicates C as well.

**Callithera (Καλλιθέα)** Mentioned only by Livy 32.13.11, but possibly to be identified with the C site at Paliouri: Helly (1992) 85–88, followed by Barr.

**Chalkai (Χαλκαί)** Theopomp. fr. 34 (on which see Martin (1982)). D. Kontogiannis (1992); Helly (1995) 293. Barr. C.

**Eretria (Ἐρέτρια)** Polyb. 18.20.5; Ptol. Geog. 3.13.43; IG ix.2 176 (C3). Steph. Byz. 276.6 (πόλις); Strabo 9.5.10 (κατοικία). Kip (1910) 28; Blum (1992). Barr. AC.

**Euhydrium (Euhydrium)** The toponym was presumably *Εὐόνδριον: it is not attested in Greek sources but may be reconstructed from its Latin form Euhydrium (Livy 32.13.9). *I. Thessalie 35 (κατὰ τὸ τῆς πόλεως φύσις) (Hell.)). Béguiquign (1932) 125–29, 140–43, 194; Decourt (1990) 196–98, 214–15. Barr. C.

**Ithome, Thamiai (Ἰθώμη/Θαμιαία)** Hom. Il. 2.729; SEG 37 494 (230–200), 43 290; Strabo 9.5.17 (πολίχνιον); Steph. Byz. 306.9 (πόλις), 329.1 (πόλις). On onomastics, see Helly (1971). Barr. AC.

**Kelaitha (Κέλαιθα)** BCH 45 (1921) i11.28 (230–220); IG iv 617.9 (316–293): ἐκ Κέλαιθας (Cabanes (1976) 124). In SEG 15 384 (370–368), a man described as Εὐστρατος Κέλαιθου ("Eustratos of the Kelaithoi") is listed as damiourgos of the Molossian Federation (though it is commonly accepted that the community was situated in or near western Thessalia (Cabanes (1976) 124)). The toponym Κέλαιθα is probably to be connected with the ethnic Κέλαιθος found here (ibid.); but whereas the Kelaithans presumably constituted a polis in the Hellenistic period (donating money to the Argives (IG iv 617) and having a Delphic theworodokos (BCH 45 (1921)), it is not certain that they formed a polis already by c370: Rhianos (FGrHist 265) fr. 18 apud Steph. Byz. 372.6 describes them as an ἔθνος (Cabanes (1976) 123–24), and this classification is accepted by Hammond (1967) 526. Helly (1992) 85–88. Barr. H, but see supra.


**Limnaeum (Limnaeum)** Toponym known only from Livy 36.13.9, 14.1–2. Probably to be identified with the city site at Strongylovouni/Keusseuki-Dag, Vlochos (Decourt (1990) 120–21, 159–63). The preserved urban remains are mostly Hellenistic and later, but certain remains are C4 or even C5, and the site has yielded Archaic and Classical inscriptions (I. Thessalie 1–3, 6–7). Barr. AC.


**Onthyron (Ὀνθύριον)** Strabo 9.5.17 (πολίχνιον, πόλις); Rhianos (FGrHist 265) fr. 24 apud Steph. Byz. 493.12: ὁ Ωνθυρίων, πόλις Θεσσαλική περί την Άρνην. το τά πολίχνων ὁνθυρικός. ’Ριανὸς οὐδέως. Unlocated by Barr. (but possibly at Kallithiro (formerly Seklitsa); cf. Indzsollogou (1997) 58. According to Strabo 9.5.15, Onthyron was one of three insignificant settlements (πολίχνια ἄσημα) merged by synecocism to produce Metropolitan (of which it was a phyle in Hellenistic times (Habicht (1978–79)). The terminus ante quem for this synecocism is 358 (see entry infra), and if Strabo’s report is historical, Onthyron must have existed prior to the Hellenistic period, but nothing is known about its political status. Barr. AC.

**Palaiapharsalos (Παλαιάφαρσαλος)** Strabo 9.5.6, 17.1.11; Livy 32.13.9 (oppidum). On the site, see Decourt (1990) 184–223. Barr. AC.

**Phaytoss (Φάιττος, Φαιστός)** IG ix.2 489 (Hell.): πόλις; Ptol. Geog. 3.12.41. Barr. AC.


Sykyron (Συκύρων) Polyb. 27.8.15. An acropolis with C5 fortification, but no circuit around the lower city (autopsy by B. Helly). Barr. AC.

Symaitha (Σύμαιθα) Unlocated, but in Thessalia, according to Steph. Byz. 591.13–14: Σύμαιθα, πόλις Θεσσαλίας. ὁ πολέτης Συμαιθέως, ὃς Θεόπορος Φιλισπικών εἰκοστῶν δευτέρων; for Stephano’s use of polites, see Whitehead (1994) 12.4. Barr. dates it only H, but Theopomp. fr. 138 proves C.

Tripolis Larisaia (Tripolis) Livy 42.55.6, on which see Helly (1995) 161 n. 85. Barr. AC.

On the status of these communities nothing is known; some may have been poleis (cf. the comments on Asbotos), others civic subdivisions (cf. the comments on Onthyron).

A common political organisation comprising the communities of Thessalia becomes visible in the later sixth century. Common political and military action is attested for this period by e.g. Hdt. 5.63.3, where it is stated that the Θεσσαλοί sent military support to the Peisistratidai in accordance with a treaty of συμμαχία and after having voted to send the reinforcement: ἀπέστειμαν κοινήν γνώμην χρεώμενοι χιλίην ... ἔπος. A war waged by the Θεσσαλοί and their σύμμαχοι against Phokis is briefly mentioned at Hdt. 8.27 and dated “not many years before” Xerxes’ invasion of Greece. During the Persian Wars, the Thessalians at first collaborated with the Hellenic League (Hdt. 7.172–74); later, however, when the large Greek army sent to Thessalia had left, possibly due to medism on the part of the Aeolodai, the Thessalians as such medised (Hdt. 7.174, 9.31.5; see further Robertson (1976)). A symmachia with Athens in 461 is attested at Thuc. 1.102.4. External collective dedications by the Thessalians are attested in BCH (1958) 329, 1 (458/7), and BCH (1963) 206–7, no. 6 (c.369). In C5, the Thessalians were party to a dispute adjudged by Elis (no. 251) and involving also Athens (no. 361), Thespiai (no. 222) and the Boiotians (SEG 26 475, 31 358).

In form, this political organisation was presumably a federal state (Larsen (1968) 12–26, 281–94; Beck (1997) 119–34). Federal citizenship, in addition to polis citizenship, is not explicitly attested, but may be assumed if there was a regional primary assembly, as argued by Larsen (1968) 19 with n. 4, and Beck (1997) 126, both referring to Hdt. 5.63.3 (quoted supra) and Thuc. 4.78.3: τὸ πάντων κοινών with HCT ad loc. (cf. also IG ii2 116.18 (361/60) attesting election of the chief magistrate, presumably by an assembly, and AM 59: 57, 15.2, a C4 grant of proxeny by the Petthaloi which mentions prostatai; cf. also the use of συμπολεμεῖς θέσιν in Isoc. 5.20). For the purpose of federal administration, the region was divided into four units, tetrades: Thessaliotis, Phthiotis, Pelasgiotis and Hestiaiotis (Hellan. fr. 52; on these units, see further infra). The tetrades were created by Aeulas the Red (Arist. fr. 497, Rose; cf. Helly (1995) 150–67); the terminus ante quem for their creation would be c.500 if the word Πελασγιώτηδος in Hecat. fr. 133 apud Steph. Byz. 381.21 is derived from Hekataios—which is, however, far from certain; a date in C5 is, on the other hand, commonly assumed (cf. Helly (1995) 170–75). The chief function of the tetradic system seems to have been as units of military conscription (Gschnitzer (1954); Beck (1997) 125). Other attested federal institutions include coinage (Martin (1985) 37–40); a board of polemarchoi (SEG 17 243 (c.458/7); IG ii² 116.23 (361/60); IG ii2 175.6 (C4m)) selected on a tetradic basis (IG ii² 175.5–8), a board of hipparchoi (IG ii2 116.24), a board of hippheis (IG ii2 116.24), a board of pezarchoi (IG ii² 175.8), a board of hieronmomenes (IG ii2 116.24), presbeia (IG ii² 116.8–9) and proxenia (AM 59: 57, 15.2 (C4)). The chief magistrate of the federation is called ταγός in Xen. Hell. 6.1.18, but this title is not attested prior to the era of Jason (Helly (1995) 67). The usual title of the highest magistrate was presumably ἀρχως (Anacr. fr. 107, Diehl; cf. Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 5.74.3), ἀρχων (IG ii² 116.18 (361/60)), or τέτραρχος (CEG ii 7951 (rC5)); on these titles, see Helly (1995) 39–68. The tetrarchoi are sometimes conceived of as heads of the tetrades (Beck (1997) 125), but see the discussion by Helly (loc. cit.) according to Theopomp. fr. 208, Philip II of Makedon installed an archon at the head of each tetras (Helly (1995) 56–57). The office of archos, i.e. the chief office of the federation, was elective in 361/60 (IG ii² 116.18) and presumably long before that date (Larsen (1968) 14–15); the office was held for life (Larsen (1968) 13; cf. CEG ii 795.16 (330s) for a reign of 27 years).

Despite the existence of a federal structure, Thessalia was not always de facto firmly united; cf. e.g. Xen. Hell. 2.3.4 for a battle fought between Lykophrone I of Pherai and forces from (among others) Larisa, a battle fought over the hegemony of Thessalia (Ἄριστης Ἀριμνῆς Τῆς Θεσσαλίας). However, when the region was firmly united, it was capable of controlling the minor adjacent regions; cf. Xen. Hell. 6.1.9–12 where Xenophon has Jason say that when Thessalia is governed by a tagos, all the surrounding peoples (πάντα τὰ κόσμων ἐθνη)—commonly referred to as periöikoi in...
modern literature (Martin (1985) 69–73; Helly (1995) 18ff)—are its subjects (ὑπήκοα; cf. 6.1.19 for the expression οἱ περίοικοι to refer to these peoples). Not much is known about the position of these dependent peoples (perioikoi) vis-à-vis the Thessalians, but the following seems reasonably clear.

(i) The subjection of the adjacent regions was completed before the end of C6; this appears from (a) the fact that the Thessalians in 510 offered Iolkos on the coast of the Pagastic Gulf to Hippias of Athens (Hdt. 5.94.1) and thus must have controlled this region (Kip (1910) 11; Gschnitzer (1958) 2 n. 3; Martin (1985) 70); and (b) the probability that the subjection had taken place before the prolonged conflicts between Thessalia and Phokis (Kip (1910) 10; Lehmann (1983)); McInerny (1999) 145–46, 174–78) and Boiotia (Buck (1979) 107–20), which antedate the Persian Wars (Gschnitzer (1958) 2 n. 3). That the subjection was effected by force of arms is a reasonable inference from Aristotle’s reference to ancient warfare between the Thessalians and the Achaians, Perrhaibians and Magnesians (Pol. 1267b5–7).

(2) Among the subjected peoples were (a) the Achaians: at 8.3.1, Thucydides refers to the Achaians as among the hypekooi of the Thessalians (cf. Arist. Pol. 1267b5–7 for ancient warfare between the Achaians and the Thessalians); (b) the Magnesians: at 5.94.1, Herodotos relates that the Athenian tyrant Hippias, upon his expulsion from Athens, was offered Iolkos on the coast of the Pagastic Gulf by the Thessalians, and this suggests that the area around Iolkos was subjected to the Thessalians by C6 (cf. Martin (1985) 70); at 2.101.2, Thucydides refers to hypekooi of the Thessalians and names the Magnesians as among them (cf. Arist. Pol. 1269b5–7 for ancient warfare between the Magnesians and the Thessalians); (c) the Perrhaibians: at 4.78.6, Thucydides describes the Perrhaibians as hypekooi of the Thessalians (cf. Arist. Pol. 1269b5–7 for ancient warfare between the Perrhaibians and the Thessalians). These are the only specifically named dependants, but there may well have been others: (i) at 3.93.2, Thucydides describes the Thessalians as in control of the areas in which Herakleia Trachinia was founded in 426 (i.e. presumably areas such as Ainis, Malis and Trachis); (ii) Xen. Hell. 6.1.9 has Jason say that all (πάντα) neighbouring ethe were subjects of the Thessalians, and this may include, e.g., the Athamanians and the Dolopians; (iii) Thucydides twice (2.101.1, 8.3.1) uses οἱ ἄλλοι to refer to unspecified subjects.

(3) The dependent peoples (i) paid phoros to the Thessalian Confederacy (Kip (1910) 12): (a) Jason fixed the tribute to be paid (Xen. Hell. 6.1.19) by putting it at the level it had been (b) in the time of Skopas; the date and identity of this Skopas is unknown, but he is often placed in C6 (Larsen (1968) 18; cf. Helly (1995) 171–72, 183–86); (ii) they were obliged to render military service, as is clear from Xen. Hell. 6.1.9 (cf. Kip (1910) 12).

(4) The dependent peoples continued to constitute political communities of their own and were not absorbed by the Thessalians; this is clear (a) from Herodotos’ list of those who gave earth and water to the Great King (7.152.1), which in addition to the Thessalians includes (i) the Perrhaibians, (ii) the Magnesians, (iii) the Achaians, as well as (iv) the Dolopians, Ainians and Malians, who may also have been subjects of the Thessalians; (b) from the fact that (i) the Perrhaibians (Aesch. 1.116; Theopomp. fr. 63; CID ii 43.45, 44.8), (ii) the Magnesians (Aesch. 2.116; Theopomp. fr. 63; CID ii 43.24, 49), (iii) the Achaians (Aesch. 2.116; Theopomp. fr. 63; CID ii 36.1.31, 43.24), as well as (iv) the Dolopians (Aesch. 2.116; Theopomp. fr. 63; CID ii 43.46), Ainians (Theopomp. fr. 63; CID ii 43.25) and Malians (Aesch. 2.116; Theopomp. fr. 63; CID ii 71.46) were members in their own right of the Amphiktyonic League; (c) from the fact that, despite Thessalian protests, the Achaians (and other subjects) entered into bilateral relations with Sparta in 413/12 (Thuc. 8.3.1); (d) from the fact that four of these peoples struck their own coins: the Achaians (BMC 1963: 48 (C41/C3e); cf. infra), the Ainians (Head, HN2 291; cf. infra), the Oitaians (Head, HN2 302; cf. infra) and the Perrhaibians (Head, HN2 304; cf. infra); and finally (e) from the fact that the Oitaians, the Malians, the Ainians, the Dolopians and the Perrhaibians joined the Corinthian League of 338/7 (IG ii² 236b (338/7)). Moreover, poleis are found in all of these regions (see sections 2.1–8 infra).

Exactly what the formal status of the subjects was is unknown. The story of the offer of Iolkos to Hippias (Hdt. 5.94.1) suggests that the Thessalians could on occasion consider perioikic land as Thessalian possession (cf. Soph. fr. 915 with Helly (1995) 137–40), but this reveals little about formalities. One possibility is that the perioikoi were in fact symmachoi: (1) at 8.27.2, Herodotos states that at a point “not many years before” the Persian War the Θεσσαλοι καὶ οἱ σύμμαχοι made an attack on Phokis; these symmachoi may possibly have been the subjects discussed here, and the formula “the Thessalians and the allies” is reminiscent of such formulas as “the Lakedaimonians and the allies” and may suggest that the Thessalians were leaders of a hegemonic alliance (cf. Nielsen (1997) 139–41); (2) a similar suggestion may be made on the basis of IG ii² 116.13–14: this is a treaty of symmachia between Athens and the Thessalian
As already mentioned, Thessalia proper was subdivided into four tetrades: Thessaliotis, Phthiotis, Pelasgiotis and Hestiaiotis (on which see in general Gschnitzer (1954) and Helly (1995)).

**Thessaliotis** The toponym is Θεσσαλιώτις, ἦ (Hellen. fr. 52 apud Harp.; Strabo 9.5.17), called ἦ γῆ ἦ νῦν Θεσσαλιώτις καλεοµένη at Hdt. 1.57.1. The corresponding “ethnic” is Θεσσαλιώτης (IG ii² 175.7 (Θετ[ταλιωτῶν] (C4m)) or Θεσσαλιώτης (SEG 34 558.34 (C2s)). This “ethnic” is attested by only one Classical source, which clearly shows that it is not an ethnic proper but a term used to refer to an administrative/geographical unit of the Thessalian state (supra); [οἴς] ἄµοσαν Θετκαιλον [...]/ [π]ολεµαρχος Πελασγιωτις[ῶν ---]/ Φθιωτῶν: Μεγάλος, Θετ[ταλιωτῶν ---]/ ([Ε]στιαιωτις[ῶν] ν Εἰριον (IG ii¹ 175.5–8 (C4m)). For the origin of the term, see Gschnitzer (1954) and Helly (1995) 159–60.

The tetrads of Thessaliotis and its “ethnic” is not as frequently attested as the other tetrades, and the reason is presumably the similarity between the names Θεσσαλία and Θεσσαλιώτις and the confusion to which this similarity could potentially give rise: Ptol. Geog. 3.12, e.g., knows the correct names of the other tetrades, but for Thessaliotis gives simply Θεσσαλία (followed by an absurd list of cities); and Steph. Byz. 310.23–24 treats Θεσσαλιώτις/Θεσσαλίωτις as a variant form of Θεσσαλία.

Thessaliotis occupies the southern part of the western plain of Thessalia. For a suggestion of which four communities constituted the administrative unit created by Aleuas the Red in C6, see Helly (1995) 177: Methyliion, Limnaion, Kieron and Thetonion. The Inventory below describes the following six poleis situated in Thessaliotis: Kieron, Methyliion, Orthos, Peirasia, Phakion and Thetonion.

**Pelasgiotis** The toponym is Πελασγιώτις, ἦ (Hellen. fr. 52; Hecat. fr. 133); Dicaearchus fr. 61, Wehrli, apudSteph. Byz. 251.9–10 has ἦ Πελασγιάτις χώρα (but not obviously in reference to the area of the Thessalian tetrads); Diod. 4.37.4 has ἦ Πελασγιάτις γῆ. The corresponding “ethnic” is Πελασγιώτης (IG ii² 175.6 (C4m); cf. Simon. fr. 612, Page, where it is used in a, presumably, mythological context); like Thettaliotes and Pheitiotes, Pelasgiotes is attested only once in Classical inscriptions (IG ii² 175.10, cited supra); the inscription demonstrates that it is not an ethnic proper but a term used to refer to an administrative/geographical unit of the Thessalian state (supra). For the origin of the term, see Gschnitzer (1954) and Helly (1995) 159–60.

Pelasgiotis bordered on all three other tetrades as well as on three perioikic areas: Perrhaibia, Magnesia and Achaia. By and large, it consisted of the plain of Larisa with its extension towards Phereia and the Pagastic Gulf. For a suggestion as to which four communities constituted the administrative unit created by Aleuas the Red in C6, see Helly (1995) 177: Larisa, Phereia, Kranon and Skotoussa. The Inventory below describes the following eleven poleis situated in Pelasgiotis: Amphanai, Argoussa, Atrax, Gyrton, Kondaia, Krannon, Larisa, Mopsion, Pagasai, Phereia and Skotoussa.

**Hestiaiotis** The toponym is Ἡστιαίωτις, ἦ (Hellen. fr. 52; Andron (FGHist 10) fr. 16a); Steph. Byz. 254.10 (citing Andron) gives Ἡστιαίωτας, and Hdt. 1.56.3 has Ἡστιαίωτας (but not in reference to the area of the historical tetrads; Helly (2001a)). The corresponding “ethnic” is restored as Ἡστιαίωτης in IG ii² 175.8 (C4m); the inscription demonstrates that it is not an ethnic proper but a term used to refer to an administrative/geographical unit of the Thessalian state (supra). For the origin of the term, see Gschnitzer (1954) and Helly (1995) 159–60.
Hestiaiotis was the north-western tetras for a suggestion as to which four communities constituted the administrative unit created by Aleus the Red in C6, see Helly (1995) 177: Trikka, Pharkadon, Gomphoi and Pelinna. The Inventory below describes the following six poleis situated in Hestiaiotis: Gomphoi, Metropolis, Pelinna, Phaloria, Pharkadon and Trikka.5

2. Adjacent Regions

2.1 Dolopia

The toponym is ∆ολοπία, η (Thuc. 2.202.2; Teles, De exilio 22.10, Hense). The corresponding ethnic is ∆όλοφ (Hdt. 7.132.1), of which the external individual use has been restored in IG ii² 546 (C4), (cf. JHS 104 (1984) 153 n. 16); in Amphilktiony documents, individuals are listed under the heading ∆όλοπων, mostly without a city-ethnic (e.g. CIDs 18 43.46 (340/39); 96.7 (327/6)), but sometimes with one (CIDs 111 74.1.48–49: Κτημεναίος (337/6)). The external collective use of the ethnic is found in Hdt. 7.185.2; Thuc. 5.51.1; Xen. Hell. 6.1.7; Ps.-Skylax 64 and IG ii² 236b.10 (338/7). The Dolopians are classified as an ethnos by Hdt. 7.185.2 and Thuc. 5.51.2. As an ethnos, the Dolopians were a member of the Amphilktiony League (Theopomp. fr. 63; CIDs 11 43.46 (340/39)); they provided a single hieronmemon who in C4 was sent by Ktimene (CIDs 11 32.45, 102.11.fr.A.9; Lefèvre (1998) 84–85).

The only explicit evidence that the Dolopians were subject to the Thessalians is at Xen. Hell. 6.1.9, where Jason of Pherai is made to claim that the Dolopians were his hyperkooi; it may, however, be assumed that the Dolopians were among the peoples commonly subjected to the Thessalians when these were effectively united (ibid.). Even so, the Dolopians seem to have constituted an individual political entity; thus, they gave earth and water to the Great King and sided with the Persians in 480 (Hdt. 7.132, 185; cf. Diod. 11.3.2); in 420/19 they waged war on Herakleia Trachinia with the Ainians and some Thessalians (Thuc. 5.51.1; Diod. 12.77.4, who substitutes Milians for Thucydides’ Θεσσαλιών τινάς; cf. Diod. 16.29.1 (the Sacred War) and 18.11.1 (the Lamian War)); and in C4 they joined the Corinthian League of Philip II (IG ii² 236b.10 (338/7)).

Dolopia is not well explored, and its borders are imprecisely known. In the historical period, they occupied a large part of southern Mt. Pindos (Flacelière (1937) 23), south of Thessalia proper, bordering on the east on Achaia (Helly 1992 81), to the south on Ainis, and to the north-west on Athamania. Only two Dolopian communities, Angeia and Ktimene, are known in the Archaic and Classical periods (Helly 1992); they are both described in the Inventory below.

2.2 Ainis

The toponym is Αἶνια, η (Plut. Quaest. Græc. 26; IG IX.2 5b.10 (150–125)); it does not occur prior to the Roman period; in the Archaic and Classical periods, only the ethnic is found: it is Αἴνιαν in Thuc. 5.51.1; Xen. Hell. 4.13.15; Ps.-Skylax 35; and Ἑφεσα (v.l. Αἴνιας; cf. Hym. Hom. Ap. 217) in Hdt. 7.132, 198.

Theopomp. fr. 80 may possibly have used Αἴνιαν χώρα about the territory which is called Αἴνιακη χώρα in Arist. Mir. ausc. 843b17. The Ainians are classified as an ethnos by Hdt. 7.185 and Thuc. 5.51.2, and as an ethnos, they were a member of the Amphilktiony League (Theopomp. fr. 63; CIDs 11 36.1.8 (343–340), etc.); they provided two hieronmiones who in C4 came, at least sometimes, from Korophe and Phyrax (Lefèvre (1998) 21–23).

The internal collective use of the ethnic is found on C4 coins (Head, HN² 291; Babelon, Traité ii.4 nos. 451–53) and in IG IX.2 3b (shortly after 323), a grant of proxeny to a man of Athens by [τῷ κοινῷ] τῶν Αἴνιαν. The external individual use of the ethnic is found in Diod. 18.7.2 (1723); CIDs 11 43.58 (340/39); and SEG 8 513 (C4). The external collective use is found in Thuc. 5.51.1; Xen. Hell. 3.5.6; Ps.-Skylax 62; and Philoch. fr. 56. In its external uses, the regional ethnic may be specified by a city-ethnic vel sim: Αἴνιαν . . . Καφελεύς (CIDs 11 74.1.55–56 (337/6)); Αἴνιαν . . . Κοροφαῖος (CIDs 11 97.64 (327/6)); Ἠκ Ταλανάς . . . Αἴνιαν (CIDs 11 1.1.45 (362/1)); [Α]网约νες Υπ[αιο]ι (CIDs 11.3.7 (362–357)); Αἴνιαν Ψηφάργως (CIDs 11 1.1.40 (362/1)).

There is no direct evidence that the Ainians were subjected to the Thessalians, but two passages in Thucydides indicate that they were within the Thessalian sphere of interest and power: (i) at 3.93.3 he describes the Thessalians as in control of ἐν δυνάμει ὐντες of the areas in which Herakleia Trachinia was situated, and (ii) at 5.51 he describes the Ainians as an ethnos bordering on Herakleia and thus as within the areas of Thessalian control and interest.

A C4 koinon of the Ainians is suggested by silver coins struck in the name of the ethnos (triobols and obols on the

---

5 A few polities cannot be assigned to any specific tetras: Asbotos (Thessalian, according to Steph. Byz. 130.8); Oxyonium, which may have been in Hestiaiotis, or in Pherai (Strabo 7.7.9). In the Inventories below they are both described s.v. Thessalia.
Aiginetan standard). Types: obv. head of Zeus; rev. warrior hurling javelin, or sword in sheath and javelin. Legend:

**AINIAN, AINIANΩN** (Head, HN² 291; Babelon, Traité ii.4 nos. 451–53). It is also suggested by IG ix.2 3b, a grant of prokynia passed by the Ainians shortly after 323.

During Xerxes’ invasion, the Ainians medised (Hdt. 7.132, 185; Diod. 11.3.2); in 420/416, the Ainians, with the Dolopians and some Thessalians, waged war on Herakleia Trachinia (Thuc. 5.51; Diod. 12.77.4, who substitutes Malians for Thucydides’ Θεσσαλῶν τῆνδας). A treaty with the Lakedaimonians is attested by Xen. *Hell.* 3.5.6 and Diod. 14.82.7 (395); the Ainians joined the anti-Spartan alliance in the Corinthian War (Xen. *Hell.* 4.3.15) and were allied to Boiotia at the battle of Mantinea in 362 (Diod. 15.85.2 (1363/2)); IG ii² 236b.10 (338/7) has been restored [Ἄινιάνων], thus indicating membership of the Corinthian League of Philip II; in the Lamian War, the Ainians joined the Greek alliance (Diod. 18.11.1 (1323)).

Ainis was constituted by the basins of the middle and upper Spercheios valley (cf. Hdt. 7.198) and its principal tributary, Inachos. To the east, Ainis bordered on Malis and Oita, to the south on Aitolia, and to the north on Dolopia and Achaia. The Inventory below describes five poleis situated in Ainis (Hypata, Kapheleis, Korophaioi, Phyrughioi and Talana); in addition there were in the area in the pre-Hellenistic period the following settlements.⁶

### 1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis

*Erythrai* (Ἐρυθραῖος) A toponym is not explicitly attested, but the city-ethnic *Ἐρυθραῖος* suggests *Ἐρυθραία*. *F.Delphes* 111.1 514 (c.278); ἡ πόλις Ἐρυθραίας; IG ix.2 7a (C2m); ἡ πόλις *Ἐρυθρηγοὺς; I.Erythrai i 36 (C3m); Syll. 3 492 (C3s). Stählin (1924a) 222; Helly (1978). *Barr. C.*

**Macra Come** (Macra Come) Mentioned only by Livy 32.13.10 and probably to be identified with the site at Varybopi. Béquignon (1937b) 316–22; Roux (1954); classified as a fort/tower by *Barr. Barr. C.*

**Side** (Side) *CIL* 886.8. Kip (1910) 47; *Rp* 11 2208; classified as a fort/tower by *Barr. Barr. C.*

**Sosthenis** (Σωσθενίς) *BCH* 45 (1921) 312.128 (230–220); IG ix.1² 34 (C2f); Ptol. *Geogr.* 3.12.42. Kontogiannis (1994). *Barr. C.*


### 2. Unidentified Settlements

**Ano Phteri** Béquignon (1937b) 305–6; Philipsson (1950) 244. *Barr. C.*

**Vounous** Kase (1991) 47. *Barr. C.*

On the status of these communities in the Archaic and Classical periods, nothing is known. Some of them may possibly have been poleis, as Erythrai certainly was in C3m (supra).

#### 2.3 Oita

In Strabo 9.5.10, the toponym is Ὀίτα, ἦ; this toponym may have to be restored (as ὈΪΤΑΙΟΣ) at Hdt. 7.185 (cf. Legrand (1951) 184 app. crit. and 185 n. 3), and ὈΪΤΑΙΟΣ χθὼν is found in Soph. *Phil.* 479; IG ix.1 227.1 (C2f) has ὈΪΤΑ, ἦ. The ethnic is ὈΪΤΑΙΟΣ on C4f coins (Babelon, *Traité* ii.4 nos. 438, 442; ὈΪΤΑΙΟΣ is found in Aeschin. 2.116; IG ii² 236b.9 (338/7); and Babelon, *Traité* ii.4 no. 439 (C4f), etc.

The internal collective use of the ethnic is found on C4 coins (Head, HN² 302; Babelon, *Traité* ii.4 nos. 227–30). The external collective use of the ethnic is found in Hdt. 7.217; Thuc. 3.92.2; Aeschin. 2.116, 142; [Dem.] 59.101; IG ii² 236b.9 (338/7). The external individual use is found in Xen. *An.* 4.6.20 and *Tit. Cal.* 3.5 (C4).

In Aeschin. 2.116, the Oitaians are described as an *ethnos* and are listed as a member of the Amphiktyonic League; they are, however, absent from the list of Amphiktyonic members found in Theopomp. fr. 63, and they do not appear in C4 Amphiktyonic documents (Lefèvre (1998) 92; cf. Kip (1910) 19–20).

Oitaian subjection to the Thessalians is not explicitly attested, but may perhaps be inferred from Thuc. 3.92.2, where the Thessalians are described as in control of (ἐν δυνάμει ὄντες δὸντες) the areas in which Herakleia Trachinia was founded.

The Oitaians as such presumably formed a political unit, as is suggested by the following evidence. (1) In C4f, they struck silver and bronze coins: silver (triobols and obols on the Aiginetan standard): obv. head of lion, spear in mouth,
or laureate head of Apollo; rev. naked Herakles with club, or lion’s head, or spear and knife, or bow and quiver; legend: ΟΙΤ, ΟΙΤΑ, ΟΙΤΑΩΝ, ΟΙΤΑΙΩΝ. Bronze: obv. lion’s head, spear in mouth, or head of Apollo, or head of young Herakles crowned with vine wreath; rev. spear and knife, or spearhead and jawbone of boar and bunch of grapes; legend: ΟΙΤ, ΟΙΤΑΩΝ, ΟΙΤΑΙΩΝ (Head, ΗΝ² 302; Babelon, Traité ii.4 nos. 227–30; Rogers (1932) nos. 414–20).

(2) Warfare by the Oitaioi is attested at Thuc. 3.92.3 (a war with the Malians) and Xen. HELL. 1.2.18 (a war against Herakleia Trachinia and the Achaians). (3) In 370, Jason of Phereai handed over to the Oitaians and the Malians the city of Herakleia Trachinia (Xen. HELL. 6.4.27; Diod. 15.57.2). (4) Πραξιτέλης ἵκον Οἰταίων was granted proxy by Khalymna in C4 (Tit. Cal. 3) and Phylarchos (FGH 81) fr. 70 (r350s) apud Part. Amat. narr. 25 describes a man as Οἰταίων προστάτης. (5) Treaties/alliances are attested as follows: (a) a treaty with the Lakedaimonians is implied by Xen. HELL. 3.5.6; (b) membership of the Corinthian League of Philip II is attested by IG II² 236b.9 (338/7); and (c) except for Herakleia Trachinia, the Oitaians joined the Greek alliance set up for the Lamian War (Diod. 18.11.1 (r323)).

The Oitaians seem to have been a group composed ethnically of Dryopes, Malians and Ainians (Béquignon 1937b) 168–69; Baladié (1996) 277; they originally occupied the upper valley of the river Asopus (Flacelière (1937) 16), and later controlled the eastern part of Mt. Oita as far as the southern bank of the river Spercheiios. Their only well-known polis is Herakleia Trachinia, which was founded in order to protect the Malians against the Oitaians (Thuc. 3.92) but was handed over to the Oitaians and the Malians by Jason of Phereai in 370 (Xen. HELL. 6.4.27; Diod. 15.57.2) and is described as Oitaios in reference to 323 by Diod. 18.11.1 (but is Malian in C4 Amphiktyonic documents, e.g. CID II 43.27 (340); see, however, Kip (1910) 19, 39–41, and Lefèvre (1998) 92, suggesting that this may be mere Amphiktyonic chanceller style, obscuring the fact that the Oitaians were represented by Herakleia). In addition to Herakleia, the Inventory below describes two other Oitaios polis (Chen and Parasopioi). Finally, the area comprised the following pre-Hellenistic settlement, which cannot be shown to have existed:

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlement not Attested as a Polis

Homilai (Οιμιλαι) SGD I 2527.7 (C3); IG X 1.227, 229, 230 (C2m); Ptol. Geog. 3.12.15. Stählin (1924) 210–11; Béquignon (1937b) 260–63; Kase (1991) 49–50. Barr. AC.

2.4 Malis

The toponym is Μηλίς, ἴ (Hdt. 7.198.1, 201, 8.31). The corresponding ethnic is Μηλιεύος (Hdt. 7.132.1; Thuc. 3.93.1) or Μαλιεύος (Aesch. 2.116; Ps. –Skylax 62; CID II 43.26 (340)).

The territory is called Μηλίς γῆ in Hdt. 7.198.1 and Μαλιεύοι χώρα in Ps. –Skylax 62. The internal collective use of the ethnic is found in Hdt. 7.213.1, and C4 Amphiktyonic documents list individuals under the heading Μαλιεύοι, sometimes without a city-ethnic (e.g. CID II 69.25), sometimes with the addition of Αλαμπίνος or Ἡρακλειώτατος (e.g. CID II 32.49 (358/7)). The external collective use of the ethnic is found in Hdt. 7.132.1, 9.31.5; Thuc. 3.93.1, 5.51.3; Xen. HELL. 3.5.6, 4.2.17; and IG II² 236b.9 (338/7).

Thuc. 5.51.2 describes the Malians as an ethnos, and as an ethnos they were a member of the Amphiktyonic League (Aesch. 2.116; Theopomp. fr. 63; CID II 43.26 (340)). According to Thuc. 3.93.2, the Malians were subdivided into three parts (τρία µέρη): the Παράλιοι, the Τραχίνιοι (on which see form HCT ad loc.) and the Παράλιοι; the latter were the neighbours of the Oitaians (Thuc. 3.92.2), but apart from that these groups cannot be located.

A plurality of poleis in Malis is securely attested, e.g. (1) by Hdt. 7.198–99, who mentions first Antikyre and then Trachis as poleis, at 7.176.2, he furthermore calls Anthela polis (a city which, by implication, he considers Malian; cf. 7.216 describing Alpenos as the first East Lokrian polis after Malis; it is called kome at 7.200.2); and (2) by Ps. –Skylax 62, who names Lamia and Echinos and adds εἰδώ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα πόλεις Μαλιεύας. Thus, Malis was a region subdivided into poleis. But the region as such may also have constituted a πολη, however, Οἰτή here is probably the mountain, just as Mt. Knemis is listed in the preceding chapter: καὶ πόλεως αὐτοῦ εἶναι ἀδεία Θρόινος, Κάιμος, Ναυπεύς, Πλάστεα, Πικαστίος (cf. Nielsen (2000) 108). Cf. Müller’s remark: “Inepte Οῖτα ριά τρία µέρη ἐν Ἀρκαδία καὶ Ἀχαιαὶ ἄλλη πρὸς τήν Ὀιτήν Ἀσίας... (= Rhians (FGH 81) fr. 36); probably confused with Phalaro in Malis (see entry for Lamia).
political unit, as is indicated by the following: (1) the fact that the Malians as such are described as medisers by Hdt. 7.132.1; (2) in 420/9, the Malians as such, according to Thuc. 5.51.1, were involved in a war against Herakleia Trachinia; (3) a treaty with the Lakedaimonians is implied by Xen. Hell. 3.5.6, one with the Spartan alliance during the Corinthian War is implied by Hell. 4.2.17, and one with the Boiotians by Hell. 6.5.23. Membership of the Corinthian League of Philip II is attested by IG ii2 236b.9 (338/7), and the Malians excluding the Lamians joined the Greek alliance during the Lamian War (Diod. 18.11.1); (4) the Malians' politeia was described in an Aristotelian treatise (Arist. fr. 533–54, Rose). Furthermore, a detail is given at Arist. Pol. 1297b14–16, where it is stated that at an unspecified point in the past the politeia (citizenry or constitution) of the Malians had consisted of both active and superannuated hoplites, whereas the magistracies had been open only to those actually serving in the ranks; (5) in C4, the Malians struck both silver and bronze coins. Silver (triboros on the Aiginetan standard). Types: obv. head of young Dionysos; rev. amphora; legend: MALIEΩΝ. Bronze: obv. head of Athena; rev. Philoktetes with bow; legend: MALIEΩΝ (Head, HN2 296; Babelon, Traité ii.4 no. 462; Rogers (1932) no. 384).

Thucydides' account of the antecedents of the founding of Herakleia Trachinia, however, suggests that Malian unity was not always equally strong: the Trachinians, a meros (= polis; cf. Trachis (no. 432)) of the Malians, were hard pressed by the Oitaians and thus, apparently on their own, first contemplated an alliance with Athens, but then elected an ambassador and sent him to Sparta in the company of, not other Malians, but metropolitic Dorians (3.93.1–3).

According to Hdt. 8.31, to the south-west Malis bordered on Doris; according to Thuc. 3.92.2, the Malian Trachinians bordered on the Oitaians to the west, and according to Hdt. 7.126, East Lokris was also a southern neighbour, the last Malian community in this direction being Antheia; the neighbours ἀνωθεν ἀπὸ µεσογείας were the Ainians (Ps.-Skylax 63), and the northern neighbours were the Achaians (Ps.-Skylax 63 continues with Achaia). The area of Malis was modest, and its extent was limited further by the Spartan foundation of Herakleia on Malian territory in 426. None the less, it was an area subdivided into poleis (supra), and the Inventory below describes six Malian poleis (Anthele, Antikyre, Echinos, Herakleia (on which see supra s.v. Oita), Lamia and Trachis). Finally, the area comprised the following pre-Hellenistic settlements which cannot be shown to have been poleis, though it is not known what status they did have. 8

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis

Aia (Αἰα, Αἰαία) Soph. fr. 915, Pearson, apud Steph. Byz. 37.2; Callim. Hymn. 4.287 (cf. White (1984b)); inscribed Συν Μηλιέων (Helly (1995) 137); unlocated, but presumably a harbour settlement (Helly (1995) 137–40); no date in Barr., but the written evidence attests to C.


Phalaria (Φάλλαρα) Polyb. 20.10.16; Steph. Byz. 656.3. Probably the harbour settlement of Lamia. Not precisely located (cf. entry for Lamia). Barr. C.

2.5 Achaia

The simple toponym is Ἀχαια, ἡ (Thuc. 4.78.1; cf. Kip (1910) 54–55), in Ionic Ἀχαιία (Hdt. 7.198.2); toponyms denoting cities often make clear that the reference is not to the Peloponnesian Achaia (τῆς Ἀχαιέως Ἀλος (Hdt. 7.173.1, 197.1); Μελέτεια τῆς Ἀχαιίας (Thuc. 4.78.1)), but the toponym itself is sometimes qualified by Φθιῶτις (Diod. 5.50.5; ἡ Φθιῶτις Ἀχαιά; IG vii 288.5 (240); [Ἀχαιά]ς τῆς Φθιῶτιδος). The corresponding ethnic is Ἀχαιός (Hdt. 7.185.2; CID 11 31.1.31 (343/2)), which is used either on its own (Hdt. 7.197.2; Xen. Hell. 1.2.18; Arist. Pol. 1269b6; CID 11 43.2 (340/39)) or qualified by Φθιῶτας (Hdt. 7.132.1; Thuc. 8.3.1); Ps.-Skylax 63; Theopomp. fr. 63; IG ii2 1132.56). Aeschin. 2.116 uses simply Φθιῶτας.

The internal collective use of the ethnic is found on Cal/Cs coins (BMC 1963: 48). The external collective use is

8 Paralos in Steph. Byz. 503.1 (ἐν Θεσσαλίᾳ πόλεις τῶν Μηλιέων) must be a fabrication on the basis of the name of the Παράλος (on whom supra); likewise, Iros (Lycoph. Alex. 905; Steph. Byz. 337.8; Ira (Steph. Byz. 337.2) is probably a fabrication based on the name of the Ἰρας (on whom see supra).
found in Hdt. 7.185.2; Thuc. 8.3.1; Xen. Hell. 1.2.18; Theopomp. fr. 63 and Ps.-Skyllax 63. The external individual use is found in CID ii 118.5–6 (365–360), and Amphiktyonic documents list individuals under the heading Ἰχαιών either without (<phCID ii 36.1.6 (341/0), 43.2 (340/39), 72.8 (327)) or with a city-ethnic (Ἀλοπεις) CID ii 32.47 (340/39), 76.1.23 (335), 84.Α.2–3 (332/1); or Μελιταιος CID ii 32.47 (340/39), 74.1.39 (337/6), 76.1.24 (335)).

The territory is termed χώρη at Hdt. 7.197.3, and the people are called ἕθος at Hdt. 7.185.2; Theopomp. fr. 63; and Aeschin. 2.166, and as an ηθος the Achaiai were a member of the Amphiktyonic League (Theopomp. fr. 63; Aeschin. 2.116; CID ii 36.1.6, 43.2, 72.8). They provided the Amphiktyonic League with two hieron moncnctes while in C4 were sent by Larisa and Melitaia (Lefèvre (1998) 87).

At Pol. 1267b5–7, Aristotle refers to ancient warfare between the Achaiai and the Thessalians, and it is very probable that this warfare led to Achaian subjection to Thessalia: at 8.3.1, Thucydides mentions the Achaiai as among the hpekooi of the Thessalians. However, it seems that Achaia was not absorbed by Thessalia, but continued to constitute an independent political unit; thus, they are listed individually in Herodotos’ list of mediisers (7.132); in 413/12, the Achaiai, despite Thessalian protests, entered into bilateral relations with Sparta; an alliance with Herakleia Trachinia seems implied for 185 b.c. According to Diod. 325 (r302; (πόλις); Steph. Bytz. 229.1 (πόλις). According to Diod. 301.10.3, in 302 Cassander planned to metoecise the population of Dion to Phthiotic Thebes (a metoecism prevented by Demetrios); though the city is unlocated, it may be assumed that if it was a candidate for metoecism in 302, it existed in the Classical period. The same would follow if C4 coins inscribed ΔΙΑΩΝ (Demetriadi (1998)) belong to this Dion (Hatzopoulos and Psoma (1998–99)). Unlocated in Barr. but see A. Batziou-Eustathiou, Deltio Othryos (1997) B.I: 69–85; ArchDelt 49 (1994) Chron. 325–26 for a possible location.

Koroneia (Κορώνεια) Syll.2 240.0.10 (308); [Κορώνειες; Ptol. Geog. 3.12.43; Strabo 9.5.10; Steph. Bytz. 377.16–17. Unlocated. Stählin (1924a) 167 n. 2 and 185; RE xi. 1431; White (1984a). Barr. dates it AC, but it is in fact not attested till c.308 (Syll.3 240.0.10); however, if it really donated money towards the rebuilding of the temple at Delphi in C4, it may be assumed to have existed prior to that date and thus at least in the Classical period.

Narthakion (Ναρθάκιον) Xen. Hell. 4.3.9; BCH 45 (1921) iv.28; IG IX.2 89.31 (c.140). Béguignon (1937b) 286–92. Barr. C. There may just possibly be some evidence that Narthakion was constituted as a polis in C4; an inscription of c.140 (Ager (1996) no. 156) records a verdict by the Senate in a territorial conflict between Narthakion and Melitaia, which was a polis in C4 (see entry infra); the evidence presented by the Melitaiains before the Senate refers retrospectively to what may possibly be a C4 verdict in a similar conflict (Ager (1989) 108). If Narthakion really had a territorial conflict with Melitaia settled by international arbitration in C4, then it must have been a polis.

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis

Alope (Ἀλόπη) Hom. II. 2.682; Strabo 9.4.9; Pherecydes (FGrHist3) fr. 147 apud Steph. Bytz. 77.8–9 (πόλις). REi. 1595. Barr. AC.

Orchomenos (Ὀρχομενός) Dio. 20.110.3 (r302) (πόλις). According to Dio. 20.110.3, in 302 Cassander planned to metoecise (the population of) Orchomenos to Phthiotic Thebes (a metoecism prevented by Demetrios); though the city is unlocated and unattested prior to this date, it may be assumed that if it was a candidate for metoecism in 302, it existed in the Classical period. Not in Barr.

Pereia (Πέρεια) IG ix.2 205.19 (C3f): πόλις; F.Delphes iii.4 351 (C3f) (collective city-ethnic). Located at the AC site near Petrot (formerly Tsatma) by Stählin (1924a) 167; Barr. follows Kirsten, RE suppl. vii. (1940) 885–92 and Philippson (1950) 200, 272, in preferring the AC site at Tsournati Vrysi, where Cantarelli (1995) and Helly (2001b) 241–49 place Chalai(on).

Phylladon (Φυλλαδόν) F.Delphes iii.4 351.18–19 (C3f): Φολλαδάνων; IG ix.2 205.13 (C3). Stählin (1924a) 168; Lauffer (1989) 549; Cantarelli (1995) 320–21. Barr. treats Phylladon as a fortress, but in C3f it had a territorial conflict with Peuma settled by international arbitration (Ager (1996) no. 31), and the record of the verdict describes Phylladon by the collective-ethnic. These two facts suggest that Phylladon was, in C3f, not a fortress but a community of citizens. Barr. C?

Pras (Πρᾶς) Xen. Hell. 4.3.9; Steph. Byz. 534.12 (πόλις). Presumably to be identified with the fortified Classical site (fortress?) at Divri, for which see Stählin (1924a) 39 i. 3, 187, 228; Béquignon (1937b) 287ff; RE suppl. x. 651–52. Unlocated in Barr.

Pteleon (Πτελεών) Hom. Il. 2.697; Dio. 20.110.3 (r302); Strabo 9.5.8; Steph. Byz. 537.20 (πόλις); Eust. Il. 1.505.28 (πόλις); IG ix.2 520 (C2f): Ἡ πόλις τῶν [Π]τελεῶν. Stählin (1924a) 181; Prakt (1951) 129–54, (1952) 164–85, (1953) 120–32. RE xxiii.2. 1481–82. Barr. AC.

Xyniai (Ξυνίαι) IG ix.1.2 177 (214/13) = Ager (1996) no. 55; Polyb. 9.45.3 = Steph. Byz. 481.19 (πόλις). Barr. AC.

2. Unidentified Settlements


It is unknown what status these communities had. Some of them, such as Dion and Narthakion, may have been poleis, as, e.g., Pteleon was in the Hellenistic period (supra).

2.6 Magnesia

The toponym is Μαγνησία (Aeschin. 3.83; Dem. 1.13; IG ix.2 1101.4 (C2)); the Ionic form is Μάγνησι (Hdt. 7.176.1). The corresponding ethnic is Μάγνης (Hdt. 7.132; Thuc. 2.101.2; Xen. An. 6.1.7; CID ii 12.1.68 (341)).

The external collective use of the ethnic is found in Hdt. 7.132, 185; Thuc. 2.101.2; Isoc. 5.21; and Arist. Pol. 1269’7. In addition, Μάγνητες is used in conjunction with collective city-ethnics: Μάγνητες Κροκαῖοι (CID ii 5.11.36 (358)); Μάγνητες Μεθωναῖοι (CID ii 5.11.39); Μάγνητες Ὀξύωναιοί (CID ii 5.11.42). The external individual use of the ethnic is found in CID i 12.1.68–72 (341), which list three individuals; furthermore, Amphiktyonic documents list individuals under the heading Μαγνητῶν, either without (CID ii 36.1.7, 33, 11.21 (341/0), 43.2 (341/0), 102.11.32 (342/3)) or with a city-ethnic (Κροκαῖοι; CID ii 32.48 (C4); Μεθωναῖοι; CID ii 74.1.55 (337/6); Ὀξυώναιοι; CID ii 84.4.1 (332/1); Ὀμολογοί: CID ii 74.1.39 (337/6)).

The territory is called Ἡ Μαγνησία χώρη at Hdt. 7.183, 188.1, and Μαγνητική γαία at Aesch. Pers. 492. The people are called an ethnos in Hdt. 7.332, and as an ethnos the Magnesians were a member of the Amphiktyonic League (Aeschin. 2.116; Theopomp. fr. 63; CID ii 36.1.33 (341/0)); they provided the Amphiktyonic League with two hieron emenones who in C4 were sent by Homolion and either Methone, Korakai or Olizon (Lefèvre (1998) 89).

The Magnesians are described as among the ἀντικαὶ of the Thessalians by Thuc. 2.101.2; it would appear from Arist. Pol. 1267’5–7, mentioning ancient warfare between the Magnesians and the Thessalians, that the subjection of the Magnesians was effected by force of arms, and from Hdt. 5.94.1 (on which see Kip (1910) 11); Gschwinder (1958) 2 n. 3 and Martin (1985) 70), mentioning a Thessalian offer of the Pagastic city of Iolkos to Hippias after his expulsion from Athens, that it had been carried out before 510. However, the Magnesians were not absorbed by the Thessalians, as is indicated by the fact that they are listed individually in Herodotos’ list of medisers at 7.332 and the fact that they formed a member of the Amphiktyonic League (Aeschin. 2.116; Theopomp. fr. 63; CID ii 36.1.33 (341/0)). In addition, there were several poleis in Magnesia; the inventory below describes fourteen Magnesian poleis (Amyrois, Eureaioi, Eurymenai, Homolion, Iolkos, Kastanhai, Kikynthos, Korakai, Meliboia, Methone, Olizon, Oxoniaioi, Rhizous and Spalathra).

In the Archaic and Classical periods, the area of Magnesia corresponded to the peninsula traditionally called Magnesia,
except for the western coast of the Pagasitic Gulf with the Thessalian cities of Amphanai (no. 393) and Pagasai (no. 407), and Pyrasos (no. 442) in Achaia. In this area there were, in addition to the polesis listed above, the following settlements which cannot be shown to have been polesis and about whose status nothing is known.¹⁰

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements
not Attested as Poleis


Galphyrai (Γάλφυραι) Hom. II. 2.712; BCH 95 (1971) 551. 9 (C2s); Steph. Byz. 209.2 (πόλεις). Wace (1906); Stählin (1924a) 61; di Salvatore (1994) 106–7; PECS 357. Barr. AC.

Isai Limen (Ἰσαί λυμήν) Ps.-Skylax 65. Unlocated; cf. Stählin (1924a) 56. Not in Barr. but Ps.-Skylax 65 attests to C.

Kerkinion (Κερκίνιον) Livy 31.41; Procop. Aed. 4.4.163; EAM no. 47 (C2–C1). RE xi. 1279; ArchEph (1931) 175. Barr. AC.


Neleia (Νῆλεια) Strabo 9.5.15 (1293) (πολύχνη). According to Strabo (loc. cit.), Neleia was in 293 synoecised into Demetrias and became a kome of the new polis. Prior to that, it was probably the port of Iolkos (Baladié 1996) on Strabo 9.5.15 in Lexique des noms de lieux 275). Barr. treats it as unlocated, but it may have been situated on the hill of Pefkakia (formerly Tarasanas); cf. Baladié (loc. cit.). However, excavations here have unearthed only prehistoric material (cf. Die deutschen Ausgrabungen auf der Pefkakia-Magula in Thessalien i–iii.2 (1989–92)). However, since it existed in 293 when it was merged into Demetrias, the presumption is that it existed in C4 as well. Cf. however Bakhuizen (1996), seriously questioning the existence of Neleia by suggesting that it is a metonymic appellation for Iolkos (“city of Neleus”), and thus providing an excellent reason for the unresolved location. Barr. HR, but see supra.

Orminion (Ὀρμίνιον, Ὀρμίνιον, Ὀρμένιον) Perlman (2000) E.1 l. 44 (post-316): an Epidaurian theoerdokos at Orminion (though the reference could well be to Armenion/Orminion (supra 678)); Strabo 9.5.15 (1293): Orminion, a polichne synoecised into Demetrias; Strabo 9.5.18. Unattested in the Classical period, but the fact that it existed in C4/C3e (supra) suggests that it existed prior to the death of Alexander. Unlocated (cf. Indzesiloglou (1994)). Undated by Barr.


Thaumakie (Θαυμακή) Hom. II. 2.716. RE v.A. 1331. Barr. AC.

2. Unidentified Settlements

Dimini Identified with Aixon by Barr., but see Bakhuizen (1996). Possibly the site of Iolkos (Adrimi-Sismani (1994)). Barr. C.

Goritsa Bakhuizen (1986), (1992). A major urban site of c.325–300, whose fortification wall encloses an area of 33 ha, its ancient name is unknown, but it may possibly have been the site of Methone (no. 454) (Helly (2001b)). Barr. C?

It is unknown what status these communities had. Some of them may possibly have been polesis e.g. Orminion seems to have been a polis in C4 when it had an Epidaurian theoerdokos (supra).

2.7 Perrhaibia

The toponym is Πέρραβία, ί (Thuc. 4.78.6; Theophr. De lapidibus fr. 2, Wimmer; Diod. 15.57.2 (r370/691)); the
corresponding ethnic is Περραβίδος (Hym. Hom. Ap. 218; Hecat. fr. 137); an undated inscription from Koroneia has Περραβίδος (IG vii 2858). The internal collective use of the ethnic is found abbreviated as ΠΠΕΡ, ΠΠΕΡ, ΠΠΕΡΑ on silver coins dating to 480–400 (drachmas, triobols, trihemiobols, obols, hemiobols on the Aiginetan standard) with types: obv. man restraining bull, or forepart of bull, or horseman, or head of Athena; rev. galloping horse, or forepart of horse, or Athena seated or running with spear, or horse’s head, or nymph (Head, HN² 304; Babelon, Traité ii.4 nos. 571–80; Liampi (1996) 109–10; Rogers (1932) nos. 437–39; SNG Cap. Thessaly 193–95). The ethnic is given in full as ΠΕΡΡΑΒΙΩΝ on C4f bronze coins: obv. laureate head of Apollo, or veiled head of Hera, or head of Zeus; rev. head of nymph, or naked hero, or Hera seated (Babelon, Traité ii.4 nos. 581–82; Rogers (1932) nos. 437–39; SNG Cap. Thessaly 196). The external collective use is found in Thuc. 4.78.6; Isoc. 5.21; Ps.-Skylax 65; IG ii 236b.11 (338/7) and in CID ii.9.4 (C4q.m., where it is coupled with a city-ethnic (Παρραβίων Ἐρημίτες); and the external individual use is found in CID ii 12.1.59, 66 (341/40), 31.78 (345/4), etc. In Amphiktyonic lists, individuals are listed under the heading Περραβίων (e.g. CID ii 43.45 and 44.8 (339/8)), sometimes with the addition of the city-ethnic of Phalanna (CID ii 96.6–7 (327/6) and 97.60 (327/6)).

The Perrhaiians are described as an ἔθνος at Hdt. 7.185.2, and as an ἔθνος they were a head of the Amphiktyonic League (Aeschin. 2.116; Theopomp. fr. 63; CID ii 43.45 and 44.8); they provided the Amphiktyonic League with a single hieromnemion who in C4 was sent by Phalanna (Lefèvre (1998) 85). Thuc. 4.78.6 describes the Perrhaiians as ἑπεκοοί of the Thessalians, and Arist. Pol. 1268b5–7, mentioning ancient warfare between the Perrhaiians and the Thessalians, suggests that the subjection was initially effected by force of arms. However, the Perrhaiians were not absorbed by the Thessalians, as is apparent not only from their membership of the Amphiktyonic League, but also by the facts (1) that Herodotos records the Perrhaiians individually in his list of medisars at 7.132.1; (2) that the Perrhaians struck coins in C5 and C4 (supra); (3) that in 375–350 the Perrhaiian poleis (infra) made a joint dedication to Apollo Pythis at Oloosson (SEG 29 546, on which see Helly (1979b)); (4) that they joined the Corinthian League of Philip II as a separate entity (IG ii 236b.11 (338/7)); (5) that a plurality of poleis is attested by Diod. 15.57.2 for 370/69, by which time Jason of Pherai had subjected them by a combination of force and negotiation. The Inventory below describes eleven Perrhaiian poleis (Azoros, Chyretiai, Doliche, Ereikinion, Gonnos, Malloia, Mondaia, Mylai, Oloosson, Phalanna and Pythoion). Nos. 1–4 also suggest that the Perrhaiians as such constituted a political unit (cf. Helly (1979b) 184–88 on no. 4).

Perrhaiia is bounded on the north by Makedonia and to the south-east and south-west by the tetraedes of Hestiaiotis and Pelasgiotis. In Perrhaiia there were, in addition to the poleis listed above, the following pre-Hellenistic settlements which cannot be shown to have been poleis:¹¹

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis

*Askryris (no toponym attested; the ethnic is Ἀσκυρίωτος: IG ix.2 521 (C3e)) Lucas (1991). Barr. C.

Condylos (Condylus) Livy 44.6.10. Helly (1973) 44–46. Barr. C.

Leimone (Λειμώνη) The earlier name was Ἡλώνη (cf. Hom. Il. 2.739), according to Strabo 9.5.9; Steph. Byz. 301.11 (πόλις Περραβική). Barr. AC.


It is unknown what status these settlements had. Gonnocondylus and Condylos were presumably second-order settlements of Gonnoi (Helly (1973) 46): “Gonnocondylus et Condylos . . . ne sont pas des cités, πόλεις, mais des villages. Les ruines qu’on y trouve, comme les inscriptions, montrent qu’ils étaient des κοιμαστές, dispersés sur le territoire de Gonnoi.” About the remaining two nothing is known.

2.8 Athamanía

The toponym is Ἀθαµανία, ἦ (Antig. Car. Mirabilia 148.1; BCH 45 (1921) 111.34 (230–220)); the corresponding ethnic is Ἀθαµάν ν (Heracl. Lemb. 53; IG ii 1956.115.156 (c.300); SEG 8

¹¹ Osyoinon (Strabo 7.7.9) may have belonged to Perrhaiia or to Hestiaiotis. Bodone: Steph. Byz. 190.20; Cineas (FGrHist 603) Fr. 22 as it is unknown in what context Cineas (c.355/277 according to Jacoby) discussed Bodone, and since this city has left no other literary, epigraphical or archaeological trace, it is better considered unhistorical, possibly a confusion with Homeric Dodone (infra); Helly (1973) 58; Dodone: Hom. II. 2.749; Steph. Byz. 246.9; has no historical existence; cf. Helly (1973) 58; Gonoussa (Steph. Byz. 211.4; schol. in Lycoph. Alex. 870, 906) is merely a corruption of Gonnoi (Helly (1973) 63). Kyphos: Hom. II. 2.748; Lycoph. Alex. 897; Strabo 9.5.20; Steph. Byz. 399.15; has no historical existence (Helly (1973) 51–71).
II. The Poleis

1. Thessalia

393. Amphanai (Amphanaius) Map 55. Lat. 39.20, long. 22.55. Size of territory: ?. Type: [A]. The toponym is Ἀµφαναῖος, α' (Hecat. fr. 3) or Ἀµφαναία, ἦ (Theopomp. fr. 54) or Ἀµφαναίοι, τό (Ps.-Skylax 64). A city-ethnic is attested only in late sources: IG i.x.1 227,5 (C2) has Ἀµφανάνος; Polemon 1 (1929) 126–27 no. 423 (C2s) has Ἀµφαναίες; Steph. Byz. 89,5 adds Ἀµφανάιος to the latter. In Ps.-Skylax 64, where poles is used in the urban sense, Amphanaiön is the first of nine toponyms listed between the heading πόλεις αἰδὲ and the addendum εἰσι δὲ καὶ ἄλλαι πόλεις Θετταλῶν.

The city remains unlocated, though the palaikastro of Sesklou, proposed by di Salvatore (1994) 115–16, seems the best candidate (infra). Several locations have been proposed for Amphanai. (1) Soros, above Alykes Volou, proposed by e.g. Stähl (1924a) 68; Indzesiloglou (1994) 46; and Triantophyllopoulou (2000), followed by Barr. Soros has commonly been identified with Amphanai, but recent excavations (AAA 7 (1974) 60–75) have made it more likely that Soros is to be identified with Pagasai; cf. Marzolf (1994b) 274 n. 10. (2) Damari or Velanidia, proposed by Bakhuizen (1987) 323 n. 2. (3) Palio-Alikes, proposed by Marzolf (1994a) 70 n. 6. (4) The palaikastro Sesklou, proposed by di Salvatore (1994) 115–16. It would be reasonable to begin by locating the harbour. The harbour must have been situated on the southern shore of the peninsula terminated by Cap Ankistri. The site most suitable for a harbour is found at the inlet of Chrysi Akti Panagia (formerly Kandir Aga). The urban centre proper must be sought in the hinterland at a place which satisfies the socio-economic needs of the community; the site at Palio Alikes does not fulfil this requirement, and the palaikastro Sesklou is a preferable site within reasonable distance of the proposed location of the harbour.

Hekataios may have described Amphanai as a Dorian city (FGrHist 1 fr. 3 = Steph. Byz. 89,4–5), but presumably in reference to the Heroic Age (cf. Jacoby, comm. ad loc; cf. however Helly (2001a), dating it to the early first millennium). Ps.-Skylax 64 puts it in Thessalia (Pelasgiota; cf. infra on Pagasai). Philip II of Makedon presumably handed over Amphanai (with Pagasai) to the Magnesians (see the entry for Pagasai).

394. Argoussa (Argoussios) Map 55. Lat. 39.40, long. 22.20. Size of territory: 2. Type: B. The toponym is Ἀργοσσα,
Ἀτρακία (Hom. Il. 2.738), later Ἀργούσσα (Strabo 9.5.19: Ἀργούσσα, ἦ τιν Ἀργούσσα); Steph. Byz. 113.19 (followed by Barr.) mistakenly gives Ἀργούσα, presumably by confusion with the Euboian Argoura mentioned at 114.1 (Knoepfler 1981) 315–16). The city-ethnic is Ἀργούσσιος (IG ix 2.1.31.103; cf. SEG 33 447 (C3)).

No Archaic or Classical source calls Argoussa a polis, but it deserves inclusion in this Inventory as a probable polis on account of the C5f inscription published in ArchEph (1934–35) 140–45 (cf. Helly (1979a)): it describes itself as a θεσθύμος of the damos (l. 1), refers to a local board of tagoi (ll. 7–8) and to Athena Polias (ll. 11–12). Cf. Helly (1995) 30–31.

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found in the abbreviated legends (APIT) of C3 coins (Franke 1955).

The external individual use is found in IG ix 2.1.31.103 (cf. SEG 33 447), a C3l grant of politeia by the Aitolians to a citizen of Argoussa.

Argoussa was situated in the tetrα of Pelasgiotis (Strabo 9.5.19). At the site are remains of a C5–C4 isodomic circuit wall with square towers; the agora has been located, and temples identified (AA (1955) 191–219, (1956) 166–79, (1957) 37–51, (1959) 74–76). The ceramic material covers C7 to the third century AD (Hanschmann 1981) 120. In addition to Athena Polias, Hellenistic dedications attest to cults of Apollo Pythios and Artemis (Helly (1979a) 250).

395. Atrax (Atragios, Atrakios) Map 55. Lat. 39.35; long. 22.10. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Ἀτραξ, -αγος (SEG 34 560.3 (c.450); IG iv 617.7 (316–293)) or ἀσκος (Strabo 9.5.20; Steph. Byz. 143.5–10; Steph. Byz. 143.5 also has Ἀτρακία. The Epigraphical catalogue of theodokoi, IG iv 2.1 94.b.3 (360/59), has the unique nominative form Ἀδρακος (cf. Perlman (2000) 178, E.1 b.3). The city-ethnic is Ἀτράγιον (C4f coins (infra); CID 11 100.11.5 (325); Tod 196.24 (330–326)); Ἀτράκιος (cf. Suda s.v. Κιλκίς) and Ἀτραξ are given as variant forms by Steph. Byz. 143.7.

Atrax is called a polis in the political sense in a funerary epigram of c.450 (SEG 34 560). The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C4f coins (infra), the external collective use in Tod 196.24 (330–326), and the external individual use in CID 11 100.11.5 (325).

Atrax was a Thessalian community (Marcadé, Signatures 1 no. 35 (C4m)), situated in the tetrα of Pelasgiotis (Steph. Byz. 143.5). Prior to the expansion of the Thessalians, the area was Perrhaiabian (Strabo 9.5.19–20). To the north its territory was bounded by that of Phalanna, and to the north-east by that of Argoussa; and to the south-east by Kranion.

A board of tagoi is attested by SEG 45 553 (C6–C5) (Helly (1995) 31–32, 148). SEG 27 184 (C4e) lists ἄρχοντες (cf. SEG 35 494). During the crisis of 330–326 Atrax received 10,000 midimnoi of grain from Kyrene (Tod 196.24).

A survey by the Institut Courby and the ephorate of Larisa in 1977 produced evidence of public architecture, all presumably of C4 and Hellenistic times, including remains of sanctuaries of unidentified divinities (cf. infra on cults) as well as remains of a theatre. In C5 the acropolis and the slope of the hill were enclosed by a polygonal circuit, which was rearranged in C4m in connection with new construction work. C4 saw reconstruction on the summit of the acropolis: a quadrangular main tower and strengthening by a new wall with five towers, one of them including a fortified gate. The eastern part of the wall on the slope was reinforced by serratation dated to C4m on account of its similarity with constructions at Halos (Reinders (1988) 54). The lower city proper was enclosed by a C4 isodomic wall with quadrangular towers. The wall ran for 3 km and enclosed an area of c.64 ha. The main gate was to the north-west above the level of the plain, and access was provided by a long ramp supported by a polygonal retaining wall.

Attested cults include those of Apollo Hebdomaios (SEG 33 454 (C4–C3)), Athena Agoria (SEG 27 184 (C5)), Themis Agoria (SEG 27 183 (C5)), Zeus Kataibates (ArchDelt 48 (1993) Chron. 255 no. 27 (C4); SEG 47 674), Zeus Thaulios (SEG 32 569 (450–425)), Zeus Homoloios (SEG 35 493 (C5)) and Zeus Tritiodios (SEG 34 494 (C.300)).

IG iv 2.1 94b.3 (360/59) lists a man of Atrax as theodoredos of Epidauros (Perlman (2000) 178). IG iv 617.7 (316–293) records a monetary donation by Atrax “to the βευτοποι sent out from Argos to announce the celebration of the Nemean Games and the Heraia” (Perlman (2000) 74,127–29). Cf. CID 11 100.11.5ff (325), presumably a collective donation towards the rebuilding of the temple at Delphi.

Atrax struck coins in both silver and bronze from C4f. (1) Silver (triobols and obols on the Aiginetan standard). Types: obv. head of nymph r i; rev. galloping horse; legend: ATRAION; or obv. prancing horse; rev. monogram in wreath of laurels. (2) Bronze: obv. bearded head (of Atrax?), or laureate Apollo, or prancing horseman, or head of nymph; rev. drinking cup, or butting bull, or free horse standing or feeding, or horseman in chlamys; legends: ATRA, ATRAION, ATRAION (Head, HH 2 292; Babelon, Traité ii.4 nos. 736–40; Rogers (1932) nos. 159–68; SNG Cop. Thessaly 27–31).

396. Gomphoi (Gompeheus) Map 55. Lat. 39.25; long. 21.40. Size of territory: 2. Type: B (classified as a fort/tower
by Barr., but see infra). The toponym is Γόνφοι, οί (IG iv 617.10 (316–293)) and Γόμφοι (BCH 45 (1921) iii.32 (230–220); App. B Civ. 2.10.64); the city-ethnic is Γόμφευς (C4m coins, infra) or Γομφίτης (C4l coins, infra)). According to Steph. Byz. 666.7, the name was changed to Φιλιππος, and this is borne out by C4m coins inscribed ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΠΟΛΙΤΩΝ (infra); Livy 39.25 has Philippopolis, presumably a reference to Gomphoi.

No Archaic or Classical source calls Gomphoi a polis, but it may be included here on account of its C4 coins and its monetary donation “to the θεωροί sent out from Argos to announce the celebration of the Nemean Games and the Heraia” (IG iv 617.10 (C4l); cf. Perliman (2000) 74.12–29); in addition, the use of -πολίτης for the city-ethnic of the renamed community may be significant. Later sources variously describe it as a polis (IG ix.2 287 (C1); Plut. Caes. 41.7; App. B Civ. 2.10.64), as a polichne (Cass. Dio 41.51.4) and as a phorourion (Strabo 9.5.17). The only attested Classical usage of the city-ethnic is the internal collective use found on C4 coins (infra).

Gomphoi was situated in Thessalia (Plut. Caes. 41.7), more specifically in Hestiaiotis (Strabo 9.5.17). It is located at Episkopi (Turkish Rapsita), about 5 km north-east of Mouzaki and 10 km south-west of Trikala, on the eastern side of Mt. Kerketion, close to the border with Epeiros (Caes. B Civ. 3.80), i.e. via Athamania. The remains at the site, which include foundations of public buildings, fortifications and habitation, are essentially of Roman date.

Gomphoi struck coins of silver and bronze from C4m onwards. (1) Silver, C4m. Denominations: didrachm and drachm on the Aiginetan standard. Types: obv. head of Hera facing; rev. Zeus Akraios; legend: ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΠΟΛΙΤΩΝ. (2) Bronze, C4s–C3e: obv. head of Hera, or head of Apollo; rev. Zeus seated; legend: ΓΟΜΦ or ΓΟΜΦΕΩΝ or ΓΟΜΦΙΤΟΥΝ (Head, HN2 295; Babelon, Traité ii.4 nos. 531–37; Rogers (1932) no. 214; Martin (1985) 39, 56; SNG Cop. Thessaly 50).

397. Gyrton, Gyrtone (Gyrtonios) Map 55. Lat. 39.50, long. 22.35. Size of territory: 2. Type: [A]. The toponym is Γύρτωνιος in Hom. II. 2.738 (cf. Steph. Byz. 215.20) but otherwise Γύρτων, ἡ (IG iv 2.194b.4 (360/59); Ephor. fr. 93; Strabo 9.5.19). The city-ethnic is Γύρτωνιος (Thuc. 2.22.3; IG i 92.6 (c.416); CID ii 31.72 (345/4)), or Κύρτωνιος (CID ii 102.11.B.20 (324/3), 119 (C4l)).

Gyrton is listed as a polis in the political sense at Thuc. 2.22.3; it is called ἄρτων in a mythological context in Orphica Argonautika 145. The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C4 coins (infra); the external collective use is found in Thuc. 2.22.3; the external individual use is found in e.g. IG i 92 (c.416) and CID ii 31.72 (345/4), 85 (344/3).

The mythological people Phlegyai were associated with Gyrton (Pherecydes (FGrHist 3) fr. 41e), and Strabo describes it as both Perrhaibian and Magnesian (71.1.14, 9.5.19; cf. Steph. Byz. 215.20); however, by the Classical period Gyrton was definitely a Thessalian community (Thuc. 2.22.2–3; IG i 92 (c.416)) in the tetras of Pelasgiotis.

A citizen of Gyrton was awarded hereditary proxenia by Athens in c.416 (IG i 92). In 360/59, a citizen of Gyrton served as Epidurian theorodokos (IG iv.1.94b.4). For citizens of Gyrton serving the Amphiktyonic League as naopoioi, see CID ii 31.72 (345/4), 85 (344/3), 74.1.67 (337/6), 75.11.41 (336), 76.11.16 (335), 79A.110 (334/3), 102.11.20 (324/3). A Gyrtonian cavalry contingent and its commanders (ἀρχηγοί) are mentioned at Thuc. 2.22.2–3.

Both the acropolis and the lower city were fortified, possibly already in the Archaic period, and both fortifications were built of slate (Stählin (1924a) 88–89 (the site is not identified as Gyrton here)). A cult of Zeus may be inferred from C4s coin types (infra).

Gyrton struck coins of silver and bronze in C4. (1) Silver (Aiginetan standard): Head, HN2 295 and Babelon, Traité ii.4 no. 741 describe a C4f triobol: obv. head of nymph facing; rev. horse feeding; legend: ΓΥΡΤΩΝΙΩΝ. (2) Bronze, C4s: obv. youthful Gyrton beside horse’s head, or Apollo, or Zeus laureate; rev. nymph Gyrtona, or bridled horse; legends: ΓΥΡΤΩΝΙΩΝ, ΓΥΡΤΩΝΙΩΝ or ΓΥΡΤΩΝΙΩΝ (Head, HN2 295; Babelon, Traité ii.4 nos. 741–44; Rogers (1932) nos. 227–37; Moustaka (1983) 101, 112, 119 and 125; SNG Cop. Thessaly 55–61).

398. Kierion (Kierieus) Map 52. Lat. 39.20, long. 22.05. Size of territory: 2. Type: [A]. The toponym is Κίερος, τό (IG iv 617.8 (316–293)); at Ps.-Skylax 64, Müller (GGM 1) prints Κιέρος (an emendation from ίερος); Strabo 9.5.14 has Κίερος; I.Thessalie 15.2 (C2e) has Κιάριος. Tradition claims that before the arrival of the Thessalians the city was called Αργος, (Steph. Byz. 123.22). The city-ethnic is Κιερεύς (Head, HN2 292–93 (c.400–344)), or Κιάριος (I.Thessalie 14 (C3–C2)).

In Ps.-Skylax 64, where polis is used in the urban sense, Kierion is one of nine toponyms listed between the heading πόλεις αἰδε and the addendum εἰς δὲ καὶ ἄλλαι σάλευς Θεταλών; it is also called a polis in, e.g., I.Thessalie 15.13 (C2e). [Δαμάντιος is found in IG ix.2 269 (C4?)]. The internal and collective use of the city-ethnic is found on coins
Kieron struck silver coins on the Aiginetan standard from c.400. Denominations: didrachms, triobols, trichemisbols, obols and hemiobols. Types: obv. head of Zeus, or Arne, or Poseidon, or Apollo, or horse feeding or galloping; rev. youthful male god (Asklepios?) seated on a throne or rock, or nymph Arne kneeling, or head of Arne, or naked hero warrior fighting; legend: ΚΙ, ΚΙΕ, ΚΙΕΠΙΕ, ΚΙΕΠΙΑΙΟΝ, ΚΙΕΠΙΕΙΩΝ. Bronze coinage likewise begins c.400. Obv. head of Poseidon, or head of Zeus laureate, or head of Apollo; rev. Arne kneeling, or bridled horse prancing, or naked Zeus standing holding eagle; legends: ΚΙΕ, ΚΙΕΠ, ΚΙΕΠΙΕ, ΚΙΕΠΙΕΙΩΝ, ΚΙΕΠΙΕΙΩΝ. Head, ΗΝ2 292–93; Babelon, Traité ii.4 nos. 507–18; SNG Cop. Thessaly 32–37; Rogers (1932) nos. 173–78. In addition to these divinities there is evidence of cults of Artemis (IG ii.2 271 (C5)), Hekales (I.Thessalie 15 (C2e)), and Poseidon Kouerios (I.Thessalie 20 (C3–C2)).

399. *Kondaia* (Kondaiaios) Map 55. Lat. 39.50, long. 22.25, but see infra. Size of territory: C. Type: C (classified as a fort/tower by Barr., but see infra). A toponym is not attested, but *Κονδαία* may be assumed (cf. infra Kondaia); it has been proposed to emend ΜS Κονδαίας at Hdt. 5.63.3 to Κονδαίας (cf. Helly (1995) 103), but the city-ethnic found in Hellenistic sources is Κονδαιεύς (Gonnii 11 no. 3.3 (C3f)).

The location is uncertain, but the community should probably be located at the ancient site at Orthe Magoula, near the modern village of Phalaneri Larisis (Helly (1999)); Barr. locates it at Bakrina. Both locations put it in the tetras of Pelasgiotis.

At 5.63.3 Herodotos states that the Θεσσαλοί . . . ἀπέστειραν κοινὴ γνώμη χρεώμενοι χιλινὸν τε ἵππον καὶ τὸν βασιλέα σφέτερον Κνῆνα ἀνάφαρα Κονδαίας to support the Peisistratidai of Athens. Κονδαίας is most probably proposed to restore Κονδαίος, to be interpreted as the city-ethnic of Kondaia (Helly (1995) 103). Since there is no other evidence for the political status of Kondaia in the Archaic (or Classical) period, the inclusion of Kondaia in this Inventory depends upon acceptance of this emendation, which would provide an attestation of the external individual use of the city-ethnic; such a usage is often indicative that the site to whose toponym the ethnic is related was a polis (Hansen (1996) 182–87). In C3 Kondaia was undoubtedly a polis: Gonnii 11 no. 3 is a Cf3 grant of proxeny by Gonnioi to Θέαρχος Ἐπάρχου Κονδαιεύς.

At the site identified with Kondaia (supra) ancient architectural elements have been found, as well as a temple foundation (Helly (1977)).

400. Kranon (Kranonios) Map 55. Lat. 39.30, long. 22.20. Size of territory: 3. Type: A. The toponym is Κράννων -ονος, Η (Arist.) Mir. ause. 842; Θeopolomp. fr. 267a), Κράννων (Hecat. fr. 133), Κράννων (Hdnl. 111.261.17) or Κράννους (Kineas (FGrHist 603) fr. 1). The city-ethnic is Κραν(ω)νούς (Head, ΗΝ2 293–94 (C5–C4); SEG 23 421 (C4)), Κραννώνιος (Hdt. 6.127; Head, ΗΝ2 293–94), or Κραννώνιος (Diog. Laer. 2.25). Tradition claims that before the arrival of the Thessalians the city was called Εφύρα or Εφύρα (Kineas (FGrHist 603) fr. 1) or Εψυρος (Apolodoros (FGrHist 224) fr. 179).

Kranon is listed as a polis in the political sense at Thuc. 2.22.3; in Ps.-Skylax 64, where polis is used in the urban sense, Kranon is one of nine toponyms listed between the heading πόλεις αἰδε and the addendum εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλαι πόλεις Θεσσαλίων. Cf. also [Arist.] Mir. ause. 842; Dio. 15.61.5 (1369); Πολύγαρσε found in Polyain. 2.34 (possibly rC4) (cf. RE xii. 1583); and at Hdt. 6.126, 127, πάτηρ is used about Kranon. The earliest epigraphical reference to a πόλις *Κραννώνιον* is in a C3s honorific decree (IG ix.2 458). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins (Head, ΗΝ2 293–94 (C5–C4)) and in the decree IG ix.2 458 (C38); externally it is attested in Thuc. 2.22.3; Xen. Hell. 4.3.3; and CID 11 7B.2 (c.357). The external and individual use is found, e.g., at Hdt. 6.127.4, in SEG 23 421 (C4) and in CID 11 24.1.14 (c.336–332). Kranon is implicitly described as patre (= patris) in Hdt. 6.127.1–4.

Kranon was situated in Thessalia (Hdt. 6.127.4; Thuc. 2.22.3), and more precisely in the tetras of Pelasgiotis (Simon. 127, Page; Hecat. fr. 133; cf. Helly (1995) 166). The territory is called πεδίον Κραννώνιον in Callim. Ηymn 4.138. To the north, it was bounded by the territory of Larisa, to the west by that of Atrax, to the east by that of Skotoussa, while to the south the crest line of the Revenia hills separated it...
from the Enipeus valley (Decourt (1990) fig. 27).

In C6 the most prominent family in the political life of the city was the Skopadai (RE iiiA. 567–69; Helly (1995) 107–12). Cavalry and an anonymous cavalry commander are attested in Thuc. 2.22.3, when Krannon was allied with Athens alongside other Thessalian cities. Xen. Hell. 4.3.3 mentions Krannon among the allies of the Boiotians, again alongside other Thessalian cities. If the story about Deinias in Polyaen. 2.34 refers to C4 (cf. RE xi. 1583; Berve (1967) 294–95), the city experienced a tyranny in this period. (The same source refers to Krannonian farming out of ἀρην θελέως and ἤ τοῦ αὐτοῦ δεκάτη.) In 369, Krannon joined Alexander II of Makedon, who had been called in by the Aleuadae of Larisa in their struggle against Alexander of Pherai, and the city was presumably garrisoned by the Makedonian king (Diod. 15.61.5); the garrison was probably removed, as was a similar one at Larisa, when Pelopidas arrived at the head of a Boiotian army later in the year (Diod. 15.67.4).

SEG 23 421 is probably a C4 grant of proserenia by Pherai to two citizens of Krannon. Krauxidas of Krannon was victorious in the horse-race at Olympia in 648 (Paus. 5.8.8; Olympiakos 53).

At an unknown date Krannon became a walled and fortified city, but almost nothing is known about the acropolis and the urban centre, except for a possible temple of Athena Polias on the acropolis (Arvanitopoulos (1922–24)).

The main cults of the Krannonians seem to be those of Athena (IG ii 2 640 (C2); cf. Arvanitopoulos (1922–24) 37), Asklepios (ArchDelt 43 B: 280 (C3); IG ix 2 462 (C2)) and Apollo (Prounios: Habicht (1981) (c.200); Tempeitas: Prakt (1915) 17 (C3))). Other cults: Ennodia (LIMC ii 882 (C4)), Poseidon (Head, SN 293–94 (C4)) and Zeus (Megas: ArchDelt 43 B: 280 (C3); Notios: ArchDelt 16 B: 182 (C4)).

Kranon struck silver coins in C5 and bronze coins in C4. (1) Silver, 480–400. Denominations: drachms, tetradrachms, triobols, obols and hemiobols on the Aginetan standard. Types: obv. naked man subduing a bull, or bull’s head, or bull’s hoof; rev. forepart of galloping horse and trident in incuse square, or horse’s head; legend: ΚΠΑ or ΚΡΑΝΟ or ΚΡΑΝΟ. For similarities between these coins and contemporary coins of Larisa, the Perhiaians, Pharkadon, Trikka, Pherai and Skotoussa, see Kraay (1976) 114–16 and Martin (1985) 36–37. (2) Bronze, c.400–344, or later. Obv. Poseidon laureate, or Thessalian horseman; rev. Thessalian horseman, or rushing bull, or hydra on wheel; legend: ΚΠΑ, ΚΡΑΝΟ, ΚΡΑΝΟΝΩΝ, ΚΡΑΝΟΥΙΩΝ (Head, SN 293–94; Babelon, Traité ii.1 nos. 1425–26, ii.4 nos. 634–40; Rogers (1932) 179–204; Diampi (1996) 101, 111–12; SNG Cop. Thessaly 38–44).

401. Larisa (Larisis) Map 55. Lat. 39.40, long. 22.25. Size of territory: 3. Type: A. The toponym is Λάρισα(σ)α, η (Bacchyl. 16.8, Maehler; Thuc. 4.78.2; Xen. Hell. 6.4.31; Ps.-Skyrax 64; IG iv 2 194 b.3 (360/59); SEG 31 585 (C4)). The city-ethnic is Λαρισα(σ)αιος (Thuc. 2.22.3; Xen. Hell. 2.3.4; Tod 196.8 (330–324); IG ix 2.518.2 (undated); Diod. 14.19.8). Some early coins are inscribed ΛΑΡΙΣΑΕΟΝ as if from Λαρισα(σ)αιος (Head, SN 298; Babelon, Traité ii.1 no. 1412). The Ionic form is Λαρισα(σ)αιος (Hdt. 9.1).

Larisa is implicitly called a polis in the political sense in Thuc. 2.22.3; in Pl. Meno 70 B, polis is used in the urban sense, and in Ps.-Skyrax 64, where polis is again used in the urban sense, Λάρισα(σ)α is the second toponym listed between the heading πόλεις αὐτῶς and the addendum ἐν θέμεν ἐν καὶ ἀλλαὶ πόλεις Θεταλων. Polites is found in Pl. Meno 70 B; akropo- lis is found in Antiochos (FGrHist 29) fr. 2; asty is found in Theophr. Caus. pl. 5.14.3; and ἅστυ νήσιον appears as epikleis of the goddess Enodia in IG ix 2.574 of 450–425; patris is found in SEG 31 585 (C4) (cf. CEG ii 693).

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C5B coins (infra); the external collective use is found in Thuc. 2.22.3; Xen. Hell. 4.3.3; CID ii 68.11.14 (338–330); Tod 196.8 (330–324); and the external individual use in Hdt. 9.1, 9.58.1; CID ii 4.1.44 (360); SEG 26 327 (c.350); IG vii 414.14 (C4–5); IG ii 2 353.11 (329/8).

Larisa was a Thessalian community (F.Delphes ii 11.4 378 (342/1)) and belonged to the tetras of Pelsegiotis (schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.40). The name of the territory was η Λαρισα(σ)αιο (Theopomp. fr. 34; on this fragment, see Martin (1982)); it is termed χώρα in Theophr. Caus. pl. 5.14.2. Theopomp. fr. 34 mentions a site called Χαλκαί in the territory; it is probably to be located at Nikaia Larisis, a site with Classical material (D. Kontogiannis (1992) 386). Apollo Leschaioi was worshipped in the territory (IG ix 2.1027 (C3)). On the territory, see further Helly (1984).

The resemblance of the C5 coinage of the Perhiaians (see entry for Olouson) to that of Larisa (see infra) has been taken to indicate that Larisa may have brought the Perhiaians into dependence upon itself (Martin (1985) 72–73).

Early in the Peloponnesian War, Larisaiian cavalry assisted the Athenians (Thuc. 2.22.3) alongside other Thessalian poleis which were allied to Athens. In the 390s, Larisa, alongside other Thessalian poleis, was allied to Boiotia (Xen. Hell.
4.3.3). In 404, forces from Larisa and other unspecified Thessalian polities were defeated by Lykophron I of Pherai, who struggled for pan-Thessalian hegemony (Xen. Hell. 2.3.4). The conflict continued into the 390s, when, during the Corinthian War, Medeios of Larisa was supported by the anti-Spartan alliance (Diod. 14.82.5 (395)) and captured Pharsalos. In 369, the Aleuadai of Larisa called in the Makedonian king Alexander II to support them in their struggle with Alexander of Pherai; the king, however, only used the city by force and placed a garrison on the acropolis (Diod. 15.61.3–5), a garrison which was withdrawn at the arrival of Theban troops under Pelopidas (Diod. 15.67.4 (369/8)). In 357/6, the Aleuadai again called upon the king of Makedon, Philip II, who responded favourably and thus started his interference in Greek politics (Diod. 16.14.2).

During the crisis of 330–324, Larisa received 50,000 medimnoi of grain from Kyrene (Tod 196.8). A man from Larisa is listed in an Athenian catalogue of mercenaries (IG ii² 1156.1.61–63 (c.300)).

A refugee is attested in 399 by Arist. Pol. 1311b17; as tagos of Thessalia, Polyphron II of Pherai (370/69) had many citizens of Larisa sent into exile (Xen. Hell. 6.4.34). Reception of envoys, sent by Aegialos of Sparta during his march home from Asia Minor in 394, is recorded in Plut. Ages. 16; the Larisaian, allied to Sparta’s enemies, arrested these envoys, who were released only after a truce had been negotiated. Citizens of Larisa were appointed proxenoi by Delphi in 342/1 (F.Delphes iii.4 378) and 333/2 (F.Delphes iii.1 401), by Lamia in Cal (IG ix.2.60), and by Gonnoi in Cal/Cse (Gonnoi 111); but note that Aristonous of Larisa (for whom see Thuc. 2.22.3) was, presumably, appointed proxenoi by Athens c.430 (IG i² 55 with Walbank (1978) 158–66) and that IG ii² 39.13 (379/8) has been restored [Aap]σα[λος], which, if accepted, is an Athenian grant of proxeny to four citizens of Larisa.

A mass grant of citizenship by Larisa seems to be implied by Arist. Pol. 1275b29ff (Helly 1984) 229). Residence of free non-citizens is implied by Pl. Meno 70B. Grants of citizenship to citizens of Larisa are attested by F.Delphes iii.4 378 (342/1); IG i² 558 (c.305/2), and IG ix.2.60 (Cal) (Lamia). IG iv.1 194.5 (360–359) lists a citizen of Larisa as theorodoros of Epidaurus. A monetary donation by Larisa to “theoroi sent out from Argos to announce the celebration of the Nemese Games and the Heraia” is recorded by IG iv 617.6 (316–293); Perlman (2000) 74–75, 127–29.

According to Arist. Pol. 1305a22–30 and 1306b20–30, Larisa was an oligarchy; the most powerful family was that of the Aleuadai (RE i.2. 1372–74; Helly (1995) 112–24), who dominated Larisaian, and Thessalian, politics for long periods. A board of demiotropoi is implied by Arist. Pol. 1275b29; polito-phylakes are mentioned at Pol. 1305a29; they were elected by the assembly (ibid.). An ἄρχον μεσαίοις in, possibly, C4m (cf. Dem. 18.48; but see Martin (1985) 255–60) is mentioned at Pol. 1306a28–30. A stasis is attested for Cs7 (Xen. An. 1.1.10; RE xii. 850); one faction in this stasis may have sought the support of Archelaos of Makedon: Thrasymachos fr. 2, DK, obviously suggests Makedonian interference at Larisa (Westlake (1935) 51f; Hammond and Griffith (1979) 140–41; Martin (1985) 89). Further outbreaks of stasis are attested in 370/69 (Xen. Hell. 6.4.34) and c.344/3 (Arist. Pol. 1306a26–30; Callim. fr. 588, Pfeiffer; cf. Gehrke, Stasis 189–97).

At Pol. 1331a30ff, Aristotle describes as Thessalian the institution of the eleutheria agora: that is, an agora from which artisans and traders were banned and to which they could have access only if invited by the magistrates. An eleutheria agora may have been identified at Larisa, south of the acropolis (Tziaphalias (1994b) 158–59, 169–70, 173–74, cf. plan 155). A “commercial agora” was probably located to the west on the bank of the river Peneios (Tziaphalias (1994b) 159, plan 155). A C4 amphora stamp (ΘΑ΢ΙΘΩΝ) indicates trade (SEG 35 635).

A temple of Athena on the acropolis is mentioned by Antiochos (FGrHist 29) fr. 2; in it was the grave of the mythical founder of the city, Akrisios (cf. schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.40; Paus. 2.16.2); on the acropolis are traces of a Classical road and remains of buildings constructed in mudbrick (Tziaphalias (1994b) 157–58); there are no remains of a separate fortification of the acropolis, but at 15.61.4 (1369/8) Diodorus mentions a siege of the acropolis which suggests that it was fortified.

The teichos is mentioned by Diod. 15.61.4 (1369). The undated circuit wall runs for some 4,000 m, but is not known for its entire course, and accordingly the area enclosed by it cannot be estimated. The wall is constructed in mudbrick on a stone socle (Tziaphalias (1994b) 177–78, plan 155). Since the ancient city is overlaid by the modern, not many remains are visible, and it cannot be ascertained whether it was built on a grid plan (ibid. 158). In the city are remains of what was probably a C4 Doric temple of Apollo Kerdoios; here public documents were displayed (ibid. 169–70). The cemeteries span the period from C5 onwards (ibid. 177–78).

Attested cults include those of Athena Polias (IG ix.2 592 (C3), but cf. Antiochos (FGrHist 29) fr. 2), Apollo Leschasios (supra), Dionysos Karpios (SEG 35 590 (450–425)), Enodia Wastika (IG ix.2 575 (450–425)), Gaia (SEG 29 533 (C4)),
Three citizens of Larisa achieved Olympic victories: Echekratidas in 464 (Olympionikai 258), Lykos in 452 (Olympionikai 281) and Krokinas in 404 and 396 (Olympionikai 351, 367a). In 366–338, Epikrates of Larisa won the pentathlon for ageneioi at the Amphiparaia at Oropos (IG vii 414.14); Lykormas was victorious at the Pythian Games in 310 (Paus. 10.7.8).

Several citizens of Larisa served the Amphiktyonic League as naopoioi (CID ii 10A.1.7 (357/6); 31.73, 96 (345/4); 32.3 (341/40), etc.). After the Third Sacred War, the Larisaions rented one of the houses confiscated from exiled pro-Phokian Delphians (CID ii 68.1.13 and 11.14 (338–330)).

Larisa was the first Thessalian polis to strike coins. The earliest silver issues of drachms, triobols, trihemibols and obols antedate the Persian War and are on the Persian standard (Lavva 2001). Types: obv: horse biting its foreleg, or head of Jason, or head of nymph, or bull's head, or horseman with two spears; rev: sandal of Jason (sometimes with double axe above) in incuse square, or horse's head in incuse square, or bearded man seated in incuse square; legends: ΛΑ, ΛΑΠΙ, ΛΑΠΙΣΑ, ΛΑΠΙΣΑΙ, ΛΑΠΙΣΑΙΟΝ, ΛΑΠΙΣΑΙΕΩΝ (Head, HN² 298; Babelon, Traité ii.1 nos. 1109–18, ii.4 nos. 367–410; SNG Cop. Thessaly 136–46, Suppl. 245–47; Rogers (1932) 93–100; Liampi (1996) 101–110–11).

402. Methylion (Methylious) Map 55. Unlocated, but see infra. Type: B. The toponym is Μεθύλιον, τό (BCH 45 (1921) iii.29 (230–220)). The city-ethnic is Μεθυλεύς (C5–C4 coins (infra)).

No Archaic or Classical source calls Methylion a polis, but it merits inclusion in this Inventory because (1) it minted coins in C5–C4 (infra); (2) a man of Methylion served as Delphic theorodokos in 230–220 (BCH 45 (1921) iii.29); (3) some C3 tiles are stamped with the collective city-ethnic (infra); cf. also Biesantz (1965) 140 n. 235 for an—undated—inscription: Μεθυλεύων δημόσιον (C3). The only Classical source attesting to the existence and status of Methylion is its C5–C4m coinage.

Methylion was situated in Thessalia (Steph. Byz. 440.16 s.v. Μεθυλιόν, where the passage καὶ ἐτέρα πόλις Θεσσαλίας, ὡς Φελών possibly refers to Methylion), more precisely in Thessaliotis (Heyman (1970); Helly (1995) 165, 229–30). It is probably to be located at the village of Myrina near Prodromos Karditsis, whence come C3 tiles stamped Μεθυλεύων (information kindly provided by C. Indzesiloglou). A cult of Athena is presumably indicated by the coin types depicting this goddess (Heyman (1970) nos. 6–7).

Methylion struck coins in silver and bronze in C4; a drachm on the Aiginetan standard is presumably C5. It shows obv: forepart of horse; rev: grain (ΜΕΘΥ); for similarities between this coin and coins of Skotoussa and coins struck in the name of “the Thessalians” (possibly by Pherai), see Kraay (1976) 116 and Martin (1985) 37–38. C4 obols: obv: male head, or Nike; rev: female head, or a warrior, or Athena; legend: ΜΕΘΥ, ΜΕΘΥΑΙΕΩΝ. Bronzes: obv: young male head, or head of nymph; rev: Nike, or horseman with spear; legend: ΜΕΘΥΛΕΩΝ (Head, HN² 301–2; Babelon, Traité ii.4 nos. 505–7; Heyman (1970)).

403. Metropolis (Matropolitias) Map 55. Lat. 39.20, long. 21.50. Size of territory: 2. Type: [A]. The toponym is
Mατρόπολις, η’ (BCH 45 (1921) iii.30 (230–220)); the
city-ethnic is Ματροπολίταις (CID ii 5.11.32 (358)) or
Μητροπολίτης (C4f coins, infra).

Metropolis is listed as a polis in the political sense under
the heading ταίδες τάμων ἡμικαὶ in CID ii 5.11.25–26, 32–33 (358). The internal collective use of the city-ethnic
is found on C4f coins (infra) and the external collective use in
CID ii 5.11.32–33 (358).

According to Strabo 9.5.17, Metropolis was founded by a
synoecism (συνώμοστρό) of τριῶν . . . πολιῶν ἀδήμων.
The terminus ante quem for this synoecism is 358, the year in
which the city is mentioned in the naopic accounts in
Delphi (CID ii 5.11.32–33; Diod. 15.30.5 (737) does not refer
to Thessalian Metropolis; cf. Stylianou (1998) 280). The cir-
cular fortifications, running for 5 km, are located in the plain and
encompass an isolated hill; the masonry style of the cir-
cuit is isodomic with moat). The earliest coins to Thessalian Metropolis; cf. Stylianou (1998) 280). The cir-
cular fortifications, running for 5 km, are located in the plain and
encompass an isolated hill; the masonry style of the circuit
(isodomic with moat) points to a date in C4f for its con-
struction (C. Indzesiloglou, pers. comm.). The earliest coins
of the city are likewise dated to C4f (infra). Among the com-
munities originally participating in the synoecism were
Onthyrion (Strabo 9.5.17) and probably Polichnai (cf. Helly
in BCH 94 (1970) 187), but the city expanded after the
foundation (Strabo 9.5.17: ἑστερὸν δὲ καὶ πλείους
προσελήφθαι μὲν). Remains are reported in ArchDelt

Metropolis was a Thessalian community (CID ii 5.11.32–33)
situated in Hestiaiotis (Strabo 9.5.17). To the north the neigh-
bours were Ithome, which was eventually absorbed by Metropolis (Strabo 9.5.17), Gomphoi and Pelinna; to the east were Methyliion and Kieron; to the south was Onthyrion, which was also absorbed by Metropolis (supra); to the west was the Pindos range.

The entry Ματροπολίταις Θεσσαλῶν in CID ii 5.11.32–33
(358) presumably indicates membership of the Thessalian
Confederacy. A grant of C3l proxeny, etc. to a citizen of
Kranon is published by Habicht in Klio 52 (1970) 143; the
inscription also testifies to a system of phylai and boards of
magistrates. A cult of Aphrodite, the patron divinity, is
attested by coins (no. (1) infra) and Strabo 9.5.17 (citing
Callim. fr. 200a, Pfeiffer); public documents were displayed at
the temple of Aphrodite (cf. PECS 576); Apollo is likewise
attested by coins, and a C6s suburban temple dedicated to
Apollo Hekatombios has been excavated by C. Indzesiloglou.

A collective donation of 120 dr. towards the rebuilding of
the temple at Delphi is recorded in CID ii 5.11.32–33 (358); IG
iv 617.9 (316–293) has been restored Μα[τροπολίται]
(Foucard, accepted by Perlman (2000) 75); the inscription
records monetary donations by Thessalian cities “to the
θεοροι sent out from Argos to announce the celebration of
the Nemean Games and the Heraia” (IG iv 617.10 (C4f); cf.
Perlman (2000) 74, 127–29). Cf. CID ii 100.11.5ff (352), pre-
sumably another collective donation towards the rebuilding
of the temple at Delphi.

Metropolis struck silver coins on the Aiginetan standard
c.400–c.344. (1) Diobol: obv. head of Aphrodite facing, bird
to the right, Nike crowning her; rev. standing Dionysos; leg-
end: ΜΗΤΡΟΠΟΛΙΤΩΝ. (2) Trihemio: obv. as (1),
rev. Apollo Kitharoidos; legend: ΜΗΤΡΟΠΟΛΙΤΩΝ. (3)
Obol: obv. bearded head facing; rev. figure (Aphrodite?)
holding thyrsos and seated on rock under tree; legend:
ΜΗΤΡΟΠΟΛΙΑ (Head, HN2 302; Babelon, Traité ii.4
520–22; Martin (1985) 39).

404. Mopson (Mopseus) Map 55. Lat. 39.50, long. 22.25.
Size of territory: 2. Type: B. The toponym, Μόψιων, τό is
attested only in post-Classical sources (Strabo 9.5.22; Steph.
Byz. 480.11). The city-ethnic is Μοψευς (C4f coins, infra; Ηο-
ροι 10–12 (1992–98) 356 l. 2 (C3m)) or Μοψεύ(ς)άτας (C4f

No Archaic or Classical source calls Mopson a polis; it is
included as a probable polis here on account of its C4f coinage
(infra). The community refers to itself as a polis in the
political sense in Ηοροι 10–12 (1992–98) 356 l. 2, a C3m
grant of politēia and other privileges to three men of Atrax
(cf. IG ix.2.1056 (C3)). The internal collective use of the city-
ethnic is found on C4f bronze coins (infra); the external
individual use of the city-ethnic is found in IG ix.2 521.21
(C2m).

Mopson was a Thessalian community in the tetras of
Pelagstoi (Steph. Byz. 480.11), situated 0.5 km inside the
pass of Rhodia (Helly (1999) 102–3). Archaeological investiga-
tions of the site remain unpublished.

Mopson struck bronze coins in C4f. Types: obv. head of
Zeus facing with fulmen to the right; rev. Lapith fighting
centaur; legend: ΜΟΨΕΙΩΝ or ΜΟΨΕΤΩΝ; or obv.
draped female bust r.; rev. standing Aphrodite with dove in
hand; legend: ΜΟΨΕΙΩΝ (Head, HN2 302; Babelon,
Traité ii.4 no. 744a; Rogers (1932) nos. 412–13). The coin types
t point to cults of Zeus and Aphrodite.

405. Orthos (Orthieus) Map 55. Lat. 39.15, long. 22.00.
Size of territory: ? Type: B. The toponym is Ὀρθός or Ὀρθοὶ
or Ὀρθαί; the genitive Ὀρθοῦ is found in CID ii 12.1.68
(C4m); and the forms ὕν Ὀρθαί and ἔν Ὀρθοὶ are both
found in the Delphic catalogue of theorodokoi of c.230–220
No Archaic or Classical source calls Oxynion a polis, but it deserves inclusion in this Inventory as a probable polis on account of its late Classical bronze coinage (infra). In addition, CID 11 12.1.68 records a contribution by a man described as Θεσσαλος ἐκ Ορθιου (C4m).

The site of Orthos—not to be confused with the Homeric Orthe, the probable ancestor of Phalanna—lay north-east of the village of Kidros (Helly 1992) 78 and so in the tetras of Thessaliotis. However, there is no published material on this site. A cult of Athena may be assumed on the basis of the coin types (see infra), and outside the walls is a sanctuary of Demeter (C. Indzesiloglou, pers. comm.).

Oxynion has traditionally been located at Meritsa (modern Oxynia) north-west of Kalambaka, but this location does not fit the indications provided by Strabo 7.7.9 that it was 120 stades from Azoros. The same applies to the site at Nea-Smolia (Darmezin 1992)). A site near Daskochari may fit: a hill on the left bank of the river Paliomandano at Paliogourtia, with some architectural remains on the surface and ceramics covering C4 to Roman times; however, epigraphical confirmation is lacking (Darmezin 1994)).

Oxynion 406. | Map 55. Unlocated. Type: C. The toponym is Ὀξυνίον [v] (IG iv2 1.94.b.1 (359)) or Ὀξύνεια, ἦ (Strabo 7.7.9). A city-ethnic is not attested.

No Archaic or Classical source calls Oxynion a polis, though Strabo 7.7.9 does. The reason for including it in this Inventory is the attestation in 359 of an Epidaurian theodorodokos (IG iv² 1.94.b.1); note, however, that Perlman (2000) E.1 fr.b.1 prints Πέλων [va], not Ὀξύνιον as IG. Nothing further is known about the city.

Oxynion has traditionally been located at Meritsa (modern Oxynia) north-west of Kalambaka, but this location does not fit the indications provided by Strabo 7.7.9 that it was 120 stades from Azoros. The same applies to the site at Nea-Smolia (Darmezin 1992)). A site near Daskochari may fit: a hill on the left bank of the river Paliomandano at Paliogourtia, with some architectural remains on the surface and ceramics covering C4 to Roman times; however, epigraphical confirmation is lacking (Darmezin 1994)).

Pagasai 407. | Pagasitsa | Map 55. Lat. 39.20, long. 22.55. Size of territory: 2. Type: [A]. The toponym is Παγασαί, α' (Hdt. 7.193.2; Dem. 1.9; Xen. Hell. 5.4.56). The city-ethnic is Παγασαίας (CID 11 100.11.8 (325)) or Παγασαίος (IG iv 617.4 (316–293)).

In Ps.-Skylax 64, where polis is used in the urban sense, Pagasai is one of nine toponyms listed between the heading πόλεις αυτες and the addendum ἐτεις δὲ καὶ ἂλλα πόλεις Θεταλῶν. Theopomp. fr. 53 described it as the epineion of Pherai (cf. Plut. Them. 20.1). The external collective use of the city-ethnic is found in IG iv 617.4 (316–293), and the external individual use in CID 11 100.11.8 (325).

Theopompus’ description of Pagasai as the epineion of Pherai (FGrHist 115 fr. 53) does not mean that it cannot have been a polis (Hansen 1997) 36–37); the exact relationship between the two cities is unknown, but Pagasai may possibly have been a dependent polis of Pherai serving as its harbour (cf. ibid. for parallels); or Theopompus’ statement may simply mean that the city was within the general sphere of Pheraiian influence (a brother of Jason resided there: Polyena. 6.1.6).

Ps.-Skylax 64 describes Pagasai as Thessalian (cf. CID 11 100.120, 11.8), and Theopompus’ description of it as ἐπίνειον Φεραίων puts it in Pelasgiotis (FGrHist 115 fr. 53). Dem. 1.12, 22, 2.11 (cf. Ath. 43a; Polyena. 6.1.2) distinguishes between Pagasai and Magnesia, so Pagasai was accordingly not Magnesian; but in 353 the city was taken by Philip II (presumably after a siege: Dem. 1.9) and forced into submission (ὑγάκινας ὑποταγής, Diod. 16.31.6; cf. Dem. 1.22, 2.11). Presumably from then on it was regarded as Magnesian and may have been handed over to the Magnesians by Philip (RE xviii. 2308), though according to schol. Dem. 1.22 the incomes from the harbours and the agora were given to Philip himself; Philip probably installed a garrison at Pagasai (Martin 1985) 97).

Hes. Scut. 70 mentions a bonos of Apollo Pagasaios, and a C5–C4 temple of Apollo and a stoa have been found outside the circuit on the saddle south of the acropolis (Milojcic 1974)). The rocky summit of the hill of Soros, the acropolis of Pagasai, was crowned by a presumably C6–C5e circular wall, and the lower city was surrounded by a contemporary triple wall (Prakt. 1909 165–70) which enclosed an area of c.6–7 ha. For a plan, see Marzolf (1994b) 256 fig. 1. The earliest indications of occupation are late Archaic, and there are no Hellenistic sherds either in the city proper or in the extra-mural sanctuary, or in the graves (Triantaphyllopoulou 2000) 60), a fact which fits the report of its relocation to Demetrias in 293 (Strabo 9.5.15).

The central social and economic feature of Pagasai was, it seems, its harbour. In 477/6 a Delian League fleet wintered at the harbour (Plut. Them. 20.1), and Pagasai was a trading port exporting grain (Xen. Hell. 5.4.56), meat (Plut. Mor. 193DE) and slaves (Ar. Plut. 521; Hermippus fr. 63.19 (PCG)).

The cult of Apollo Pagasaios is frequently mentioned (RE xviii.2. 2303). A cult of Poseidon is attested by a C5e dedication (ArchEph 1932 27 no. 12), and a cult of Artemis may be inferred from IG ix.2 112 (C3e); a cult of Dionysos Pelagios is attested in Theopomp. fr. 352, and Alexander of Pherai
may possibly have been worshipped as a hero at Pagasai (RE xviii. 2307).

IG IV 617.4 (316–293) records a monetary donation by the Pagasaians “to the θεοροί sent out from Argos to announce the celebration of the Nemean Games and the Heraia” (Perlman (2000) 74, 127–29); cf. CID ii 100.11.5ff (325), presumably a collective donation towards the rebuilding of the temple at Delphi.

408. Peirasia (Peirasieus) Map 55. Lat. 39.30, long. 22.15. Size of territory: 1. Type: [A]. The toponym is Πειρασία in Ap. Rhod. 1.37, the earliest attestation, but the city-ethnic regularly uses a stem in -ρα for -ρας: Πειράσιος (Thuc. 2.22.2), or Πειρασιεύς (C4 coins, infra).

Peirasia is listed as a polis in the political sense at Thuc. 2.22.2. Similarly, in the Delphic naoros’s accounts the Peirasieans are recorded in a fragmentary list (CID ii 8.11.6), the heading of which undoubtedly included the formula: ται δε ται πολιών ἤνικαν (CID ii 5.11.25–26) vel sim. The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is attested on C4 coins (infra), and the external collective use in Thuc. 2.22.2 and CID ii 8.11.6 (c.360/59).

Peirasia was Thessalian (Steph. Byz. 138.17; Livy 32.13.9) and most probably belonged to the tetras of Thessaliotis. Cavalry and an unnamed cavalry commander are attested in Thuc. 2.22.3. A contribution of more than 200 dr. to the naopic board at Delphi is recorded in CID ii 8.11.6 (c.360/59).

The fortification of the acropolis and lower town is very badly preserved, difficult to describe and impossible to date (Decourt (1990) 157); the habitation area seems to have been situated to the south-west of the lower city, close to the valley of the Enipeus (autopsy by J.-C. Decourt).

Peirasia struck silver trihemiobols on the Aiginetan standard c.400–344. Types: obv. head of Athena; rev. horseman; legend: ΠΕΙΡΑΣΙΕΩΝ (Head, HN² 303; Babelon, Traité ii.4 no. 519).

409. Pelinna(ion) (Pelinna(i)eus) Map 55. Lat. 39.35, long. 22.00. Size of territory: 2. Type: [A]. The toponym is Πειλίνναιος, τό (Pind. Pyth. 10.4; Ps.-Skylax 64); Πέλιννα, η is found in Arr. Anab. 1.7.5; Steph. Byz. 515.4. IG IV 617.11 (316–293) has been restored [ε]ςιν Πελίννας, while Perlman (2000) E.1 fr. b1 prints Πέλιννα (note, however, that IG IV 17.1 94/95, b1 prints this entry as Ὀζύννων). The city-ethnic is variously Πελίνναιες (CID II 31.73 (345/4)), Πελίνναιες (coins c.300, infra), and Πελίνναιος (coins c.300, infra; Diod. 18.11.1 (1323); Polyaen. 4.2.19 (1356)).

In Ps.-Skylax 64, where polis is used in the urban sense, Pelinna(ion) is the seventh of nine toponyms listed between the heading πόλεις αἰθή and the addendum εἰσι δὲ καὶ ἄλλαι πόλεις Ἑθηρσαλών, and Diod. 18.11.1 (1323) by implication describes Pelinna(ion) as a polis in the political sense. Strabo 9.5.17 calls it a phrourion in an achronic reference. The internal collective use of the (abbreviated) city-ethnic is found on C4 coins (infra); the external collective use of the city-ethnic is found in Polyaen. 4.2.19 (1336) and Diod. 18.11.1 (1323). The external individual use is found repeatedly in CID ii, e.g. 24.1.13 (336/5), 31.73 (345/4), 32.10 (340/39).

Pelinna(ion) was a Thessalian city (Ps.-Skylax 64); Steph. Byz. 515.3 locates it in Phthiotis, but Strabo 9.5.17 in Hestiaiotis, which is more likely to be correct. It was situated at Palaiogardiki on the left bank of the Peneios, 3 km north-east of Petroporo and 14 km east of Trikala (see, however, infra Pharkadon). The acropolis was separately walled: the wall is a C5 polygonal structure running for 1,650 m and has square towers (Stählin (1938); Tziaphalias (1992) 124–31). The lower city was enclosed by a C4 wall descending from the northernmost point of the acropolis wall; it runs for 2,600 m and encloses an area of 59 ha south of the acropolis (Stählin (1938) 335); it has numerous towers and three gates (Stählin (1938); Tziaphalias (1992) 124–31). In the lower city are undated remains of such public constructions as stoas (Stählin (1938)), temples (ibid.; Tziaphalias (1992) 125–27), cisterns (Tziaphalias (1992) 125), and possibly a theatre (Stählin (1938) 335). Traces of a C4 Hippodamian grid plan are found as well (Tziaphalias (1992) 126–27).

The history of the city is almost unknown, but Polyaen. 4.2.19 (1336) mentions a war between Pelinna(ion) and Pharsalos (in which both seem to have had allies and in which Philip II of Makedon played a part (Hammond (1994) 48)), and according to Diod. 18.11.1, Pelinna(ion) was the only Thessalian city that did not join the Hellenic alliance in the Lamian War; so it seems to have favoured Makedonia. IG IV 617.11 (316–293) records a monetary donation by Pelinna "to the θεοροί sent out from Argos to announce the celebration of the Nemean Games and the Heraia" (Perlman (2000) 74, 127–29). A citizen of Pelinna(ion) possibly as theorodos for Epidaurus in 360/59 (Perlman (2000) E.1 fr. b1, printed as Πέλιννα; note, however, that IG IV 1.1 94/95.1b1 prints this entry as Οζύννων). Citizens of Pelinna(ion) served the Amphiktyonic League in various capacities: ἄργυρολογέων (CID II 24.1.13 (336/5); naoros (ibid.; 31.73 (345/4), 32.10 (340/39); hieronemon (ibid.; 96.3, 97.57 (both 327/6), 32.42 (C4))). In 498, Hippokleas of Pelinna(ion) was victorious in the Pythian double stadium race (Pind. Pyth. 10); in Cól his father
Phrikias was a double Olympionikes (Olympionikai 150, 156), and Hippokleas himself later likewise became a double Olympionikes (Olympionikai 175, 184).

Coin types indicate a cult of the sibyl Manetho, and ivy-shaped gold leaves one of Dionysos (Tziaphalas 1992 136–37).

Pelinnus struck silver coins on the Aiginetan standard in C5f. Obols: obv. youth restraining bull, or forepart of bull; rev. horse’s head; legend: ΠΕΛΙΝΝΑΙΟΝ. Hemiomboi: obv. bull’s hoof; rev. horse’s head; legend: ΠΕΛΙΝΝΑΙΟΝ. In C4, the city struck in both silver and bronze. (1) Silver (drachm, triobol, trihemimoibol). Obv. horseman galloping or spearing prostrate foe; rev. armed warrior; legends: ΠΕΛΙΝΝΑΙΟΝ, ΠΕΛΙΝΝΑΙΩΝ ΑΥΘΙΝΝΑΙΑ or ΠΕΛΙΝΝΑΙΩΝ ΑΥΘΙΝΝΑΙΟΝ. (2) Bronze, C4. Same types and legends but sometimes [ΠΕΛΙΝΝΑΙΩΝ, ΠΕΛΙΝΝΑΙΩΝ ΑΥΘΙΝΝΑΙΑ or ΠΕΛΙΝΝΑΙΩΝ ΑΥΘΙΝΝΑΙΟΝ (Head, ΗΝ² 303; Babelon, Traité ii.4 nos. 523–30; Rogers (1932) 140–42 nos. 426–35; Liampi (1996) 109, 112; SNG Cop. Thessaly 185–87).

410. Phakion (Phakiastas) Map 55. Unlocated (cf. Decourt (1990) 155–58) but presumably in Thessaliotis (Helly (1995) 165). Size of territory: ? Type: [A]. The toponym is Φάκιας, τό (Thuc. 4.78.5); cf. Phakian at Livy 32.13.9. The city-ethnic is Φακιαστάς (C3 coins, infra). No Archaic or Classical source calls Phakion a polis, but Phakion seems to be indirectly attested as a polis in the political sense in the Delphic accounts of 337/6 (CID II 74): if the restoration Φ[ακι]αστάς is accepted in 1.43 (cf. 7.7.1.4 and the index p. 305) it follows that a ταμίας of Phakian is recorded after the heading τῶν ταμίων ἀποστέπεσεν τὰς τάξεις in 1.4. A citizen of Phakian served as Phakian theorodokos in 230–220 (BCH 45 (1921) 111.25), and Phakion struck bronze coins in C3. Types: obv. head of crowned nymph; rev. horseman; legend: ΦΑΚΙΑΣΤΑΣ (Head, ΗΝ² 304; Rogers (1932) 146 nos. 444–45).

411. Phaloria (Phaloriastes) Map 55. Lat. 39.50, long. 21.30, but see infra. Size of territory: ? Type: C. Steph. Byz. 657.1 gives the toponym as Φαλωρίη, but cites Rhiandos (FGH Hist 265) fr. 37 for the form Φαλωρία; the 230–220 Delphic list of theorodokoi (BCH 45 (1921)) has Φαλωρία or Φαλωρία (Oulhen) at 111.35, but Φαλωρία at v.C.7 (BCH; Oulhen reads Φαλεξ[...αν]) at i.C.7 (I.5.7). The city-ethnic is Φαλωριαστάς, attested in inscriptions (IG i.x.2 13.31 (271/70)) and on coins (infra). Steph. Byz. suggests Φαλωρεύς and Φαλωρεῖτης, but neither form is attested in any other source.

The exact location of Phalaria is unknown, but it must have been situated in Hestiaiotis. Some travellers (e.g. Bursian (1862) 49; Heuzey and Daunet (1876) 431) located it at the site of Skoumbos near Megarchi, south of Kalambaka. At the site are important architectural remains (of walls, a tower, a lower city) and a cemetery; these remains attest to the existence of a city, occupied at least during the Classical period. However, most travellers (e.g. Stählin (1924a) 124; Philipppon (1950) 275; Meyer, RE suppl. x s.v.) have identified this site with Pialeia (cf. n. 4). Following Philipppon (1950) 305 (who himself followed Stählin (1924a) 114), who seems not to have examined the site), Barr. prefers a location at Meritsa (now Oxyria) where, however, (unpublished) surveys conducted in 1991–92 by Darmezin, Decourt et al. failed to locate ancient remains. Another possible location is at Nea Koutsouphtani near Malakasi (cf. Hammond (1967) 260 and 681), where quarrying has unfortunately destroyed the ancient site (unpublished survey by Darmezin, Decourt et al.).

No Archaic or Classical source calls Phaloria a polis, and the reason for its inclusion in this Inventory is the existence of bronze coins dated to 302–286 by both Head, ΗΝ² 305 and Rogers (1932) 149–50; if these coins are correctly dated to ΗΝ² 341, the presumption is that Phaloria possibly existed as a polis prior to their minting, i.e. in C4. In 271–270 a Thessalos Phaloriasiastas was awarded proxeny by the Aitolian koinon (IG i.x.2 13.31), and in 230–220 a Delphic theorodokos resided in the city.

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is attested on the rare bronze coins dated to 302–286. (1) Obv. head of Athena; rev. wolf running; legend: ΦΑΛΩΡΙΟΝ. (2) Obv. head of Apollo; rev. Apollo seated on a rock holding an arrow; legend: ΦΑΛΩΡΙΟΝ ΑΥΤΟΝ. (Head, ΗΝ² 305; Rogers (1932) nos. 459–61). The types suggest cults of Athena and Apollo.

412. Pharkadon (Pharkadonios) Map 55. Lat. 39.35, long. 22.05, but see infra. Size of territory: 2(?). Type: B. The toponym is Φαρκαδῶν (IG i.v.1 94.B.1.2 (359); Theopomp. fr. 82) or Φαρκηδόν (Polyaen. 4.2.18 (1361)). The city-ethnic is Φαρκαδώνος (C5 coins, infra) or Φαρκαδώνος (Diod. 18.56.5 (1319)) or Φαρκηδόνος (Polyaen. 4.2.18 (1361)). No Archaic or Classical source calls Pharkadon a polis, but it deserves inclusion here as a probable polis on account of its C5–C4 coinage and the fact that in 360/59 an Epidaurian theorodokos resided at Pharkadon (IG i.v.1 94.B.1.2). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on C5 coins (infra) and externally in Polyae. 4.2.18 (1356) and Diod. 18.56.5 (1319).
Pharkadon was a Thessalian city (Polyaen. 4.2.18 (1356)) situated in the tetras of Hestiaiotis (Strabo 9.5.17). It has traditionally been located on a double-peaked hill, Sykia, above the modern village of Klotoko, about 20 km east of Trikkala (PECS followed by Barr.). However, the find of an inscription referring to τὸ κοινὸν Φαρκαδονίων at Palaiogardi (Tziaphalias (1992) 116–20), a site normally identified as Pelinna, may cast some doubt on the identification of Pharkadon with Sykia and serve as a reminder that the ancient topography of this part of Hestiaiotis is still not completely understood. For the site at Palaiogardi, see supra s.v. Pelinna.

At the site of Sykia are remains of Classical and later fortifications enclosing both peaks and a lower city (Kirsten (1938) with a plan at 1836). Polyaen. 4.2.18 (1356) mentions a poliorkia of Pharkadon by Philip II of Makedon and uses such terms as teichos and pyrgos to describe the fortifications. The account refers to steigai as well, and thus implies the existence of buildings inside the wall; there are, however, no remains of such buildings. In 319, Pharkadonian exiles were explicitly excluded from the general amnesty decreed by Polyperchon (Diod. 18.56.5; cf. Martin (1985) 104). Nothing further is known about these exiles, but their very existence indicates a defined body of citizens. A C3 ι inscription refers to τὸ κοινὸν Φαρκαδονίων and a system of phylai (Tziaphalias (1992) 116–20). Philip's siege and the fact that exiles from Pharkadon were explicitly excluded from Polyperchon's general amnesty of 319 (Diod. 18.56.5, 18.56.6) suggest that the city had followed an anti-Makedonian line of policy (Martin (1985) 104; Hammond (1994) 48). The silver coin depicting Athena (infra) suggests a cult of Athena.

Pharkadon struck silver coins on the Aigentinian standard c.480–400, and bronze coins in C4f. (1) Silver. Denominations: triobols, obols and hemiobols. Triobols: obv. youth restraining forepart of bull; rev. forepart of horse in incuse square; legends: ΦΑΡΚ, ΦΑΡΚΑΔΟ, ΦΑΡΚΑΔΟΝΙ (for similarities between coins with these types and contemporary coins of Kranon, Larisa, the Perrhaibians, Trikka, Pherai and Skotoussa, see Kraay (1976) 115–16 and Martin (1985) 36–37). Obols: obv. free horse walking; rev. Athena standing; legends: ΦΑΡΚΑ, ΦΑΡΚΑΔ, ΦΑΡΚΑΔΟ, ΦΑΡΚΑΔΟΝΙ; or obv. bull's head; rev. horse's head; legend: ΦΑΡ; or obv. bull's head; rev. horse's head and trump, or ram; legend: ΦΑ, ΦΑΡ, ΦΑΡΚ. Hemiobols: obv. bull's head; rev. ram; legends: ΦΑ, ΦΑΡ. (2) Bronze: obv. head of nymph; rev. horseman; legend: ΦΑΡΚΑ, ΦΑΡΚΑΔ (retrogr.); or obv. horse feeding; rev. star beneath inverted crescent; legend: ΦΑΡΚΑΔΟΝΙΩΝ; or obv. feeding horse; rev. thyrsos below inverted crescent; legend: ΦΑΡΚΑΔΟΝΙΟΝ (retrogr.). (Head, HN2 305; Babelon, Traité ii.4 nos. 560–71; Rogers (1932) nos. 462–63; Liampi (1996) 108–9; SNG Cop. Thessaly 209–16).

413. Pharsalos (Pharsalios) Map 55. Lat. 39.15,long. 22.20.

Size of territory: 3. Type: A. The toponym is Φάρσαλος, ῦ (Phercydes (FGrHist 3) fr. 1; Thuc. 1.111.1; Xen. Hell. 6.1.8).

The regular city-ethnic is Φαρσάλοι (Xen. Hell. 4.3.3; I.Thessalie 56 (C4); and on coins, infra), though Hippoc. Epid. 6.8.18 has Φάρσαλος; Φαρσάλιος is found in Hdn. 111.1123.8.

Pharsalos is called a polis in the urban sense by Thuc. 1.111.1, and in Ps.-Skylax 64 Pharsalos is the fifth of nine toponyms listed between the heading πόλεις αἵδε and the addendum εἰς δὲ καὶ ἄλλαι πόλεις Θητελαίων; asty is found in Anac. fr. 107, Diehl (see Helly (1995) 43–44). Polis in the political sense is found in Xen. Hell. 6.1.5 and implicitly at Thuc. 2.22.3. In the C4 dedication I.Thessalie 56 polis is restored: [Ο]μενον Φαρσαλιων ῦ [πόλις]; the earliest certain epigraphical reference to a πόλις Φαρσαλίων is in a C3 decree (I.Thessalie 50). Arist. Pol. 1306b11 has the phrase ἐν Φαρσάλῳ πολιτείᾳ; πολιταί is found at Xen. Hell. 6.4.34, and σατρής in I.Thessalie 57.4 (3308); CEG II 795 (3308); Xen. Hell. 6.1.13.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on C5–C4 coins (Head, HN2 306) and in I.Thessalie 56 (C4), and externally in the Delphic naopoiioi's accounts of 357/6 (CID II 8.1.8), in a dedication at Delphi (SEG 1 210 (C4m)), and in Thuc. 2.22.3. The external and individual use is found in Thuc. 8.92.8; IG II2 26 (394–387); and CID II 4.1.31 (c.360).

Pharsalos was situated in Thessalia (Thuc. 1.111.1), more precisely in Phthiotis (Strabo 9.5.3, 10; Kip (1910) 68). The territory is referred to as γῆ in Thuc. 1.111.1; it was bounded to the north-east by the territory of Skotoussa and Eretria Phthiotis (Strabo 10.1.10 says explicitly that Eretria was near Pharsalos, and Polyb. 5.9.3 that it was near Thebai Phthiotis), to the south by the territories of Peuma and Proerna; and to the west by that of Euhydron. In the territory were the rivers of Apidanos (Thuc. 4.7.5, Enipeus (Strabo 9.5.6) and Louerchos (I.Thessalie 50). The Thetideion was situated near the eastern border of the Pharsalian pedion (Eur. Andr. 16 with Decourt (1990) 205–8), and it was most probably the same (on the other bank of the Enipeus) for the place called Palaipharalos by Strabo 9.5.6, 17.1.11 (Decourt (1990) 200–23). Two other toponyms are known, but not precisely located: Makounai
The political system of Pharsalos was clearly a narrow oligarchy: δυναστεία μᾶλλον ἡ ισονοµία (Thuc. 4.78.3), ὀµονοούσα ὀλιγαρχία (Arist. Pol. 1305£; cf. 1306±11–12); and some families, especially the Daochids and the Menonids (on whom see Larsen (1968) 22), are well known from the literary and epigraphical record (on Daochids see, e.g., Béquignon (1970) 1053–56; Helly (1995) 51–52, 63–67; on Menonids: Helly (1995) 233–35, 263–64, 303–6). A stasis is mentioned by Xen. Hell. 6.1.2, and this conflict seems to have been solved by granting exceptional powers to a single individual, Polydamas (Gehrke, Stasis 126), who was subjected to an annual rendering of accounts (Hell. 6.1.2: ἀπελογίζετο κατ’ ἐνιαυτόν ὁµονοοῦσα ὀλιγαρχία). A set of laws (νόµοι) that specified (inter alia) public incomes is referred to at Xen. Hell. 6.1.2.

The Thessalian cavalry took part in the Lelantine War under the Pharsalian Kleomachos (Arist. fr. 98, Rose). The city was attacked by Athenians with allies in 457/6, but these forces did not manage to capture the city (Thuc. 1.111.1). Cavalry and an anonymous cavalry commander from Pharsalos are attested in Thuc. 2.22.3, when the city was allied with Athens (alongside other Thessalian cities); a hipparchos is also mentioned at Xen. Hell. 4.3.8 and polemarchoi in SEG i 210 (C4m). With Larisa, Kranonn and Skotoussa, Pharsalos is mentioned as being allied with the Boiotians in 395/4 (Xen. Hell. 4.3.3). In 374, Polydamas failed to gain help from Sparta and accordingly had to ally Pharsalos with Jason of Pherai (Xen. Hell. 6.1.19); as tagos, Polyphon II of Pherai had nine citizens of Pharsalos, including Polydamas, executed (Xen. Hell. 6.4.34). A war against Pelinna(ion) in the time of Philip II is mentioned in Polygen. 4.2.19; Pharsalos was allied with Philip II of Makedon against the Achaian city of Halos (Dem. 11.1; Strabo 9.5.8), and Kottyphos of Pharsalos was the stratēgos of the Amphiktyonic League against Amphiissa (Aeschin. 3.128). Pharsalan cavalry fought with Alexander the Great in Asia (Arr. Anab. 3.10.11).

According to Diod. 14.82.6, Pharsalos, though garrisoned by Lakedaimonians, was captured by Medios of Larisa in 395, and the inhabitants (τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ κατοικοῦντας) were sold off as booty (λαφυροπωλεῖν). Medios may have placed a mercenary garrison in Pharsalos after his capture of the city: Arist. Hist. an. 618713–14 refers to “the time when Meidios’ mercenaries were killed at Pharsalos”.

In 374 Pharsalos may have ruled over an unknown number of unidentifiable but presumably minor poleis: at Hell. 6.1.8 Xenophon has Jason of Pherai state that if he is joined by Pharsalos and αἱ ἐξ ὑµῶν (sc. τῶν Φαρσαλίων) ἠρνητέµαι πόλεις he will easily become tagos of Thessalia. Thessalian allies of Pharsalos are implied by Polyena. 4.2.19 (at time of Philip II).

Thoukydides of Pharsalos was proxenos of Athens (Thuc. 8.92.8), and Polydamas was hereditary proxenos of Sparta (Xen. Hell. 6.1.4); in C4 Daochos was proxenos of Anaphel (IG xii.3 251 (c.345–330)), and Iphitos was honoured by Athens (IG ii 2 26). Reception of an Athenian embassy seems implied by Ar. Vesp. 1271.

The patron divinity of Pharsalos was probably Zeus: Olympios (I.Thessalie 58 (C4e)); Soter (ibid. 1 59 (C3l) and 60 (C3s)) or Thaulios (ibid. 3). The Pharsalians also had cults of Aphrodite Peitho (ibid. 1 67 (450–430)), Apollo (ibid. 1 65 (C4s)), Artemis (ibid. 1 66 (C3)), Athena (coins, infra; cf. Lavva (2001) 31–32, stressing the importance of this goddess), Demeter (Daffa-Nikonanou (1973) 27–28), Hestia and Symmachos (I.Thessalie 68 (C4f)), Hermes (ibid. 1 69 (C3m)), Pan and the Nymphs (ibid. 1 72 (C5f), 73 (C4)). The locations of the cult sites are uncertain, except that of Pan and the Nymphs in the so-called Alogopati grotto (ibid. 1 72–73) and perhaps that of Demeter at Ambelia Pharsalou (ArchDelt 43B1: 273 (C6–C3m)), and, of course, the Theidion (supra); the Theidion is actually called a polis by Phercydes (FGrHist 3) fr. 1a, but in a purely mythological context and without implications for its status in the Classical period (cf. Hansen and Nielsen (2000) 148–49).

Several Pharsalians are known as victors in the Panhellenic games: in the Olympic Games victories were won by Phaidros (Olympionikai 107, in 556) and Agias (Olympionikai 192, in 484); Pythian victories were won by Agias (I.Thessalie 57, in c.490–480) and Telemachos (Olympionikai 190 (C5)); and Agias and Telemachos were both periodonikai (Knab (1934) nos. 11–12). In 366–358, Melanippos of Pharsalos was victorious in the hoplite race at the Amphiaraiata at Oropos (IG vii 414.27–28).

I.Thessalie 56 (C4) is an internal communal dedication, while SEG i 210 (C4m) is a dedication to Pythian Apollo. Donations of money to Delphi and Argos are attested in CID ii 8.1.8 (C4m) and IG iv 617 (316–293). Citizens of Pharsalos served the Amphiktyonic League in various capacities: as argyrologos (CID ii 11A.5, B.6); hieromnemn

(I.Thessalie 50 (C3l)), possibly near modern Rizi; and Makkarai (Theopomp. fr. 55); they may refer to the same place. The ruins called Hellas by Strabo 9.5.6 were, in his day, 60 stades from Pharsalos, with the two springs of Messeis and Hypereia close to them. When Philip II of Makedon had destroyed Halos, it was handed over to Pharsalos (Dem. 11.1 with schol.).
(CID ii 32.42, 89.6, 94.2); naopoios (CID ii 31.72, 32.30, 33.8, 74.166–70, 79A.1.9, 95.6) and tamias (CID ii 74.4.2, 77.1.4).

The acropolis of Pharsalos is mentioned by Xen. Hell. 6.1.2, 18; it was located on the Profitis Ilias hill, and was c.500 m long (east–west) and 50 m wide; the preserved walls are all Byzantine. The upper (c.750 × 400 m) and the lower (c.1500 × 1,200 m) town were situated on the northern slope of the hill and in the plain near the Apidanos spring. The walls (polygonal and trapezoidal or rectangular isodomic), not well preserved except near the acropolis itself, are between 2.70 m and 4.0 m wide. There are remains of four gates and a postern, as well as at least twenty-four towers. Part of the city wall was constructed in C5e (cf. Diod. 11.83.3–4 for a poliorokia in 457/6), but most of it dates to C4s (Stählin (1924a) 139–41; Katakouta and Toufexis (1994)). A C6l tholos tomb was found outside the circuit wall (Prakt (1951) 155–63, (1952) 185–202, (1953) 127–32), but almost nothing is known about the degree of urbanisation during the Archaic and Classical periods: some houses have been excavated, but they all date to the Hellenistic or Roman periods (see further Lavva (2001) 4–10). An extensive Archaic-Classical cemetery is located west of the city (ibid. 9).

Pharsalos struck coins in silver on the Aiginetan standard and bronze between c.480 and c.320. Denominations: drachms, triobols, trihemibols, obols, hemibols and fractions in bronze (from C5l). The most common types are: obv. head of Athena, in C4 facing; rev. forepart of horse, or horse’s head, or horseman (cf. Lavva (2001) 19ff); legends: ΦΑΡΣ or ΦΑΡΣΩ or ΦΑΡΣΑ or ΦΑΡΣΑΛΙΩΝ (Head, HN2 306; for the end of minting, see Martin (1985) 161; Babelon, Traité ii.1 nos. 1422–23; ii.4 nos. 476–504; Rogers (1932) 151–61; Lavva (2001); SNG Cop. Thessaly 217–33).

414. Pheraï (Pheraioi) Map 55. Lat. 39.25, long. 22.45. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Φεραίοι, αἱ (Dem. 1.13; IG v.1 948.2 (C4); Diod. 15.61.5). The city-ethnic is Φεραῖοι (Xen. Hell. 2.3.4; SEG 23 416 (450–425); IG iv 617.4 (316–293)).

Pherai is called a polis in the political sense in SEG 23 433.5 (C4) and is listed as a polis in this sense at Thuc. 2.22.3; polis in the urban sense is found in Dem. 7.32; at Ps.-Skytlos 64, Pherai is the first toponym listed between the heading πόλεις αἱδε and the addendum εἶδαι δὲ καὶ ἄλλαι πόλεις Θετταλῶν; akropolis is found in Dem. 7.32.

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found in SEG 23 416.1 (450–425) and 417.3 (C5l); the external collective use is found in Thuc. 2.22.3; Xen. Hell. 6.4.31; CID ii 11.1.47 (362/1); IG iv 617.4 (316–293); and the external individual use in Xen. Hell. 2.3.4; CID ii 31.73 (345); IG iv 1.1 122.26 (C4).

Pheraï was a Thessalian community (IG v.1 948.2 (C4)), belonging to the tetras of Pelasgiotis (Strabo 9.5.10). Archaeological material demonstrates the existence of several military installations and second-order settlements (often fortified) in the territory in the Archaic and Classical periods; for details, see Di Salvatore (1994). Pagasai is described as the epineion of Pheraï by Theopomp. fr. 53 (see further the entry for Pagasai, supra). A C4 decree (SEG 23 418), by extending privileges granted to Θετταλίας, suggests that the city controlled territory other than the civic territory proper.

Early in the Peloponnesian War, Pheraïan cavalry assisted the Athenians (Thuc. 2.22.3) alongside other Thessalian poleis which were allied to Athens. The C5l–C4 history of Pheraï, as it appears from our sources, was dominated by a series of powerful individuals who struggled for pan-Thessalian hegemony, made extensive use of mercenary forces (Parke (1933) 100ff), and were referred to as tyrannoi (e.g. Ephor. fr. 95; Berve (1967) 283–95). The first of these was Lykophron I, who in 404 defeated the Larisaians and other Thessalians in battle ἑυδαμονευόμενος ἄρης ὅλης τῆς Θετταλίας (Xen. Hell. 2.3.4; Westlake (1935) 54–55); conflict between Lykophron and Larisa continued into the 390s (Diod. 14.81.5 (1395)), and Lykophron seems to have had Spartan support (Xen. Hell. 6.4.24; Cartledge (1987) 354; Neue Pauly vii. 568). Nothing is known about the end of Lykophron’s rule; he may have been succeeded by a certain Polyalkes, who may have been a relative of his (Westlake (1935) 68; Berve (1967) 285), but his true successor was his son (Westlake (1935) 68), the famous Jason of Pherai (on whom see Mandel (1980) and Sprawski (1999)). He appears for the first time c.382–379, when he assisted Neogenes of Histaia in establishing a tyranny (Diod. 15.30.3; Stylianou (1998) ad loc.). By the middle of the 370s, he possessed a mercenary army of 6,000 foot and had by force of arms subdued not only Alketas of Epeiros (Xen. Hell. 6.1.7; cf. Hammond (1967) 524 and Mitchel (1984) 57–58) but also most of the poleis of Thessalia and made them symmachoi (Xen. Hell. 6.1.5). During the fighting, he was regularly opposed by Pharsalos (ibid.), but Pharsalos itself (presumably with its dependent poleis) was made a symmachos not by force of arms but by negotiation (Xen. Hell. 6.1.2–18), after a Pharsalos plea for Spartan assistance had been rejected (ibid.). After this, presumably in 375/4, Jason was elected tagos of Thessalia and went on to organise the military and economic affairs of the Thessalians (Xen. Hell. 6.1.18; Helly (1995) 345–53); his command of a fleet of triremes is attested by Xen. Hell. 6.4.21, but it is unclear whether the reference is
to a Pheraians, a Thessalian, or even a personal navy. His extra-Thessalian policy seems to have been to oppose Sparta (Xen. Hell. 6.1.10; Mandel 1980: 54), and he became an ally of Athens ([Dem.] 49.10) and possibly a member of the Second Athenian Naval League (IG ii2 43.B.15; Jehne 1991; Dreher 1995: 173–74; see, however, Michel 1984), who restores IG ii2 43.B.2–2 as [Θ]εοίοιος [δὲ δι’ ἡμος and argues that the Pheraians as such, and not Jason, were enrolled as a member of the League); Jason also concluded a treaty of symmachia with King Amyntas of Makedon (Diod. 15.60.2; Stylianou 1998) ad loc.). As an ally of Thebes, Jason negotiated spondai between the Boiotians and the Lakedaimonians after the battle of Leuktra (Xen. Hell. 6.4.19–25); on his foreign policy, see in general Westlake (1935) 84–102. Jason was assassinated in 370/69 (Xen. Jason’s war 7). On his successors, see Westlake (1935) 126–95 and Berve (1967) 289–95. In 353/2 the tyrants Lykophon II and Peitholos handed over Pherai to Philip II of Makedon and left the city (Diod. 16.37,3, 38;1: on chronology, see Martin 1981)). Peitholos may have returned only to be driven out by Philip, according to Diod. 16.52.9, 349/8 (Westlake 1935) 183; Berve 1967) 294; Buckler (1989) 106–7. In 344, Philip defeated a rebellious Pherai and installed a permanent garrison on its acropolis (Dem. [7.32], 8.59, 9.12; Westlake 1935 192).

Pherai made grants of proxeny to citizens of Opous (SEG 23 415 (450–425); SEG 420 (C4), Proerna (SEG 23 416 (450–425)), Thebes (SEG 23 417 (C5–C4); SEG 422 (C4)), Skotoussa (SEG 23 419 (C4)) and Kranon (SEG 23 421 (C4)). F.Delphes 111.4 385 (338–320) is possibly a grant of proxeny by Delphi to a citizen of Pherai.

Pherai made grants of proxeny to citizens of Opous (SEG 23 415 (450–425); SEG 420 (C4), Proerna (SEG 23 416 (450–425)), Thebes (SEG 23 417 (C5–C4); SEG 422 (C4)), Skotoussa (SEG 23 419 (C4)) and Kranon (SEG 23 421 (C4)). F.Delphes 111.4 385 (338–320) is possibly a grant of proxeny by Delphi to a citizen of Pherai.

Pherai made grants of proxeny to citizens of Opous (SEG 23 415 (450–425); SEG 420 (C4), Proerna (SEG 23 416 (450–425)), Thebes (SEG 23 417 (C5–C4); SEG 422 (C4)), Skotoussa (SEG 23 419 (C4)) and Kranon (SEG 23 421 (C4)). F.Delphes 111.4 385 (338–320) is possibly a grant of proxeny by Delphi to a citizen of Pherai.

The earliest preserved public enactments are two grants of proxeny dating to 450–425 (SEG 23 415–16); the term ὑπέκις(μισταρ) is found in SEG 23 424.6 (C4). A board of tagoi is attested by SEG 23 425.6 (C4). SEG 23 420 (C4) contains a grant of προδικία to a man of East Lokrian Opous. The raising of taxes is implied by several grants of ἀπέλεια (cf. SEG 23 418, 419, 420, 422, 425 (all C4)). SEG 23 418 (C4) extends privileges granted to Δασικας γας [Φεραιοι αργοντι. Grants of epinomia are found in SEG 23 422 and 424 (both C4).

There are few remains of the ancient city of Pherai (RE suppl. vii. 993–94; PECS 702), the most important being the remains of a suburban temple of En(n)odia (or En(n)odia and Zeus Thaulios; it was erected in the Doric style in Η6 (Béquignon 1937a) 44–47, and rebuilt in C4l with a peri-

style of 6 × 12 columns (Ostby (1992), (1994)). A Dioskoureion in the city is mentioned at Dem. 19.158 (cf. Chrysostomou 1983). A C5 marble statue of Athena was found on the acropolis, which may indicate a sanctuary of the goddess there (PECS 702).

Dem. 8.59 and 10.61 refer to the τείχη of Pherai; the city wall was constructed in C4l (Camp 2000) 43); it is 3–5 m thick, built of rough-faced rectangular and trapezoidal blocks laid in fairly regular courses (PECS 702) and runs for c.5 km; at the Athanassios hill, a gate and six towers have been identified (Kakavoyannis (1977)); the area enclosed measures at least 82 ha (= the upper city) but perhaps as much as c.120 (including the lower city; M. Di Salvatore, pers. comm.); to the south-west, there may have been a second wall; to the south it was an emplektron wall (ArchDelt 50 (1995) B1: 363).

The patron divinity was En(n)odia, who is depicted on Classical coins (infra; Chrysostomou 1998); LIMC 111.1 744). Other cults include those of Artemis (IG ix.2 417.2 (C4)), the Dioskouroi (Dem. 19.158), Poseidon (Chrysostomou 1998) 249), Zeus Thaulios (Béquignon 1937a) 92, 66.2 (Archaic)), as well as those of Aphrodite, Athena, Demeter, Hestia and Themis (Chrysostomou 1998) 48–49).

Citizens of Pherai served the Amphiktyonic League in the capacities of naopoios (CID ii 31.73, 85 (345), 74.1.69 (337/6), 75.11.40 (336/5), etc.) and hieronmonem (CID ii 102.11.A.25 (324/3); cf. 118.1). A monetary donation by Pherai towards the rebuilding of the temple at Delphi is recorded in CID ii 1.1.47 (362/1) and one to “θεορεοι sent out from Argos to announce the celebration of the Nemean Games and the Heraia” is recorded by IG IV 617.4 (316–293; Perlman 2000) 74–75, 127–29).

Pherai began minting silver coins in C5f, striking drachms, triobols, obols and hemiobols on the Aiginetan standard. Types: obv. Thessalian subduing bull, or head and neck of bull clasped by bull-fighter, or bull’s hoof; rev. horse with loose rein and lion’s head fountain in incuse square, or horse springing from rock in incuse square, or naked rider in incuse square, or horse’s head in incuse square; legends: ΦΕ, ΦΕΡ, ΦΕΡΑ, ΦΕΡΑΙ, ΦΕΡΑΙΟΝ. For similarities between these coins and contemporary coins of Kranon, Larisa, the Perrhaibians, Pharkadon, Trikka and Skotoussa, see Kraay (1976) 115–16 and Martin (1985) 36–37. Pherai may, in addition, have been the city that struck coins in the name of the Thessalians C.470–450; see Kraay (1976) 116 and Martin (1985) 37–38. For similarities between these putative coins of Pherai and contemporary coins of Skotoussa and

In C₄, drachms and triobols were minted: obv. head of nymph Hyperæia, or head of Ennodia, or lion’s head; rev. Ennodia with two torches riding on a galloping horse, or standing nymph Hyperæia with her hand on lion’s head fountain, or lion’s head fountain; legends: ΦΕΡΑΙΟΝ, ΦΕΡΑΙΩΥΝ. Bronze coins appear c.400: obv. head of Ennodia, or lion’s head; rev. lion’s head fountain, or Ennodia with torches riding on a horse (two denominations); legend: ΦΕΡΑΙΟΝ. Two of Jason’s successors struck coins in their own name. Alexander (369–357) struck both silver and bronze coins. Silver (didrachms, drachms, triobols, and obols): obv. head of Ennodia (sometimes with ΕΝΝΟΔΙΑΣ added), or young male head in petasos, or wheel; rev. armed horseman prancing, or lion’s head, or leg and foot of horse, or double axe; legends: ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΕΙΑ, ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΕΙΟΝ, ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΕΙΟΣ, ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ (of which the adjectival forms denote denominations). Bronze: obv. young male head in petasos, or forepart of rushing bull; rev. leg and foot of horse, or forepart of horse; or double axe; or horse’s head; legend: ΤΕΙΣΙΦΟΝΟΥ (Head, ΗΝΙ 306–9; Babelon, Traité ii.1. 1023–30, ii.4. 339–58; Rogers (1932) 162–68; Liampi (1996) 107–8, 112; SNG Cop. Thessaly 234–47).

415. Skotoussa (Skotoussaios) Map 54. Lat. 39.25, long. 22.35. Size of territory: 2. Type: [A]. The toponym is Σκοτούσα (Simon. fr. 127, Page), Σκοτούσα (Ps.-Skylax 64), Σκοτούσα (Arist. Mir. ausc. 841b9) or Σκοτόσα (Paus. 7.27.6). The city-ethnic is Σκοτόσαιος (IG ii² 8843 (C₄f); SEG 23 419 (C₄)), Σκοτοσαιοί (Xen. Hell. 4.3.3; SEG 34 452 (C₄)), Σκοτοσαιοί (SEG 43 310 (C₃)); Steph. Byz. 578.2 gives Σκοτοσαιοί.

In Ps.-Skylax 64, where πόλις is used in the urban sense, Skotoussa is one of nine toponyms listed between the headings πόλεις αὐτῆς and the addendum ἐλαῖ ἰἄι καὶ ἄλλαι πόλεις Θετταλῶν. The political sense is found at Dio. 15.75.1 (r367). The earliest epigraphical reference to a πόλις Σκοτοσαιοίων is in a citizenship decree of C₄l–C₃e (SEG 43 310). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins of C₃–C₄ (infra) and in the decree SEG 43 310; externally it is found at Xen. Hell. 4.3.3. The external individual use is found in SEG 34 452 (C₄) and CID 11 10, A.1.8 (357/6).

Skotoussa was situated in Thessalia (IG ii² 8843 (C₄f); Xen. Hell. 4.3.3), more precisely in Pelasgiotis (Simon. fr. 127, Page; Kineas (FGrHist 603) fr. 3). Its territory included the river Onchestos (Polyb. 17.20.5), Kynos Kephalai (hills and/or kome). Polyb. 18.22.9; Strabo 9.5.20), Melambion (another kome: Polyb. 18.20.6) and a hill, Phagoes (schol. Hom. II. 16.233a); none of these toponyms can be equated with sites on the ground. Skotoussa was bounded to the north by the crest line of the Revenia hills, to the east by the territory of Pherai, and to the south by the territories of Eretria Phthisiotis and, in particular, Pharsalos (Decourt (1990) fig. 27).

Alongside Larisa, Kranon and Pharsalos, Skotoussa is mentioned by Xen. Hell. 4.3.3 as being allied to the Boiotians in 395/4. Later in C₄ Skotoussa was conquered by Alexander of Pherai, who in 367/6 summoned a meeting of the ekklesia (Diod. 15.75.1) to be held in the theatre (Paus. 6.5.2; cf. Stählin (1924a) 109, and Dilke (1948) 138–39), whereupon he had his mercenaries kill all the participants.

A citizen of Skotoussa was appointed as proxenos by Pherai in C₄ (SEG 23 419), and one by Delphi c.320 (SEG 18 179).

Skotoussa was a walled and fortified city in 367 (Diod. 15.75.1), but there are no visible remains of the Classical wall, the preserved remains being Hellenistic (Missaïlidou-Despotidou (1993)). Remains of a wall enclosing the acropolis in the south-western corner of the city could still be seen by Leake in 1809, but were already badly preserved (Leake (1835) iv. 45ff).

Skotoussa had cults of Apollo Kerdoios (Missaïlidou-Despotidou (1993) A71), Asklepios (ibid. A1), Demeter (Moustaka (1983) 94 (C₅a)), Dionysos (ibid. 106 (C₄m)), Herakles (ibid. 162, 163, 199 (C₅l, C₄m, C₃)), and Zeus (schol. Hom. II. 16.233a).

Poulydamas of Skotoussa achieved an Olympic victory in the pankration in 408 (Olympionikai 348).

Skotoussa struck silver coins on the Aiginetan standard c.480–400 and coins of silver and bronze from c.400 to, probably, 367. (1) Silver, C₅ (drachm, triobol, obol): (i) obv. man wrestling bull; rev. forepart of horse; or obv. bull’s head; rev. horse’s head; legend: ΣΚΟ (on similarities between these coins and contemporary coins of Kranon, Larisa, the Perraibians, Pharkadon, Pherai and Trikka, see Kraay (1976) 115–16 and Martin (1985) 36–57); (ii) obv. forepart of horse; rev. corn-grain in deep incuse square; legend: ΣΚΟ; on similarities between these coins and contemporary coins of Methylión and coins struck in the name of “the
Thessalians” (possibly by Pherai, supra), see Kraay (1976) 116 and Martin (1985) 37–38. (2) Silver, 400–367 (triobol, trihemiobol); obv. head of bearded Herakles; rev. forepart of horse; legend: ΣΚΩ; or obv. head of young Herakles; rev. Demeter(?); legend: ΣΚΟΤΟΥΣΣΑΙΩΝ. (3) Bronze, c.400–367: obv. head of young Herakles, or female head facing; rev. forepart of horse, or vine-branch with grapes; legend: ΣΚΟ or ΣΚΟΤΟΥΣΣΑΙΩΝ. Babelon, Traité ii.1.1030–31, i.i.4 nos. 626–33; Head, HN2 309; Rogers (1932) nos. 539–545; Liampi (1996) 107; SNG Cop. Thessaly 250–52.

416. Thetonion (Thetion) Map 55. Lat. 39.20, long. 22.10. For the location, see Helly (1992) 84. Size of territory: 2. Type: B. The toponym is presumably Θητώνιος, τό (cf. Hellan. fr. 8 and Keil (1899) 192). The city-ethnic is Θητώνιος in IG ix.2 257.2 (C5m).

No Archaic or Classical source calls Thetonion a polis, but it deserves inclusion in this Inventory because of an honorific decree passed by the Thetonions in C5m (IG ix.2 257) which (1) attests an eponymous official, a hyloros (cf., however, Sherk (1990) 259); (2) has the internal collective use of the city-ethnic; (3) grants a foreigner ἀσυλία and ἀτέλεια; (4) bestows the title of ἐνεργετας upon him; and (5) records the magistracy of τάγος in the community itself (see Helly (1995) 29–35). The expression Θητώνιος ἐδόκαν points to a session of an assembly. Finally, the inscription attests to a cult of Apollo Delphinios (ll. 10–11). Thetonion probably belonged to the tetras of Thessaliots (Helly (1995) 165).

417. Trikka (Trikkaios) Map 55. Lat. 39.35, long. 21.45. Size of territory: 2 or 3. Type: A. The toponym is Τρίκκα (κατά τόν Τρίκκα) (cf. Hellan. fr. 8 and Keil (1899) 192). Trikka is recorded (1.16) under the heading ταίδε τάν πολίων ἃν κακάν (1.11); Strabo 9.5.17 calls it a phrourion.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is found internally on C5 coins (infra) and externally in CID ii 1.1.16 (362/1) and Diod. 18.56.5 (1319). In the Delphic naopoioi’s accounts of 362/1 (CID ii 1) the Trikkaian are recorded (1.16) under the heading ταίδε τάν πολίων ἃν κακάν (1.11); Strabo 9.5.17 calls it a phrourion.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is found internally on C5 coins (infra) and externally in CID ii 1.1.16 (362/1) and Diod. 18.56.5 (1319). The external individual use is found in CID ii 48.1.46 (334/3).

Trikka was situated in Thessalia (IG iv.2.1 128.29 (c.280); IG xi.4 606 fr. b.8 (C3f)), more specifically in Hestiaiotis (Strabo 9.5.17). It is located in north-western Thessalia at modern Trikala. The site was inhabited in the Archaic and Classical periods, but the preserved building remains are all from a later date (Tziaphalias (1988) 186–92).

Diod. 18.56.5 reports that Trikkaian exiles were explicitly excluded from the general amnesty decreed by Polyperchon in 319, and this suggests that the city had followed a policy opposed to Philip II of Makedon (Martin (1985) 104; Hammond (1994) 48). Nothing further is known about these exiles, but their very existence indicates a defined body of citizens.

The patron divinity was Asklepios, who, according to Strabo, was born at Trikka (14.1.39) and there had his oldest and most famous sanctuary (9.5.17); the Asklepieion has not yet been identified (Tziaphalias (1988) 188–92). Coin types (infra) suggest cults of Athena and the eponymous nymph.

Trikka struck coins in both silver and bronze; the silver issues are dated to 480–400, the bronze issues to 400–344. (1) Silver (Aiginetan standard). Triobols: obv. Thessalian subduing bull or forepart of bull; rev. forepart of horse in incuse square; legend: ΤΡΙΚ, ΤΡΙΚΚΑ, ΤΡΙΚΙΚΑΙΟΝ, ΤΡΙΚΚΑΙΟΝ or ΤΡΙΚΚΑΙΩΝ; on similarities between these coins and contemporary coins of Krannon, Larisa, the Perraibians, Pharkadon, Pherai and Skotoussa, see Kraay (1976) 115–16 and Martin (1985) 36–37. Trihemiobols: obv. horseman; rev. nymph Trikka seated with phiale and mirror; legend: ΤΡΙΚΚΑΙΟ. Obols: obv. horse; rev. nymph engaged in various activities, or Athena running; legend: ΤΡΙΚΚ, ΤΡΙΚΑ, ΤΡΙΚΑΙΟ, ΤΡΙΚΚΑΙΟΝ. Hemibols: obv. bull’s hoof; rev. forepart of horse; legend: ΤΡΙΚΚΑΙΩΝ. (2) Bronze: obv. head of nymph Trikka; rev. armed warrior advancing, or Asklepios seated with serpent and serpent erect below chair or serpent erect before chair being fed a bird by the god; legend: ΤΡΙΠΙΚΚΑ, ΤΡΙΚΚΑΙΟΝ, ΤΡΙΚΚΑΙΩΝ. (Head, HN2 310–11; Babelon, Traité ii.1 no. 1443, ii.4 nos. 538–59; Rogers (1932) 176–78; Liampi (1996) 112; SNG Cop. Thessaly 262–67).

2. Adjacent Regions

2.1 Dolopia

418. Angeia (Angieius) Map 55. Lat. 39.05, long. 22.40. Size of territory: 2 Type: A (classified as a fort/tower by Barr., but see infra). The toponym has been restored as Ἀγγεία, ἤ (ἐν Ἀγγείαί) in a C5s catalogue of theorodokoi from Delphi (CID ii 26. p. 26). The city-ethnic is Ἀγγείεις (CID ii 8.11.16 (C4f)) or Ἀγγείατις (F.Delphes 31.2 68.10 (C2f)).

No Archaic or Classical source calls Angeia a polis; but in the Delphic naopoioi’s accounts the Ἀγγείεις are recorded in a fragmentary list (CID ii 8.11.16), the heading of which undoubtedly included the formula ταίδε τάν πολίων ἃν κακάν (cf. CID ii 5.11.25–26 vel sim. Ager (1996) no. 65 is a
C3l/C2e arbitration between Ktimene and Angeia, which refers to both these communities as poleis (ll. 21, 25). Since the external collective use of the city-ethnic occurs in CID II 8.16 (C4f) to record a collective donation by the Angeians of 100 dr. towards the rebuilding of the temple at Delphi, it was possibly a polis in C4. Angeia was a Dolopian community (IG II² 112.59 (C2)), but it apparently did not provide the Amphiktyonic League with Dolopian hieromnemones in C4 when these were provided by Ktimene (Lefèvre (1998) 85). At the site (for which see Helly (1992)) are remains of a poly- 
circular court with diateichisma, gate and towers (Stählin (1924a) 149).

419. Ktimene  (Ktimenaioi)  Map 55. Lat. 39.05, long. 22.00. Size of territory: 2. Type: [A]. The toponym is Κτιµενῆ, ἥ (Ap. Rhod. 1.68; Steph. Byz. 388.17); in REG 62 (1949) 28 l. 16 (C2) Daux restored the plural form ἐν ᾿ Κτιµὲναις. The city-ethnic is Κτιµεναῖος (CID II 74.1.49 (337/6)).

Ktimene is not explicitly called a polis in any Archaic or Classical source, but the political sense is indirectly attested in the Delphic accounts of 337/6 (CID II 74), where a tamias of Ktimene is recorded (1.49) after the heading τὸν ταµίαν ἀποστέψειν τὰς πόλεις (1.4). For an explicit attestation, see Ager (1996) no. 65, a C3l/C2e arbitration between Ktimene and Angeia which refers to both these communities as poleis (ll. 21, 25). The external and individual use of the city-ethnic in C4s (CID II 32.45, 74.1.49, 77.1.10, 100.1.10, 102.1.11) is further proof of polis status in this period.

Ktimene was a Dolopian community (CID II 74.1.49; Ap. Rhod. 1.68) and as such sometimes provided the Amphiktyonic League with the Dolopian hieromnemon (CID II 32.45 (C4l)).

At Ktimene, a C3 wall crowns the acropolis (Stählin (1924a) 148), and a second fortified place was found “½ Stunde südöstlich” from Rentina (ibid.).

2.2 Ainis

420. Hypata (Hypataioi)  Map 55. Lat. 38.50, long. 22.15. Size of territory: ? Type: [A]. The toponym is Ὑπαταῖος, ἥ (BCH 45 (1921) 111.127 (230–220); ArchEph (1914) 88, 2.9 (C3)) or  Ὑπαταία (Arist. Mir. ausc. 843.16). The city-ethnic is Ὑπαταῖος (CID II 3.8 (362–357); C4f coins (infra); IG IX.2 32.1 (C4)), and Ὑπαταίες (IG IV 617.2 (316–293)).

If [τ]α[δὲ τὰν πολὲον] and [Ἠ]πατα[ῖον] are correctly restored in CID II 3.1 and 8, then Hypata is there listed as a polis in the political sense; later sources frequently apply polis in the political sense to the city (e.g. IG IX.2 7a, passim). The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found in IG IX.2 32.1 (C4) and on C4f coins (infra). The external collective use is found in CID II 3.8 (362–357, heavily restored) and IG IV 617.2 (316–293); see further Perlman (2000) 74, 127–29.

The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested only in Hellenistic sources, e.g. F.Delphes 111.4.363.2 (225–210).

Hypata was an Aenian city (Arist. Mir. ausc. 843.16). At the site are remains of an acropolis wall (Béguignon (1937b) with fig. 13) and a circuit wall, certain parts of which date to C4–C3 (Stählin (1924a) 211; Béguignon (1937b) 310–11). Inside the walls are undated remains of walls (Béguignon (1937b) 310).

A C4 grant of proxeny (along with epinomia and enktesis) by Hypata is recorded in IG IX.2 3a, which also attests to the existence of a board of ἀρχοντες (3a.4).

Coin types suggest cults of Zeus and Athena; Hermes is attested by IG IX.2 31 (Hell.?). Apollo Hypataioi is attested outside the city itself in Epidaurus (IG II² 1.451 (C3)), and Asklepios Hypataioi on Paros (IG XII.5 156 (“late”) and Thera (IG XII.3 suppl. 1330 (C2)). Relations to Panhellenic sanctuaries are attested by a collective donation of money by the city towards the rebuilding of the temple at Delphi (CID II 3.8 (362–357), heavily restored). IG IV 617.2 (316–293) records a monetary donation by the Hypataioi “to the ἄρχοντες sent out from Argos to announce the celebration of the Nemean Games and the Heraia” (Perlman (2000) 74, 127–29).

Hypata struck bronze coins in C4f. Types: obv. laureate head of Zeus and thunderbolt within border of dots; rev. Athena Nikephoros with spear and shield; legend: ΥΠΑΤΑΙΩΝ (Head, HN² 296; Babelon, Traité i.4 no. 454; Rogers (1932) nos. 267–68; SNG Cop. Thessaly 74).

421. (Kapeleis)  Unlocated. Not in Barr. Type: [A]. A toponym is not attested. The city-ethnic Καψελεύς is attested only once in a Classical source: viz. in the Delphic accounts of 337/6 (CID II 74), where a Kaphelin tamias is recorded (1.56) after the heading τὸν ταµίαν ἀποστέψειν τὰς πόλεις (1.4). The same source assigns the community to Aenis.

422. (Korophaioi)  Map 55. Unlocated. Not in Barr. Type: C. A toponym is not attested. The city-ethnic Κοροφαῖος (CID II 97.64 (327/6)). The community is mentioned in a single type of source: the Delphic naopic accounts, which four times mention Κέλων Κοροφαῖος as Aenian hieromnemon (CID II 92.5 (328), 94.8 (328/7), 96.10 (327/6), 97.64 (327/6)).
423. **Phyrrhagioi**  
Map 55. Unlocated. Not in Barr. Type: [A]. A toponym is not attested. The city-ethnic is Φυρράγιος (CID ii 1.1.40 (362/1)). *Polis* in the political sense is indirectly attested in the Delphic accounts of 337/6 (CID ii 74), where a *tamin* of the *Phyrrhagioi* is recorded (1.57) after the heading τῶν ταμίων ἀποσπημένων τὰς πόλεις (1.4). Cf. also CID ii 1 (362/1), a list of contributions towards the rebuilding of the temple at Delphi headed by the phrase ταῖδε τὰν πολίων ἤνικαν (1.28); one donation is described as handed in by an Αἰνιάν Φυρράγιος Στράτων (1.40), which shows that the *Phyrrhagioi* were conceived of as a *polis*. Other *Phyrrhagioi* were mentioned in the Delphic naopic accounts as Αἰνιαν Φυρράγιος Στράτων (Strabo 8.6.24, 9.2.23) or Παρασοπιοι (Strabo 9.5.10). The city-ethnic is Παρασοπιοι (F.Delphes.iii.118.3 (324/3)).

No Archaic or Classical source calls Παρασοπιοι a *polis* (Strabo 8.6.24, 9.2.23 calls it a *kome* in reference to his own day); but it may be included as a probable *polis* here on account of two Delphic grants of proxeny to men from the community: F.Delphes.iii.118 is a grant of 324/3 to a man described as Παρασοπιοι, and F.Delphes.iii.118.3 one of c.300 to an [Ο]λ[τάοις ἐκ Παρασοπιων. It was thus an Oitaian community.

2.4 Malis

427. **Anthele**  
Map 55. Lat. 38.45, long. 22.30. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is Ἀνθήλη, η in Hdt. 7.176.2, 200.2. No city-ethnic is attested. At 7.176.2, Herodotos describes Anthele as a *polis* in the urban sense; at 7.200.2, however, he describes it as a *kome* associated with the sanctuary of Demeter Amphiktyon. There is no obvious explanation for these two different classifications (Hansen (2000) 197), and there is no evidence either to support or to reject Herodotos’ *polis* classification. Hdt. 7.216 implicitly places Anthele in Malis. For the site, see Béguignon (1937b) 181–91; Thalmann (1980).

428. **Antikyra**  
Map 55. Lat. 38.50, long. 22.25. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Αντικυρή, η (Hdt. 7.198.2). The city-ethnic is Αντικυραῖος in Hdt. 7.214.1, 8.21.1, or Αντικυρίταις (IG ix.1.227 (C2m)). The only Classical source to mention Antikyra is Herodotos, who at 7.198.2 calls it a *polis* in the urban sense, and at 7.214.1 and 8.21.1 applies the city-ethnic to two individuals of the city.

Antikyra has not yet been securely located, but it was in Malis (Hdt. 7.198.1–2) and most probably lay on the southern bank of the river Spercheios, between Komma and Phrantzi, upstream from the confluence with the

2.3 Oita

425. **Cheneus**  
Map 55. Unlocated. Type: C. The toponym is Χενεύς (Diog. Laert. 1.106) or Χεναῖος, ai (Paus. 10.24.1; cf. Dio. 9.6). The city-ethnic is Χενεύς (Pl. 343A; Paus. 10.24.1; Diog. Laert. 1.106) or Χεναῖος (Musonius Rufus 11.39; Stob. Flor. 4.154.18–46).

Chenes is always mentioned in connection with Myson, one of the Seven Sages of the Archaic period (Pl. 343A). According to Diog. Laert. 1.107–8, the location of Chenes was subject to dispute already in Antiquity, but there is a reasonably consistent tradition associating it with the area of Oita and Malis (Diod. 9.6; Paus. 10.24.1; Diog. Laert. 1.106). Its only claim to inclusion in this Inventory is the existence of an ethnic closely related to the toponym and used as a part of Myson's name as early as Plato (Pl. 343A); such a usage is often indicative that the site to whose toponym the ethnic is related was a *polis* (Hansen (1996) 182–87), especially in external contexts. If Χενεύς/Χεναῖος is not a sub-ethnic (ibid. 171–73, 182), then Chen was possibly a *polis*. However, Χενεύς/Χεναῖος may very well be a sub-ethnic: our sources consistently describe Chen as a *kome* (Diod. 9.6; Paus. 10.24.1; Diog. Laert. 1.106), and Aristoxenos is cited by Diogenes as saying that Myson the Sage did not live in a *polis* but a *kome* (Aristox. fr. 10, Wehrli = Diog. Laert. 1.107); if it was a *kome*, it is not known to which *polis* it belonged.
Gorgopotamos, possibly at Kostalexi (Béquignon (1937b) 305–6; Kase (1991) 78, followed by Barr.).

429. Echinos (Echinaios) Map 55. Lat. 38.55, long. 22.45. Size of territory: ? Type: A. The toponym is 'Εχιναῖος, δ (Ar. Lys. 1169) or 'Εχινος (Dem. 9.34; IG iv 617.2 (316–293)) or 'Εχινεος (BCH 45 (1921) iii.131 (230–220)). The city-ethnic is 'Εχιναιοι (CID ii 167.27 (C45)).

Echinos is called a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 62 (cf. Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 145, 154), but apart from that the earliest references to a πόλις 'Εχιναῖοι are SEG 25 642 (C2f) and Polyb. 9.42.1 (r210). The C3 poet Rhianos (FGrHist 265) fr. 34 uses ἀστικὸν about Echinos. The external and collective use of the city-ethnic is found in CID ii 67.27, 71.28 (C48). The external and individual use of the city-ethnic is attested in F.Delphes iii 377 (346). IG iv 617.2 (316–293) records a monetary donation by Echinos "to the θεοτεροι sent out from Argos to announce the celebration of the Nemean Games and the Heraia" (Perlman (2000) 74, 127–29).

Not much is known about the history of Echinos. F.Delphes iii 377 = Syll.3 222 (346) is a grant of proxeny by Delphi to an Echinian, and Dem. 9.34 implies Theban control of, or influence at, Echinos in the time of Philip II, brought to an end by Philip.

Echinos was situated in Malis according to Ps.-Skylax 62; the territory is described as γῆ πάµφορος by Polyb. 9.41.11. The urban history of Archaic/Classical Echinos is unknown, most remains being Hellenistic; cf. the entry on Trachis (Thuc. 3.92.4), or his statement about the renaming must be taken to refer to the community, not the site, of old Trachis. That would indicate that the 'Trachinians themselves were enrolled as citizens of Herakleia (cf. Diod. 14.82.6; Polyenaen 2.21), as would the fact that a new distribution of land followed the foundation (Diod. 12.59.3). Cf. also Paus. 10.22.1 (r280), who distinguishes the ruins of old Trachis from the city of Herakleia; and Stählin (1924a) 208 with fig. 27 at 206, who locates old Trachis in the lower city of Herakleia. See also Béquignon (1937b) 244, who locates old Trachis on the later acropolis of Herakleia; both locations imply that Trachis was merged with Herakleia at the latter's foundation. (Ps.-Skylax 62 lists Τραχίς alongside 'Ηράκλεια. However, this is presumably irrelevant for the discussion above, since it is at Strabo 9.4.13; polis in the political sense is found at Thuc. 3.92.4, 5.51.1–2; it is called ἄσποκικα at Thuc. 3.92.1.

The C4e coin legend HPAK (infra) is presumably an abbreviation of the internal collective city-ethnic; the external collective use of the city-ethnic is found at Thuc. 5.51.1–2; Xen. Hell. 3.5.6, 6.5.23; and IG iv 617.1 (316–293). The external individual use is found at, e.g., CID ii 36.1.9, 35 (3405).

Herakleia was founded in 426 by the Lakedaimonians (Thuc. 3.92.1), who provided the three oecists Leon, Alkidas and Damagon (Thuc. 3.92.5). Pressed in war by the Oitaianas (πολέμων ἐφθαρμένοι: Thuc. 3.92.2; τοὺς πλείους τῶν πολιτῶν ἀπέβαλον... κρήμαν οὐσίς τῆς πόλεως: Diod. 12.59.4), the Trachinians (one of the three mere of the Milians; cf. the entry on Trachis infra) and the Dorians of central Greece had sent an embassy to Lakedaimon (Thuc. 3.92.2–3). Neither Thucydides nor Diodorus states exactly what was asked of the Lakedaimonians (cf. Malkin (1994) 221), but they decided to grant help in the form of a colony (Thuc. 3.92.4) and proceeded to consult the Delphic oracle, which recommended the foundation (Thuc. 3.92.5). The settlers were drawn from the Spartans themselves, from the perioikoi and from other Hellenes to the exclusion of certain ethe such as the Achaians and the Ionians (Thuc. 3.92.5); Diod. 12.59.4 says that the settlers were drawn from Lakedaimonians, Peloponnesians and other Hellenes.

Thuc. 3.92.6 presumably means that Herakleia was a new foundation (cf. HCT ad loc.; Malkin (1994) 221), and Strabo's statement that Herakleia was 6 stades from the site of Trachis (9.4.13) confirms this if the reference is to the original site; however, Diod. 12.59.3 says that Trachis was renamed Herakleia (cf. Strabo 9.4.13) whereby he possibly means to locate the city at the site of Trachis. If Strabo's statement about the location of Herakleia is accepted as referring to the original site, then Diodorus must be wrong, or his statement about the renaming must be taken to refer to the community, not the site, of old Trachis. That would indicate that the 'Trachinians themselves were enrolled as citizens of Herakleia (cf. Diod. 14.82.6; Polyenaen 2.21), as would the fact that a new distribution of land followed the foundation (Diod. 12.59.5). Cf. also Paus. 10.22.1 (r280), who distinguishes the ruins of old Trachis from the city of Herakleia; and Stählin (1924a) 208 with fig. 27 at 206, who locates old Trachis in the lower city of Herakleia. See also Béquignon (1937b) 244, who locates old Trachis on the later acropolis of Herakleia; both locations imply that Trachis was merged with Herakleia at the latter's foundation. (Ps.-Skylax 62 lists Τραχίς alongside 'Ηράκλεια. However, this is presumably irrelevant for the discussion above, since it is
From the outset the ethnic identity of the city was mixed (see supra). In the context of the Amphiktyonic League, Herakleia counted as Malian, at least in C4s when its citizens are seen serving the Amphiktyony as Malian hieromnemos, of which Herakleia regularly provided one (CID 36.1.9, 35.11.23 (340s), 43.27 (340), 76.1.27 (335), 77.1.2 (334/3), 97.65 (327/6), 102.1.17 (324/3), 102.11.33 (324/3), 32.49 (CD 5); cf. 73.1.38 (337/6) for one serving as tambias), the other being provided by Lamia. However, Diod. 18.11.1 (1323) describes it as Oitaian (cf. Diod. 15.57.2), and so does Strabo (9.5.10).

According to Thuc. 3.93.2, the city was originally populous (παντοκράτορας); Diod. 12.59.5 (cf. Ps.-Skymnos 597) gives the number of settlers as 10,000 (4,000 Lakedaimonians and other Peloponnesians, and 6,000 from the rest of the Hellenes; but see Schaefer (1961)). However, the city was soon depopulated due to Spartan maladministration (Thuc. 3.93.2, 5.52.1): the Spartans sent out ἀρχηγοί to govern Herakleia, which was clearly treated as a Spartan dependency (Thuc. 3.93.2; cf. Xen. Hell. 1.1.18, where such a Spartan officer is termed ἄρχοντας; cf. the sketch of the political history infra). Ten thousand settlers (Diod.; Ps.-Skymnos) is probably not a historical figure, but an ideological number (Schaefer (1961); for another view, see Helly (1995) 280–87, a discussion of Thessalian military figures). For information on the level of population there are only hoplite numbers vel sim.: in 426, 500 hoplites served with Sparta (Thuc. 3.100.2), and in 409/8, 700 hoplites fell in battle against the Oitaians (Xen. Hell. 1.1.18); in 399, 500 citizens were executed during a stasis (Diod. 14.38.4). But the composition of the population underwent several modifications as the city was drawn into the power struggles of the larger poleis.

In 422/1 a Spartan army on the march for Thrace interfered in the political life of the city (Thuc. 5.12). In 420/19, the Herakleots were defeated in battle by the Ainians, Dolopians, Milians and some Thessalians (Thuc. 5.51.2; Diod. 12.77.4 reporting heavy losses); these people had been hostile towards the foundation from the beginning (Thuc. 5.51.2). In 419/18 the Boiotians (possibly sent for by Herakleia itself, cf. Diod. 12.77.4) took over the city and expelled the Spartan archon Agesippidas (Thuc. 5.52.1); however, by 395 it was apparently once again a Spartan ally (Xen. Hell. 3.5.6). In 409/8, the Herakleots again fought the Oitaians, losing 700 men due to betrayal by their Achaian allies (Xen. Hell. 1.2.18). A stasis is attested for 399 (Diod. 14.38.4 and infra); citizens exiled by the Lakedaimonians are reported for 395 (Diod. 14.82.6), and they may have been exiled on this occasion. In 399, the Spartan officer Herippidas successfully fought off the Oitaian threat (Diod. 14.38.5). In 395 the city was captured (with inside help) by the Boiotians and Argives, who killed captured Lakedaimonians, sent off other Peloponnesians, and restored citizens previously exiled by the Lakedaimonians (Diod. 14.82.6–7). In 371/0, Jason of Pherai took the city by treachery, razed the walls (Xen. Hell. 6.4.27), made it anastatos, and handed over the territory to the Oitaians and the Malians (Diod. 15.57.2). The community must, however, have been reconstituted, since it appears in C4s: cf. the Delphic inscriptions cited supra and Diod. 18.11.1, 56.5.

The city was initially an ally of Sparta (Thuc. 3.100.2), and again on later occasions such as the battle of Leuktra (Xen. Hell. 6.4.9); an alliance with the Phthiotic Achaioi is implied by Xen. Hell. 1.2.18. An alliance with Boiotia is attested by Xen. Hell. 6.5.23.

A stasis occurred in 399 (Diod. 14.38.4): the Lakedaimonians sent out Herippidas to settle the problems; he called a meeting of the ekklesia and proceeded to execute 500 citizens (Diod. 14.38.4); Polyaen. 2.21 describes the citizens here executed as Trachinioi; the exiles restored by the Boiotians and Argives in 395 are likewise described as Trachinioi (Diod. 14.82.7), and this suggests that the city experienced severe difficulties in integrating the Trachinians and the new settlers (Gehrke, Stasis 73; Malkin (1994) 221–27). Exiles are attested in 395 (Diod. 14.82.6) and again in 319, when they were explicitly excluded from the general amnesty issued by Philip Arrhidaios (Diod. 18.56.5).

A citizen of Herakleia is listed as proxenos of Karthaia on Keos in IG xii.5 542.33 (C4m).

Herakleia was situated at a distance of 20 stades from the sea, 40 stades from Thermopylae (Thuc. 3.92.6), and 6 stades from the site of Trachis (Strabo 9.4.13). To the west the neighbours were Ains and Oitaia, to the north Malis and Lamia, and to the south was Doris, and to the south-east Thermopylae. In Strabo’s day Parasopias was a kome in the territory (8.6.24, 9.2.23); in the Classical period it was possibly a polis (see the entry for Parasopioi).

Herakleia was fortified at its foundation (Thuc. 3.92.6; cf. Xen. Hell. 6.4.27); traces of fortifications (acropolis wall and city wall) are briefly mentioned by Stählin (1924a) 207. Docks (φαραγγία) were constructed at the foundation as well (Thuc. 3.92.6). The agora is mentioned in IG ix.2 103.9 (C2m). Demetrios of Kallatis (FGrHist 85) fr. 6 (apud Strabo 1.3.20) reports that the city was badly damaged by an earthquake, presumably the one in 426 (Fossey (1990) 183) and thus at or shortly after the foundation.
The chief cult was presumably that of Herakles (Diod. 12.59.4); other attested deities are Artemis (Livy 36.22) and Asklepios (A. Kontogiannis (1997) 176). A festival called Herakleia is attested by IG ix.1.229.10 (C2).

IG IV 617.1 (316–293) records a monetary donation by the Herakleots "to the theaoroi sent out from Argos to announce the celebration of the Nemean Games and the Heraia" (Perlman (2000) 74, 127–29). Donations, presumably by individual Herakleots, towards the rebuilding of the temple at Delphi are recorded by CID ii 12.1.54, 56 (341/40).

Herakleia struck coins in silver and bronze from C4e. (1) Silver: denominations: obol, hemiobol, tetartemorion on the Aiginetan standard; types: obv. lion’s head; rev. club with different symbols, or bow and quiver; legend: HpA, HpAk. (2) Bronze: obv. lion’s head, or head of nymph; rev. club with different symbols, or lion’s head; legend: HpA (Head, HN² 296; Babelon, Traité ii.4 nos. 444–50; Rogers (1932) nos. 247–53; SNG Cop. Thessaly 66–69).

431. Lamia (Lamieus) Map 55. Lat. 38.50, long. 22.25. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Λαμία, ἦ (Ps.-Skyxal 62; Hyp. 6.18; CID ii 118.3 (c.365–360); BCH 45 (1921) iii.135 (230–220)); the city-ethnic is Λαμιεύς (CID ii 8.11.13 (before 356), 32.49 (325)).

Lamia is called a polis in the urban sense at Ps.-Skyxal 62 (ἐστὶ δὲ Μαλιεύσιν ἦ πρώτη πόλις Λαμία) and Diod. 18.12.4 (1323); in the political sense, polis is indirectly attested in the Delphic accounts of 337/6 (CID ii 74), where a tamias of Lamia is recorded (1.57) and the heading τῶν ταμιῶν ἀποτέμπεσεν τὰς πόλεις (1.4). The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C4f coins (infra) and in IG ix.2.60 (C4l); the external collective use is found in CID ii 8.11.13 (before 356), Demetrios of Kallatias (FGrHist 85) fr. 5 (1426) (cf. Fossey (1990) 183–84) apud Strabo 1.3,20, and Diod. 18.11.1 (1323/2); and the external individual use is found in CID ii 36.1.10 (343–340), 43.5 (340).

Lamia was a Malian community (Ps.-Skyxal 62; Diod. 18.11.1 (1323); cf. infra on coins) and regularly provided the Amphiktyonic League with one of the Malian hieromnemones (CID ii 32.49 (325), 36.1.10 (343–340), 36.1.36 (343–340), etc.), the other being provided by Herakleia (Stählin (1924b) 554). (For the possibility that Lamia belonged to Achaia prior to 413, see Kip (1910) 42–43 and Stählin (1924b) 553). A citizen of Lamia served the Amphiktyonic League as tamias (CID ii 74.1.57 (337/6)), and another fulfilled an unidentifiable function (CID ii 118.2–3 (c.365–360) with comm.). A collective donation by Lamia of 600 dr. towards the rebuilding of the temple at Delphi is recorded in CID ii 8.11.13 (before 356).

In contradistinction to the other Malians, the Lamians did not join the Greek alliance during the Lamian War (Diod. 18.11.1) but served Antipatros as a refuge (Diod. 18.13).

A grant of politeia and prooexenia to two men of Larisa is attested by IG ix.2.60 (C4l). The same decree attests to the existence of a board of archons, a strategos, a hipparchos and a grammateus (13–18); cf. SEG 16 373 (C3f) attesting to the same magistracies. A grant of ἔκτησις γας καὶ ὀικίας is included in IG ix.2.60.7–8 (C4l) as well.

According to Demetrios of Kallatias (FGrHist 85) fr. 6, as transmitted by Strabo 1.3,20, the city of Lamia suffered considerably from the earthquake of 426 (cf. Fossey (1990) 183–84), but no details are given. The earliest urban remains at the site are on the acropolis, which rises to 173 m; there are remains of a C6 polygonal fortification wall and of a second phase dating to C5–C4 (Stählin (1924b) 548; Scarron (1941) 91–92; Lauffer (1989) 365–66). During the Lamian War, Antipatros was besieged by Leosthenes in Lamia (Hyp. 6.12), but its city walls, whose fine construction Diodorus empha-
sises (πείχοις πολυτελοὺς κατασκευασμένους), were able to withstand the assaults (Diod. 18.13.1–3). The course of these walls can be traced or reasonably hypothesised for its entirety. The Classical fortification (c.400) consisted of an inner and an outer wall, the inner running for c.3 km and the outer for c.4 km (see the plan in Stählin (1924b) 549–50), and enclosed an area of 80 ha (ibid. 552). Polyain. 4.4.2 refers to houses (οἰκίαι) in Lamia during the Lamian War.

Phalara (τὰ Φάλαρα: Polyb. 20.10.16) was, according to Steph. Byz. 656.3, a place πλησίον Λαμίας; it is described by Livy 27.30.3 as having a "good harbour" ( egregius portus) and so was probably the harbour of Lamia; its precise location is disputed (cf. Stählin (1924a) 217; Béquignon (1937b) 295–97; PECS 697; Lauffer (1989) 533); it is mentioned as existing in 426 by Strabo 1.3,20.

The principal divinity was presumably Dionysos, who is depicted on coins (infra) and whose sanctuary seems to have been used for publishing official documents (IG ii² 861.28 (C3l)).

Babelon, Traité ii.4 no. 464 is a silver diobol: obv. naked and bearded Herakles seated on rock holding kantharos in extended right hand and club in left; legend: ΛΑ (ΜΙΕΩΝ?); rev. hydra in incuse square; legend: ΤΠ (ΑΧΙΝΙΩΝ?). If the legends are correctly understood as abbreviations of the city-ethnics of Lamia and Trachis, then this coin may represent a joint issue of these two Malian cities (in which case the coin should predate 426,
which fits Babelon’s date of C3m; cf. Babelon, *Traité* ii.4 nos. 465–66 for two other coins possibly to be ascribed to Lamia). However that may be, Lamia is known to have struck in both silver and bronze from c.400. Silver (triobols and obols on the Aiginetan standard): obv. head of young ivy-crowned Dionysos; rev. amphora; legend: AAAMIEΩΝ. The legend is sometimes MAΛIΕΩΝ, presumably indicating a leading role for Lamia in the Malian *ethnos*. Also obv. head of nymph (Lamia?); rev. Philoktetes wearing pilos seated on rock, or Philoktetes kneeling and shooting with bow; legends: AAAMI, AAAMIEΩΝ. Bronze: obv. head of nymph (Lamia?); rev. Philoktetes on one knee or kneeling on rock shooting with bow; legend: AAAMIEΩΝ; or obv. head of nymph (Lamia?); rev. naked Philoktetes seated on rock, bow in front, or sitting on island with dolphin swimming in sea; legend: AAAMI; or obv. head of nymph (Lamia?); rev. Philoktetes kneeling, sometimes on rock, and shooting with bow; legends: AAAM, AAAMIEΩΝ; or obv. head of nymph; rev. amphora with ivy leaf above; legend: AAAMI; or, finally, obv. head of Athena; rev. standing Philoktetes shooting with bow; legend: MAΛIΕΩΝ (cf. supra). Head, HN² 296; Babelon, *Traité* ii.4 nos. 455–62; Rogers (1932) nos. 385–88; SNG Cop. Thessaly 75–81.

### 432. Trachis (Trachinios) Map 55, location as Herakleia (q.v.). Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is Τραχίς in Hdt. 7.199, and Τραχίζ in Ps.-Skylax 62 and Strabo 9.5.8. The city-ethnic is Τραχινίων (Thuc. 3.92.2) or Τραχινίων (Hdt. 7.175.2). Trachis is called a *polis* in the urban sense in Hdt. 7.199, a passage which also uses the verb πεπόλεμσα about the city. At Thuc. 3.92.2 the Τραχίνιον are described not as a *polis*, but as one of three μέρη into which the Malians were subdivided; however, the use of *meros* need not mean that Trachis was not a *polis*, as is clear from Hdt. 1.145, where *meros* is used to describe twelve communities in Peloponnesian Achaia which were all *polis* in the Classical period. Moreover, Diod. 12.59.3 (1426) describes the Trachinioi as the politai of Trachis, and Diod. 14.82.7 and Polyae. 2.21 use *Trachinios* in a manner which indicates that it was in fact the city-ethnic of Trachis. On the assumption that *Trachinios* is a city-ethnic, the following should be noted: the internal collective use is possibly found abbreviated as *TP* on C3m coins which may be a joint issue of Trachis and Lamia (*infra*). The external collective use of the city-ethnic is found in Hdt. 7.175.2, 217.1; Thuc. 3.92.2; and Ctesias (*FrHist* 688) fr. 13.128 (which also implies some social stratification: Τραχινίων οἱ δυνατοί, Καλλιάδης καὶ Τιμιάφερνης). The external individual use is found at Hdt. 7.213.3, 214.2. Thuc. 3.92.2 attests to a war fought by the Trachinians (πολέμων ἐφθαρμένων), which implies the existence of armed forces, as may—for what it is worth—Ctesias (*FrHist* 688) fr. 13.128 (Θώραξ δὲ Θέσαλος καὶ Τραχινίων οἱ δυνατοί, Καλλιάδης καὶ Τιμιάφερνης, παρῆσαν στρατιῶν ἐχόμενες). The sending of an embassy to Lakedaemon is attested by Thuc. 3.92.2. The territory is referred to as ἦ γάγη ἡ Τραχινίη at Hdt. 7.199 and as τῆς Μηλίδος ἡ Τραχινίη at 7.201.

In 426, the city was either renamed Herakleia or absorbed by a new Sparta-sponsored foundation of that name (see further the entry for Herakleia). Babelon, *Traité* ii.4 no. 464 is a C3m silver diobol on the Aiginetan standard: obv. naked and bearded Herakles seated on rock holding kantharos in extended right hand and club in left; legend: ΛΑΛΙΕΘΩΝ; rev. Hydria in incuse square; legend: TP(AXINIWΩΝ?). If the legends are correctly understood as abbreviations of the city-ethnics of Lamia and Trachis, then this coin may represent a joint issue of these two Malian cities.

### 2.5 Achaia

#### 433. Antron Map 55. Lat. 38.55, long. 22.55. Size of territory? Type: [A]. The toponym is Ἀντρών (Hom. II. 2.697), either ὁ (Strabo 9.5.8) or ἦ (Eust. II. 2.697), or Ἀντρώνες ([Dem.] 10.9; Ps.-Skylax 63; Strabo 9.5.7). A city-ethnic is not attested except in late sources, such as the entry in Steph. Byz. 101.16.

In Ps.-Skylax 63, where *polis* is used in the urban sense, Antron is the first of five toponyms listed between the head- ing Ἀχαιῶν πόλεις αὖδε and the addendum εἶδοι δὲ καὶ ἄλλαι πόλεις Ἀχαιῶς; *polis* in the political sense is not attested, but is possibly implied by Diod. 20.110.3 (r302). A citizen of Antron served as Delphic *theorodokos* in 230–220 (BCH 45: v.C(b).3).

The history of Antron is almost completely unknown; [Dem.] 10.9 states that Philip II “bought” (επτρίατο) the city, and Diod. 20.110.3 (r302) that it joined Demetrios after his capture of Larisa Kremaste.

Antron was situated in Achaia (Ps.-Skylax 63; Strabo 9.5.8). At the site of the city are traces of both an extremely badly preserved acropolis wall (Stählin [1924a] 182) and a polygonal circuit wall (ibid.). At modern Phano a cemetery of Classical and later times has been identified (*ArchDelt* 41 (1986) 1990 Chron. 74: 42 ([1988] 1993) B.1: 223 and later issues).
434. *Ekkarra (Ekkarreus) Map 55. Lat. 39.05, long. 22.10. Size of territory: 2. Type: B. The toponym is Ἀκαρρα in Steph. Byz. 58.9, who ἐκ τῆς τέχνης suggests the city-ethnics Ἀκαρράδος and Ἀκαρράτης; C48 coins, however, have Ἐκκαρρέως.

No Archaic or Classical source calls Ekkarra a polis, but polis status is suggested by the bronze coinage of C48 (infra). IG ix.2 223 is a C3l(?) proxeny decree by Ekkarra which uses polis and attests to the existence of archons.

Ekkarra was situated in Achaia (Steph. Byz. 58.9; Livy 32.13.13), and has been located at Kaitsa (Helly (1992) 85–89, pace Stählin (1924a) 154). The site at modern Ano Ktimeni (formerly Ano Dranista) was probably a second-order settlement in its territory. At the site of Ekkarra itself is a C4 circuit wall running for 775 m and with quadrangular towers; the acropolis was separately walled (Stählin (1924a) 159; Béquignon (1928) 463–65).

Ekkarra struck bronze coins in C48: obv. head of Zeus, or Apollo; rev. Artemis standing; legend: ΕΚΚΑΡΡΕΩΝ (Head, HN² 294; Babelon, Traité ii.4 no. 475; Rogers (1932) nos. 207–9; SNG Cop. Thessaly 47–48, Suppl. 244).

435. Halos (Haleus) Map 55. Lat. 39.10, long. 22.50, but see infra. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Ἀλος (Hom. Il. 2.682; Hdt. 7.173.1), Ἀλος, ὁ (Dem. 19.163); cf. Strabo 9.5.8: Ἀλος Ἰππος ἰππος, λέγεται γάρ ἀμφιστέρως. The city-ethnic is Ἀλεύς (Dem. 19.36, 39; coins, infra); Steph. Byz. 78.6 cites Sophokles (fr. 998, Pearson) for the form Ἀλεύσιος and glossographoi for Ἀλος.

Halos is called polis in the urban sense at Dem. 19.39, and the political sense is presumably implied at 19.36. The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C4–C3 coins (infra), and the external collective use is found in Dem. 19.36, 39.

Halos was situated in Achaia (Hdt. 7.173, 197; cf. C3 bronze coins with ΑΧ in monogram: Head, HN² 295). Its location, certainly close to the sea (Hdt. 7.173.1; Dem. 19.163), remains unknown; Reinders (1988) 159–63 proposes to locate it at Magoula Plataniotiki. In its territory were some minor settlements, presumably villages (Stählin (1924a) 176–77; Reinders (1988) 155–57, 161, 172), and a temple with Geometric pottery (Stählin (1924a) 177). Several military installations are attested as well (Stählin (1924a) 177, 185; Reinders (1988) 171; Haagsm et al. (1993); ArchDelt 49 (1994) Chron. 325–26; Malakassioti et al. (1994)), some of them with C4 phases.

The urban centre itself, then, remains unlocated (Barr. follows e.g. PECS in putting it at modern Halmyros, which is unlikely). At 7.197.2, Herodotos mentions a prytaneion (called λήστον in the local dialect), but it is unclear whether it is thought of as belonging to the local community of Halos (so Miller (1978) no. 324 and Hansen and Fischer-Hansen (1994) 32) or to the Achaians as such. From the mention of a siege by Parmenion at Dem. 19.163 (Ἄλον πολιορκημένον) it may be inferred that Halos was fortified by C4m; upon its capture, it became depopulated (ἀνάστατος . . . γέγονεν, Dem. 19.39) and the territory was handed over to the Pharsalians (Dem. 11.1) with whom Halos had had a conflict prior to its capture (Dem. 19.36). It was refounded in the early Hellenistic period (c.302) on the initiative of Demetrios Poliorcetes. See Reinders (1988).

A sanctuary of Zeus Laphystios is mentioned by Hdt. 7.197.1, where a legend associated with it is recounted. The patron divinity was presumably Artemis Panachaia (IG ix.2 add. 205.1 A.22, B.49 (Hell.)).


436. Kypaira (Kypharreus) Map 55. Lat. 39.00, long. 22.05. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Κύφαιρα,ἡ (BCH 45 (1921) i1 138 (230–220)), or Κύπαιρα (Ptol. Geog. 3.12.42). The city-ethnic is Κυφαρρέως (CID 11 2.1.21 (C4m)).

Kypaira was situated at Kydonia according to Helly (1992) 79–80 (followed by Barr.), who rejects Kaitsa (championed by Stählin (1924a) 159–60 and Béquignon (1957b) 336). At Kydonia are undated remains of an upper circuit measuring 120 × 40 m with a width of 2–2.5 m, constructed in rectangular blocks in regular courses; three towers are preserved; to the south is a poorly preserved lower circuit (Béquignon (1957b) 326–29, fig. 17). According to Ptol. Geog. 3.12.42, Kypaira was situated in Thessaliotis, but its geographical position puts it in Achaia (cf. Kip (1910) 73). Kypaira is listed as a polis in the political sense in CID 11 4.3–4, 12 (C4m); cf. 1.11.11, 21 (C4m). These same sources attest to the external collective use of the city-ethnic. Apart from these inscriptions, the information on Kypaira postdates our period, but worth noting is BCH 45 (1921) i1 138 (230–220) listing ἄ τόλις as theodorokos of Delphi.

437. Larisa (Larisaios) Map 55. Lat. 38.55, long. 22.50. Size of territory: ? Type: [A]. The toponym is Λάρισα (Ps.-Skylax 63), specified as Λάρισα νῆ Ἰεραμαστῆ by Heracle. Cret. 3.2 (GGM i 109) and Polyb. 18.38.3; Strabo 9.5.13 men-
tions another epithet: ἡ Πελασγία (cf. Steph. Byz. 412.19). The city-ethnic is Ἀλασσαῖοι (CID II 78.1.54 (337/6)), specified as [Ἀλασσαῖοι ἐκ Φθίλωτιδος] in IG xii.5 542.32 (C4).

In Ps.-Skylax 63, where polis is used in the urban sense, Larisa is the second of five toponyms listed between the heading Ἀχαιῶν πόλεις αἰδε and the addendum εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλαι πόλεις Ἀχαιῶς. The urban sense of polis is found in Diod. 20.110.2 (r302) as well. The political sense is indirectly attested in the Delphic accounts of 337/6 (CID II 74), where a tamias of Larisa is recorded (1.54) after the heading τῶν ταμίων ἀποστέμπειν τὰς πόλεις (1.4). For an explicit attestation, see an undated inscription from the city itself (IG ix.2 94.5). The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C4/C3e coins (Rogers (1932) no. 312), the external use in Demetrios of Kallatis (FGrHist 85) fr. 6 apud Strabo 1.3.20 (r426) (cf. Fossey (1996) 183–84) and Diod. 20.110.2 (r302). The external individual use is found in, e.g., CID II 118.6–7 (365–366), 78.1.38 (337/6); IG xii.5 542.32 (C4).

A citizen of Larisa is listed in a C4 catalogue of proxenoi from Karthaiia on Keos (IG xii.5 542.32).

Larisa was situated in Achaia (Hercla. Cret. 3.2; IG xii.5 542.32 (C4); Syll. 3 492.36 (232)) and was thus an Achaian community (CID II 78.1.38 (337/6)); the city regularly provided the Amphiktyonic League with one of the Achaian hieromnemones (CID II 32.47, 74.1.38, 76.1.23, 86.16, 118.6), the other being provided by Melitia.

According to Strabo 9.5.13, Larisa was situated 20 stades from the coast; Diod. 20.110.2 (r302) mentions a harbour (limen) at Larisa. The Archaic/Classical urban history of Larisa is almost unknown, all remains being Hellenistic (Stählin (1924a) 182–84), but a city was presumably in existence in C5l since, according to Demetrios of Kallatis (FGrHist 85) fr. 6 (apud Strabo 1.3.20), Larisa suffered seriously from an earthquake, certainly the one in 426 (Fossey (1996) 183–84).

Larisa struck bronze coins in C4l/C3e; types vary, the most interesting being obv. head of, presumably, Achilles; rev. Thetis riding on a sea-horse and carrying the shield of Achilles; legend: ΛΑΠΙΣΑΙΩΝ and ΑΧΑΙΩΝ in monogram (Rogers (1932) no. 312; SNG Cop. Thessaly 151–52). For a possible C4 bronze state seal of the city depicting obv. riding Thetis bringing shield + ΛΑ; rev. Skylla, see Robinson (1934).

438. Melitia (Melitaeus) Map 55. Lat. 39.00, long. 22.25. Size of territory: 1. Type: [A]. The toponym is Μελιταία, η (Ps.-Skylax 63), Μελιτεία (Thuc. 4.78.1; Theopomp. fr. 373), or Μελιτέα (CID II 118.6 (C4m)). The city-ethnic is Μελιταιεύς (Ephor. fr. 95.4; CID II 74.1.38; C4 coins, infra).

In Ps.-Skylax 63, where polis is used in the urban sense, Melitia is the third of five toponyms listed between the heading Ἀχαιῶν πόλεις αἰδε and the addendum εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλαι πόλεις Ἀχαιῶς. The political sense is indirectly attested in the Delphic accounts of 337/6 (CID II 74), where a tamias of Melitia is recorded (1.53) after the heading τῶν ταμίων ἀποστέμπειν τὰς πόλεις (1.4). An explicit attestation of the political sense is found in IG ix.2 208.3 (C3e). The internal and collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C4m coins (Head, HN 2 301). The external and individual use is found in CID II 32.47 (C4l), 74.1.38 (337/6). The external and collective use is found in Ephor. fr. 95.4.

According to Ephor. fr. 95, the Melitians had at one point entertained friendly relations with the tyrants of Pherai, but apart from that the political history of the city is unknown; a citizen of Melitia was granted proxeny by Delphi in 271 (F.Delphes 111.2 187). An inscription of c.140 (Ager (1996) no. 156) refers retrospectively to a possibly C4 arbitration between Melitia and Narthakion (Ager (1989) 108).

Melitia was situated in Achaia (Thuc. 4.78.1; Ps.-Skylax 63; CID II 118.5–6 (C4m)). The city regularly provided the Amphiktyonic League with one of the Achaian hieromnemones (e.g. CID II 32.47 (C4l), 79A.11.14 (334/3)), the other being provided by Larisa. The territory is referred to as τῶν Μελιταιῶν χώρα at Polyb. 18.6.4; c.270–260 its borders were regulated by international arbitration (Ager (1996) no. 30). At the site of the city, traces of a circuit wall, running for c.4 km, are visible, constructed in irregular rectangular blocks (Stählin (1924a) 162). At modern Haloni a C4 sanctuary of Asklepios has been found (BCH 96 (1972) 711).

In C4m Melitia struck coins in both silver and bronze. (1) Silver. Denominations: drachm, diobol, obol on the Aiginetan standard. Obv. head of Zeus, or of young Dionysos; rev. bull, or lion’s head, or bee (alluding to the name of the city); legends: ΜΕΛΙΤΑΙΩΝ. (2) Bronze. Obv. head of Zeus; rev. bee; legend: ΜΕΛΙΤΑΙΩΝ (Head, HN 2 301; Babelon, Traité ii.4 nos. 470–74; Rogers (1932) nos. 394–401; SNG Cop. Thessaly 172–73).

439. Peuma (Peumatos) Map 55. Lat. 39.30, long. 22.30. Size of territory: 1. Type: C. The toponym is Πεύμα, τό (BCH 45 (1921) iv.39 (230–220)). The city-ethnic is Πευμάτιος (C3e coins, infra; Arvanitopoulos (1909) 451 (c.300); I.Thessalie 131 (C2e)).
Peuma is called a polis in the political sense in a C2e honorific decree (I. Thessal., 131) and implicitly in F. Delphes iii, 4 351 (C3m). In I. Thessal. 131 polis is found as well as the internal collective use of the city-ethnic. The external collective use is found in F. Delphes iii, 4 351, and the external and individual use is attested in, e.g., Arvanitopoulos (1909) 451 (Demetrius, c. 300). On a retrospective interpretation of these sources it can be presumed that Peuma was a polis in C4.5

Peuma was situated in Achaia. F. Delphes iii, 4 351 (C3m) records a boundary and territorial conflict between Peuma and at least two of its neighbours, Meliteia and Chalai, a conflict which the city lost by arbitration (cf. Cantarelli (1995)). In 230–220, two Delphic therorodokoi in Peuma (BCH 45 (1921) iv, 39, v, 25).

The well-preserved remains of Peuma at Kallithea/Kislar date to the very end of C4 or, better, to the beginning of C5. The fortification comprises a circuit wall c. 400 m long, with many towers and several gates, a diateichisma and a small acropolis with towers, perhaps of an earlier date. Remains of civic buildings ( agora and cisterns) and houses as well as streets are still visible on the top of the flat hill.

Peuma struck bronze coins c. 302–286. Types: obv. head of nymph facing; rev. helmet and Achaean monogram; legend: 

ΠΕΥΜΑΤΙΩΝ (Head, HN2 304; Rogers (1932) nos. 442–43; SNG Cop. Thessaly 198).

440. Phylake Possibly a polis (type B) more or less at the site of the later Thebai (no. 444), with which it was merged by synoecism in C4; see further the entry for Thebai.

441. Proerna (Proernios) Map 55. Lat. 39,15. long. 22,15. Size of territory: 2. Type: [A]. The toponym is Προέρνα, ἡ (Daffa-Nikonanou (1973) 34–35 (C2); Strabo 9,5,10). The city-ethnic is Προερνακός (CID II 8,1,12 (338/7)) or Προερύδας Προερνακός (coins (c. 300–200), infra); in SEG 23 416,7 (450–425), Προερνακός is presumably a variant form of the city-ethnic.

No Archaic or Classical source explicitly calls Proerna a polis, but it merits inclusion here on account of (1) SEG 23 416 (450–425), a grant of proxeny by Pherai to men described as Προερνακός (= external individual use of the city-ethnic), and thus presumably citizens of Proerna (supra); (2) in the Delphic naoroi's accounts the Proernians are presumably recorded in a fragmentary list (CID II 8,1,12: [Προερνακός (= external collective use of the city-ethnic)), the heading of which undoubtedly included the formula: ταὶ ὀνομα ταῖς πόλεως ἡπίκειν (CID II 5,11,25–26) vel sim.; (3) furthermore, coins dated c. 306–283 (Rogers (1932) no. 534) indicate the prior existence of the community in C4; (4) the fact that a man of Proerna served as Delphic therorodokos in C3 may also be of some significance (see the note on Proerna in CID II p. 26).

Proerna probably belonged to Achaia (Strabo 9,5,10; Kip (1910) 70–71). At the site are remains of a trapezoidal circuit wall in grey limestone with an average width of c. 25 m and at least three gates or posterns; it may go back to C4 but has seen many repairs. The acropolis itself was walled as well (Daux and La Coste Messelière (1924) 356–59; Stählin (1924, 40) 157–58). Some remains of the lower city have been excavated to the south of the Tapsi hill (Papakonstantinou (1994) 236–38). Outside the city-wall too is a C5–C4 sanctuary of Demeter, where numerous votives, etc., have been found (Daffa-Nikonanou (1973)).

Proerna struck bronze coins c. 306–283. Types: obv. head of nymph facing; rev. Demeter with torch and corn-ears; legend: 

ΠΡΩΕΡΝΙΩΝ (Head, HN2 309; Rogers (1932) no. 534; SNG Cop. Thessaly 248).

442. Pyrasos (Pyrasios) Map 55. Lat. 39,15. long. 22,50. Size of territory: 2. Type: [A]. The toponym is Πύρασος, ἡ (Hom. II. 2,695; Strabo 9,5,14); the city-ethnic is Πυρασίας (Thuc. 2,22,3 with Helly (1995) 233 n. 88). Strabo 9,5,14 gives Δημήτριον as the contemporary name of Pyrasos and a Δημήτριον is listed by Ps.-Skylax 63 among the cities of Achaia.

Pyrasos is listed by Thuc. 2,22,3 (for which see Helly (1995) 233 n. 88) as a polis in the political sense. In Ps.-Skylax 63, Demetron is the fourth of five toponyms listed after the heading Χαιών πόλεις ἄδεια followed by εἰς ἓν ἕνω ἀλλά τὸ πόλεις Χαιών, but here the reference may be to the community as absorbed by the synoecism of Thebai Phthiotides (Stählin (1924a) 174; RE xxiv. 12). The external collective use of the city-ethnic is found in Thuc. 2,22,23.

Given its geographical location in Achaia, compared with Thucydides’ description of it as Thessalian (2,22,3), a good parallel to the status of Pyrasos (i.e. a polis of Thessalian Pelasgiots geographically situated in Achaia) would be Pagasai (cf. Helly (1995) 233 n. 88 with refs.). Ps.-Skylax describes it as belonging to the Achaians (cf. Steph. Byz. 541,2), and it seems that the city was synoecised into Thebai Phthiotides (no. 444) some time in C4 (Stählin (1924a) 174; RE xxiv. 12). See further the entry for Thebai Phthiotides. According to Strabo 9,5,14, Pyrasos had been (ὑπή) a polis with a good harbour and a sanctuary of Demeter.

443. Thaumakoi (Thaumakos) Map 55. Lat. 39,10. long. 22,20. Size of territory: 2 or 3. Type: B(?). The toponym is
The earliest attestation of a πόλις Θαυμακῶν is in IG ix.2 216.1 (C3e), an inscription that records two grants of proxeny and other privileges, and refers to a board of archons. However, an inscription of C4 (ArchDelt 26: B.1 237) is possibly a grant of proxeny, etc., to a citizen of Thaumakoi; so Thaumakos may be included in this Inventory as a possible polis. An unattributed epigram of the Anthologia Graeca (7 544.2) refers to Thaumakoi as a πόλις ἄργαγα.

Thaumakoi was situated on the main road between the Spercheios valley to the south and the Koile to the north, in Achaia (Strabo 18.8.5; AG 7 544; Steph. Byz. 307.5; Eust. II. 513.). According to Strabo 8.8.5 quoting Artemidoros, Thaumakoi was 500 stades from Kirrha via Herakleia, and from Larisa.

The acropolis is situated under the mediaeval kastro (rising to 639 m), immediately west of the road (Daux and de La Coste Messelière 1924) 354; RE² v.2.1332); it has a rough rectangular shape measuring c.100 × 70 m. The upper town was enclosed by a circuit running for c.800–900 m; it is constructed in polygonal or rectangular isodomic masonry, but is not very well preserved; there is evidence for two semicircular towers; short stretches of the circuit wall date to C4, but the remains are mainly later (PECS 324; Papakonstantinou 1994 235). A lower city probably existed, but nothing is known about it.

444. Thebai (Thebais) Map 55. Lat. 39.15, long. 22.45. Size of territory: 4 (RE² v.2.1584). Type: [A]. The toponym is Ἐθῆμα, αἱ (Ps.-Skylax 63; Diod. 20.110.3 (1302)), distinguished from that of homonyms by the addition of αἱ Ἀχαιῶν (Heracl. Cret. 3.2 (GGM 1)), or (αἱ) Φιλαύσιδες (Diod. 26.9; Strabo 9.5.6) or Φιλωτόδου (Ptol. Geog. 3.12.14); according to Steph. Byz. 666.6, it was also called Φιλίσσιον (ἐκλήθασαν Φίλισσιον καὶ αἱ Ἐθῆμα Θεσαλίας). The city-ethnic is Ἐθῆμαeos (Diod. 18.11.1 (1323)); in SEG 12 375.5 (242) it was specified in some way now lost; in IG vii 288 (C3m) it is distinguished from that of homonyms by the addition of ἕξ Ἀχαιός τῆς Φιλωτίδος.

In Ps.-Skylax 63, Thebai is the last of five toponyms listed between the heading Ἀχαιῶν πόλεις αἰθέ and the addendum εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλαι πόλεις Ἀχαιῶι. Thebai refers to itself as a polis in the political sense in SEG 12 372 (242). The collective use of the city-ethnic is found internally on coins of C4 (infra) and externally in Diod. 18.11.1 (1323). The external individual use is found in IG vii 288 (C3m).

Thebai belonged to Achaia (Ps.-Skylax 63; Diod. 18.11.1 (1323)). To the north the neighbour was Pherai, to the north-east it was Amphanai, to the east (until C4) Pyrasos, to the south Halos, to the south-west Peuma, and to the west Eretria and Pharsalos. On the territory, see di Salvatore (1994): minor settlements and fortresses. On the frontier with Halos was a sanctuary of Athena shared by the two adjoining cities (BCH 59 (1935) 208–9).

In contradistinction to the rest of the Achaians, the Thebans did not join the Greek alliance opposing Makedonia in the Lamian War (Diod. 18.11.1). A board of ἄρχασκοποι is attested by a C4 dedication (IG ix.2 1322; cf. Prakt (1907) 165).

Recent rescue excavations have revealed a city with cemetery, antedating C4f and situated on the western slope of the hill on which Thebai itself lay (ArchDelt 47 (1992) 222–29); Heracl. Cret. 3.2 (GGM 1) claims that Φιλαύσιον was an earlier name of Thebai, and the present site may possibly be that of Phylake; a synoecism of Phylake and Pyrasos is commonly assumed to have occurred in C4s (RE² v.2. 1587–88) and is presumably to be regarded as the founding of Thebai (in which case the pre-C4s evidence from the site, notably that belonging to the cult of Athena Polias, strictly speaking belongs to Phylake, which must then be regarded as a polis (type B) in its own right prior to the synoecism); a Demetrion is listed as a polis in the urban sense under the heading πολείς αἰθέ by Ps.-Skylax 64, and the reference may be to Pyrasos (renamed as Demetrion at one point; cf. Strabo 9.5.14) as absorbed by the synoecism of Thebai (Stählin (1924a) 174; RE xxiv. 12) and functioning as the harbour of Thebai (cf. Hansen (1997) 36–37). Cf. Diod. 20.110.3 for a planned C4f expansion of the synoecism attempted by Kassandros but prevented by Dionysios Poliorketes.

A cult of Athena Polias is attested by a C4f dedication (IG ix.2 1322; cf. Prakt (1907) 165); by C6 she had a temple on the acropolis (Prakt (1907) 161, (1908) 163), which was rebuilt in C5 and again in C4 (ArchDelt 49 (1994) 324). The acropolis itself measures 1.9 ha (RE² v.2. 1584) and shows remains of a “sehr altertümlichen kyklopischen Mauer” (RE² v.2. 1584). On the north and west sides an isodomic wall was added in the early Hellenistic period (RE² v.2. 1584–85).

The C4f/C3e (RE² v.2. 1589) circuit wall runs for 2,400 m and encloses an area of 40 ha (RE² v.2. 1585). It consisted of
an isodomic stone socle supporting a mudbrick wall; some forty towers are discernible. For a recent plan, see ArchDelt 47 (1992) Chron. 224. Outside the circuit are cemeteries (Adrimi-Sismani (2000)). A C₄–C₅ sta to wooden columns is reported in Prakt (1907) 162. In C₅m a theatre was constructed (ArchDelt 47 (1992) Chron. 222–25).

In addition to Thessaloniki, cults included those of Athena Ilia (Prakt (1908) 171–72, 175 (C₄)), Demeter Panachaia (SEG 25 643 (Hell.); coins, infra), Protesilaos (Pind. Isthm. 1.58; coins, infra), Nika (Prakt (1907) 171–72, 175 (C₅)) and Leukothea (ibid. (C₄–C₅)).


2.6 Magnesia

445. Amyros (Amyreus)  Map 55. Lat. 39.40, long. 22.40. Size of territory: ? Type: [A]. For the location, see Helly (1987) 152–53 and Tziaphalias (1994a). The toponym is Άμυρος, ἳ (Hes. fr. 59.3; Steph. Byz. 88.11); according to Steph. Byz. 89.2–3, the C₄–C₅ writer Suidas used the toponym Άμυρική (= FGrHist 602, fr. 4). In Ps.-Skylax 65, Μύραι is presumably a corruption of Άμυρος. The city-ethnic is Άμυρεας (IG II² 5227 (C₄/C₅e?)); according to Steph. Byz. 88.15, Eupolis (= fr. 423 (PCG)) used the city-ethnic Άμυρος (= Άμυρεας; cf. 708.12); Steph. Byz. 88.16 suggests Άμυραῖος as an alternative.

No Archaic or Classical source calls Amyros a polis, but as paraphrased by Steph. Byz. (89.2), Suidas (FGrHist 602) fr. 4 may have classified Amyrike as a polis (καὶ τῆν πόλιν Άμυρικήν καλεῖ), and if the restoration of Άμυρος in Ps.-Skylax 65 is accepted, Amyros is there one of the cities mentioned under the heading πόλεις αἵδε, where polis is used in the urban sense. That it was a polis in the political sense too is indicated by its C₄f bronze coinage (infra).

No Archaic or Classical source calls Amyreus a polis, but as paraphrased by Steph. Byz. (89.2), Suidas (FGrHist 602) fr. 4 may have classified Amyrike as a polis (καὶ τῆν πόλιν Άμυρικήν καλεῖ), and if the restoration of Άμυρος in Ps.-Skylax 65 is accepted, Amyros is there one of the cities mentioned under the heading πόλεις αἵδε, where polis is used in the urban sense. That it was a polis in the political sense too is indicated by its C₄f bronze coinage (infra).

446. (Eureaioi)  Map 55. Unlocated, not in Barr. A possible location is at Kato Polydendri-Skitha (Helly (forthcoming (a))). Type: C. The Eureaioi are known solely from very rare C₄m bronze coins: obv. head of maenad in border of dots; rev. vine branch with grapes and letter A above or below; legend: ΕΥΡΥΜΕΝΑΙΩΝ (Head, HN² 294; Babelon, Traité ii.4 no. 745; Rogers (1932) 75–76 nos. 210–11; SNG Cop. Thessaly 49). On the basis of the types (which recall those of Larisa, as Stählin (1924a) 227 noted) the Eureaioi may possibly be assigned to Pelasgiotics; but, also on the basis of the types, Moustaka (1983) 45 assigned them to Magnesia (cf. Westlake (1935) 4 with n. 2). The Dionysiac iconography and the style of the coins along with the letter A do in fact associate these coins with those of Eurymenai, and it is not impossible that they indeed belong to this city. However, if they belong to an otherwise unattested community, this community may be classed as a possible polis in C₄m.

447. Eurymenai (Eurymenios)  Map 55. Unlocated, but see infra. Type: [A]. The toponym is Εὐρυμεναί, αί (Hecat. fr. 136 = Steph. Byz. 287.1; Ps.-Skylax 65). The city-ethnic is Εὐρυμεναίοι (C₄f coins, infra).

No Archaic or Classical source calls Eurymenai a polis, but in Ps.-Skylax 65 Eurymenai is one of the toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις αἵδε, where polis is used in the urban sense. That it was a polis in the political sense too is indicated by its C₄f bronze coinage (infra).

Eurymenai was a Magnesian city (Ps.-Skylax 65). For the location, Ap. Rhod. 1.594–95 is decisive, and Eurymenai should be located at the entrance to the Tempe valley at the site traditionally identified with Homolion (Barr, lat. 39.50, long. 22.50). The acropolis was enclosed by a wall constructed in irregular slabs of slate; on it has been found the remains of a temple with which were associated C₅–C₆ black-glazed sherds and a foot of a colossal statue (Stählin (1924a) 47). The lower city was fortified as well (ibid.).

Eurymenai struck bronze coins in C₄f. Types: obv. head of Dionysos; rev. grapes, sometimes with letter Δ; legend: ΕΥΡΥΜΕΝΑΙΩΝ. Babelon, Traité ii.4 no. 428; Rogers (1932) 75–76 nos. 212–13. Cf. also the entry on Eureaioi.

448. Homolion (Homelieus)  Map 55. Lat. 39.55, long. 22.40, but see infra. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Ὅμολλον, τό (Ps.-Skylax 33; IG II 1.1.8 94.1.b.6 (C₄m–s)). The city-ethnic is Ὅμολλευς (CID II 1.1.18 (362/i)).
Homolion served as Epidaurian (League with one of the Magnesian hieromnemones Barr found in 754 (Perlman (2000) announce the celebration of the Nemean Games and the Amphiktyonic). The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C4 coins (infra); the external collective use is found in CID 11 1.1.18 (362/1). The external individual use is found in CID 11 32.48 (C4l) and 74.1.55 (337/6).

Homolion was a Magnesian city (Ps.-Skylax 33; CID 11 74.1.55 (337/6)); for the location, Ap. Rhod. 1.594–95 is clear, and pace Stählin (1924a) 46–47 and Giesinger (1956), it should be located at Palaiokastro Karitas, though the only evidence there is a Byzantine wall (Helly (forthcoming (b))), and not in the immediate vicinity of Tempe at modern Homolio, formerly Laspochori (PECS, etc., followed by Barr.). Homolion regularly provided the Amphiktyonic League with one of the Magnesian hieromnemones (e.g. CID 11 32.48 (C4l), 74.40 (337/6); see Lefèvre (1998) 89), the other being provided by Korakai, Methone or Olizon; an Amphiktyonic tamias provided by Homolion is listed in CID 11 74.55 (337/6). A donation of 300 dr. toward the rebuilding of the temple at Delphi is attested by CID 11 1.1.18 (362/1), and IGIV 617.13 (316–293) records a monetary donation by Homoloion “to the θεωροί sent out from Argos to announce the celebration of the Nemean Games and the Heraia” (Perlman (2000) 74, 127–29). In 360/59, a citizen of Homolion served as Epidaurian theorodokos (IG IV 2.1 94.1b.6).

In C4, Homolion struck bronze coins. Types: obv. head of Philoktetes; rev. snake; legend: ΟΜΟΛΙΕΩΝ or ΟΜΟΛΙΚΩΝ (Head, HNP 296; Babelon, Traité ii.4 nos. 754–56; Rogers (1932) nos. 257–66; SNG Cop. Thessaly 70–73).

449. Iolkos (Iolkus) Map 55. Lat. 39.20, long. 22.55. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: [A]. The toponym is Ιαολκός (Pind. Pyth. 4.77), Ιαολόκος (Hymn. Hom. Ap. 218), or Ιωλοκός (Hdt. 5.94.3; Ps.-Skylax 65), Η (Pind. Pyth. 4.77) and ο (schol. Pind. Nem. 3.57). The city-ethnic is Ιολοκεῖος on C4f coins (infra) and Ιολόκειος in a decree of 276–236 (Meyer (1936)).

Iolkos is primarily connected with Thessalian mythology (Bakhuizen (1996) 89–90), and evidence for the historical community is exiguous (ibid. 103). By C6l at the latest, it must have been a dependency of the Thessalians: it is reported by Hdt. 5.94.1 that the Thessalians offered Iolkos to the Athenian tyrant Hippias upon his expulsion from Athens in 511/10. The evidence for its polis status is C4s: in Ps.-Skylax 65 Iolkos is the first toponym listed after the heading πόλεις αἰδε, where polis is used in the urban sense, and the city struck coins inscribed ΙΩΛΙΚΕΩΝ (A. Furtwängler and K. Liampi, pers. comm.; no further details).

In C4s, Iolkos was a Magnesian city (Ps.-Skylax 65), and it is commonly located at Kastro Volou (so Barr.; cf. Indzesiloglou (1994)). Here is a settlement with which are associated inter al. C6 and C5 graves (Lauffer (1989) 709) and remains of a temple (RE ix. 1853). The principal divinity was Artemis (Meyer (1936) 371).

450. Kasthanaie (Kassanaeus) Map 55. Lat. 39.35, long. 22.55. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The only Classical source for the toponym is Herodotos, who gives Κασθαναῖα, ἡ (7.183.3, 188.1, 3); later sources have Κασθαναία (Strabo 9.5.22), Κασσαναεύς (Hsch. K 967) and Κασταναῖα (Lycoph. Alex. 907; Steph. Byz. 366.11). The city-ethnic is Κασσαναεύς (IG II 2 5227.1 (C4l/C3e)); Steph. Byz. 366.13 has Κασσαναῖος.

Kasthanaie is called a polis in the urban sense by Herodotos (7.183.3, 188.1). The (external?) collective use of the city-ethnic is found in IG II 2 5227.1 (C4l/C3e), a sepulchral inscription set up by the city of Kasthanaie to commemorate Μαγνητῶν Ἁμυρεῖς, who had fallen in battle.

Kasthanaie was a Magnesian city (Hdt. 7.183.3), situated right on the coast. At the site are remains of C5 isodomic fortifications of both the acropolis and the lower city (Stählin (1924a) 51–52; Pritchett (1963) 3; Müller (1987) 332–34 with Abb. 1–3).

451. Kikynethos Map 55. Lat. 39.10, long. 23.05. Size of territory: 1 (= size of island: 4.25 km² (RE xi. 382)). Type: A. The toponym is Κικυνηθός (Ps.-Skylax 64; Strabo 9.5.15). No city-ethnic is attested. Unlocated, but on homonymous island (Ps.-Skylax 64; Strabo 9.5.15). This polis is known exclusively from Ps.-Skylax 64 (ἐν δὲ τῷ Παγασητικῷ κόλπῳ ἑστι νῆσος Κικυνήθος καὶ πόλις) and Strabo 9.5.15, citing Artemidoros (ἐν δὲ τῷ κόλπῳ φησὶν εἶναι τὴν Κικυνῆθος νῆσον καὶ πολέχρην ἀμφώνων).

452. Korakai (Korokaios) Map 55. Unlocated, but see infra. Type: [A]. In Ps.-Skylax 65 is a reference to a Magnesian settlement by the name of Κορακαί, listed between Methone and Spalauthra. Delphic inscriptions mention a Magnesian ethnic as Κοροκαίος (CID II 5.III.36 (362–360)) or Κοροκαίοις (CID 11 32.48 (C4l)), and it seems reasonable to regard the K(ο)rokiôai as the inhabitants of Korakai (cf. Stählin (1921) 1371). Korakai is listed as a polis in THESALONIKI AND ADJACENT REGIONS 719.
the urban sense in Ps.-Skylax 65 under the heading πόλεις αἰδε; in CID II 51.11.25, 36 (362–360) the community is listed as a polis in the political sense under the heading ταῖδε τὰμ πολῶν ἤνικαν. The external collective use of the city-ethnic is found in CID II 51.11.36 (362–360), and the external individual use in CID II 74.11.30 (337/6).

Korakai is possibly to be located at Nevestiki near Lechonia, a hill with a pre-C4 fortification and black-glazed pottery (Wace (1906) 153–54); this site was presumably Thessalian after C4m; a parallel is provided by Iolkos and Pyrasos and by Pagasai and its sanctuary of Apollo Aktios (or Pagasites), situated on the southern shore of the bay of Volos opposite Korope. Pagasai is described as Thessalian by Ps.-Skylax 64 (see further the entry for Pagasai). This part of the Gulf of Pagasai, then, was Thessalian in the Classical period until the arrival of the Magnesians in this part of Thessaly, when it was detached from the Thessalians by Philip II (cf. Pagasai (no. 407)). The identification is, however, uncertain, and the site has also been identified as that of Magnesian Methone (Masson (1968) 97 n. 5; Barr.).

Korakai was a Magnesian community (Ps.-Skylax 65), and it sometimes provided the Amphiktyony with one of the Magnesian hieromnemones (CID II 32.48 (C4l), 74.1.39, 11.30 (337/6), 76.1.25 (324/4), 100.1.16 (325/4), 102.1.15 (324/3)), the other being provided by Homolion (and by Methone or Olizon when Korakai did not provide one). An Archaic inscription (SEG II 287 (c.550)) from the possible site of Korakai (see above) records building activity, presumably connected with a public construction, and describes a man as δικαστορεύρων (see further Masson (1968) and idem in RPhil 54 (1980) 226–27).

453. Meliboia (Meliboieus) Map 55. Unlocated, but see infra. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is ΜΕΛΙΒΟΙΑ, η (Hom. II. 2.717; Hdt. 7.188.3; Ps.-Skylax 65; Illos 54.7 (C4l)). The city-ethnic is ΜΕΛΙΒΟΙΩΤΙΟΣ (IG II² 9331 (C4m); Illos 54.5 (C4l) and on C4f coins (infra)) or ΜΕΛΙΒΙΩΤΙΟΣ (Theopomp. fr. 372; Tod 196.13, 37 (330–326) and on C4f coins, infra).

Meliboia is called a polis in the territorial sense by Hdt. 7.188.3, and in Ps.-Skylax 65 it is one of the toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις αἰδε, where polis is used in the urban sense. It is called a polis in the political sense at Plut. Pel. 29.4 (196–366). The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is attested by C4f coins and on undated tiles stamped ΑΓΙΟΙ ΜΕΛΙΒΙΟΙΩΤΩΝ (Stählin (1924a) 50); the external individual use is attested by IG II² 9331 (C4m); Illos 54.5 (C4l), and the external collective use by Tod 196.13 (330–326). During the crisis of 330–326 Meliboia received 28,500 medimnoi of grain from Kyrene (Tod 196.13, 37). Meliboia was a polis enspondos of Alexander of Phereai, who nevertheless massacred those attending an ekklisia in 367–366 (Plut. Pel. 29.4). A citizen of Meliboia was granted proxeny by Iasos in C4f (I. Iasos 54).

Meliboia was a Magnesian city (Ps.-Skylax 65) and was probably situated at Kastro Velika near Velika, north of the Agiokampos plain (Ziafallas (1994a)), a site which remains to be archaeologically investigated. C5 cults are attested for Apollo, Poseidon and Athena (ArchEph (1930) 39 nos. 2–4).

In C4f, Meliboia minted in both silver and bronze. (1) Silver (obols on the Aiginetan standard): obv. head of nymph facing crowned with grapes; rev. grapes; legend: ΜΕΛΙΒΟΙΟΣ. (2) Bronze: obv. head of Dionysos, or of nymph; rev. grapes; legends: ΜΕΛΙΒΟΑΙΟΣ, ΜΕΛΙΒΟΙΟΣ, ΜΕΛΙΒΟΙΟΣ (Head, HN² 301; Babelon, Traité ii.4 nos. 749–51; Martin (1985) 39; SNG Cop. Thessaly 170–71).

454. Methone (Methonaios) Map 55. Lat. 39.20, long. 23.05. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is given as ΜΕΘΩΝΑΙΚΟΣ by the MS of Ps.-Skylax 65, usually emended to ΜΕΘΟΝΑΙΟΣ, η, the form suggested by the city-ethnic (which is ΜΕΘΟΝΑΙΟΙ (CID II 51.139)) and transmitted in Strabo 9.5.16; Hom. II. 2.716 has ΜΥΘΘΑΙΟΝ, and Strabo 9.5.16 obviously took this passage to refer to Magnesian Methone.

In Ps.-Skylax 65, Methone is the second toponym listed after the heading πόλεις αἰδε, where polis is used in the urban sense; in the political sense polis is attested in CID II 51.11.25–36, 39 (358), where ΜΑΓΝΗΤΕΣ ΜΕΘΟΝΑΙΟΙ (39) are listed under the heading ταῖδε τὰμ πολῶν ἤνικαν (25–26) (cf. CID II 74.1.4, 55), and in CID II 74, where a tamias of Methone is recorded (1.55) after the heading τῶν τασίαν ἀποστέρεων τὰς πόλεις (1.4). The external collective use of the city-ethnic is found in CID II 51.11.39 (358), and the external individual use is found in CID II 74.1.55 (337/6) and 97.63 (327/6), etc.

Methone was a Magnesian city (Ps.-Skylax 65; CID II 51.139 (358)), and it often provided the Amphiktyonic League with one of the Magnesian hieromnemones (CID II 79A.11.15 (334/3), 86.18 (331), 89.14 (329/8), 92.4 (329/8), 94.7 (328/7), 96.10 (327/6), 97.63 (327/6)), the other being provided by Homolion (and by Korakai or Olizon when Methone did not provide one). A citizen of Methone served the Amphiktyony as tamias (CID II 74.1.55 (337/6)). A collective donation by Methone of 306 dr. towards the rebuilding of the temple at Delphi is recorded in CID II 51.11.39 (358).
The location of Methone on the Pagasitic Gulf is not beyond dispute, but it is most often located at Nevestiki near Lechonia (Stählin (1924a) 53; Barr.,) on the hill of Nevestiki are remains of a pre-C4 fortification wall and black-glazed pottery (Wace (1906) 153–54); if not Methone, this site may possibly be that of Korakai (see entry supra). Helly (2001b) suggests that it could be located at Goritsa. An Archaic inscription (SEG 17 287 (c.550)) from the site of Nevestiki, a possible location for Methone (supra), records building activity, presumably connected with a public construction, and describes a man as δικαστορεύτων (see further Masson (1968) and idem in RPhil 54 (1980) 226–27).

455. Olizon (Olizonios)  Map 55. Lat. 39.10, long. 23.15. Size of territory: 2. Type: [A]. The toponym is Ὠλιζόνιος, ἦ (Hom. Il. 2.717; Hecat. fr. 135 = Steph. Byz. 489.14; Ps.-Skylax 65). The city-ethnic is Ὠλιζόνιος (CID ii 84.A.4 (332)).

In Ps.-Skylax 65 Olizon is the fifth toponym listed after the heading πόλεις αἰδε, where polis is used in the urban sense. It is called a polichne by Strabo 9.5.15 in reference to C3e. The external individual use of the city-ethnic is found in CID ii 84.A.4 (332).

Olizon was a Magnesian city (Ps.-Skylax 65; CID ii 84.A.4) and as such sometimes provided the Amphiakton League with a hieromnemon (CID ii 84.A.4 (332)), the other being provided by Homolion (and by Methone or Korakai when Olizon did not provide one). At the site are remains of “a wall built of big blocks in irregular courses . . . the wall went all around the hill” (Wace (1906) 148) and possibly of a small prostyle temple (ibid. 149).

456. (Oxonioi)  Map 55. Unlocated, but a Magnesian community (CID ii 5.11.42 (358)). Size of territory: ? Type: [A]. No toponym is attested (but cf. Kip (1910) 84–85). The city-ethnic is Ὀξονιαίοι (CID ii 5.11.42 (358)). The Oxoniaioi are known from a single source: CID ii 5.11 of 358, where the Μάγικης Ὀξονιαίοι (42) are listed under the heading τάδε τάμ πολίων ἤνικαν. The Oxonian donation amounted to 19 dr. and 3 obols.

457. Rhizous (Rhisousios)  Map 55. Lat. 39.50, long. 22.50. Size of territory: 2. Type: [A]. The toponym is Ρηζούσιος, -οῦντος pop. (Ps.-Skylax 65; Strabo 9.5.22). The city-ethnic is Ρηζοῦσιος (C4m coins, infra); Steph. Byz. 545.4 gives Ρηζοῦσιος.

No Archaic or Classical source calls Rhizous a polis but in Ps.-Skylax 65 it is one of the toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις αἰδε, where polis is used in the urban sense. It is called polichne by Strabo 9.5.15 in reference to C3e. That it was a polis in the political sense too is indicated by its C4f bronze coinage (infra).

Rhizous was a Magnesian community (Ps.-Skylax 65). It struck bronze coins in C4m. Types: obv. head of Zeus, or of Artemis; rev. star, or vine branches; legend: ΠΙΖΟΥΣΙΩΝ or ΠΙΖΟΥΣΙΩΝ (Head, HN² 309; Babelon, Traité ii.4 nos. 746–48a; Rogers (1932) nos. 535–38; SNG Cop. Thessaly 249).

458. Spalauthra (Spalathreus)  Map 55. Lat. 39.10, long. 23.15. Size of territory: 2. Type: [A]. The toponym is Σπαλαυθρα, τά (Ps.-Skylax 65; IG ix.2 111.35 (c.130)); Steph. Byz. 583.13 has Σπαλαθρη but cites Hellan. fr. 201 for a form which Jacoby prints as Σπαλάθραν and Meineke (loc. cit.) as Σπαλάθραν (cf. Meineke’s app. crit. ad loc.). The city-ethnic is Σπαλαυθρείς (IG ix.2 111.11 (c.130)).

Spalauthra is listed as a polis in the urban sense in Ps.-Skylax 65 under the heading πόλεις αἰδε. The city-ethnic is attested only at a time when the city was a constituency of Demetrias (IG ix.2 1111 (c.130)).

Spalauthra was a Magnesian city (Ps.-Skylax 65). To the south the neighbour was Olizon, to the north-west Korope and Korakai. Although it does not appear in Strabo’s account of the synoecism of Demetrias (9.5.15 (293)), it appears as a constituent community of Demetrias in Hellenistic and later inscriptions (IG ix.2 1111 (c.130); SEG 23 405 (first to second centuries AD)) and so was included in the synoecism at some point. On top of the hill of Chortokastro the church of Ag. Nikolaos presumably stands on the site of an ancient temple (Koder and Hild (1976) 140); if so, this hill was probably the acropolis of Spalauthra.

2.7 Perrhaibia

459. Azoros (Azoristias)  Map 55. Lat. 40.00, long. 22.05. Size of territory: 2. Type: C (classified as a fort/tower by Barr., but see infra). The toponym is Ἀζωρος (Gommi 93.3.28 (C3)) or Αζώρος, τό (Polyb. 28.13.1; IG xi1.8.178.2 (C2)); Rhianos apud Steph. Byz. 32.19 uses Ἀζώρας; Steph. Byz. 32.18 states that a plural form was also found (ἐν Αζώροις). The city-ethnic is Αζώραστας (IG ix.1 689.17 (Cae)).

No Archaic or Classical source calls Azoros a polis, but it may possibly have been one; according to Livy 42.53.5, it was one of the three oppida making up the Perrhaibian Tripolis (<Perseus> descendit ad Azorum, Pythoum, Dolichen: tripolim vocant incolentes haec tria oppida), an association for which C4f bronze coins are attested (infra). If the name Tripolis means that the constituent communities were
poleis, then Azoros was a polis. (See also the entries for Doliche and Pythoion.) Furthermore, the name of the city has been restored at Diod. 19.52.6, and this passage uses polis in the urban sense retrospectively in reference to 316; Strabo 7.7.9 uses polis about it retrospectively too, but with no precise indication of date. It is also called polis in a C3 inscription (Gonnoi 93.B.28). The city-ethnic is attested only in the Hellenistic period: the external collective use is found in IG 1.x.1 689.17 (C2e), and the external individual use in ArchEph (1923) 144, 379.C.16 (first century AD).

The territory of Azoros to the north bordered on that of Doliche (a fellow member of the Tripolis), to the east on the territories of Askryris and Oloosson, to the south on that of Malloia, and to the west on that of Mondaia. See the map in Lucas (1995) 130. On the territory, see further Lucas (1997) 149–51.

Azoros was situated in Perrhaibia (Diod. 19.52.6; Polyb. 28.13.1; IG 1.x.1 689.5 (C2)) or Pelagonia (Strabo 7.7.9); Ptol. Geog. 3.12.39 places it in Pelasgiotis. With Pythoion and Doliche, Azoros formed the Perrhaibian Tripolis (Livy 42.53.5, quoted supra; IG xii.8 178.a.2 (C2); Strabo 7.7.9: Steph. Byz. 32.16, 637, s.v. Τρίπολις: καί ἄλλη Περραιβίας). Like Doliche and Pythoion—fellow members of the Tripolis—Azoros is absent from the list of Perrhaibian polities in SEG 29 546 (375–350); this fact (and the fact that the dispute between Doliche and Eleimiotis was settled by the Macedonian king, Amyntas, see s.v. Doliche) suggests that in C4e the Tripolis was under Macedonian rule (Lucas [1997] 80–81, 211–16).

The acropolis was separately walled (Lucas [1997] 162–65). The preserved remains of the circuit wall are of the later Hellenistic period (ibid.), but Diod. 19.52.6 (1316) mentions a siege of Azoros and thus implies the existence of fortifications. There are numerous traces of buildings at Azoros, but in the absence of excavation they cannot be identified (Lucas [1997] 166–68).

A few divinities are known from dedications: Apollo Lykeios (C4–C3, unpublished), Apollo Doreios (C3–C2, unpublished), Apollo Pythios (Peek [1974] 7 (C3–C2)), and Asklepios (C3f, unpublished), but the patron divinity has not been identified.

The Tripolis of Azoros, Pythoion and Doliche struck bronze coins in C4f. Types: obv. Apollo; legend: ΤΡΙΠΟΛΙΤΑΝ; rev. tripod (Liampi [1990]).

460. Chyretiai (Chyretaios) Map 55. Lat. 39.50, long. 22.10. Size of territory: 2. Type: C. The toponym is Χυρετιάιοι, Χυρετιαίοι (Ptol. Geog. 3.12; ArchEph [1917] 1, 301.3 (C2e)). The city-ethnic is Χυρετιαιός (SEG 29 546.10–11 (375–350)) or Χυρετιεύς (EAM 40.8 = GVI 40.8 (C3f/C2e)).

No Archaic or Classical source calls Chyretiai a polis, but two men from the city are listed under the heading Χυρετιαίων in an inscription of 375–350 which has been interpreted as a catalogue of Perrhaibian polities making a joint dedication to Apollo Pythisos at Oloosson and which includes such Perrhaibian communities as Phalanna and Gonnoi (SEG 29 546 (375–350)). It is called polis in the political sense in Hellenistic documents, e.g. ArchEph (1917) 1, 301.8 (ἐδοξε τῇ Χυρετιεύς πόλει (191))]. The external individual use of the city-ethnic is found on a C3 tombstone (EAM 40.8 = GVI 40.8 (C3f/C2e)).

Chyretiai was situated in Perrhaibia (SEG 29 546, by implication; see the map in Lucas [1995] 130), though Ptol. Geog. 3.12 places it in Pelasgiotis. (For C5 coins of the Perrhaibians, see the entry for Oloosson.) Stählin (1924a) 25 briefly mentions an acropolis wall and traces of an isodomic city wall.

461. Doliche (Dolichaios) Map 50. Lat. 40.05, long. 22.10. Size of territory: 2. Type: C. The toponym is Δολιχή, Δολιχή (Polyb. 28.13.1; IG 1.x.2 1296 (C1)); the city-ethnic is Δολιχαῖος (EAM 6.2 (C1)). No Archaic or Classical source calls Doliche a polis, but it may possibly have been one: according to Livy 42.53.5, it was one of the three oppida making up the Perrhaibian Tripolis (<Perseus> descendit ad Azorum, Pythoum, Dolichen: tripolim vocant incolentes haec tria oppida), an association for which C4f bronze coins are attested (infra). If the name Tripolis means that the constituent communities were poleis, then Doliche was a polis. (See also the entries for Azoros and Pythoion.) Furthermore, C4f possession of a territory by Doliche is attested by a document dating to the reign of Trajan: the document concerns a territorial conflict between Doliche and the Eleimiotes and refers to a similar conflict between the same communities during the reign of Amyntas III (390–371), the father of Philip II (Wace and Thompson [1910–11] 195, ll. 16–18, 198; Lucas [1992] 132–34, [1997] 148–49). The external individual use of the city-ethnic is found in C1 (EAM 6.2). The external collective use of the ethnic may have been used on the stele of Amyntas’ arbitration which was set up in the forum at Doliche (l. 13) and was pronounced inter Dolichanos et Eleimiotes (ll. 18–19; Wace and Thompson [1910–11]).

Doliche was situated in Perrhaibia (Polyb. 28.13.1; cf. Ptol. Geog. 3.12.39, who places it in Pelasgiotis). Like Azoros and Pythoion (with whom Doliche formed the Perrhaibian
Tripolis), it is absent from the list of Perrhaibian polities in SEG 29 546 (375–350); this fact (and the fact that the dispute between Doliche and Eleimiotis was settled by the Makedonian king, see supra) suggests that in C4 the Tripolis was under Makedonian rule (Lucas (1997) 80–81, 211–16). To the south its territory bordered on that of Azoros (a fellow member of the Tripolis), to the west on that of the Eleimiotis, and to the east on that of Pythion (a fellow member of the Tripolis). See the map in Lucas (1995) 130. In C4f Doliche had a territorial conflict with the Eleimiotis (Wace and Thompson (1910–11); Lucas (1992) 132–34, (1997) 148–49).

The acropolis was separately walled, but the wall, built of quadrangular blocks, has been destroyed by modern constructions (Lucas (1997) 175–77). Since the publication of Lucas (1997) new archaeological investigation has (1) demonstrated the existence of a C4–C3 city wall, and (2) unearthed several remains of buildings (possibly the agora); ArchDelt 51 (1996) 363–64.

The Tripolis of Azoros, Pythoion and Doliche struck bronze coins in C4f. Types: obv. Apollo; legend: ΤΡΙΠΠΟΛΕΙΣΑΩΝ; rev. tripod (Liampi (1990)).

462. *Ereikinion (Ereikines) Map 55. Lat. 39.45, long. 22.00. Size of territory: 2. Type: [A]. The toponym is probably *Ερεικίνιον reconstructed from Latin Ericcium (Livy 36.13.6) and the city-ethnic *Ερεικινεύς (SEG 29 546; cf. 33 457 (375–350)) or *Ερικινεύς (CID ii 9.4 (C4m)).

No Archaic or Classical source calls *Ereikinion a polis, but in the Delphic naoportoú's accounts the *Ερικινεύς are recorded in a fragmentary list (CID ii 9.4), the heading of which undoubtedly included the formula παίδε τά μπι πολίων ἤρων (CID ii 5.11.25–26) vel sim. Furthermore, two men from the city are listed under the heading *Ερεικινεύων in an inscription of 375–350 which has been interpreted as a catalogue of Perrhaibian polities making a dedication to Apollo Pythios at Oloosson and includes such Perrhaibian communities as Phalanna and Gonnoi (SEG 29 546). Furthermore, CID ii 9.4 (C4m) records a donation by the *Ερεικινεύς. A C2 inscription attests the external individual use of the city-ethnic (Gonnoi 42).

*Ereikinion was situated near the village of Mega-Eleutherochori (formerly Kebir); cf. Lucas (1995). It was a Perrhaibian city (CID ii 9.4 (C4m); see the map in Lucas (1995) 130) and is listed in SEG 29 546 (375–350). (For C5 coins of the Perrhaibians, see the entry for Oloosson.)

463. Gonnoi (Gonneus) Map 55. Lat. 39.50, long. 22.30. Size of territory: 3. Type: A. The toponym is Γόννοι, ἤ (Hdt. 7.128.1; Eust. ii. 2.739) or Γόννοι (BCH 45 (1921) 111.39 (230–220)). The city-ethnic is Γόννεύς (C4 coins, infra; SEG 29 546.16 (375–350); cf. 33 457); Steph. Byz. 211.3 gives Γονναῖς and Γόννοις, both unattested.

Gonnoi is called polis in the political sense at Hdt. 7.128.1, 173.4; polis in the political sense occurs in SEG 35 566 (c.300) and frequently in Hellenistic decrees of the city, e.g. Gonnoi 2.8 (C3e), which also has [politai] (l. 9). Patris is found in Gonnoi 211 (C3). The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C4 coins (infra) and in, e.g., Gonnoi 1.3 (C4/C3e). The external collective use is attested in SEG 29 546.16 (375–350) and IG IV 617.13 ([Γόννεύς (C4l)]). At Hdt. 5.63.3, the transmitted Κονιαῖος is sometimes emended to Κονιαίοις (e.g. How and Wells (1928) ad loc.), but see Helly (1995) 103. The external individual use is found in IG ii 1132.66 (c.278).

Gonnoi was situated in Perrhaibia (Hdt. 7.128.1, 173.4; IG ii² 1132.66 (130/29)), and is recorded in SEG 29 546 (375–350), a list of Perrhaibian polities making a joint dedication to Apollo Pythios at Oloosson. (For C5 coins of the Perrhaibians, see the entry for Oloosson.)

On military matters, all evidence is Hellenistic (see Helly (1973) 145–46; evidence on the political organisation is likewise Hellenistic (Helly (1973) 138–45). Gonnoi i (C4l/C3e) is a grant of proxeny to a man from Larisa. Gonnoi 5 (C3) combines proxeny with enktesis, epinomia, etc. IG IV 617.13 (316–293) records a monetary donation by Gonnoi “to the θεοποίη sent out from Argos to announce the celebration of the Nemean Games and the Heraia” (Perlman (2000) 74, 127–29).

Situated on the end of a ridge on the lower slopes of Mt. Olympos, the city of Gonnoi was centred on three hills, the northernmost of which formed the acropolis with a temple of Athena Polias constructed 650–600 (Helly (1973) 72 with map i); in this sanctuary public documents were published; it was restored in C4l (ibid. 95). The acropolis was separately walled, possibly from the Archaic period (PECS 359). In the Hellenistic period (PECS 360) the city was protected by a fortification wall (for which see Helly (1973) 23–28 with map i) which incorporated all three hills in the fortified area. The area enclosed measured c.6 ha. For two Classical second-order sites in the territory, see Helly (1973) 39–47.

Gonnoi 147 (C3?) attests to a cult of Athena Polias and SEG 35 567 (c.300) to one of Athena Patroia; Gonnoi 158 (C4f) is a dedication to Apollo Pythios, and Gonnoi 162 (C4l/C3e) is one to Artemis. Asklepios is attested by SEG 35 565 (C4) and Gonnoi 199 (C3), Ennodia by Gonnoi 201 (C3) and Herakles by 202 (C3).

464. *Malloia* (Malloioitas) Map 55. Lat. 39.55, long. 22.05. Size of territory: 2. Type: C (classified as a fort/tower by Barr., but see infra). The toponym is not recorded in Greek sources, but is given as Malloia by Livy 31.41, 36.10, etc., which with the city-ethnic (infra) suggests Μαλλοία, ἡ. The city-ethnic is Μαλλοιάτας (SEG 29 546.13 (375–350)).

No Archaic or Classical source calls Malloia a *polis*, but two men from the city are listed under the heading Μαλλοιαστῶν in an inscription of 375–350 which has been interpreted as a catalogue of Perrhaibian polities making a dedication to Apollo and which includes such Perrhaibian communities as Phalanna and Gonnoi (SEG 29 546); note also SEG 35 636 (C58), an epitaph that uses ἄρταξον about the deceased, which presumably indicates that he died while in office and suggests the existence of magistrates at Malloia.

Malloia was a Perrhaibian city (Livy 31.41, 36.10, etc.) situated at the site of Margara north-west of the village of Palaiokastro (Lucas (1995) 124 and map at 130). It is recorded in SEG 29 546 (375–350), a list of Perrhaibian polities making a joint dedication to Apollo Pythios at Oloosson. A circuit wall is visible at the site, but the city remains to be investigated archaeologically. (For C5 coins of the Perrhaibians, see the entry for Oloosson.)

465. *Mondaia* (Mondaieus) Map 55. Lat. 40.00, long. 21.55. Size of territory: 2. Type: B. The toponym is Μονδαίαia (BCH 45 (1921) v. C.(b).6 (230–220); cf. infra). The city-ethnic Μονδαίατας was originally restored in SEG 29 546.14 (Μονδαίαιατας); and this form is found also in Syll.2 793 (presumably C3e); however, Knoepfler has suggested restoring Μονδαιεύς (Μονδαιεύας; cf. SEG 33 457), a form also found in C.4s (BE (1994) 111); apart from Syll.3 793 (presumably C3e), later sources invariably have Μονδαιεύς (IG IX.1 689.9; Gonzalez 69.6 (both C3e)).

No Archaic or Classical source calls Mondaia a *polis*, but two men from the city are listed under the heading Μονδαίαιας vel Μονδαίαιεως in an inscription of 375–350 which has been interpreted as a catalogue of Perrhaibian polities making a joint dedication to Apollo Pythios at Oloosson and which includes such Perrhaibian communities as Phalanna and Gonnoi (SEG 29 546). Mondaia is called a *polis* in the political sense in Gonnoi 69.7 (178) while Syll.3 793 (presumably C3e) terms the community Μονδαίαιας τó κοινόν. The external collective use of the city-ethnic occurs on C.4s stamped tiles found in Pella (BE (1994) 111), as well as in SEG 29 546 (375–350). In 230–220 a citizen of Mondaia may have served as Delphic *theorodokos* (BCH 45 (1921) v. C.(b).6), but certainty is impossible, since the first letter is illegible, which means that *[K]ondaia, a city of the Larisaian plain*, is also a possible reading (Lucas (1997) 87).

Mondaia was a Perrhaibian city and is recorded in SEG 29 546 (375–350), a list of Perrhaibian polities making a joint dedication to Apollo Pythios. It was situated at the site of Kastri, east of the village of Loutro Elasonnas (Lucas (1997) 155, 201–201 with map at 130). At the site, remains of walls are visible on the acropolis and in the lower city; on the acropolis are remains of fine buildings as well (autopsy by G. Lucas).

The patron divinity was presumably Themis, in whose sanctuary documents were published (Gonnoi 69; cf. Syll.3 793). Syll.2 793 (presumably C3e) records a consultation by Mondaia of the oracle at Dodona. (For C5 coins of the Perrhaibians, see the entry for Oloosson.)

466. *Mylai* (Mylaios) Map 55. Lat. 39.45, long. 22.05. Size of territory: 2. Type: C (classified as a fort/tower by Barr., but see infra). The toponym is Μυλαί, άi (BCH 45 (1921) 111.134 (230–220); Steph. Byz. 461.9). The city-ethnic is Μυλαίος (SEG 29 546.9 (375–350)).

No Archaic or Classical source calls Mylai a *polis*, but three men from the city are listed under the heading Μυλαίων in an inscription of 375–350 which has been interpreted as a catalogue of Perrhaibian polities making a joint dedication to Apollo Pythios and which includes such Perrhaibian communities as Phalanna and Gonnoi (SEG 29 546). In 230–220, a citizen of Mylai served as Delphic *theorodokos* (BCH 45 (1921) 111.134).

Mylai was a Perrhaibian city, and it is recorded in SEG 29 546 (375–350), a list of Perrhaibian polities making a joint dedication to Apollo Pythios. (For C5 coins of the Perrhaibians, see the entry for Oloosson). Mylai was situated at Kastri, north of the village of Vlachogianni (Lucas (1995) 122). To the north its territory bordered on that of Malloia, to the north-west on that of Chyretiai, to the south-east on that of Phalanna, to the south on that of Erikinion, and to the west on the territories of Phakion and Oxyneia. See the map at Lucas (1995) 130. The acropolis of Mylai was enclosed by a wall; it runs for c.400 m and is constructed in large irregular blocks which do not join; there may have been an entrance in the south-east, and gates or sally-ports were possibly located to the south and north-west; and a...
ruined square tower (possibly Hellenistic) was found on the highest point of the wall (autopsy by G. Lucas). To the north a wall is seen descending towards the city wall, though no trace of the latter has been found (autopsy by G. Lucas). In the centre of the acropolis are the foundations of a rectangular building; and there are numerous traces of habitation to the west, north-west and south-west (autopsy by G. Lucas).

467. Oloosson (Oloossonios) Map 55. Lat. 39.55, long. 22.20. Size of territory: 2. 'Type: B. The toponym is 'Ολοσσώνιος, ἦ (Hom. II. 2.739; Eust. II. 520.25), 'Ολοσσωνιος (Gonnoi 93.B.23 (C3l); Strabo 9.5.19). The city-ethnic is 'Ολοσσόνιος (Gonnoi 11.3, C3f), and presumably C4 coins (infra).

No Archaic or Classical source calls Oloosson a polis, but it is included as a probable polis here because (1) it struck coins in C4, and (2) it is highly likely that 'Ολοσσονίον (gen. pl.) should be restored in SEG 29 546.4, an inscription of 375–350 found at Oloosson which has been interpreted as a catalogue of Perrhaibian polities making a dedication to Apollo Pythios and which includes such Perrhaibian communities as Phalanna and Gonnoi. Oloosson is called a polis in the political sense in Gonnoi 18.14 (C3l). The internal collective city-ethnic is abbreviated on C4 coins (infra) and has been restored at SEG 29 546.4 (375–350). The external individual use is found in Gonnoi 11.3 and SEG 23 455 (both C3f). In C3s Gonnoi conferred proxenia and other privileges upon two citizens of Oloosson (Gonnoi 11.18).

Oloosson was Perrhaibian (Strabo 9.5.19; though Steph. Byz. 490.11 places it in Magnesia, presumably confusing it with Magnesian Olizon, which at 489.14 he places in Thessalia). It was situated at modern Elsssson, and in 375–350 it was probably listed in SEG 29 546 (cf. app. crit.), a list found at Oloosson itself and cataloguing Perrhaibian polities making a joint dedication to Apollo Pythios at Oloosson. Oloosson was presumably a leading city of the Perrhaibian etnos if the hypothesis that the C5 silver coinage of the Perrhaibians (infra) was struck by Oloosson is accepted (Babelon, Traité ii.4 327–28; Liampi 996) 119); for the similarities between these coins and contemporary coins of Kranon, Larisa, Pharkodon, Trikka, Pherai and Skotoussa, see Kraay (1976) 115–16 and Martin (1985) 36–37.

An unpublished inscription (C3s) mentions a sanctuary of Asklepios, and on the basis of coin types a cult of Zeus may be assumed as well. SEG 29 546, a joint dedication to Apollo Pythios by the Perrhaibian polities, was found in Oloosson. On the northern slope of the acropolis traces of an isodomic wall are visible (Stählin 1924a 24).

The C5 silver and C4 bronze coinage of the Perrhaibians was probably struck by Oloosson (Babelon, Traité ii.4 327–28): (1) Silver, denominations: drachm, triobol, tri-hemiobol, obol and hemiobol on the Aiginetan standard; types: obv. young man restraining a bull, or forepart of bull, or horseman, or galloping horse, or head of Athena; rev. galloping horse, or forepart of horse, or Athena running, or horse’s head; legend: ΠΕΡΑ or ΠΕΡΑ. (2) Bronze: obv. veiled Hera facing; rev. Zeus; legend: (Π)ΕΡΡΑΙΒΩΝ (Head, HN² 304; Rogers (1932) nos. 437–39; Gardner (1963) 39; Liampi (1996) 109–10; SNG Cop. Thessaly 193–97). In C4 Oloosson struck its own bronze coins: obv. horseman; rev. Zeus brandishing thunderbolt; legend: ΟΛΟΣΣΩΝΙΟΝ (Lavva (1994)).

468. Phalanna (Phalannaios) Map 55. Lat. 39.45, long. 22.10. Size of territory: 2. 'Type: A. The toponym is Φάλλαννα, ἦ in SEG 38 649 (C4) (cf. Voutiras (1991)); BCH 45 (1921) v.43 (230–220); and Strabo 9.5.19. According to Steph. Byz. 655.20, Ephoros (= FGrHist 70) fr. 62 used the toponym Φάλλαννας (cf. Eust. II. 520.18: ἦ Φάλλαννας). Hecat. fr. 5 is quoted by Steph. Byz. 655.19 for the variant name Ἰππία, which is taken by Jacoby (ad loc.) to be a variant name not of the city, but of the eponymous heroine Phalanna. According to Strabo 9.5.15, “some” (τινές) used the toponym Ὄρθη (cf. Hom. II. 2.739) about the acropolis of Phalanna, whereas Ael. Herod. De pros. cath. 5.1, 321.5 takes Ὄρθη to be a πόλις Περραίβων ἦ Θετταλίας, καλωμένη, φασί, καὶ Κορεά. However, according to Eust. II. 1.520.28, Korsea was another name for the acropolis. The city-ethnic was Φάλλανναῖος (C4 coins, infr; SEG 29 546.6 (375–350); CID ii 32.45 (C4)); an inscription from Argos uses Φάλλανναῖος (IG iv 671.12 (316–293)).

No Archaic or Classical source explicitly describes Phallana as a polis; but the political sense is indirectly attested in the Delphic accounts of 357/6 (CID ii 74), where a τανίας of Phallana is recorded (1.48) after the heading τῶν ταμιῶν ἀποσπώμεν τῶν πόλεως (1.4). For an explicit attestation, see ArchEph (1916) 18, 272, 1 (C3e); IGIX.2.1228.2.13, b17 (C3) has πολιτεία in II. 17–18. The term ἄστος (= Φασστός) in the sense of “citizen” is found in a C5 law (IG IX.2 1226.23) which describes itself as a νόμος (ai) and refers to κοινὰ χρυσά (a6–7). Phalanna is described as πατρίς in SEG 38 649 (C4); cf. Voutiras (1991).

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C4 coins (infra) and in ArchEph (1916) 18, 272, 1 (C3e). The
external collective use is found in SEG 29 546.6 (375–350) and IG iv 617.12 (316–293), an inscription recording a collective donation of money by the Phalanhians (see further Perlan (2000) 74, 127–29). The external individual use is found in CID ii 32.45 (C4l), 74.1.48 (337/6), 77.1.9 (334/3), 96.7 (327/6), 100.1.9 (325/4), 102.1.10 (324/3).

Phalanna was a Perrhaibian city (CID ii 77.1.9, 96.7), and it is listed in SEG 29 546 (375–350), a list of Perrhaibian polities making a joint dedication to Apollo Pythios at Oloosson. (For C5 coins of the Perrhaibians, see the entry for Oloosson.) It was probably situated at Damasi (Lucas (1995) 122 with map at 130).

Citizens of Phalanna served the Amphiaktyonic League on behalf of the Perrhaibians as hieromnemes (CID ii 32.45 (C4l), 96.7 .2 (327/6), 100.1.9 (325/4), 102.1.10 (324/3)) and as tamiai (CID ii 74.1.9 (337/6), 77.9 (334/3)). With the other Perrhaibian communities, Phalanna in 375–350 made a dedication to Apollo Pythios at Oloosson (SEG 29 546).

IG iv 617.4 (316–293) records a monetary donation by Phalanna “to the theürpoí sent out from Argos to announce the celebration of the Nemean Games and the Heraia” (Perlan (2000) 74, 127–29). In 230–220 a citizen of Phalanna served as Delphic theorodokos (BCH 45 (1921) v.43).

The earliest public enactment is a C5 law (νόμος) concerning public finances (IG ix.2 1226). Hellenistic inscriptions refer to several officials (ArchEph (1916) 18, 272, 1 (C36); IG ix.1 2233 (C3)).

A theatre is mentioned in a C2 inscription (IG ix.2 1230), and recent explorations have revealed traces of a polygonal wall on the acropolis (autopsy by G. Lucas), but apart from that there is no evidence for the urban centre.

Phalanna minted in both silver and bronze in C4. (1) Silver, denominations: drachms, triobols, trihemiobols, obols on the Aiginetan standard; types: obv. young man with short hair (Ares?), or Hekate holding two torches seated on lion (beneath ΠΟ); rev. bridled horse, or hunter with dog; legend: ΦΑΛΑΝΝΑΙΩΝ. (2) Bronze: obv. head of young man (Ares?), or Zeus, or nymph; rev. head of nymph, or horseman, or the eponymous heroine Phalanna seated, her left hand stretched toward a stork; legend: ΦΑΛΑν or ΦΑΛΑΞ or ΦΑΛΑΝΝΩ or ΦΑΛΑΝΝΑΙΩΝ (Head, HN² 305; Babelon, Traité ii.4 nos. 583–94; Rogers (1932) 147–49 nos. 446–58; Gardner (1963) 41; SNG Cop. Thessaly 199–208).

469. Pythoion (Pythoiastrag) Map 50. Lat. 40.05, long. 22.15. Size of territory: 2. Type: C. The toponym is Πύθοιον, τό (IG iv.2.1 94.b.11.39 (post-316)) or Πυθείον (F.Delphes iii.4 417.i.15 (c.257/3)); Πύθον is found in late literary sources (Plut. Aem. 15.2; Ptol. Geog. 3.12.39). The city-ethnic is Πυθοιοιστας, but attested only in the Hellenistic period (SEG 36 554.4 (C2f)).

No Archaic or Classical source calls Pythoion a polis, but it may possibly have been one: according to Livy 42.53.5, it was one of the three oppida making up the Perrhaibian Tripolis (<Perseus> descendit ad Azorum, Pythoum, Dolichen: tripolim vocant incolentes haec tria oppida), an association for which C4 bronze coins are attested (infra). If the name Tripolis means that the constituent communities were poleis, then Pythoion was a polis. Furthermore, in C4 a citizen of Pythoion served as Epidaurian theorodokos (IG iv.1.1 94.1.b.39). Pythoion calls itself ἡ πόλις ἡ Πυθιαστῶν in a C2f proxeny decree (SEG 36 552.4). A coin inscribed ΠΥΘΙΑΤΩΝ is a forgery (Lucas (1997) 77).

Pythoion was situated on the hill of Ag. Apostoli south of the present village of Pythion, formerly Selos (Lucas (1997) 182–85). Though geographically located in Perrhaibia (Plut. Aem. 15.2), Pythoion (like Azoros and Doliche, with which it formed the Perrhaibian Tripolis) is absent from the list of Perrhaibian polities in SEG 29 546 (375–350; cf. Lucas (1997) 80–81); this fact (and the fact that the dispute between Doliche and Eleimiots was settled by the Macedonian king, s.v. Doliche) suggests that in C4 the Tripolis was under Macedonian rule (Lucas (1997) 80–81, 211–16). In addition, the Epidaurian list of theorodokoi (IG iv.2.1 94.1.b.39 (post-316)) seems to record Pythoion in the Makedonian section (Lucas (1997) 81–82), and F.Delphes iii.4 417.i.15 (c.257–253) is a grant of proxeny to a man described as Μακεδών ΕΛ[η]ειμίωτ[ης] ἐκ Πυθείων; Steph. Byz. 538.21 also locates it in Macedonia; another passage of Steph. Byz. (157.12–13) possibly attests to the settlement of Macedonians in Pythoion in C4–C3: Θεαγένης ἐν Μακεδονία “Βαλλαίος μεταγαγὼν εἰς τὸν νῦν λεγόμενον Πύθιον τόσον” (see Lucas (1997) 76, 216).

A temple of Apollo Pythios, the patron divinity, is mentioned in a C2m inscription (SEG 36 552; cf. Plut. Aem. 15.10), and recent excavations have unearthed two temples of Roman date (ArchDelt 51 (1996) 2001) 364).

The acropolis was surrounded by a wall constructed in small flat stones (Lucas (1997) 183–84). A wall surrounding the lower city, probably isodomic to judge from the visible remains, has recently been located, but is as yet unpublished and undated. To the south and south-west are numerous traces of occupation (ibid. 184).
The Tripolis of Azoros, Pythion and Doliche struck bronze coins in C4f. Types: obv. Apollo; legend: ΤΡΙΠΟΛΙΤΑΝ; rev. tripod (Liampi (1990)).

2.8 Athamania

470. Argeitha (Argethieus) Map 55. Lat. 39.20, long. 21.30. Size of territory: ? Type: B. The toponym is Αργεθία, ἦ (BCH 45 (1921) 111.132 (230–220)). The city-ethnic is Αργεθιεύς (SGDI 1341 (C4s)).

No Archaic or Classical source calls Argeitha a polis, but it is included as a possible polis here on account of SGDI 1341, a C4s grant of proxeny by the Molossi to a man of Argethia ([Θέ]δώρων Στοιμον Ἀργεθιεύς ἦ Μολοσσοί πρόξενον ἐποίησαν]. In c.230–220, a citizen of Argeitha served as Delphic theorodokos (BCH 45 (1921) 111.132).

The city was situated on the east side of Mt. Pindos, in Athamania (or Thessalia, the exact border between the two regions being unclear); the site is at Hellinika, c.2 km west of modern Argithea (formerly Knisovo, in the nomos of Karditsa). There are traces of a Hellenistic circuit wall (Indzesiloglou (1987) 345) and a Classical–Hellenistic cemetery (ArchDelt 43 (1988) 252).
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I. The Region

The islands of the Aegean, which number in the thousands, no more formed a logical unit in the Archaic and Classical periods than they do today. The two main groupings are the Kyklades (Κυκλάδες) and the Sporades (Σποράδες). The designation “Kyklades” is attested in Classical sources (Eur. Ion 1583; Hdt. 5.31.2; Thuc. 1.4; Isoc. 4.136; Ephor. fr. 63; Ps.-Skylax 48, 58). “Sporades” is apparently a Hellenistic invention (Ap. Rhod. Argon. 4.1711; Strabo 2.5.21, 10.4.1; Arist. [Mund.] 393*14). Both names were geographical terms only, embracing different islands at different times and according to different authors. These groupings posed difficult problems for ancient geographers, especially when they tried to insert discussions of the islands into larger geographic texts; this explains why treatment of islands that are neighbours may occur far apart in a text (e.g., Ps.-Skylax treats Amorgos at chapter 58 but Astypalaia at 48; see generally now Counillon (2001)). It is rare, however, that geographical groups corresponded to political associations. For example, while both Melos and Thera counted among the Kyklades for Thucydides (1.4, 2.9.4), both avoided Athenian domination until almost the 420s or later; in both cases, this resistance was probably connected with the islands’ foundations as Doric colonies, in contrast to the Ionic Kyklades, many of which recognised Athens as metropolis. Of the neighbouring northern Sporades, Skyros and Ikos, the one was subjected to direct Athenian control, probably from 476/5, while the other remained an independent polis (or two). These examples could be multiplied.

Perhaps no man is an island, but every island is potentially a polis, or more than one (Reger (1997)). The Inventory that follows includes fifty-seven certain or likely poleis distributed among forty-two islands. None of them is unlocated (except, in a few cases, where a secondary polis attested on an island like Ikos has yet to be associated with a site). However, these represent only a very small number of potentially inhabitable islands in the Aegean Sea. If we can be confident, even without direct evidence, that a mass of rocks like the Melanteioi Skopeloi east of Mykonos was always uninhabited, the same is not true for many other islands. Some islands may have been used only as pastureage, such as perhaps the three small islands disputed between Kimolos and Melos in C4l (IG xii.3 1259 = Ager (1996) no. 3 = Magnetto (1997) no. 1). Cycles of population growth and depopulation are characteristic of the Aegean Islands over the longue durée, although recent work has suggested that the Archaic and especially the Classical period constituted a high point in island populousness and prosperity (see especially Brun (1993), (1996)). For example, Donoussa supported a habitation site in the Geometric period, but whether the island continued to be occupied into historical times is not known (Ph. Zapheiropoulou (1973)).

Even when islands were inhabited, it is not always clear whether they were poleis. Here are two examples. The Korsiai are a cluster of islands between Samos (no. 864) and Ikaros (Map 61; lat. 37.35, long. 26.30; 45 km² total area of group; main island, 30 km²). The toponym, which has a number of variants, is attested as Κόρσεαί as early as Hecat. fr. 143 (for the variants, see infra). The ethnic is attested as Κορσηίτης or Κορσηίτις in an undated rock-cut inscription of C5l or C4 found on the island on the hill of Ag. Giorgios (IG xii.6 1213.x1); the version in Steph. Byz. 376.12 differs. This evidence suffices to show that the islands, or at least the chief one, were inhabited. The fact that marble seems to have been quarried here for use on Samos in C6 implies occupation at
least that early (Shipley 1987: 21 n. 82). But were they a *polis*? The rock cut inscriptions show that these islands were controlled by Samos (no. 864) during the Classical period, and that at some point there was a Samian garrison on the acropolis (Rehm 1929: 20; Dunst 1974: 137), and see the tantalising inscription at 18–21 no. 2; Ehrhardt (1983) 17 with 200 n. 63). On mistaken grounds, Haussoulier suggested ((1902) 142: cf. Dunst (1974) 137) that perhaps earlier they were under Milesian control. Rehm (1929) 19–20 argued that as long as the Milesians controlled Leros and Patmos, they could assure passage to the Aegean via the strait between those islands, which was more important for them than the strait between Patmos and Korsiai. As the evidence stands, it is impossible to decide whether the Korsiai were a dependent *polis* under Samian control or just a Samian possession.

The other example is Gyaros (*Γύαρος*), an island of 17 km². In 31 Strabo visited it and found “a village inhabited by fishermen” (κόμιον ὑπὸ ἁλιέων συνοικούμενον) who were sending an ambassador (πρεσβευτὴς) to Octavian to ask for a reduction of a payment of tribute of 150 dr. they could not afford (10.5.3). The ethnic, attested in Steph. Byz. 214.2 as *Γυαρεῖος*, has now been found on rock-cut inscriptions of early Byzantine date (C5–C7) on Syros as *Γυαρέη* (Kiourtzian 2000) 155 no. 80, 181 no. 117, 184 no. 121 (much improved versions respectively of IG xii.5 712 84B² and 86B²; for the date, p. 142). The inscriptions originated with sailors who anchored in the bay beside which they were carved (ibid. 135–38). Thus it is clear that, at least in the late Hellenistic and Roman periods, Gyaros was inhabited; perhaps the same can be inferred for an earlier period from Strabo’s citing Aratos as calling Gyaros “worthless”. Moreover, Strabo’s story shows that in his day the island was not subject to another authority. There is a C2 proxeny decree passed by the Gyaroi (IG xii.6 470), and there are bronze coins of C1 (Head, *HN*² 486). Thus, there can be little doubt that Gyaros was a *polis* in the later Hellenistic period (though Strabo’s use of κόμιον remains striking). But there is no warrant for retrojecting this status into the Archaic and Classical periods.

Of the many islands mentioned one way or another in our sources, here are some of the more important which were probably inhabited. In no case is there evidence to show, or even suggest, that these islands were *polis*, but it is possible that some of them were.¹

*Araiai* or *Arai* (*Ἀραίαί*) Map 61. Lat. 37.05, long. 27.10. Dieuchidas (*FGrHist* 485) fr. 7.

¹ Islands mentioned in the main text as dependencies or part of the territory of other *polis*es are not included here.
II. The Poleis

Amorgos (Amorgios) Map 61. Lat. 36.50, long. 25.55. Size of island: 124 km². The toponym is Ἀμόργος,ἡ (Thuc. 8.28.5; IG xii.7 69.23 (C4l–C3e)). The ethnic is Ἀμόργιος (IG pi.43.B28; Ath. 486D: Σμικροίδης ὁ Ἀμόργιος). The alternative forms Ἀμοργίνος and Ἀμοργίτης are attested only in late sources (Suda Σ446; Steph. Byz. 86.12–13). Stephanos 86.9 makes the island one of the Kyklades. Amorgos was divided among three poleis (Ps.-Skylax 58: τρίπολος; IG xii.7 68.1–2 = Migeotte (1984) 189–92 no. 54 (C4l/C3e): ἡ πόλις [ἡ Ἀρκεσινέων καὶ ἡ πόλις ἡ Ἀγιαλέων καὶ [ἡ πόλις ἡ Μινοητῶν]). They were allegedly founded by the poet Semionides as a Samian colony more than 400 years after the Trojan War ((FGHist 534) T 1a–b). The view that the three Amorgian poleis were Samian colonies may derive some support from the names of the months (Loukopoulou (1989) 116–17 n. 2). They paid tribute to the Athenians in C5 as a synteleia (IG i3 278.11.10, 279.11.80, 280.11.73, 281.11.58, 282.11.41) and were united once again in joining the Second Athenian Naval League (IG i1i 43.B28). An Aristotelian Constitution of the Amorgians is attested (Heralc. Lemb. 47). The collective use of the ethnic is attested internally on coins: AMO (Head, HN2 48i (C4)) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists and on the stele listing the members of the Second Athenian Naval League (supra). The individual ethnic is used externally on Delos in 364/3 (Ἀμοργία, LDélós 104.72) and in Eretria c300 (Ἀμοργίος, IG xii.9 799). Thus, persons from the island were often regarded as simply Amorgi, regardless of their polis of origin or the precise political situation of the island. Loukopoulou (1989) 116–19 argues that the three poleis used the same calendar, but the evidence for several months is Hellenistic (Trimpy, Monat. 73–78). It is clear that the poleis of Amorgos combined for various purposes in C5 and C4, especially when dealing with outside powers. But there is ample evidence that on land the poleis retained their individual identities. For the political institutions of the poleis, with reservations, see Ruppel (1927) 313–19.

Amorgos struck bronze coins in C4s. Types: obv. star and crescent, or head of Asklepios, or cupping vessel; rev. two thyrsoi crossed, or bee; legend: AMO (Head, HN2 481).

471. Aigiale (Aigialeus) Map 61. Lat. 36.55, long. 26.00. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Αἰγιαλῆ,ἡ (IG xii.7 515.56 (C2)), but Αἰγιαλῶς/–οῦ, ὥτο is also reported (IG xii.7 388.35 = Migeotte (1984) 196–98 no. 56 (C2)). According to Steph. Byz. 121.2, an alternative toponym was Μελανία. The city-ethnic is Ἀγιαλεύς (IG xii.7 68.1 (C4/C3)). Aigiale is referred to as a polis in the urban sense by the term τρίπολος at Ps.-Skylax 58, and is called polis in the political sense in IG xii.7 68.1 (C4/C3), where the internal and collective sense of the city-ethnic is used. The external use seems to be unattested until C4l, when the collective use is found in an inscription of Magnesia (Syll.3 562.85). Aigiale was situated at the eastern end of Amorgos; there are walls of Archaic or Classical date, and sherds testify to occupation until C4l (Leekley and Noyes (1975) 40). The territory of Aigiale bordered on that of Minoa (no. 573). In light of the limited archaeological work in the Amorgian countryside, nothing can be said with confidence about the extent of the territory, but it seems to have been larger than 25 km². The protective divinity of Aigiale was Athena Polias, who had a sanctuary where stelai were sometimes erected (IG xii.7 386.42 = Syll.3 521 (C3)); she is once attested as sharing a sanctuary with Zeus Polieus (IG xii.7 387.23 (C3)).

472. Arkesine (Arkesineus) Map 61. Lat. 36.50, long. 25.50. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Ἀρκεσινή,ἡ (IG xii.7 53.38 (C1)) or Ἀρκεσίνα (IG xii.7 50.2 (C2)). Steph. Byz. 121.2–3 quotes Polybios as regarding it as masculine (fr. 20). The city-ethnic is Ἀρκεσιαῦς (IG xii.7 5.2, 22.10 (C4m)). Arkesine is referred to as a polis in the urban sense by the term τρίπολος at Ps.-Skylax 58 (cf. IG xii suppl. 330 (C2)) and is called polis in the political sense in IG xii.7 5.4, 6.7–8, 10, 12, 22. The collective use of the city-ethnic appears internally in C4 decrees (IG xii.7 5.2). Arkesine was situated toward the western end of Amorgos, and its territory bordered on that of Minoa (no. 473). The size of the territory was between 25 and 100 km².

The eponymous official was an archon serving as chief of a board of archons (IG xii suppl. 331 (C4); IG xii.7 55 = Syll.3 1200 (C4/C3); Sherk (1990) 262). Of other officials the most important is a strategos (IG xii.7 69.47 (C4l/C3e)). Laws and decrees (IG xii.7 69.47 (C4l/C3e)) were proposed in accordance with a probouleumatic procedure (IG xii.7 46 + add (C4)) and passed by a boule and a demos (IG xii.7.1.1 (C5), 2.1 (C4) presided over by a board of pryteanoi (IG xii.7 3.37, 4.6 (C4)). A number of honorific decrees of C4 or C4l–C3e grant proxenia to citizens of Athens (no. 361), Thera (no. 527), Rhithymnos (no. 987) and Rhodos (no. 1000) (IG xii.7 5–11). Public enactments were stored in an archive (δημόσιον) and in the sanctuary of Hera (IG xii.7 67.83).
Trials were brought before an official called ἔσαγωγεύς (IG xii.7 3,39, 42 (C4f)) and heard by a dikasterion situated in the urban centre (τὸ ἀστικὸν δικαστήριον) (IG xii.7 3,32, 49–50). The protective deity is not known. The cults of Athena Itonia were very important in the Hellenistic period (IG xii.7 22–23, 33–35), but in the Classical period the cult may have been that of Hera (IG xii.7 1, 2), in whose sanctuary public enactments were kept (IG xii.7 30,5–8 (C3l/C2e), 67,83 (C4l/C3e), 69,52 (C4l/C3e)); a public law forbidding access to foreigners is preserved (IG xii.7 2 (C4); cf. Butz (1996) 86–88). The acropolis of Arkése was called Aspis (IG xii.7 57,5 (C3)). Four months of the calendar, in order, are known from C4: Eiraphion, Anthesterion, Taureion and Thargelion (IG xii.7 62,28, 9, 10, 4, 49; Trümpey, Monat. 73–77). The fortification walls are probably Hellenistic (Rougemont et al. (1993) 104–12) but may go back to C4s (Brun (1996) 151).

473. Minoa (Minoetes) Map 61. Lat 36,50, long. 25,55. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Μινώα, Ἡ (IG xii.7 228,10 (C2)). The city-ethnic is Μινωϊτης (IG xii.7 68,2 = Migotte (1984) 189–92 no. 54 (C4l/C3) or Μινωϊτης (IG xii.7 223,6 (C2)) or Μινωϊτης (Androton (FGHist 324) fr. 22). Minoa is referred to as a polis in the urban sense by the term τρίπολις at Ps.-Skylax 58 and is called polis in the political sense in IG xii.7 68,2 (C4l/C3), where the collective and internal use of the city-ethnic is attested. The external use is attested collectively in Androton (FGHist 324 fr. 22) and individually in a C3 prokény decree from Tenos (IG xii.5 821,3). A board of prytaneis is attested in a citizenship decree of C5–C4 (IG xii.7 219). A cult of Apollo Pythios (or possibly Delios), who may have been the protective deity, is known from a sacred namos of C5–C4 (IG xii.7 220). The urban centre was walled starting in the Geometric period (Marangou (1990)). The walls enclosed an area of c.20 ha. A separately walled acropolis inside the polis covered an area of c.4,5 ha. (AR 47 (2000–2001) 122). There are remains of a C4 gymnasium (Marangou (1987) 255).

474. Anapha (Anaphaioi) Map 61. Lat 36,20, long. 25,45. Size of territory: 2 (40 km²). Type: B. The toponym is Ἀνάφη, Ἡ (Ap. Rhod. 4,1717; Ath. 400,E = Hegesandros (FHG iv 421 (C3))). The city-ethnic is Ἀνάφαιος (IG i³ 71,1,85; IG xii.3 251) or Ἀναψαιοῦς (IG i³ 283,11,31). The earliest explicit attestation of Anapha as a polis is in a decree of C2 (IG xii.3 248), but the island’s status as a polis is strongly indicated by membership of the Delian League combined with the C4 network of proxenoi in other poleis (infra). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in C4 lists of proxenoi (IG xii.3 250,15, 251 passim) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (supra). The individual and external use is attested in a C3m citizenship decree from Kalymna (Tit. Cal. 41,2).

Strabo classes Anapha among the islands in the Cretan Sea (10,5,1), but Ap. Rhod. Argon. 4,1711 and 1717 and Steph. Byz. 93,10 among the Sporades. The territory of Anapha was coterminous with the island. Anapha was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Island district (IG i³ 287,1,9) and is recorded three times in the tribute lists, in 428/7 (IG i³ 283,11,31), in 418/17 (IG i³ 287,1,9) and in 416/15 (IG i³ 289,1,9), paying a phoros of 1,000 dr. (IG i³ 283,11,31). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71,1,85) (1,000 dr.). It has been suggested that the island was brought into the League only in 428/7 by Lysikles (Thuc. 3,19,2; Mattingly (1996) 77 with n. 27), and also to restore Anapha as a member of the Second Athenian Naval League (Accame (1941) 79 and 82 at IG ii.43,86, but see Cargill (1981) 35).

Three fragmentary inscriptions contain lists of proxenoi of Anapha. The two first are of C4 and record proxenoi in Olynthos (no. 588), Thessalian Pharsalos (no. 413), Mykonos (no. 506), Knidos (no. 903), Paros (no. 509), Chios (no. 840) and Telemessos (no. 926) (IG xii.3 250–51).

The protective deity was Apollo Asgelatas—by lapsus Agelatos on the map—(IG xii.3 248,8 (C2)), or Aigletes (Callim. fr. 7,19, etc.), whose sanctuary was located a few kilometres east of the polis centre and was connected to the polis centre by a sacred way (Hiller von Gaertringen (1899–1909) i. 352–53). The sanctuary and the cult are attested in dedications of the Classical period (IG xii.3,236 (C4 or C3), 257 (C4), 258 (C4/C3)). The polis centre had temples of Apollo Pythios and Artemis Soteira (IG xii.3.268–71 (Hell.)); there was also a sanctuary for Asklepios (IG xii.3 248,29). Remains of fortification walls and harbour are probably Hellenistic (Hiller von Gaertringen (1899–1909) i. 351–58). For an updated description of the archaeological remains and especially the fortification walls, see Matthaiov and Pikoulas (1990–91).

Some anepigraphic coins on the Milesian–Phoenician standard have been dated to C5e and assigned to Anapha. Denominations: half-stater and quarter-stater. Types: obv. amphora; rev. four-part incuse square. The attribution to Anapha is not secure (Erxleben (1970) 69–70; Figueira (1998) 577).
475. **Andros** (Andrios) Map 60 (inset). Lat. 37.20, long. 24.50. Size of territory: 4 (380 km²). Type: A. The toponym is Ἀνδριάς, η (Hdt. 5.31.2; IG II² 123.20 = Tod 165.20 (356)), denoting both the island (Hdt. 5.31.2) and the town (Hdt. 4.33.2). The city-ethnic is Ἀνδριας (Pl. Ion 541D; IG II² 123.9). Hdt. 5.31.2 classes Andros among the Cyclades; cf. Strabo 10.5.3. Andros is called a polis both in the urban sense (Xen. Hell. 1.4.22; Ps.-Skylax 58) and in the political sense (Hdt. 4.33.2; Arist. Pol. 1270a12–13; SEG 12 390.6, 31, 44 (c.320); for the date see SEG 30 1076). The territory, which was coterminous with the island itself, is called Ἀνδρία χώρα by Xenophon (Hell. 1.4.22). The collective use of the city-ethnic appears externally in the Athenian tribute lists (infra) and on Delos in 377/6 (L.Delos 98.B.9–10). Internally its first appearance is in a decree of C4 (IG XII 245.3). The individual and external use is asserted in Athens in C5s (IG II² 1342–43; Pl. Ion 541D), in Epiraudores (IG IV² 3.323) and in Delphi in C5 (CID 17 Aa6) and in C4 (CID 11 22–23).

Andros was said to be under Naxian control in 494 (Hdt. 5.31.2). Herodotos reports Andrians participating in Xerxes’ invasion of Greece (Hdt. 8.66.2; Aesch. Pers. 887). The island was besieged by Themistokles after an unsuccessful attempt at extortion (Hdt. 8.111–12). Andros was a member of the Delian League, and may have been among the original members (ATL iii. 198–99). It belonged to the Island district (IG I3 270.v.20) and is recorded in the tribute lists from 451/0 (IG I3 1342.19) to 416/5 (IG I3 289.1.21), a total of fourteen times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of first 12 tol. (IG I3 289.1.21), reduced to 6 tol. in 450/49 (IG I3 263.iv.22), but raised to 7 tol. in 416/5 (IG I3 289.1.21). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG I3 71.1.64) (15 tal.). Plutarch (Per. 11.5) mentions the dispatch of 250 Athenian klerouchoi, plausibly dated to c.453–448 (Figueira 1991) 220 with note W). Naval forces, probably with marines, participated in actions during the Peloponnesian War (Thuc. 4.42.1, 7.57.4, 8.69.3). In the last phase of the war they fought on the Spartan side (Diod. 13.69.4–5; Xen. Hell. 2.1.31). In C4 Andros joined the Second Athenian Naval League (IG II² 43.4.16). In 356 the Athenians had a garrison and a general on Andros whose position was called an arche (Aeschin. 1.107; IG I³ 123 = Tod 156); see Reger (1994a) 314–15. In the 370s and later the Andrians participated closely enough with the Athenians in the administration of the amphiktyony on Delos to be punished by the Delians in 314 (Tréheux 1987) 386.

In 411 a contingent of Andrian soldiers supported the Four Hundred in Athens (Thuc. 8.69.3), and from this Gehrke, Stasis 22 infers that Andros must have been one of the poleis in which the constitution was changed from a democracy to an oligarchy after the oligarchic revolution in Athens (cf. Thuc. 8.64.1). The Athenian decree on Andros of 357/6 (IG I³ 123.9) indicates that the constitution had changed back to a democracy, probably in C4. The only known public enactments of the Classical period are a treaty with Delphi (no. 177) about theoroi (CID 17 (C5s)) and a citizenship decree of C4 (IG XII suppl. 245). We hear about a boule with a grammateus and a board of tamiai attached (CID 17; IG XII suppl. 245). The eponymous official was an archon, indisputably attested from C3 onwards (IG XI.5 715), but probably referred to already in the Classical period (CID 17A.9, cf. p. 22; Sherk 1990) 263). The Andrians dedicated at Delphi a statue of their eocist Andrexus (Paus. 10.13.4; for the date, 412/11 or 308, see Jacquemin (1999) 313 no. 63). Andros bestowed proxenia on a citizen from an unknown polis (IG XII suppl. 245 (C4)), and a citizen of Andros was appointed proxenos by Karthia (no. 492) (IG XI.5 542.b.3–7 (C4m)). C.330 a theodorokos was appointed to host theoroi from Argos (no. 347) (SEG 23 189.11.13).

The protective deity was probably Apollo Pythios (IG XII suppl. 245.14), though explicit testimony from the Archaic and Classical periods is absent. A stele recording a C4 proxeny decree was erected in his sanctuary (IG XII suppl. 245.14). An inscription of perhaps C4 mentions a cult of Zeus Meilichios (IG XI.5 727). The Andrians dedicated an αἶος on Delos (L.Delos 104–124; cf. Tréheux (1987) 381–83). Two Andrians are attested as victors in the Olympic Games (Olympionikai 339, 588; Hdt. 9.33.2; Paus. 3.11.6, 6.14.13). An Andrian boy is attested as victor at Oropos in, probably, 329/8 (Petrakos 1997) 409–15 no. 520.19 = IG VII 414; Knoepfler (1993) for the date).

The polis centre was located on the south-western coast of the island at the unoccupied site called Palaiopolis. It still has magnificent walls, which undoubtedly belong to C4 (so Sauciac (1914) 10–16) rather than to the Hellenistic period (so Tzedakis (1975) 323). The walls are implied in connection with the siege in 480 (Hdt. 8.112) and Alkibiades’ attack in 408 (Diod. 13.69.4). Remains of the western wall stretch from the coast to the acropolis, c.1600 m from the coast. Nothing is left of the other walls but, to judge from burials, the circuit must have enclosed an area of over 100 ha (Sauciac (1914) 10–16). For the urban centre, see Palaiokrassa-Kopitsa (1996). The Python, attested in C4 (IG XII suppl. 245), is probably the same as the sanctuary of Apollo (τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος) mentioned repeatedly in Hellenistic inscriptions (e.g. IG XI.5 715 b (C3)). A stoa of Classical date has been reported (ArchEph (1964) 2–4). A rock-cut inscription of perhaps C4 bearing the words μη
476. Astypalaia (Astypaleia) Map 61. Lat. 36.35, long. 26.20. Size of territory: 2 (97 km²). Type: B. The toponym is Ἀστυπάλαια, Ἡ (Ps.-Skylax 48; Arist. fr. 366, Rose; IG xii.3 172.3 (C3); cf. SEG 27 503). The city-ethnic is Ἀστυπαλαιών (IG i² 1046 with in p. 973 (C4); Ant. Pal. App. 6.44 (r.492)). The earliest reference to Astypalaia as a polis (in the political sense) is in I.Priene 8.48–49, traditionally dated to the 320s, but now down dated to the 280s; see SEG 46 1479. Polis status in the Classical period is indicated by Astypalaia’s membership of the Delian League (infra), and by the C4 grant of ateleia obtained from Epidaurus (infra). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on Hellenistic coins (Head, HN² 630) and in inscriptions (IG xii.3 215 (C3); Peek 1969) 38–40 no. 87.11–12), and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (infra). The individual and external use is attested in an Epidaurian prynexy decree (IG iv².1 48 (c.300)), in a private dedication from Delphi (Pomtow 1918) 64 no. 90 (C4m)), in a grant of citizenship (IG iv².1 615 (C4)), both for citizens of Astypalaia and for a group of individuals at Arkesine on Amorgos (IG xii.7 67.3–4 = Migeotte (1984) 183–87 no. 51 (C4/C3e)), and in a Grant of citizenship from Glory (1918) 134 T 1 (some say he was from Aegina), T 4; cf. Giannantoni (1990) ii.511–12). Patris is found in IG xii.3 211 = CEG 11 866 (C4l/C3e).

According to Ps.-Skymnos 551, Astypalaia was a colony of Megara (no. 225), but a C4 inscription claims Epidaurus (no. 348) as the metropolis (IG iv².1.47). Astypalaia was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district (IG i³ 269.iv.17) and is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i³ 259.111.14) to 428/7 (IG i³ 283.11.29), a total of thirteen times, three times completely restored, paying a phoros of 2 tal. (IG i³ 259.111.14) reduced to 1½ tal. in 443/2 (IG i³ 269.iv.17) but raised to 2 tal. again in 433/2 (IG i³ 279.1.18). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.1.143). In C48 the Astypalaioans obtained a grant of ateleia from Epidaurus (IG iv².1.47). Astypalaia received grain from Kyrene (no. 1028) c.330–326 (Tod 196.47 = SEG 9.2.47). Citizens from Astypalaia were appointed proxenoi by Epidaurus (IG iv².1 48 (c.300)) and by Chios (no. 840) (PEP Chios 50 (C4)).

Aristotle wrote of Ἡ Ἀστυπαλαιέων γῆ (De anim. fr. 4 (C4m)). The earliest attestation of the eponymous official, a demourgos, dates to C4l or C3e (IG xii.7 67.6.18 = Migeotte (1984) 183–87 no. 51; Sherf 1990). A sacred law of C4 is preserved in an inscription (IG xii.3 183, which gives a date of c.300; Le Guen-Pollet 1991) 80–81 no. 24. A single month of the calendar, Aramtios, is known (IG xii.7 67.6.17 = Migeotte (1984) 183–87 no. 51; cf. Trümpy, Monat. 197–98).

Pausanias reports a sanctuary of Athena in the story he tells of the Olympic victor Kleomedes of Astypalaia, who in 492 killed his opponent wrestling and went mad; he pulled down the roof of a school so that it fell upon sixty children, but he was later made a hero on the basis of advice from the oracle at Delphi (Paus. 6.9.6–8; Anth. Pal. App. 6.44; Olympionikai 397). For a cult of Athena in C4, see IG xii.13 184. Apollo had a sanctuary with at least one oikos and a cult statue (Peek 1969) 43 no. 89 (c.400); cf. IG xii.3 185. A sanctuary of Artemis Lochia is reported in C4 (Peek 1969) 44 no. 92, and a cult of Hera in C4 (or C3) is also attested (IG xii.3 196).

The ancient urban centre was located at modern Chora; a small site dated to the Classical period has been reported at Armenochori (perhaps a farm?; Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973) 159–62).

To Astypalaia have been assigned some silver coins dated C5e to c.460. Denominations: stater, obol and fractions. Types: obv. amphora (stater), or vessel with handle (obol), or rose (tetartemorion); rev. oinochoe with lyre; legend: AΣΤΥ in incuse square (stater); obv. oinochoe with A (obol); rev. incuse square with A (tetartemorion). A different, anepigraphic series of staters on the Aiginetan standard...

χέεν γυναῖκα (Palaikrassa (993) 125–26) may indicate a sanctuary dedicated to a female deity (Sève, BE (995) 421). At least two important settlements are known outside the polis centre at Andros, one to the east at Zagora (Cambitoglou et al. (1971), (1988)), the other west at Hypsele (Televantou (1996), (1999)), both of which began in the Geometric period but continued to be occupied later. Hypsele had a temple (cf. Reger (1997) 469). A phrourion at Gaurion on the north-east coast was fortified by Alkibiades in 408 (Diod. 13.69.4).

In the Archaic period Andros struck silver coins on the Aiginetan standard. Denominations: stater (didrachm), drachm and fractions. Types: obv. amphora; rev. incuse square (Paschalis (1898)). The coinage stopped c.478 (Figueira (1998) 577). Later coins have been attributed to C4f (Paschalis (1898) 348; Sauciuc (1914) 77; Erxleben (1970) 70), but are perhaps better seen as Hellenistic (Head, HN² 482).

The Andrians founded colonies at Argilos (no. 554), Stagiros (no. 613), Akanthos (no. 559) and Sane (no. 600) (Thuc. 4.84.1, 88.2, 103.3, 109.3, 5.6.1). A disagreement with Chalkis (no. 365) over the distribution of territory in the colony at Sane led to arbitration by Erythraians (no. 845), Samians (no. 864) and Parians (no. 509) (Plut. Mor. 298A–B; Piccirilli (1973) 7–11 no. 2).
has recently been assigned to the island. Types: *obv.* two dolphins; *rev.* two incuse squares in four compartments (Boutin 1986) 6–10; as belonging only to an island in the Dodecanese, Hackens (1973) 210; see also Sheedy (1998a) 321. Another series of anepigraphic hemidrachms has been assigned to C4. Types: *obv.* head of Helios; *rev.* Bow (E. S. G. Robinson 1949) 330; see Erxlbein (1970) 83; Figueira (1998) 580.

477. Chalke (Chalkeates) Map 60 (inset). Lat. 36.15, long. 27.35. Size of territory: 2 (28 km²). Type: B. The toponym is Χάλκη, ἕ (Thuc. 8.55.1, 60.3; Steph. Byz. 682.1) or Χαλκία (Theophr. Hist. pl. 8.2.9; Strabo 10.5.14–15) or Χάλκεια (Ps.-Skylax 99), denoting both the island and the town (Strabo 10.5.15). The city-ethnic is Χαλκείατας (I.Knidos 605 (C4m); IG i³ 280.1.54) or Χαλκείατης (IG i³ 270.iv.7); Χαλκήτας is attested in C3 and later (Susini 1963–64) 259 nos. 1–2; Tit. Cam. 3 D c 54, 4.8.8 and 11, 109–4–5; IG xii.1 844.33–34 (C1i). Chalke is not called a *polis* in any source, but its membership of the Delian League (*infra*) and a C4m treaty concluded with Knidos (*infra*) strongly suggest that it was a *polis* in C3–C4. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i³ 280.1.54) and in the inscription from Knidos (I.Knidos 605). The individual use is attested internally (IG xii.1 216 (Hell.)) and externally at Kameiros (Tit. Cam. 3 A c 54 (C1i)).

Chalke was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district (IG i³ 269.iv.6) and is recorded in the tribute lists from 450/49 (IG i³ 263.1.10) to 427/6 or 426/5 (IG i³ 284.19), a total of seventeen times, three times completely restored, paying a *phoros* of first 3,000 dr. (IG i³ 263.1.10), reduced to 2,000 dr. (IG i³ 267.iii.22) in 445/4 or possibly already in 446/5 (IG i³ 266.iii.27, completely restored). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.11.104, 2,000 + dr.).

In C4m the Chalkeatai concluded what is presumably an *isopoliteia* treaty with Knidos (no. 903) (I.Knidos 605; cf. Gawantka (1975) 209 no. 11 and 38 n. 79). The Knidians granted the Chalkeatai the right to purchase landed property and to participate in Knidian citizenship (*politeia*). The last preserved line of the inscription records the beginning of the decree of the Chalkeatai which presumably granted the Knidians the same privileges.

By C4l, however, Chalke had become part of the Rhodian state, for Theophrastos calls it Χαλκέων τὴν νῆσον τὴν Ἑρμοῦ (*Phidias* Hist. pl. 8.2.9). More specifically, it was turned into a deme of Kameiros (no. 996) (Tit. Cam. 109 (C4l); in C3 lists of *damiourgoi* Tit. Cam. 3 A c 54 (C1l), 4.8.8, 11 (first century AD)), although perhaps the process of incorporating its inhabitants into the political structure of Kameiros had not yet been completed by about 325, since the Chalkeatai are treated as exceptions in a law of approximately that date (Tit. Cam. 109.4–5).

According to Strabo (10.5.15), the island had a harbour (*limen*); its location has been a matter of dispute (see Susini (1963–64) 249). Strabo also mentions a sanctuary of Apollo, who may have been the protective deity. A dedication to Asklepios is known from C4 or perhaps C3 (IG xii.1 956); mention of Zeus and Hekate is likely to have been late (IG xii.1 958). The *polis* centre lay to the north and east of the modern settlement, which occupies the acropolis with its castle of the Knights of St John (Hope Simpson and Lazbeny (1973) 156; Susini (1963–64) 247). The preserved wall includes sections that have been dated to C6, but much of it is undoubtedly Hellenistic (Susini 1963–64) 248). No coinage is known.

Some C4 coins inscribed *XA* may belong to the present community or to Karian Chalketor (no. 881); *obv.* female head, *rev.* spearhead (BMC 18 (Caria and Islands)).

478. Delos (Delios) Map 61. Lat. 37.25, long. 25.15. Size of territory: 1 (3 km²). Type: A. The toponym is Δῆλος, ἕ (Hom. Od. 6.162; Hymn. Hom. Ap. 27; Hdt. 1.64.2; IG i³ 402.15, 1460.9, 1461.6), in Doric Δάλος (Pind. Ol. 6.59), denoting both the island (Thuc. 3.104.1) and the town (Ps.-Skylax 58). The city-ethnic is Δῆλος (I.Delos 98A 16 (377/6)). Delos is called a *polis* in the political sense throughout C4 (I.Delos 36.2 = CEG 11 836; I.Delos 74.15–16: τῆς πόλεως τῆς Δῆλου). In Ps.-Skylax 58 Δῆλος is one of the toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις αἵδε ἐν ταῖς νῆσοις. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in inscriptions (IG i³ 1460.14 (410/9); I.Delos 71.2 (C5/C4), 74.7 (C4s)) and on coins (*infra*) and externally in inscriptions (IG i³ 130.19 (c.432)) and in literary sources (Hdt. 6.97.1; Thuc. 5.1; Hyp. fr. 74, Sauppe). The individual use is attested both internally (I.Delos 98A 16 (377/6)) and externally at Athens and Karthaia on Keos (IG i³ 1349 (c.530); IG xii.1 542.49 (C4)).

Strabo (10.5.1) carefully excludes Delos from the Kyklades, which are, rather, the islands around it. The territory of Delos was of course fundamentally the island itself, but ever since Polykrates of Samos attached Rheneia (no. 514) to Delos by a chain (Thuc. 3.104.2, cf. 1.13.6; Shipley (1987) 94–97), the Delians controlled the southern half of Rheneia below the isthmus which divides the island into two unequal halves, as well as the eastern part of the half above the isthmus (see the sketch map in Kent (1948) 248 fig. 3).
This land supported several sanctuaries (see *infra*) and the necessary Delian cemeteries, given the prohibition against burial on the sacred island (see Couilloud (1974)). By C4 the rest of Delian territory on Rheneia was divided into eleven sacred estates (*temene*), which were rented out on contract; these no doubt were established soon after the Rheneian territory came into Delian possession (*I.Delos 89*, 104–11A; Kent (1948) 245–52; Charre and Couilloud-Le Dinahet (1999)). The Delians also owned property on Syros (*I.Delos 104–11A21*) and Tenos (*I.Delos 104–8B46* (C4S); cf. *I.Delos* 104–32, 4, apparently under an entry referring to houses rented out: *ἐν τῷ ἔθελον ἀντι*), perhaps having come into Delian possession as a result of foreclosure for unpaid loans (Étienne (1990) 183; *contra* Reger (1994b) 227–28, and *infra*).

In the Archaic period Delos was under the sway of the Naxians (no. 507) (generally, see Gallet de Santerre (1958)), though there is no reason to believe that the Delians thereby ceased to enjoy the status of a *polis*. Under Peisistratos the Athenians claimed Delos and carried out a purification (cf. Lanzillotta (1996) 275–79). When Datis passed by Delos in 490, the islanders fled to Tenos, but he respected the sanctity of the island and called them back (Hdt. 6.97.1). After the end of the Persian War the Athenians chose Delos as headquarters of the Delian League; meetings were held in the sanctuary (Thuc. 1.96.2). The sanctuary was controlled by an amphiktyony under the Athenians (478–404). In 426/5 the Athenians carried out renewed purifications (Thuc. 1.8.1, 3.104), and in 422 they expelled the Delians, who were permitted by the Persians to live at Adramyttion (no. 800) (Thuc. 5.1, 8.108.4: calling the action a *metoikismos* Paus. 4.27.9); but at least some of them were brought back to Delos in 421 (Thuc. 5.32.1). After the end of the Peloponnesian War the Delians enjoyed political autonomy from 404 to 394, though subject to a subordinate treaty with the Spartans (no. 345) (*I.Delos 87 = Choix no. 8* (402–399); see Prost (2001)). In 394 the Athenians again secured control over the sanctuary (though not the Delian *polis*), which they held and administered through another amphiktyony until 314, sometimes with the co-operation of the Andrians (no. 475) (see e.g. *I.Delos* 97.5; 97bis 1–2; 98.A63, 64, 96; 100.7, 10, Andrian *amphiktyoneis*).

Aristotle wrote a *Constitution of the Delians* (no. 38 and frs. 495–97, Gigon). Several Delian laws have been preserved epigraphically, including an exclusion of *xenoi* from a sanctuary, perhaps the *temenos* of the Archegetes (*I.Delos 68* (C4), with Butz (1996) 78–82; Le Guen-Pollet (1991) 77–79 no. 22, and Vallois (1929) 209 n. 2), and a regulation to keep a spring clean (*I.Delos 69* (C4f); Le Guen-Pollet (1991) 61–62 no. 14 (C5)). A grant of *ateleia* is known (*I.Delos 71 = Choix no. 6* (C4f)). In 376/5 a fine and permanent exile was imposed on Delians who had seized *amphiktyoneis* in the sanctuary of Apollo, dragged them out, and beaten them (*I.Delos 98B24–52*). A *stasis* between a pro-Athenian and an anti-Athenian faction in the 330s can be inferred from an Athenian citizenship decree to an exiled citizen of Delos and his family (*IG i² 222*; cf. Gehrke, *Stasis* 49). A fragment of Hyperides’ Delian Speech (fr. 74) recounts a lawsuit between the Delians and the Rheneians over responsibility for the deaths of Aiolian visitors on Rheneia.

The Delians bestowed *proxenia* on citizens of Athens (no. 361) (*I.Delos 74* (C4)), Ios (no. 484) (*I.Delos 76*), and Kition (*IG x1,4 512* (C4)), and *proxenia* combined with citizenship on a citizen of Byzantion (no. 674) (*IG x1,4 510* (C4)). Delian citizens were appointed *proxenoi* by Athens (*I.Delos 88* (368)), Karthaia (*IG x11,5 542–49* (C4m)); see Marek (1984) 71–73, 247–80.

The eponymous official of Delos was an archon (*IG i³ 1400.9–10* (410/9); *I.Delos 87* (c.403); Sherk (1990) 269–70). We hear of *prytaneis* (*I.Delos 88 = Choix 10* (369/8)), a *boule* (*I.Delos71* (C5/C4), 72) and an *asme* (*I.Delos 88* (369/8)). Decrees were passed typically by the *boule* and the *demos* (*I.Delos 71–73* (C5/C4–390s)), the latter sometimes simply as *Δηλιοι* (*I.Delos 71*); occasionally a named person moved the decree (*I.Delos 73* (390s), 74 (C4e)). Other known officials include an *arxias stephanephoros* (*I.Delos 37* (C4)), *hieropoioi* (*I.Delos 73* (390s)), *grammateus* of the *boule* (*I.Delos 88*), an *epistates* (*I.Delos 88*), and *strategoi* (*I.Delos 88*). *Neokoroi* appear as helpers of the *amphiktyoneis* until 409 or 408; thereafter they are called *episkopoi* or *epitropoi* (*I.Delos 93,10–15* and 94.4). The civic subdivisions (clearly modelled on Athens) (Jones, *POAG* 211–12) comprised four *phyloi* (only *Ἀργαδεῖς* is known by name: *IG x1,4 1155,3* (C3f)), several *trittyes* (e.g. *ἡ τριττύς ἡ Μαψιχιδῶν* (*IG x1,2 199A.12* (275); cf. Bruneau and Ducat (1983) 123). The protective deity was of course Apollo Delios (Ananios 11, West 2; *Hymn. Hom. Ap. passim*; Pind. *Pae. 5*, Race; on Pindar’s connections with Delos, see Simon (1997); on the tradition of Apollo’s birth, see Le Roy (1973)). The cult statue of Apollo made by Tektaios and Angelion (Paus. 2.32,5, 9,35,3 replaced a *xoanon* taken to Epidelion (Paus. 3.23,3). There was also a *xoanon* of Aphrodite (Paus. 9.40,3–4). The dedication to Athena Polias (*I.Delos 15 = LSAG 366 no. 42* (C6f)), which is carved on a column of the *bouleuterion*, should probably be attributed to the Athenians.
Apollo’s sanctuary, which can be traced back to Bronze Age roots, was the chief ἱερόν of Delos (Courby (1931) 1–106; Bruneau and Ducat (1983) 130–33), but of course the tiny island was saturated with sanctuaries. These include an Artemision on Delos which dates in its original form to C7 (I. Delos 73 (3905); Bruneau and Ducat (1983) 154–59) and an Ἀρτεμισίων ἐν νήσῳ recently shown to have been located on Rheneia (Tréheux (1995)); a Heraion dating from C7 (Plassart (1928); Bruneau and Ducat (1983) 230–31); a Letoon built c.540 (Gallet de Santerre (1959) 37–72; Bruneau and Ducat (1983) 168–71); a Dodekathenion to the Twelve Gods, but which had only altars in C5–C4 (Will (1955); Bruneau and Ducat (1983) 165–66); an Archaeion for Anios, the founder of Delos, of C6e (F. Robert (1953); Bruneau and Ducat (1983) 200–1; Bruneau (1970) 413–30 on the cult); an Aphrodision which was consecrated C6f, the founder of Delos, of C6e (F. Robert (1953); Bruneau and Ducat (1983) 159); the bouleuterion from C6f (Gnezis (1990) 45–46, 315 no. 17; cf. I. Delos 84 (c.300)); the prytaíon was begun before C4m (Etienne (1997); Bruneau and Ducat (1983) 135–37; S. G. Miller (1978) 67–78, as C5; cf. also IG xi 2.144.A; 98, 101; the hieropoion is C4f (Tréheux (1987))). The impressive theatre (TGR ii. 192–94) goes back to C4 but was not finished till C3m (IG xi.2 287.A 92–93, work still going on in 250; Vallois (1944) 220–38).

As a sacred site Delos was always unvalled (see Rigsby (1996) 51–53); for Datis, see supra; on the “battle of Delos” inferred from Hippoc. Epid. 5.61 and 7.33, see F. Robert (1973)). The city seems originally to have occupied land north of the sanctuary; the habitation quarter known as the Quartier du Théâtre was a C3 development (Chamonard (1922)), and of course the great period of expansion on Delos fell in the decades after the Romans gave Delos back to the Athenians in 167 (Roussel (1987) passim; Habicht (1997) 246–63). On the harbour facilities of Delos, see Duchêne and Fraise (2001).

Delos struck silver coins on the Euboic standard from C6f to C5e, stopping after 478. The Archaic and Classical coinage of Delos still lacks a thorough scholarly study (Hackens (1973); Bruneau and Ducat (1983) 107–11; V. Chankowski is planning such a study). Types: obv. lyre, sometimes with legend Δ, rev. incuse square in eight or four compartments; or spokes of wheel with retrograde legend ΔΗΑΙ (Head, HN2 485; Erxleben (1970) 70; Kraay (1976) 45–46).

479. Helene Map 59 (by a lapsus there as Helena). Lat. 37.40, long. 24.05. Size of territory: 1 (18 km²). Type: A. The toponym is Ἐλένη, ἦ (Strabo 10.5.3), denoting both the island and the town (Ps.-Skylax 58), or Μάκες (Steph. Byz. 265.5). Steph. Byz. 265.6–7 conjectures two different forms of the city-ethnic. Artemidoros (απευδό Strabo) starts the Kyklades with Helene; Strabo excludes it. In Ps.-Skylax 58 Ἐλένη is one of the toponyms listed after πολεῖς αἴθε ἐν ταῖς νήσοις.

Ikaros (Ikaros) Map 61. Lat. 37.35, long. 26.10. Size of territory: 4 (256 km²). The toponym is Ἰκάρος, ἦ (IG i 261.6.6; F. Delphes ii.1.497.12 (C4i/C6e); Hdt. 6.95.2; Thuc. 3.29.1), in late sources sometimes Ἰκαρία, ἦ (Strabo 14.11.9; Papalas (1992) 183 no. 5.185 no. 11). The ethnic is Ἰκάριος (IG xvii 895 (C4s)), in late sources sometimes Ικαρεύς (IG xii.7 723.18 (C2)). According to Ps.-Skylax 58, Ikaros was δίπολος, and indeed two poleis, Oine and Thermaí, are known. Unlike other islands with multiple poleis, the inhabitants do not always appear simply as Ikarians. Both poleis were members of the Delian League but always paid separately; in the tribute lists they are recorded as Οἰναῖοι ἐν Ἰκάρωι (IG i 263.11.2–3) or ἤχος Ἰκάρος (IG i 262.11.9–10) and as Θερμαίοι ἐν Ἰκάρῳ (IG i 261.7.6–7) or ἤχος Ἰκάρο (IG i 262.11.2–3). Both poleis are attested fifteen times in the tribute lists (infra), but only twice are they recorded next to each other (264.1.27–8, 265.1.29–30). According to Anaximenes of Lampsakos, Ikaros was “settled” by Milesians (no. 854) (FGrHist 72 fr. 26); the date must be C4 or earlier, perhaps in the Archaic period (Manganaro (1963–64) 297); if Archaic, perhaps starting with the Milesian expedition against Naxos, the island had expelled the Milesians by c.478 (see Ehrhardt (1983) 18–19). There are no known coins struck as island issues (see L. Robert (1969–90) i. 333–34 n. 2, 554–55 n. 4).

480. Oine (Ωινο(ω)αιοι) Map 61. Lat. 37.40, long. 26.10. Size of territory: 3 (1.125 km²). Type: A. The toponym is Οἰνή, ἦ (IG xi.1 539.7 (C4i/C6e); but note that this is an honorific decree for an individual described as Ικάρων ἦ Οἰνης; cf. also L. Robert (1938) 113 n. 1 and SEG 42.779) or sometimes in later sources Οὐνό, ἦ (Strabo 14.11.9; Ath. 30D). The city-ethnic is Οἰναίοι (IG i 262.11.9; I. Delos 98.A.13; coins, see infra), in late sources sometimes Οὐναίοι (Ath. 30D, perhaps quoting Epaerchides (FGrHist 437) fr. 1). In the Athenian tribute lists the community is referred to as Οἰναίοι ἤχος Ἰκάρῳ (IG i 262.11.9, 262.11.9–10, 263.11.2–3) or ἦν Ἰκάρῳ (IG i 263.11.2). Oine is referred to as a polis in the urban sense by the term δίπολοι at Ps.-Skylax.
58. It is called a polis in the political sense in a C4 proxenia decree (IG xii.6 1224.5; see also I.Delos 98.A.13 and B.5 (377–373), where the Οίναιοι ἐξ Ἰκάροι are listed under the heading: αἴτε τῶν πόλεων (A.11, B.1). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins: OINAION (Head, HN7 602, from c.300) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 262.11.9). The earliest attestation of the individual use of the city-ethnic is from C2e (IG x1.4 811.3–4).

Oine was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionian district (IG i3 269.1.9) and is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i3 259.iv.7) to 429/8 (IG i3 282.iv.57) a total of fifteen times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of first tal., 2,000 dr. (IG i3 259.iv.7–8), reduced to 1 tal. in 447/6 (IG i3 265.1.30) and further reduced to 4,000 dr. in the following year (IG i3 266.1.9), but raised again to 1 tal. in 433/2 (IG i3 279.i.52–53). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.1.175–76). Apart from membership of the Delian League and contributions to the Delian Amphiktyony, the only two pieces of information we have about Oine as a political community are the Oinaians’ grant of proxenia to a citizen of Byzantion (no. 674) (IG x11.6 122.4 (C4)) and a grant of proxenia by the Delians (no. 478) to a citizen of Oine (IG x1.4 539 (C4/L/C3e)).

The ancient settlement was once thought to occupy a hill (an acropolis) near modern Kambos, but in 1939 Politis showed that there was no ancient settlement on the hill; he favoured a location by the sea on the left bank of the river that flows by Kambos into the sea (Politis (1939–40) 139–43). The polis centre is located on the north coast. It seems likely that Oine’s territory included the western part of the island, and thus the temple of Artemis Tauropolos. Graves and villages of Classical date have been reported (N. Zapheiropoulos (1965a), (1965b)).

The Tauropolion, the sanctuary of Artemis (Strabo 14.1.19), was located on the north coast, c.9 km west of Oine, in whose territory it surely was (though it seems to have operated in some sense as an island-wide sanctuary, perhaps rather like Klopedi on Lesbos). Ceramics start in C7, and building by C6, and continuously thereafter (Papalas (1983); Politis (1939–40); Ph. Zapheiropoulos (1989)). Recent finds of rock-cut inscriptions mention the Theoi Samothrakoi (Hatzianastasiou (1981) 378).

481. *Therma (Thermaios) Map 61. Lat. 37.40, long. 26.10. Size of territory: 3 (125 km²). Type: A. The toponym is unattested. In the Hellenistic period the urban centre was called Δράκανον (Strabo 14.1.19) after the nearby promon-

tery. The city-ethnic is Θερμαίοι (IG i3 259.111.9–10, 261.v.6–7). In the Athenian tribute lists the community is referred to as Θερμαίαν ἐξ Ἰκάροι (262.11.2–3) or ἐν Ἰκάροι (IG i3 263.11.36–37). The Thermaioi are referred to as having a polis in the urban sense by the term δισπολις at Ps.-Skylax 58. For polis in the political sense, see I.Delos 98.A.14 and B.4–5 (377–373), where the Θερμαίοι ἐξ Ἰκάρο are listed under the heading αἴτε τῶν πόλεων (A.11, B.1). The collective use of the ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 259.111.9–10). The earliest attestation of the individual use of the city-ethnic is from C2e (IG x1.4 811.3–4). Asklepios has been suggested as the chief deity on the basis of the Hellenistic renaming of the city as Asklepieis (L. Robert (1969–90) i.549–68).

Therma was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionian district (IG i3 269.1.4) and is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i3 259.111.9–10) to 429/8 (IG i3 282.iv.35), a total of fifteen times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of 3,000 dr. in all years (IG i3 259.111.9–10).

The urban centre was located on the south-east coast of the island. A nearby cemetery shows use from the Archaic period (Leeley and Noyes (1975) 20). Ancient remains are few (a bath complex has been reported (Lauffer (1989) 278; Pleket (1960)) because most of the site slid into the sea, perhaps as a result of an earthquake in 1948 (Papalas (1992) 122).

482. Ikos (Ikios) Map 55. Lat. 39.10, long. 23.55. Size of territory: 2 (65 km²). Type: A. The toponym is Ἰκος, Ἰκ (Ps.-Skymnos 582) or Ἰκός (Strabo 9.5.16), denoting both the island and the town (Ps.-Skylax 58). The city-ethnic is Ἰκιος (IG i3 262.iv.2). The island is sometimes regarded as one of the Kyklades (Steph. Byz. 330.8), but Strabo groups it with the islands that lie off Magnesia (Strabo 9.5.16). Ps.-Skylax 58 calls the island δισπολις, principally in the urban sense, but no trace of two poleis recurs in the sources (which are meagre) or the archaeology (likewise). The political sense is attested in IG ii.4 43.78 and 84, where the Ikoi under the heading πόλεις are listed as members of the Second Athenian Naval League. The collective use of the city-ethnic appears internally on amphora stamps (infra) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 262.iv.2). The individual and external use is attested in an Attic sepulchral inscription (IG ii.4 8936 (C4f)). The amphora stamps inscribed IKIΩΝ (IG x11.8 665) or IKION (nominative neuter singular) are from C3 or earlier (Doulgeri-Intzeisiloglou and Garlan (1990) 388 with n.78, 373 fig.7; cf. Garlan (1999) 19).

Ikos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district (IG i3 271.11.51) and is recorded in the
tribute lists from 451/0 (IG i3 262.11.2v) to 429/8 (IG i3 282.11.18), a total of seventeen times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 1,500 dr. in all years (IG i3 262.11.2v). Ikos also joined the Second Athenian Confederacy in the 370s (IG ii² 43,84). Remains of the ancient urban centre on the south-eastern coast of the island include fortification walls of C4 (Philippson (1959) 48). An atelier for the production of amphorae has been found at Tsoukalia, dating from the Classical period and later; finds include stamps marked IKION or IKΩN (supra). Farmsteads of C4 have also been located (BCH 124 (2000) 960–61).

483. Imbros (Imbrios)  Map 51. Lat. 40.10, long. 25.45. Size of territory: 4 (275 km²). Type: A. The toponym is Ἰμβρος, ἱ (Hom. ll. 13.33; Hymn. Hom. Ap. 36; Thuc. 8.102.2; F.Delphes iii.1 497.14 (C4/C3e), denoting both the island and the town (Ps.-Skylax 67). The city-ethnic is Ἰμβρωνος (Archil. 114.3, West; IG ii 265.11.112). Imbros is called a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 67 and in the political sense in the King’s Peace (Xen. Hell. 5.1.31). In the Athenian tribute lists the Imbrians are twice recorded under the heading Κινδος (Xen. Hell. 5.1.31). In the Athenian tribute lists the Imbrians are twice recorded under the heading ἱαίδε πάλεξ (IG i3 282.B1.15–16, 19, 285.1.107–8, 110). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins (infra) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (infra). For the external and individual use, see Archil. 114.3. A C5s Athenian sepulchral inscription has, instead, εἰ Ἰμβρου (IG i3 1350).

Like Lemnos, Imbros was seized by the Athenians c500 (Hdt. 6.41.2–4, 104.1; see Salomon (1997) 45) and resettled with expatriate Athenians. The Imbrians were members of the Delian League. Imbros belonged to the Island district (IG i3 269.v.34), which indicates that, like the Lemnians, the Imbrians were allies (Thuc. 3.5.1, 7.57.2, 8.102–3) and not Athenian klerouchs like the Skyrians (Graham (1983) 175–84; Salomon (1997) 31–66; cf. Cargill (1995) 5–6). Imbros is recorded in the tribute lists from 447/6 (IG i3 265.11.112) to 421/20 (IG i3 285.1.110) a total of twelve times, five times completely restored, paying a phoros of 3,300 dr. in 447/6 (IG i3 265.11.112), raised to 1 tal. in, perhaps, 442/1 (IG i3 270.v.36). In 429/8 Imbros is listed among poleis which καταδελβι τόμ φόρον (present a voucher for tribute), presumably contributing to the maintenance of the Hallesponthophylakes and serving as bases for the fleet patrolling the Hallesponthos waters (IG i3 282.B1.15–16, 19; cf. IG i3 285.1.107–8, 10; Thuc. 2.24.1). Imbros was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.1.98) (1 tal., but both ethnic and amount restored). In the Peace of 404 Athens had to surrender Imbros (Andoc. 3.12; Aeschin. 2.76–77), but by 392, after a short period of independence (Andoc. 3.12, 14) the Athenians had regained control of the island (Xen. Hell. 4.8.15), and Athenian possession was confirmed by the King’s Peace of 386 (Xen. Hell. 5.1.31). Like Lemnos (Agora xix L.3, 20, 22, 33, 42, 47), Imbros was now inhabited by Athenian klerouchs. For the view that only some of the inhabitants were klerouchs, whereas the rest were naturalised Imbrians, see Salomon (1997) 75–76. Imbros was still Athenian in the 320s (Arist. Ath. Pol. 62.2; IG ii 3206; cf. SEG 39 211), and remained Athenian by the Peace of 322 (Diod. 18.18.4; see Cargill (1995) 42–58). In C4 the Imbrians were in full possession of Athenian citizenship (Dem. 3.4, 7.4; Aeschin. 2.72).

As an Athenian dependency the Imbrian state is called Ἀθηναίων ὁ δήμος ἐν Ἰμβρῳ (IG xi³ 46; IG ii² 3206, cf. SEG 39.211 (c.325) or ὁ δήμος ἐν Ἰμβρῳ (IG ii² 3203 (C4m)), but in the Athenian tribute lists it is given as Ἰμβρων (IG i3 265.11.112, etc.). All attestations of civic subdivisions copy Athens: citizens were organised into the Kleisthenic phylai and demoi (IG xi² 63 (352/1)), and retained this system even after Imbros had broken away from Athens (IG xi³ 5 (c.318–307)); see Jones, POAG 187–88. Both when the Imbrians were part of the Athenian state (IG xi³ 46 (c.350–325)) and when they were independent (IG xi³ 47–48 (c.318–307)), decrees were proposed in accordance with a probouleumatic procedure (46.4–7) and passed by the boule and the demos (46.1, 47.13, 48.6–7) in an ἐκκλησία (47.3, 48.4) presided over by an epistates and two symproedroi (47.3–4, 48.4–5). The eponymous official was the Athenian archon when Imbros was part of the Athenian state (IG xi³ 63.1) and the island’s own archon when Imbros was independent (IG xi³ 47–9), but see Cargill (1995) 146; Sherk (1990) 270–72. An Athenian law of 374/3 regulates the 8½ per cent tax on grain imports from Imbros (Stroud (1998) 4–5; cf. IG ii² 1672.297). One month-name is known: Hekatombaion, an Athenian reflection (IG xi³ 47; see Trümper, Monat. 117).

The patron deity was Athena Polias (IG xi³ 58.10). There was a cult of the Twelve Gods (IG xi³ 63 (352/1)), and the famous Kabeiron for the Θεοὶ Μεγάλοι attested in inscriptions (IG xi³ 51, 71–74 (all Hell.); cf. Fredrich (1908) 97–99) and by Strabo (10.3.21) (see Hemberg (1950) 37–43). Steph. Byz. 33.114–15 reports a sanctuary of Hermes, whose worship is attested in C4 (IG xi³ 68–69; Fredrich (1908) 100). The chief Imbrian river was called the Ilius (Plin. HN 4.72), no doubt an echo of Attika to be attributed to the klerouchs (see Fredrich (1908) 82). The urban centre has remains, including a city wall, that have been dated to C4 (Fredrich (1908) 85–88). The island is still little explored archaeologically.
The Imbrians struck bronze coins in C4s. Types: (1) obv. female head; rev. naked ithyphallic figure of Hermes Imbramos; legend: IMBPOY. (2) Obv. head of Athena; rev. owl; legend: IMBPOY. (3) Obv. head of Athena; rev. caps of the Dioskouroi; legend: INBPI (Head, HN² 261; SNG Cop. Thrace 952–61).

484. Ios (Ietes) Map 61. Lat. 36.45, long. 25.15. Size of territory: 3 (109 km²). Type: A. The toponym is 'Ios, η (IG xii.1.5 1004.4 (C4/C3); F.Delphes 111.1 497.13 (C4l/C3e); Strabo 10.5.1), denoting both the island (Ath. Pal. 7.1) and the town (Ps.-Skylax 67). The city-ethnic is 'Ιότης (IG xii.1.5 1002.3 (C4); I.Délos 98A.13 (377/6)). Ios is called a polis both in the urban sense (Ps.-Skylax 58) and in the political sense (IG xii.1.5.2 (C4)). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins (infra) and in inscriptions (IG xii.1.5 1002–4 (C4); IG xii suppl. 168 (C4 in LGPN, but for the Antigonos as Gonatas, not Monophthalmos, see Habicht (1996)) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (infra) and on Delos (I.Délos 98A.13 (377/6)). The individual and external use appears also on inscriptions of Delos (I.Délos 76.3 (C4s); I.Délos 104–26.C.2 = Choix no. 12 (C4), 104–26B (C4m), which record the acquittal of an Ietan tried in Athens; cf. Stumpf (1987) 211–13). Patris is found in Arist. fr. 76, Rose.

Ios was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Island district (IG 108 269.v.27) and is recorded in the tribute lists from 450/49 (IG 108 259.v.14) to 416/15 (IG 108 289.1.20), a total of sixteen times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 1 tal. in 454/3 (IG 108 259.v.14) to 452/1 (261.1.13), lowered to 840 dr. in 450/49 (IG 108 263.13.23), but raised to 3,000 dr. in 433/2 (IG 108 279.8.7) or some years before. Ios was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG 108 71.1.77) (1 tal., but amount restored). In C4 Ios was a member of the Delian Amphiktyony (I.Délos 98A.13, 104–282a.14, 18a 20).

Decrees (psphismata) moved by individuals (IG xii.1.5 1001–4 (C4–C3e)) were put to the vote by prytaneis (IG xii suppl. 168) or four proedroi (IG xii.1.5 1002, 1004) and passed by the boule and demos (IG xii.1.5 2, 1002, 1004) or sometimes just the demos (IG xii.1.5 1001, suppl. 168) presided over by an epistates (IG xii.1.5 2, 1001). Attested officials are a board of strategoi and some triarchers (IG xii.1.5 1004), a board of praktores (IG xii.1.5 1001), a board of ekloges (IG xii.1.5 1002–2, 1004) and a board of hieropoioi (IG xii.1.5 2 = LSCG 199–200 no. 105). A decree of C4l (308–306) speaks of the restoration of the ancestral laws (τοὺς νόμους τοὺς πατρίους) (IG xii suppl. 168.3)). From C3l and C4 are preserved two laws about grazing sheep (IG xii.1.5 1, 2A = LSCG nos. 104–5). There is no real evidence for civic subdivisions (Jones, POAG 214).

Ios bestowed proxenia on citizens of Karystos (no. 375) (IG xii.1.5 2A (C4)), Athens (no. 361) (IG xii.1.5 1000 (C4)) and Astypalaia (no. 476) (IG xii.1.5 1003 (C300)). Citizens of Ios were appointed proxenoi by Delos (no. 478) (I.Délos 76 (C4s)) and Pholegandros (no. 513) (IG xii.1.5 9 (C4)).

The protective deities were Athena Polias and Zeus Polieus (IG xii.1.5 8 (C3s)). The Ietan calendar included a month named after Homer, though from when is not clear (Masouris (1992)); the poet’s mother is said to have been from Ios ([Plut.] Vit. Hom. 4). An extra-mural sanctuary of Poseidon Phylaitios (?) has been reported (Graindor (1904) 310). There was a sanctuary of Apollo Pythios, where public enactments were published (IG xii.1.5 3 (C5), 1000–16–17 (C4)), and a communal cult of Homer, which probably had a sanctuary or hero of some sort (Paus. 10.24.2; Strabo 10.5.1; IG xii.1.5 11–116).

The urban centre lies under modern Chora, but remains of the temple of Apollo Pythios have been identified (IG xii.1.5 100 with Graindor (1904) 308–9, 311–12). An inscription mentions a place called Philotos (IG xii.1.5 1005.4), but it has not been further identified. Remains of an undated defence circuit are still visible; it enclosed an area of less than 10 ha, perhaps, 5–9 ha (Brun (1996) 149–50 and personal information).

Ios struck coins of silver and bronze from C4l on. Types: obv. head of Homer; legend: OMHPOY; rev. laurel wreath, or Athena hurling spear, or palm-tree; legend: IHTΩΝ (Head, HN² 486; SNG Cop. Argolis-Aegaean Islands 673–77).

485. Kalymna (Kalymnios) Map 61. Lat. 37.00, long. 27.00. Size of territory: 2 (93 km²). Type: A. The toponym is originally Κάλυμνο, η (Hom. II 2.677; Diod. 5.54.1; Steph. Byz. 350.6; cf. Segre in Tit. Cal. p. 2), from C4 Κάλυμμα, η (Ps.-Skylax 99; Tit. Cal. x.1 (C4–C3), 1B.16 (C4); Strabo 10.5.19; Steph. Byz. 350.12). In Homer (II. 2.677; νόμους τε Καλύμνων), and in a number of late interpretations of this line (Strabo 10.3.14, 19; Eust. II. 1.495.4ff, 49612ff; Hsch. Κ527) the toponym occurs in the plural, and it seems reasonable to suppose that the islands in the vicinity of Kalymna were subsumed under the plural toponym Kalynai, even if we cannot say for sure which islands were included. The contrast ATL finds in a Kalymnian inscription between the Kalydian islands and the demos of the Kalymnians (Tit. Cal. 64 (C3l) = Syll.3 567; ATL cites SGDI 111 3586) rests on a false restoration; lines 9–10 are better restored as ἐπὶ ταύν πόλιν καὶ ταύχωραν καὶ τὰς νάσος
The city-ethnic was originally *Kαλύμνοι* (IG 141 261.110; Hdt. 7.99.2; Andronion (FGrHist 324) fr. 27), from C4 *Kalymnos* (Tit. Cal. 1 (C4); Men. fr. 348). Kalymna is called a *polis* both in the urban sense (Tit. Cal. 11.9 (C4–C3)) and in the political sense (Tit. Cal. 7.15–16 (C4/C3e); I.Knidos 221A.6–7, 15, 35–36, B36 (c.300)). The collective use of the city-ethnic appears internally in Kalymnian decrees of C4 (Tit. Cal. 1A–C) and externally in the Knidian arbitration between Kos (no. 497) and Kalymna (I.Knidos 221A.15 (c.300)) and in literary sources (Hdt. 7.99.2). The external and individual use of the ethnic is attested in the arbitration decree (I.Knidos 221B.36–37) and in a fragment of Menander (fr. 348). It is called *patris* in Tit. Cal. 235 (C5) and Tit. Cal. no. x = CEG 11 716 (C4l/C3e).

According to Hdt. 7.99.2–3, Kalymna was colonised by Epidaurus (no. 348). Diodorus’ version (5.54.3), which replaces Epidaurus with Kos (no. 497), should almost certainly be seen as an invention related to the absorption of Kalymna by Kos in C3l (Tit. Cal. 111). Diodorus gives Thetallas, son of Herakles, as the oecist (5.54.1).

Herodotos noted one or two warships of the Kalymnians under the command of Artemisia at Salamis (7.99.2). The Kalymnians were members of the Delian League. They belonged to the Karian district (IG 11 269.7) and are recorded in the tribute lists from 452/1 (IG 11 261.1.10) to 415/4 (IG 11 290.1.19) a total of fourteen times, twice completely restored, paying a *phoros* of 1 tal. 3,000 dr. down to 433/2 (IG 11 279.1.55) and thereafter an unknown amount (IG 11 280.1.50). The Kalymnians were assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG 11 71.1.48). It seems clear that here we have some kind of grouping around Kalymna to pay tribute, since there seems to be no evidence that the Kalymnai islands were a *polis*.

On the other hand, some scholars have proposed that Kalymna hosted three *polis*, none of which was called Kalymna. Bean and Cook ((1957) 131–33), following and systematising earlier suggestions, argue that Kalymna had three *polis*, called Pothaia, located by modern Damos and encompassing the whole valley there, Orkatos, which would have occupied the region of modern Rina (Vathy) and its valley (cf. Newton (1865) i. 319–20), and Panormos, located on the nearby island of Telendos, or possibly at Sykia. Our evidence for the organisation of these entities is Hellenistic, but it seems clear that by some point in C4 there was a Kalymnian *polis*, well attested epigraphically (see infra; but see also Bean and Cook (1957) 131–33, who argue that there never was a single state called Kalymna on Kalymna). If there were in fact three *polis* on Kalymna before c.C4m, which had formed some kind of *synteleia* with several of the smaller nearby islands to pay Athenian tribute in C5, perhaps they, like Kos, may have undergone a synoecism at roughly the same time.

In C4 the Kalymnians had a council (*boule*) (Tit. Cal. 3.1, 8.1) and an assembly, called *ekklesia* (Tit. Cal. 1A–B, 2.1–2, 3.2) or *damos* (Tit. Cal. 7.3, 8.1). Decrees (*psephismata*) were passed by the *ekklesia* (Tit. Cal. 1A–B, 2.1–2) or by the *boule* and the *damos* (Tit. Cal. 8.1, 9.1) or by the *damos* alone (Tit. Cal. 7.19); sometimes proposals were put forward by a board of *prostatai* (Tit. Cal. 7.1, 8.2), and sometimes they were brought forward on the motion of an individual (Tit. Cal. 2.3–4, 3.3). Kalymna bestowed *provincia* on citizens of Delphi (no. 177) (Tit. Cal. 1B), Sikyon (no. 228) (Tit. Cal. 1C), Athens (no. 361) and (the region of) Oita (Tit. Cal. 3), and citizenship on citizens of Thera (no. 527) (Tit. Cal. 8) and Miletos (no. 854) (Tit. Cal. 7.23).

The citizens were organised into tribes (*φυλαι*) and demes (*δαμοί*). In the Hellenistic period there were a minimum of five *phylai* and seven *damoi* (Jones, POAG 231–36). The three ancient Doric *phylai* are attested in C4 (Tit. Cal. 88), probably as a survival of a much earlier period. A citizenship decree of C4l/C3e stipulates that the new citizen be inscribed in the *phyle* called Περφίδας and in the *damos* called Ποθαίων (Tit. Cal. 8.20–23; cf. 9.7). The names of two months are attested in C4 inscriptions (Tit. Cal. 1A–B); they show that the Kalymnian calendar was identical with that of Kos already in the Classical period (Trümper, Monat. 179–81). A late inscription attests directly to Apollo Delios as the chief deity (Iscr. Cos EV 232 (first/second century AD), but there is no doubt that he had served in this role earlier as well (see infra).

The site of the *polis* centre of Kalymna has not been identified with certainty, though it may well have occupied the site of the modern town of Embolos, which has produced remains of Classical and Hellenistic date as well as Roman period sigillata (Bean and Cook (1957) 128–29). Others have suggested a site at Sykia (Maiuri (1925–26b) 323 n. 1, “Periboli”). The main Kalymnian sanctuary was dedicated to Apollo (Tit. Cal. 8.25–26) and lay outside the putative *polis* centre. It was in use throughout the Archaic and Classical periods (Newton (1865) i. 304–12). Near it was a theatre possibly antedating C3 (TGR ii. 144).

The territory of Kalymna included not only the island of the same name, but several neighbouring islands. Of
these perhaps only Telendos, Kalinos and Pserimos were large enough to have been occupied permanently. On Telendos have been reported ruins of a theatre and other evidence of habitation (Segre (1944–45) 319); Pserimos has yielded an inscription of (probably) third century AD, which confirms the island’s toponym as Ψύρμος (Tit. Cal. 250.1).

The C6 coins long attributed to Kalymna (Head, HN2 631; Segre (1944–45) 5) have now been dissociated from the island (Wartenberg (1998), unknown to Figueira (1998) 578), which leaves Kalymna to the best of my knowledge without coinage before the Hellenistic period.

**Karpathos** (Karpathios) Map 60 (inset). Lat. 35.25–55, long. 27.5–15. Size of territory: 4 (301 km²), or, if Saros is included, 324 km². The toponym is Κάρπαθος, ἦ (Hdt. 3.45.3; Diod. 20.93.2); the form Κράπαθος occurs in the Homeric Catalogue of Ships (II. 2.676). The toponym denotes both the island (Hymn. Hom. Ap. 43; Diod. 5.54.4; Strabo 10.5.17; Steph. Byz. 361.8) and one of the towns on the island (IG i³ 1454.35–37 (C5), see infra). The regional ethnic is Καρπαθίας (Archil. fr. 248; Arist. Rhet. 1413a19; IG i³ 271.1.66); for Καρπάθος as a city-ethnic, see infra. Ps.-Skylax 99 calls Karpathos tripolis, and the names of three poleis are attested independently, viz. Arkesia, Brykous and Karpathos (infra); but in C5 the island was also home to the semi-independent koinon of the Eteokarpathians (infra). Strabo (10.5.17), however, calls the island tetrapolis. This must reflect Strabo’s confusion (Reger 1997 453) and not the absorption of Saros as suggested by Susini (1963–64) 245 (see under Saros for further discussion).

Hsch. Κήφις 697 speaks of Karpathos as νήσου Ρόδου. The island was indeed incorporated by the Rhodians (no. 1000), but the date is not certain (Papachristodoulou (1989) 45–46); some scholars see the incorporation as a process that occurred across C4 (Susini 1963–64) 231. Karpathos had a sanctuary of Poseidon Porthmios, who was perhaps the guardian deity. Epigraphic evidence in the form of decrees published at the sanctuary belongs in the Hellenistic period (IG xii.1 1031–37), but the archaeological record reaches back into the Archaic period (Hope Simpson and Lazenby (1962) 167), when the sanctuary must have been in the territory of Brykous.

On Karpathos have been found remains of three settlements of the Archaic and Classical periods, one at modern Ag. Ioannis, identified with ancient Brykous, one at modern Arkassa, identified with ancient Arkessia, and one at modern Pegadi, identified with ancient Potidaion (Hope Simpson and Lazenby (1962) 158).

The Athenian tribute lists record four communities on Karpathos as members of the Delian League: Arkessia, the Brykontioi, the Karpathioi and the Etoekarpathioi. A combination of the tribute lists with the other sources and the archaeological evidence results in the following reconstruction.

486. **Arke(s)sea** (Arkesieus) Map 60 (inset). Lat. 35.30, long. 27.05. Size of territory: presumably 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is Ἀρκέσεια, ἦ (IG i³ 271.1.66–67) or Ἀρκάσεια (IG i³ 272.1.77). The city-ethnic is Ἀρκασει(ε)εύς, attested in late sources only (IG xii.1 218 (Hell.), 990 (Roman)). Arkesia is convincingly identified with modern Arkassa, where an abundance of sherds from the Geometric through the Hellenistic periods were found in and around an acropolis with walls of the late Classical or Hellenistic period enclosing an area of c.1.5 ha (Della Seta (1924–25) 91–92; Hope Simpson and Lazenby (1962) 162–63). It follows that Arkesia is one of the three poleis referred to by tripolis at Ps.-Skylax 99 and thus attested as a polis in the urban sense of the term.

Arkessa was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district (IG i³ 269.iv.22) and is recorded in the tribute lists from 450/49 (IG i³ 263.11.26–27) to 428/7 (IG i³ 283.11.3) a total of nine times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 1,000 dr. (IG i³ 265.11.26–27). It is listed by toponym (IG i³ 265.11.49: Ἀρκάσεια), usually specified as Καρπάθο Αρκάσεια, that is, “Arkes(e)ia of Karpathos” (IG i³ 272.1.77), or as Καρπάθοι ντος Ἀρκάσεια, “Arkessa of the Karpathians” (IG i³ 271.1.66–67). Since there seems to be no pattern to the use, no change in status should be inferred.

487. **Brykous** (Brykountios) Map 60 (inset). Lat. 35.50, long. 27.10. Size of territory: presumably 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is Βρυκόντιος, -ντος (IG xii.1 995 (first century AD); IG i³ 282.iv.9–10, completely restored). The city-ethnic is Βρυκόντιος (IG i³ 71.11.139) or Βρυκόντιος (IG xii.1 220.3 (Hell.); IG i³ 100.11.4, restored). Inscriptions (IG xii.1 994–1009 (C2 and later)) secure identification with modern Ag. Ioannis, with remains from the Archaic through the late Roman period, including a city wall of the late Classical or Hellenistic period (Hope Simpson and Lazenby (1962) 161–62), but Susini (1963–64) 233 gives no date for the fortifications. It follows that Brykous is one of the three poleis referred to by tripolis at Ps.-Skylax 99 and thus attested as a polis in the urban sense of the term. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in late
inscriptions (IG xii.1 994–95 (first century AD)) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i 71.11.139). The individual use is attested both internally (IG xii.1 1000–9) and externally (IG xii.1 220 (Hell.)).

Brykous was a member of the Delian League and is recorded in the tribute lists mostly by city-ethnic but once probably by toponym (IG i³ 282.iv.9–10) from 448/7 (IG i³ 264,iii.17) to 429/8 (IG i³ 282.iv.9–10) a total of three times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of 500 dr. (IG i³ 264,iii.17). Brykous is absent from the full panel of 441/0 (IG i³ 271.1–11.64–86), and in 429/8 it paid the phoros of that year and the preceding year (IG i³ 282.iv.9–10). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.11.139) (500 dr.) and perhaps also in 410/9 (IG i³ 100.ii.14). The sanctuary of Poseidon Pthomios was presumably in the territory of Brykous; perhaps Poseidon was the chief deity. Inscriptions starting in the Hellenistic period attest to a temple of Athena Lindia on the acropolis: that is, in the period when Karpathos was controlled by the Rhodians and formed part of the Rhodian state (IG xii.1 997–98). On the unlikely possibility that the island of Saros was part of the territory of Brykous, see under Saros, infra.

488. Eteokarpathioi Map 60 (inset). Lat. 35.35, long. 27.10. Type: [A]. Since the Eteokarpathians were organised as a koimôn (IG i³ 1454.7, 12, restored), there is no toponym. The ethnic, attested only in the plural, is ΕΤΕΟΚΑΡΠΑΘΙΟΙ (IG i³ 1454.6, 11, 21, 28 (445–430)). In the Athenian tribute lists the Eteokarpathians are listed under the heading πόλεις αὐτῶν τάφον ταχαίμεναι (IG i³ 279.76–77, 81–82). C.445–430 the Athenians declared a Karpathian, his children and τὸ ΕΤΕΟΚΑΡΠΑΘΙΩΝ κοινὸν as euergetai of the Athenians, and the koimôn was declared autonomous (IG i³ 1454.12: [α]ὐστρογόμος). This inscription is said to have been found at Pini (see IG i³ p. 899), which is located in the south-central part of the island. If the inscription was found in situ, or at least near its original position, this site should then be that of the sanctuary of Apollo where the cypress was cut for Athens in Athens (for a copy of the inscription it was to be erected ἐν Καρ[pάθωι ἐν τῶι] ἱερῷ τὸ Ἀπόλλωνος ὄθεν ἐτύμωθη ἡ κυπάρις [τῆς] (IG i³ 1454 35–37) (for the view that the tree was used on Karpathos, not in Athens, see Alfieri Tonini (1999)). No material earlier than the Hellenistic period seems, however, to have been reported (Leeley and Noyes (1975) 27). Sites in the general region with Archaic and/or Classical period remains have been suggested as villages of the Eteokarpathians (Hope Simpson and Lazenby (1962) 163–65). After the Eteokarpathians had been declared autonomous, they appear in the Athenian tribute lists among the poleis that voluntarily paid phoros (πόλεις αὐτῶν τάφον τάχαμεναι), viz. in the years 434/3 (IG i³ 278.vi.14), 433/2 (IG i³ 279.81.1–82) and 432/1 (IG i³ 280.ii.75, restored). Thereafter they appear twice as regular members of the League, in 428/7 (IG i³ 283.ii.11) and in 415/4 (IG i³ 290.1.23). The Eteokarpathians seem to have had no separate city, but a separate organisation (ATL i. 497), probably set up by the Athenians as a short-lived splinter community of Karpathos. There is no trace of their existence after C5. Thus, they are not likely to have been one of the three poleis on Karpathos recorded by Ps.-Skyllax in C4.s.

489. Karpathos (Karpathos) Map 60 (inset). Unlocated, not in Barr. Type: A. The toponym is ΚΑΡΠΑΘΟΣ (IG i³ 1454.35–37: ἐν Καρ[pάθωι ἐν τῶι] ἱερῷ τὸ Ἀπόλλωνος), probably referring to a site on Karpathos and not to the island as a whole, c.445–430, see now Alfieri Tonini (1999). The city-ethnic is ΚΑΡΠΑΘΙΟΣ (IG i³ 1454.5), recorded in, e.g., the Athenian tribute list of 428/7 (IG i³ 283.iii.5) alongside the Eteokarpathians (ii.1) and Arkeseia on Karpathos (ii.2–3), which “implies a geographical unit less than the entire island for ΚΑΡΠΑΘΙΟΣ alone” (ATL i. 497). It follows that Karpathos is one of the three poleis referred to by tripolis at Ps.-Skyllax 99 and thus attested as a polis in the urban sense of the term. The external use of the city-ethnic is attested collectively in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i³ 269.iv.19) and individually in an Athenian honorific decree (IG i³ 1454.5). Karpathos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district (IG i³ 269.iv.19) and is recorded in the tribute lists from 443/4 (IG i³ 267.iii.23) to 415/4 (IG i³ 290.1.5) a total of nine times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 1,000 dr. (IG i³ 267.iii.23), raised to 1,500 dr. in or before 415/4 (IG i³ 290.1.5). The urban centre of the Karpathioi remains unidentified (Hope Simpson and Lazenby (1962) 164–65 suggests a site near modern Aperi, but see Susini (1963–64) 232–33). A stater attributed to Karpathos was found in a hoard dated to c.375 (IGCH 1790).

In, probably, the territory of Karpathos, at modern Pegadi, are the remains of “a sizeable classical town . . . convincingly identified with Potidaion” (Hope Simpson and Lazenby (1962) 159). The toponym is ΠΟΤΙΔΑΙΟΣ, τό (I. Lindos p. 1009, I. 25 (Maier (1959–61) i. 188–91 no. 50) (C2m); ΠΟΣΕΙΔΙΟΝ πόλις in Ptol. Geog. 5.2.33). The ethnic is ΠΟΤΙΔΑΙΟΙΣ (I. Lindos p. 1009, II. 31–32 (Maier (1959–61) i. 188–91 no. 50), C2m). Our written sources for this place are all post-Classical and refer to the κτοιὼν of the Potidaeis.
when it was part of the Rhodian state. Because Potidaion does not appear in the Athenian tribute lists, it has been taken to be the polis centre of the Eteokarpthioi (Head, *HN*² 631; but see *infra*). Others have seen it as the port (epineion) of the Karpathioi (so Hiller von Gaertringen in *IG* xxi.1 p. 158, followed by Hope Simpson and Lazebny (1962) 159). But given the lateness of our sources, it is difficult to be confident that this entity existed before the Hellenistic period, and in any case it is not needed to make up the number of poleis attested by Ps.-Skylax. Perhaps the best solution is to connect it, as Hiller von Gaertringen does, with the Karpathioi, who otherwise have no obvious civic centre, and who—if they reappear as the Rhodian deme of the *Karpasathospolêtai* in the Hellenistic period, as seems very likely—are closely associated in our epigraphical evidence with the *kteina* of the Potidaeis (see, e.g., *I. Lindos* p. 1009; Susini (1963–64) 231). The acropolis of Potidaion has walls that have been attributed to C₄, and it has yielded pottery of Classical date (Melas (1991) M–25).

The coins long attributed to this city (silver staters with obv. three dolphins; rev. incuse square) in fact belong elsewhere (Cahn (1957), and already Hiller von Gaertringen in *IG* xxi.1 p. 158). The Elmalı hoard, which was buried in C₃m, is said to contain a Karpthian coin (Figueira (1998) 578).

490. Kasos (Kasios) Map 60 (inset). Lat. 35.25, long. 27.00. Size of territory: 2 (69 km²). Type: [A]. The toponym is Kάσος, ἰ (Hom. Il. 2.676; Ps.-Skylax 99 emended by Voss, MSS Κράσος; Steph. Byz. 364.3; Hsch. 977), denoting both the island and the town (Strabo 10,5.18). The city–ethnic is Κάσιος (IG i² 279.118; IG i.2 199.B.14). In the Athenian tribute lists of 434/3 (IG i² 278.vii.5–6, 11) and 433/2 (IG i² 279.117–118, 83) the Kasiosi are recorded under the heading Πόλεις αὐτάλ φόρον ταχςάµεναι. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (*supra*).

Steph. Byz. 364.3 catalogues the island among the Kyklades. The islands around Kasos, the Κασίων νῆσοι (Strabo 10,5.18), were part of its territory. Kasos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionian–Karian district (IG i² 283.11.4) and is recorded in the tribute lists from 434/3 (IG i² 278.c11.11) to 415/4 (IG i² 290.1.6) a total of six times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of 1,000 dr. (IG i² 279.118.83). The presence of Kaskan theoroi on Delos in 274 provides a terminus post quem for the absorption of Kasos by the Rhodians (IG i² 1.2 199.B.14 with Fraser and Bean (1954) 152; Papachristodoulou (1989) 48). The urban centre and its harbour were connected by an ancient road (Susini (1963–64) 206). A sanctuary of Apollo Temenitas is attested from the Hellenistic period (*I.Cret.* I xxi.4.C.xiii. 1.66–69; cf. Susini (1963–64) 211). Otherwise, physical remains are sparse; see Hope Simpson and Lazebny (1962) 168.

**Keos (Keios)** Map 61. Lat. 37.35, long. 24.20. Size of territory: 3 (159 km²). The toponym is Κέος (Bacchyl. *Epin.* 6,5; Hdt. 8.76.1) or Κέος, ἰ (Ps.-Skylax 58; IG i² 404.6–7 (C₄s)). The ethnic is Κεῖος (IG xxi.5 594.7) or Κήιος (*CID* ii 6.B.10–26). Strabo, quoting Artemidors, places Keos among the Kyklades (Strabo 10.5.3). Keos had four poleis (Ps.-Skylax 58: τετράπολις). Harpokration s.v. Κεῖοι quotes Lysias (fr. 96, Sauppe) for referring to Keos as being one *polis* “οἱ Κεῖοι μὲν πόλεις τοσαυτά”. Harpokration notes the anomaly and takes *polis* to be used synonymously with *nεσος* τήν νήσον δὲ πόλιν ὲνώματεν ὥ ρήτωρ. But Lysias’ use of the ethnic instead of the toponym indicates that the reference is to Keos as a kind of political community (*CPActs* 5: 126–27). The individual use of the ethnic is attested internally in C₄ decrees (SEG 14 531.7) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (*infra*) and in the C₄ lists of the Delian Amphiktyony (*L.Delos* 98.12.1 = IG ii 1635.113 (377/6)). The individual and external use is attested in an Athenian list of crews of ships of 405 (IG i² 1032.vi.72–82) and in Delphic inscriptions (*CID* ii 4 iii.40 and 6.B.10–26). In the accounts of the Delphian *naofoi* we find Κέοις ἐξ Ἱουλίδος (CID i² 12.1.33) and Κεῖοι ἐξ Καρθαίας (CID i² 12.1.1) alongside the simple *Keios* (*CID* ii 17), also attested in a Delphic proxeny decree of C₄l (SEG 31 536). This probably reflects the federation (cf. Reger and Risser (1991) 316–17).

It is not always easy to distinguish between the use of the island ethnic Κεῖος (*IG* xxi.5 594.7 = SEG 14 531) or Κήιος (*CID* ii 6.10–26) to designate merely “a person from Keos” (without reference to his or her *polis* of origin) and its use to denote “a citizen of (one of) the Keian federation(s)” of the four poleis in C₅ and C₄ (cf. Reger (1997) 474 and *infra*). “Keios” probably means “from the island of Keos”, in Bacchylides (*Epigr.* 1.4: Κήιοις; 17.30: Κήιοι), in the expression Κήια φλυαρία in Timokreon (10.1–2 West (C₅f)), and in the Parian Chronicle mentioning Simonides as a Keian (*IG* xxi.5 444.70 (*FGrHist* 239)). Cf. also the Keians in Plato: Simonides, Prodikos and Pythokleides (Pl. *Hipparch.* 228C; Ap. 19E; *Prt.* 314C (all rC₅)), as again in the Athenian list of crews (*IG* i² 1032.vi.72–82) or in the victor lists for the Olympic, Nemean and Isthmian Games (*Olympionikai* 116 (540), 203 (480), 288 (452)). But when Herodotos speaks of
ties between the participant Keian strongly suggests, as already argued by Brun (1984), that the federation did not completely restore, paying a phoros of at most more than 1 tal. (IG i² 262.v.22), raised to 4 tal. in 450/49 (IG i² 263.iv.21), reduced to 3 tal. in 433/2 (IG i² 279.1.74), but raised again to 6 tal. in 417/16 (IG i² 288.1.10). They were ascribed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.1.69) (10 tal.) and in 410/9 (IG i³ 100.11.3). They are recorded among the paying members in 433 (Thuc. 7.57.4). Although the most recent study of Keian coinage assigns no coins with the legend KEI(2)N to before the end of C4 (Papageorgiadou-Banis (1997) 43; but cf. Sheedy (1998b)), this need mean only that a C5 federation did not issue coins. Archaic coins minted by Ioulis, Karthaia and Koresia have a dolphin alongside the individual type of each polis (infra 749, 750 and 751). On balance the evidence strongly suggests, as already argued by Brun (1989), that the Keian poleis created in C5 a federal state of some kind with ties between the participant poleis that reached beyond merely joint payment of a phoros to Athens.

In C4 under the heading Κείων, the Ioulitai, Karthaiai and Koresioi are listed individually as members of the Second Athenian Naval League (IG ii² 43B.23–26); the Poissians are recorded separately (I. 82). Two isopoliteiai agreements between the Keians and the Euboian cities of Histiaia (no. 372) (SEG 14.531 = improved text of IG ii¹ 2594 = Tod 141) and Eretria (no. 370) (SEG 14.530), both of perhaps c.646 (cf. Brun (1989) 124), show that at least the three usual Keian poleis formed a federation again at this time: there was a common citizenship for all Keians, and the citizens were subdivided into phylai, trittyes and choroi (χώροι) (Jones, POAG 203–4). A common boule and boards of thesmophylakes, proboulai and astynomoi are also attested. According to Herac. Lemb. 28, quoting Aristotle, the Keians passed a law (nomos) forbidding girls and boys from drinking wine (cf. Villard (1997)); but he also says (26) that Keos was settled by one Keos from Naupaktos (no. 165), a story which may owe its origins to Keian relations with that town in C3 (see IG xi¹.5 527); otherwise the best ancient testimony agrees that the Keians were Ionians from Athens (Hdt. 8.46; Thuc. 7.57.4; schol. Dionys. Perig. 525, giving Thersidamas as the leader). Ioulis seems to have been the capital of the federation. The Keians appear as debtors on Delos in 377/6 (I.Délos 98.A.12). An Aristotelian Constitution of the Keians is attested (Herac. Lemb. 26–29). Lys. fr. 96 indicates that the federation was formed before c.380, it may go back to 411 (D. M. Lewis (1962) 3–4). The Keians defected from the Athenian League in 364 but were subdued by a squadron under Chabrias and forced to dissolve the federation (IG ii² 111 = Tod 142). The injunction to remain as separate poleis is repeated in a decree of 354–338 (IG ii² 404.13–14 with Dreher (1985) 268; for the date, see Hansen (1984) 125 n. 6). Again, in the list of recipients of grain from Kyrene c.330 (SEG 9.2), Ioulis, Koresia and Karthaia are listed individually alongside an amount to the Keians as such (45, 51–55); Ruschenbusch (1982) 183 argues that the Poissians are inadvertantly omitted after the Keians; contra Brun (1989) 137. It has been suggested that IG xi¹.5 609 was a list of citizens of a C4l sympoliteia between Ioulis and Koresia (Ruschenbusch (1982); see still D. M. Lewis (1962)). Poisessa seems never to have participated in any of these federal states (Phylarchos, FHG 1.346; Brun (1989) 131–32). Trümpy, Monat. 55–60 argues that the calendars of all four Keian poleis must have been identical, but the evidence to support this is slim.

491. Ioulis (Ioulitai) Map 57. Lat. 37.40, long. 24.20. Size of territory: 2 (c.47 km²). Type: A. The toponym is Ιούλια, η (CID 11.12.11.30). The city-ethnic is Ιούλιατης (IG ii¹ 43B24; as ιούλιατης in IG ii¹ 1128.25 = Ro 40) or (once) Οιλιάτης (SEG 9.2.45, but the ethnics in this inscription are generally odd). Ioulis is referred to as a polis in the urban sense by the term τετράπολις at Ps.-Skylax 58. It is called polis in the political sense in IG ii¹ 111.6 = Tod 142, and in the territorial sense (city plus hinterland) in SEG 14.532.3 = Migeotte (1992) no. 56 (C4l/C3e). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested both externally (IG ii¹ 43.B24; SEG 9.2.45) and internally (IG ii¹ 1128.25). The individual use of the city-ethnic is probably attested in a Delian inscription of 301 (IG xii.2 146.45). For a later unquestionable attestation, see I.Délos 1313–15 (C2), with SEG 45 1049 for the date.

A fragmentary C4m list of citizens (or rather citizens fit for military service) must originally have recorded about 480 names, corresponding to a citizenry of about 700 adult males and a population of roughly 3,500 persons (IG xi¹.5
ever, we hear of a presence of the Koresioi shows that in this period Koresia c. 550 male citizens of Ioulis before the incorporation of Koresia e the citizens were further subdivided in units called choral inscription: IG xii (Jones, POAG 204–6). In C4l/C3e the citizens were further subdivided in units called kouvia (SEG 14 532.16–17).

Ioulis occupied the north-eastern quadrant of the island and bordered on the territories of Koresia and Karthaia (infra). Its harbour (limen) (IG i12 1128.38) lay at Otzias, where recent work has revealed the traces of docks and other facilities (Spondyles (1998)). The river Elixos (Strabo 10.5.6) rose near Ioulis and flowed down into the sea by Koresia. The approximate boundaries of Ioulis can be worked out on the basis of topography and some of the sites that recent intensive fieldwork by several teams have discovered (see generally Reger (1998) and the map of Cherry, Davis and Mantzourani (1991) 6).

The eponymous official was an archon, known first from Hellenistic texts (IG xii.5 610.1 (C3l), 597 with Mendoni (1989) 292–95 no. 11 (C3), 595 (C3–C2)). As early as C5s, however, we hear of a boule and a demos meeting in an ekklesia (IG xii.5 593.B.1–3, C1). Other C4 officials include a board of, probably, five strategoi (IG i12 111.15–17), a board of judicial officials called prostatai (IG i12 1128.36) and a grammateus (SEG 14 532.18). The references to Thesmophylakes and a grammateus may be C4 or C3e (IG xi.5 595B; SEG 14 532).

Laws (nomoi) and decrees were passed by the boule and the ekklesia (IG xi.5 593 (C5); IG ii.5 1128 (C4mi)). Of public enactments preserved in inscriptions the most notable is the C5s law on burial rites and customs (IG xi.5 593; cf. SEG 45 2263). In connection with the abortive revolt against Athens in the 360s, the death penalty and confiscation of property were imposed on pro-Athenian citizens, and the Ioulitai murdered the citizen who served as Athenian proxenos (IG ii.5 111). The protective deity was certainly Apollo Pythios (cf. IG ii.5 111.22). Other communal cults include Athena (IG xi.5 611 (C6–C5)). The month of Heraion is attested (IG ii.5 1128; Trümpy, Monat. 55).

The urban centre lay inland at modern Chora, about 3 km from the coast. Part of the C5 acropolis fortification wall still exists (Welter (1954) 71–74). The walls were repaired in C4l/C3e (SEG 14 532 = Migeotte (1992) no. 56). In C4 inscriptions are mentioned a prytaneion (IG i12 1128.34–35), a sanctuary of Apollo Pythios where many public documents were inscribed (IG i12 111.22; IG xi.5 1102 = Migeotte (1984) no. 63 (C4–C3); cf. Welter (1954) 74–78), and a Lykeion (SEG 14 532.19). A theatre is attested for C3 (IG xi.5 597.8). A sanctuary of Zeus Ikmaios may have stood on the border between Ioulis and Karthaia (IG xi.5 543; K. Manthos (1991) 62–63 with 135 n. 328; Bürchner (1921) 186; for sacrifices by Aristaios to Zeus on Keos, see Theophr. De vent. 14). Within the territory of Ioulis K. Manthos believed he had identified a sanctuary of Aphrodite, but this has been doubted (Manthos (1991) 46 with Mendoni’s comments at 119 n. 179); two other sanctuaries have been identified archaeologically but not assigned to deities (Georgiou and Faraklas (1985) nos. 18.08, 13.06). Milos, which figured so importantly in relations with Athens in C4 (and undoubtedly earlier as well), was mined at two or more sites in the territory of Ioulis (Georgiou and Faraklas (1985) no. 17.04; Mendoni (1985–86) 181–82), and the Ioulitain decree on the export of millos refers to the harbour (limen) of the city (IG ii12 1128.38).


492. Karthaia (Karthaieus) Map 57. Lat. 37.35, long. 24.20. Size of territory: 2 (c.67 km²). Type: A. The toponym is Κάρθαια, ἢ (Pind. Pae. 4.13–14; CIL 11 12.11.66 (C45)). The city-ethnic is Καρθαϊεύς (IG ii3 43.B.25); the dative plural Καρθαῖεσσα is attested at SEG 9 2.51. Karthaia is referred to as a polis in the urban sense by the term περὶ πάροικως at Ps.-Skylax 58 (for MS Αἰρα, read Καρβαία). It is called polis in the political sense in several C4s decrees (IG xi.5 528.2–3, 5; 537.6–7; 538.6, dates: Brun (1989) 126–28). The collective use of the city-ethnic can be found internally on Karthaian coins (infra) and decrees (IG xi.5 528.4) and externally in C4 Athenian decrees (IG ii3 43.B.25, 111.54). The individual
and external use is first attested in a C₃f proxeny decree from Delos (IG XI.3 544.C1.8, 12 (C₃–C₄)); cf. also 552). Other officials attested in Classical sources are a board of, probably three, strategoi (IG XII.5 544.A1.15–19, A2.11–15, 19–23) and envoys (presbeis) sent to Karystos (IG XII.5 537.2). Decrees were passed by the boule and the demos on the motion of an individual (IG XII.5 537.1, 528, 538 with add. (C₄/C₅)). Public enactments preserved on inscriptions include an undated and rather obscure sacred law (IG XII.5 530) and a regulation about a spring in the sanctuary of Demeter of C₄l (IG XII.5 569). Public enactments were set up in the sanctuary of Apollo (IG XII.5 528.16, 538.12). Particularly important is a fragmentary C₄m list of Karthaiian proxenoi comprising a total of 110+ proxenoi in, probably, 50+ different poleis (IG XII.5 542).

The protective deity was probably Apollo (IG XII.5 544, found inter ruderam templi Apollinis), whose temple as Pythios dates from about Cöl (Mendonî 1985–86) 163–65). Public cults of him (IG XII.5 545 (C₄)) and Hestia, or possibly private, (IG XII.5 554 (C₅)) are known before Alexander. An official has left a dedication to Aphrodite, which probably dates from C₄ (IG XII.5 552 with Mitsoï 1975) 164 no. 1 and BE(1962) 264) and an hieron of Hermes is mentioned in an inscription (IG XII.5 553). The temple of Athena, which was rebuilt in C₄ (Mendonî 1990), dates originally from Cöl (Mendonî 1985–86) 161); see also the construction history of both temples in Papanikolaou (1998). We hear also of a sanctuary of Demeter (IG XII.5 569 (C₄l), with Graindor (1905) 333–37); that to Hermes is mentioned in an undated inscription (IG XII.5 553).

The site of the town has long been known, on the east coast at one of the island’s best anchorages, with a productive plain that stretches out at the mouth of the river that flows down off the Keian plateau. The town walls were probably demolished by Chabrias in 364, but with the Athenians’ permission the Karthaiians were thereafter allowed to restore a rather slim defence circuit, probably as protection against pirates (IGII² 404 (C₄s), with Maier (1959–61) no. 37; cf. also Maier (1988)). A prytaneion was present by C₅ (IG XII.5 1060.2). For the temple of Apollo, which sits on a little acropolis jutting out from the surrounding rock, see supra.

Koreisia struck coins of silver and bronze from C₆s onwards. Four series of coins seem to belong to the Archaic and Classical periods. (1)–(2) The first series seems to start c.510 (or 530 at the earliest), the second by c.500, though there are problems with both the attributions of the coins and the dates. Types: obv. amphora, or amphora and dolphin; rev. incuse square. (3) Silver, C₄. Types: obv. Zeus Aristaeus; rev. Sirius; legend: KAPAI. (4) Bronze, C₄. Types: obv. amphora; rev. grapes; legend: KAP (Head, HN² 483; Papageorgiadou-Banis (1997) 34–39; SGCG Argolis–Aegean Islands 628).

493. Koreisia (Koreisia) Map 57. Lat. 37.40, long. 24.20. Size of territory: 1 (c.5 km²; cf. Cherry, Davis and Mantzourani (1991) 235). Type: A. The toponym appears variously as Κορησία, η (IG XII.5 647.11 (C₃e)) and Κορησία (Ps. Skylax 58; Strabo 10.5.6). The only attestation of Κορησία referring to the polis on Keos is in a spurious letter (Aeschin. Ep. 1). For the distinction between Κορησία on Keos and Κορησία in Asia Minor, see L. Robert (1960a) 144–45.

The city-ethnic is Κορησίας (SEG 9 2.55 (c.350)). Koreisia is referred to as a polis in the urban sense by the term ἄρχωράβας in Ps.–Skylax 58. It is called polis in the political sense in an inscription recording a series of loans extended to the polis by “the god”, probably Apollo: ἔδαφεσαν ὁ θεὸς τετεράπολις (IG XII.5 545 (C₄)) and Hestia, or possibly private, (IG XII.5 554 (C₅)) are known before Alexander. An official has left a dedication to Aphrodite, which probably dates from C₄ (IG XII.5 552 with Mitsoï 1975) 164 no. 1 and BE(1962) 264) and an hieron of Hermes is mentioned in an inscription (IG XII.5 553). The temple of Athena, which was rebuilt in C₄ (Mendonî 1990), dates originally from Cöl (Mendonî 1985–86) 161); see also the construction history of both temples in Papanikolaou (1998). We hear also of a sanctuary of Demeter (IG XII.5 569 (C₄l), with Graindor (1905) 333–37); that to Hermes is mentioned in an undated inscription (IG XII.5 553).

The site of the town has long been known, on the east coast at one of the island’s best anchorages, with a productive plain that stretches out at the mouth of the river that flows down off the Keian plateau. The town walls were probably demolished by Chabrias in 364, but with the Athenians’ permission the Karthaiians were thereafter allowed to restore a rather slim defence circuit, probably as protection against pirates (IGII² 404 (C₄s), with Maier (1959–61) no. 37; cf. also Maier (1988)). A prytaneion was present by C₅ (IG XII.5 1060.2). For the temple of Apollo, which sits on a little acropolis jutting out from the surrounding rock, see supra.

An Archaic inscription in the Eretrian alphabet has sometimes been cited as evidence of Eretrian domination (IG XII.5 649; see LSAG 297–98 with 648 by lapsus). Koreisia was a member of the Delian League. In their first appearance in the Athenian tribute lists (IG I² 262.1.21), the Koreisians are recorded separately from the Keians (IG I² 262.2.2); later they are subsumed under a syneteelia (supra748). In the list of members of the Second Athenian League they appear as Keians along with the Ioulietai and the Karthaiians (IG I² 43.23–26). Koreisia was undoubtedly a member of the Keian Federation, dissolved by the Athenians in 362 (IG I² 1128 and 404; see supra). Koreisia was incorporated into Ioulis for a while in C₄s (IG XII.5 609.175), but was again a separate polis in C₃ until finally completely absorbed by Ioulis (Strabo 10.5.6; Reger (1998)). In C₄s Koreisia may have been both a dependent polis and a phyle of Ioulis. For the double status as dependent polis and civic subdivision of a major polis, see Hansen (1997) 37. But its status as an independent polis in C₃–C₂ follows not only from the evidence of its inscriptions—which could be compatible with a status
of dependent polis (IG xii.5 647.9; SEG 14 541; PEP Chios 51)—but also from its status as the chief station of the Ptolemaic fleet in C3, when it was renamed Arsinoe and is attested operating as an independent polis as late as c.207 (Davis and Cherry (1991); L. Robert (1960a); L. Magnesia 50).

Decrees were passed by the boule and the demos (IG ii² 1128.9, where the restoration of τῶι δήµωι in l. 9 is virtually certain). Public enactments were set up in the sanctuary of Apollo (ibid. II. 15–16), which is probably the sanctuary of Apollo Smintheus attested by Strabo 10.5.6. A board of astynomoi (l. 17) and a dikasterion (l. 18) are known from the same inscription and likewise a prytaneion (l. 24).

In C4l Koesia seems to have had some 154 citizens fit for military service, corresponding to c.230 adult male citizens and a total population of c.1,200 persons (IG xii.5 609.17ff) (see Ruschenbusch (1982); Cherry, Davis and Mantzourani (1991) 236–37; Hansen (1997) 28–29 with n. 147).

The urban centre, located on the hill above the present harbour town, has been thoroughly studied (Cherry, Davis and Mantzourani (1991) 265–81). Koesia was permitted to restore its walls after the revolt of the 360s and 350s (IG ii² 404.16 = Maier (1959–61) no. 37 and Maier (1958)). The northern part is preserved, and the circuit may have enclosed an area of c.18 ha (Cherry, Davis and Mantzourani (1991) 236). The countryside was full of structures during the Archaic and Classical periods, but most of the population lived in the urban centre (Cherry, Davis and Mantzourani (1991) 327–47, esp. 337).

Koesia struck silver coins from C6e to c.480. Three series of coins have been assigned to Koesia. Types: obv. cuttlefish, or dolphin and cuttlefish, or dolphin; legend: ρ or ρθ; rev. incuse square; legend: Κ (third series only). The identification and dating remain somewhat problematic. No C4 issues are assigned till the end of the century (Head, HN² 483–84; Papageorgiadou-Banis (1997) 19–21; SNG Cop. Argolis-Aegean Islands 637–41).

494. Poissia (Poissios) Map 57. Lat. 37.35, long. 24.25. Size of territory: 2 (c.30 km²). Type: A. The toponym is variously reported as Ποιήσια, η (IG xii.5 1076.53 (C4–C3)) or Ποιήσασα (Strabo 10.5.6) or Ποιάσασα (IG xii.5 568.10 (C5)). The city-ethnic is Ποιήσιασος (IG ii² 43.82) or Ποιάσασος (IG xii.5 568.1 (C5)). That Poissia is a polis in the urban sense is implied by the term τετράπολις at Ps.-Skylax 58. It is called polis in the political sense in a decree of C4l–C3e (IG xii.5 570.A7); for the date see Brun (1996) 114. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in inscriptions of C4l/C4c (IG xii.5 568.1, 1100.1) and externally in Athenian inscriptions (IG ii² 43.82). The individual use of the city-ethnic is unattested.

A text inscribed in stoicheion strongly suggests that the chief official was the prytnis (Mendoni (1989) 295–96 no. III). In C4l/C3e decrees were passed by the boule and the demos; a board of praktores is also mentioned (IG xii.5 507.1, B2). By C3l there was a sanctuary of Apollo Pythios, a Pythion (IG xii.5 1100, see also 571.1); he may well have been the protective deity. Public enactments were set up in the sanctuary (IG xii.5 1100.7–9 (C3)). A dedication of C5 is made to Apollo without epithet (Dunant and Thomopoulos (1954) 346–48 no. 17 = SEG 14,547). But there is also evidence of a temple dedicated to Apollo Smintheus within the territory of Poissia (IG xii.5 1101 with Graindor (1903) 290; Galani et al. (1982–84) 242). An individual who served in a public office (arxas) made a dedication (C3? C4?) to Hermes Prytaneios (Mendoni (1989) 295–96 no. III). Strabo mentions a sanctuary of Athena Néousia (10.5.6). Communal cults of Apollo Melanthios (IG xii.5 1101 (undated)) and an Apollo without epithet (and so perhaps Pythios?, SEG 14,547 (C5)) are attested. Poissia was probably among the Kerian cities permitted to restore their fortification walls in the period 354–338 (IG ii² 404 with Maier (1959–61) no. 37 and Maier (1958)). Remains of city walls have been dated as starting in Cél (Galani et al. (1982–84) 239). If correctly restored by Müller, Ps.-Skylax 58 refers to Poissia’s harbour. The approximate boundaries of its territory have been worked out (see Papageorgiadou-Banis (1999) 161 fig. 1). The territory is referred to as Ποιασίων ἡ γῆ (IG xii.5 568.1, 1100.1). For the boundary, see Galani et al. (1982–84) 238. No coins are known (see Papageorgiadou-Banis (1997) 51–52 re a false attribution).

495. Keria (Keraita) Map 61. Lat. 36.55, long. 25.40. Size of territory: 1 (15 km²). Type: C. Kería, ῥ (IG ii 71.186). In Stadiasmus 282 Kéria is an emendation of MSS ΚΩΡΣΙΑ. The city-ethnic is Κεραία (1.Cret. iv 206K (C3–C2)). The Kerians were assessed for tribute by the Athenians in 425/4 (supra), apparently 13 dr., but the entry is exceptional in being the only one in which the sum is recorded to the right of the toponym/ethnic. In the Hellenistic period a Kerian citizen received proxenia from Gortyns (no. 960) on Crete (supra). Despite the lack of explicit attestation, it seems reasonable to infer that Keria was possibly a polis in the Classical period.

496. Kimolos (Kimolios) Map 58. Lat. 36.45, long. 24.30. Size of territory: 2 (36 km²). Type: B. The toponym is Κήμολος, ῦ (Strabo 10.5.1; IG i 71.1.89; F.Delphes iii 1.1497.12
The city-ethnic is Κυμώλος (IG i3 289.1.18; perhaps also at 1032.87, where Osborne and Byrne (1996) 123 suggest reading Κυμω<λυτ>α (ος) instead of Κύμων). There is no explicit Classical attestation of Kimolos as a polis, but in C5s the Kimolians were members of the Delian League (infra); in a C4s arbitration they were on equal terms with the polis of Melos (infra), and a C3s text from Karystos does explicitly refer to τᾶς πόλεως τᾶς Κυμώλον (SEG 44 710.28). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins of C3 (Head, HN2 484) and externally in inscriptions (IG i2 289.1.18; IG xii.3 1259.7 (C4s) = Tod 179; Ager (1996) no. 3; Magnetto (1997) no. 1). The individual and external use is attested in the Athenian naval catalogue of C51 (IG i3 1032.87).

Kimolos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Island district, but is absent from the full panel of 441/0 (IG i2 271.1–11.88–101). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i2 71.1.89) (1,000 dr.), but is recorded only once in the tribute lists, viz. in 416/5 (IG i2 289.1.18), paying an unknown amount.

Soon after 338 the Kimolians were involved in a dispute with the Melians (no. 505) over the possession of the three small islands of Polyaiaga (which, later at least, had no permanent population but was used as pasture (L. Robert (1949) 167)), Etereia and Labei. In accordance with a decision of the synedrion of the League of Corinth, the dispute was submitted to arbitration by Argos (no. 347), and the Argives decided in favour of Kimolos (IG xii.3 1259 = Tod 179; Ager (1996) no. 3; Magnetto (1997) 1–8 no. 1). A certain amount of the ancient polis centre (which, unlike most Aegean Islands, does not lie under modern Chora) has been lost due to sea level changes (Mustakas (1954–55) 153–54). Lauffer (1989) 329 has references to walls, sanctuaries and other remains.

**497. Kos (Koos)**  
Map 61. Lat. 36.50, long. 27.15. Size of territory: 4 (290 km²). Type: A (from 366/5, infra). The toponym is Koos, Κόος (Hom. Il. 2.677; Hdt. 9.76.2; Thuc. 8.41.3; Herzog (1928) 14–16 no. 5.B.8 (C4m); Head, HN2 632 (C5)) or Kóos (Hymn. Hom. Ap. 42; Hes. fr. 434.57). The toponym denotes sometimes the island (Thuc. 8.41.3), sometimes, probably, the city Koos, Κόος (Hdt. 1.144.3; Thuc. 8.41.2), and sometimes the C4 synoecised polis (Dem. 15.27). The ethnic is Κόος (IG i3 262.14.15; Hdt. 7.99.2). It sometimes denotes the inhabitants of the island (Hdt. 9.76.2–3; Pl. Pnt. 311B), and sometimes the citizens of the polis (IG i3 1454.A.29; Iscr. Cos ED 34.5 (C4)). Kos is called a polis both in the urban sense (Ps.-Skylax 99; Dem. 35.35, see Hansen (2000) 154; LSG 151.55 (C4m); perhaps Paton and Hicks (1891) no. 5.7–8) and in the political sense (Dem. 15.27 and inscriptions of after 366/5: Iscr. Cos ED 19.4–5 (C4–C5), 20.1, 3, 11 (all C4l), 54.8–9 (C4), 55.411, 17, 81.13 (C4), 241.26 (C4)). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in inscriptions (Iscr. Cos ED 19.5, 54.4, 55.3) and externally in literary sources (Hdt. 1.144.3, 7.99.2) and in inscriptions (IG i3 262.14.15; CID 1 12.2 (C4f); F.Delphes 111.1 497.11 (C4l/C3e); SEG 9 2.28. The external and individual use of the ethnic is attested in literary sources (Hdt. 7.163.2, 9.76.2; Pl. Pnt. 311B) and in inscriptions (IG i3 1454.29 (C5s); IG ii 9143 (C4f); Peek (1969) 25 no. 53 (C5)).

The Koans belonged to the Dorian pentapolis (Hdt. 1.144.3 with Sherwin-White (1978) 47) and to the Delian League, paying tribute (infra). Within this framework fit at least two poleis up until 366/5, and it is not always easy to distinguish before this date the use of the ethnic as a city-ethnic from its use as a regional ethnic denoting an inhabitant of the island of Kos.

In Homer Kos and the Kalydian islands (no. 485) are explicitly demarcated as "the poleis of Eurypylus" (Hom. Il. 2.677, see also 14.255, 15.28). Hymn. Hom. Ap 42 describes Kos as πόλις Μερόπων ἀνθρώπων. According to Herodotos (7.99.3), Kos was settled by the Epidaurians (no. 348).

After the collapse of Kroisos’ Lydian kingdom and the imposition of Achaemenid suzerainty in western Asia Minor in 546, Kos was controlled by the tyrant Skythes. C.490 his son Kadmos voluntarily abdicated the tyranny (Hdt. 7.164.1), and control of Kos passed to the Karian dynasty under Artemisia, whose command at Salamis included Koan sailors (Hdt. 6.22–4, 7.99.2, 163–64.). Kos may have controlled the island of Nisyros (no. 508) c.500 (Hdt. 7.99 with Hicks in Paton and Hicks (1891) p. xii).

Kos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district (IG i3 269.14.15) and is recorded in the tribute lists from 451/0 (IG i3 262.14.15 to 427/6 or 426/5 (IG i3 284.18) a total of eleven times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of 5 tal. (IG i3 271.1/67); but in some years (450/49, 447/6) the phoros is split up into smaller amounts (IG i3 263.1.7 and v.40). The explanation may be that in these years two poleis on Kos paid separately, whereas in other years they paid together in a synedra. Kos was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.1.132).

Some time in the same period a temenos of Athena Medoeusa, an indication of Athenian authority, was installed; but from this a kleruchia should not necessarily be inferred (Iscr. Cos EV 361, see also EV 333; Mattingly (1996) 65). A copy of the famous Athenian Coinage Decree
was posted on Kos (Iscr. Cos ED 1 = ML 45). Kos remained under the Athenians until 411 (Thuc. 8.108.2); over the next five years its position shifted, till apparently coming under Spartan sway for good in 407 (Diod. 13.69.5; Xen. Hell. 1.5.1; cf. Hicks in Paton and Hicks (1891) pp. xxv–xxvi). The Koans fell away from the Spartans in 394 following the battle of Knidos (Diod. 14.84.3), but their name does not appear on the stele of Aristoteles among the members of the Second Athenian Naval League (for membership: Cargill (1981) 37–38; contra Hornblower (1982) 133; non liquet Dreher (1995) 123). But in 357, when Chios (no. 840), Rhodes (no. 1000) and Byzantium (no. 674) seceded from the Naval League, Kos joined the alliance concluded with Mausolos and took part in the Social War against Athens (Dem. 15.3, 27; Diod. 16.7.3; cf. Staatsverträge 205).

In C4m Kos was controlled by the Hekatomnids (Suda Δ238 with Hornblower (1982) 132–33). In 333 the island was conquered by Alexander (Arr. Anab. 2.5.7), won back by the Persians, but conquered definitively in 332 (Arr. Anab. 3.2.6). During the crisis of c.330–326, Kos received 10,000 medimnoi of grain from Kyrene (no. 1028) (SEG 9 2.28).

A unified Koan state was created in 366/5 by the metaikismos of at least two pre-existing poleis, Astypalaea and Kos Meropis (see infra). This action is attested by Diodorus (15.76.2) and Strabo (14.2.19). The event has been treated often: e.g. Hicks in Paton and Hicks (1891) p. xxvi; Moggi, Sin. 333–41 no. 47; Sherwin-White (1978) 63–67; Hornblower (1982) 83–84, 103–4 n. 197; Demand (1990) 127–32; Reger (2001) 171–74. Strabo attributes the decision to stasis. The incident referred to by Arist. Pol. 1304a25 is surely later (Sherwin-White (1978) 65–66, contra Gehrke, Stasis 98). It has been denied that a political unification of separate poleis in fact occurred, as has been virtually the universal scholarly opinion until recently (Stylianou (1998) 484–85), but the details of the organisation of the two poleis leave little doubt that the standard view is right (see now Reger (2001) 171–74 and infra), except in so far as the Koans, like other islanders and certain other small states, paid their tribute to Athens as a group and were identified as a group of islands.

The eponymous magistrate of the unified Koan polis was the monachos (Herzog (1928) 20–25 no. 8.Α1 (C3); cf. Gehrke, Stasis 97 n.1; Sherk (1990) 265–66). Decrees were passed by the boule and the ekklesia (Iscr. Cos ED 54.1 (C4)) or by the ekklisia (Iscr. Cos ED 34.1 (C4)) on the motion of a board of prostatasι as moved by the head of the board (Iscr. Cos ED 40.1–4; Paton and Hicks (1891) no. 2.9–10) or by an individual (Iscr. Cos ED 34.2, 54.1–2). An epistates is also attested (Iscr. Cos ED 106.2–3 (C4)); cf. Rhodes, DGS 237.

Koan officials included a board of poletai (Iscr. Cos ED 20.16 (C4), 54.13–14 (C4)). One text mentions ἕκκλητοι δικασταί (Iscr. Cos ED 2605 (C4?)), and a dikasterion is mentioned in Iscr. Cos ED 90.4, 9 (C4e).

Aristotle says that the Koan constitution was a democracy subverted by demagogues and then replaced by an oligarchy (Arist. Pol. 1304a25–27). Kos became a democracy once again in, probably, 332 (Gehrke, Stasis 99 n. 18).

A fragmentary early sacred law mentions τὸ ἰερόν (Iscr. Cos ED 53 (C4; C5–C4 according to Herzog (1899) 128–30 no. 194)); a later law of C4 protects the trees of the temenos of Apollo Kyparissios and Asklepios from being cut down for any reason, and forbade even the introduction of a motion to that effect (Herzog (1928) 32 no. 12 + Iscr. Cos ED 181). A series of sacred laws of C4m seems to regulate religious observances of the newly constructed Koan state (Herzog (1928) 5–10 no. 1, 12–14 no. 4 = LSCG 151, 19–25 nos. 6–8, 32–33 no. 12 = LSCG 150 + Iscr. Cos ED 55, 140, 181, 241; perhaps also ED 53 of C4). The many public cults known from Kos thanks in large part to the rich harvest of sacred laws include those of (1) Apollo Kyparissios (cf. Hymn. Hom. Ap. 42) and (2) Asklepios (Herzog (1928) 32–33 no. 12 + Iscr. Cos ED 181); (3) Hera (Makareus, FGH 4.442 (Ath. 262C)); (4) Rhea, Hera Argeia Eleia Basileia, Zeus Machanes, the Twelve Gods, Zeus Polieus, Athena Machanis (Iscr. Cos ED 241); (5) Homonoia, Hekate, Hestia Tamia, Aphrodite Pandemos (Pugliese Carratelli (1963–64) 158 no. 1; Paton and Hicks (1891) 401; LSCG 295–98 no. 169 (C3)) with the important discussion of the circumstances of the origin of the cult of Homonoia in Thérault (1996) 134–36; (6) Zeus Basileus (Iscr. Cos EV 27 (C4)); (7) Kore (Iscr. Cos EV 235 (C4)); (8) Demeter (Iscr. Cos EV 270 (C4)); (9) the nymphs (LSCG 152–53); and (10) Herakles (Iscr. Cos ED 140.8–9; cf. also ED 149), whose worship should no doubt be associated with his adventure on Kos in which he was wounded (see Koenen and Merkelbach (1976)).

In C4 the Koans awarded prozenia to citizens of Tyros (Iscr. Cos ED 54), Knidos (no. 903) (Iscr. Cos ED 34), Byzantium (no. 674) (Iscr. Cos ED 40), Mytilene (no. 798) (Iscr. Cos ED 106) and Sinope (no. 729) (Iscr. Cos ED 20). Koan citizens were awarded prozenia by Epidaurus (no. 348) (IAEpid. 42.58 (C4l/C3e)) and the Plataseis (Labraunda 48 = Mausolos M8).

The Koan state was organised into the three traditional Dorian tribes of Pamphyloi, Hyleis and Dymanes, further subdivided into three chiliaistes each, also called enatai (LSCG 151A.5, 16 (C4m); Herzog (1928) 6 no. 1.7, 11, 12, 15; cf. Jones, POAG 236–38). Each tribe had its own special location
for sacrifice (Iscr. Cos ED 140.2–5 (C4)). In addition there were an unknown number of triakades (Iscr. Cos ED 55.A2 (C4m)) and pentekostyes (Iscr. Cos ED 91.3 (C4)) whose relationship to the tribes and their subdivisions remains uncertain (Jones, POAG 238–39). Cutting across this system of personal groupings there was a subdivision into at least ten demes (cf. the list in Jones, POAG 239). One of these, Isthmos (demotic: Ἰσθµιώτας ἤ Ισθµιοι, IG XI.2.287.B.45 (C3m)), was located at the site of Astypalaea (see infra). Another deme—which one is not known, unfortunately—also had at least one tribal subdivision (Iscr. Cos ED 138.1–2 (C.206/5)); see Habicht (2000) 309–10, 327 (date)).

Parts of Kos town have been the object of intensive excavation, particularly after a severe earthquake of the 1930s opened up opportunities for the Italian archaeologists working there; no final excavation reports have ever been published, but there is a good summary of the state of work as of the 1940s (Morricone (1950)). Long runs of the fortification walls have been uncovered (des Courtis et al. (1982) 414; BCH 118 (1994) 798), perhaps the walls of 366/5 (Diod. 15.76.2). Sanctuaries include the great Asklepieion, begun in C4 but a site of worship originally of Apollo in C5 (Schatzmann (1932) “Zeitafel”; for an altar of C4 bearing the names of some of Asklepios’ children, see p. 26); a sanctuary for Artemis, Zeus Hikesios and the Theoi Patrioi (SEG 14.529 (C2)); temples for Demeter and Dionysos in the town centre (Iscr. Cos ED 140.5 (C4); BCH 118 (1994) 795). Remains of the theatre (TGR ii. 147) are Hellenistic (Sherwin-White (1978) 25); but references to the theatre in Eudoxos (fr. 363, Lasserre) testify to a C4 antecedent. A sanctuary of the Twelve Gods is attested in a C4 inscription (Iscr. Cos ED 54.15; see also their worship at the Zemaitlēion; Paton and Hicks (1891) no. 349 with Kader (1995) 201–2). A sanctuary of Demeter, a διαμήτριος, is attested (Iscr. Cos ED 140.5). A sanctuary starting in C4m to the Eleusinian gods has been located at Kyparisi (Laurenz (1931) 623–25). A stoa by the harbour may date from C4 (Coulton (1976) 248).

Next to nothing is known about Hippokrates of Kos (Pl. Phdr. 270C; Prt. 311B) and his medical school of Asklepiaiadaí (CID 1 12 (C4f)). The various pseudographica about Hippokrates and Kos are late innovations and cannot be used for reliable information about the institutions and history of the Koan poleis in C6–C5s (Jouanna (1999) 12–16, 21–24; for the writings, see now Smith (1990)).

Kos struck coins of electrum and silver on the Aeginetan standard in C6, coins of silver on the Persic standard in C5f, and coins of silver and bronze after 366/5. (1) Silver and electrum, C6. Types: obv. crab; rev. incuse square. (2) Silver, C5f. Types: obv. naked diskobolos with tripod behind; legend: ΚΟΣ or ΚΙΣΣ or ΚΙΩΙΩΝ; rev. crab in incuse square. (3) Silver from 395: obv. head of bearded or beardless Herakles often with lion’s scalp, facing l. or r.; rev. crab and club in dotted incuse square, or draped female head facing l. (Demeter?); legend: ΚΩΙ or ΚΙΩΙΩΝ and magistrate’s name. (4) Bronze from c.330: obv. head of beardless Herakles with lion’s scalp; rev. crab; legend: ΚΟΙ and magistrate’s name (Kos, HN3 632–34; Paton and Hicks (1891) pp. 305–6; Barron (1968); Erxleben (1970) 87–88; Kraay (1976) 245–46; Ingvaldsen (2002); SNG Cop. Caria 615–26). There has been some discussion about whether the legend ΚΙΩΙΩΝ on some coins should be taken as a Doric genitive plural (hence the ethnic) or as a kettikon (so Sherwin-White (1978) 45); in light of the widespread variability in practice with respect to amphora stamps, even in poleis that used the Ionic alphabet (see Garlan (1999) 19–20), final judgement must be suspended. (Koray Konuk (pers. comm.) reports that he has reinvestigated Koan coins and come up with important new results, but these have not been published.)

The Koans are said to have participated in the colonisation of Elpia in Apulia (Strabo 14.2.10). In an inscription of C3m the Koans are called synoikistai of Kamarina (no. 28) (SEG 12 379 = Rigsby (1996) no. 48 (C3m); Plut. Tim. 35.1–2 (emended); see Talbert (1974) 204). There are two poleis well attested for Kos before the metaikismos of 366/5: Astypalaea and Kos Meropis.

498. Astypalaea  Map 61. Lat. 36.45, long. 27.00. Size of territory: 3 (c.145 km² or less). Type: C. The toponym is Άστυπαλαία, η (Strabo 14.2.19; Steph. Byz. 140.8). There is no explicit attestation of the city-ethnic (infra). The name of this town is known certainly only from the description by Strabo (14.2.19) of the metoikismos of Kos in 366/5 (supra). For the possibility that the city was mentioned in Galen, see Walzer (1935) 336 app. with further references. Astypalaea became the deme of Isthmos in the unified Koan state (Sherwin-White (1978) 59 and especially Pugièse Carratelli (1963–64)). The toponym is Άστυπαλαία (LSGC 154A.18 (C3f)). The demotic is Ἰσθµιώτας (Iscr. Cos ED 55B.9 (C4)). Isthmos displayed its own internal organisation: in the Hellenistic period the deme was itself divided into three tribes, the Theadai, Kyniadai and Melainadai (Pugièse Carratelli (1963–64) 161–63 no. VI.4.4–5 and 425 with 48; 165–81 nos. IX–XVIII with Jones, POAG 239–41). Although there is no explicit evidence, the peculiarity of this deme in having its own tribal organisation would seem to find its best explanation in Isthmos’ earlier status, like that of
Astypalaia, as a self-governing polis before the metoikismos, or in the possibility that it persisted to function as a polis, albeit a dependent polis, after the synoecism. Another possible piece of evidence is the fact that Isthmos dispatched a theoria on its own account to Delos in 250 (IG vi.2 287.B.45). A monarchs attested at Astypalaia should be taken as the eponymous magistrate (Reger (2001) 173–74 with refs.; contra Pugliese Carratelli (1957)). A sanctuary of C5 sits on the acropolis at Kephala, the urban site of Astypalaia (MacKenzie (1897–98); Herzog (1901) 138, (1903) 2–4; Sherwin-White (1978) 27 n. 84 for more refs.). The cult of Asklepios was a local cult here before the metoikismos, which introduced it to the island as a whole.

499. Kos Meropis  Map 61. Lat. 36.50, long. 27.15. Size of territory: 3 (c.145 km² or less). Type: A. The toponym is Κώς ἡ Μεροπίς (Thuc. 8.41.2; Paus. 6.14.12) or just Κώς (Thuc. 8.108.2). The city-ethnic is Κώσος (Ebert (1972) 154–57 no. 49 with Reger (2001) and supra). Kos Meropis is called a polis in the urban sense by Thucydides at 8.41.2. The eponymous office may have been a board of prostatai (Iscr. Cos ED 272 with Pugliese Carratelli (1957) 335 n. 3, a decree of Caf dated ἐπὶ προστατὰ κατά) who continued to play an important role in the Koan polity after 366 (see Iscr. Cos ED 57.2–3: ἐπὶ προστατῶν τῶν σιν erst). The urban centre was occupied from C5 to the acropolis at Kephala, the urban site of Astypalaia (MacKenzie (1897–98); Herzog (1901) 138, (1903) 2–4; Sherwin-White (1978) 27 n. 84 for more refs.). Two citizens of Kos Meropis were Olympic victors (Olympionikai 340 (420) and 363 (400)). The urban centre seems to have been located at modern Chora. The later site of the Asklepieion was occupied in C5 by a sanctuary of Apollo Kyparissios overseen by a board of ἐπιμεληται τοῦ τεμενος (Herzog (1928) 32–33 no. 11.8–9). A sacred law forbade the cutting down of cypress trees in the temenos except for public need (Herzog (1928) 32 no. 11); this law was strengthened after the metoikismos and the establishment of Asklepios in the sanctuary (see supra). The site had a temple of Demeter and a sacred spring (dating not clear). Kos Meropis was unfortified in 412 (Thuc. 8.41.2) but was fortified by Alkibiades in the following year (Thuc. 8.108.2). Remains of a fortification wall have been identified with that mentioned by Thucydides (Kantzia (1988) 182; Bean and Cook (1957) 121, followed by Pugliese Carratelli (1963–64) 148).

It has been suggested from time to time that Kos may have hosted other poleis as well (Sherwin-White (1978) 63), and certainly every deme attested from after the metoikismos is a potential candidate for being seen as such a polis. The mention in Ps.-Hippoc. Ἐρ. 27 of τεσσάρων ... τειχῶν ἐν τῇ νῆσῳ has been cited as evidence of additional towns (Hicks in Paton and Hicks (1891) p. xix; cf. generally Sherwin-White (1978) 58–63 but also Reger (1997) 454–55, 483–84 n. 32). Of the possibilities, only Halasarna is noted here.

500. Halasarna (Halasarnitas)  Map 61. Lat. 36.45, long. 27.10. Size of territory: 2 Type: B. The toponym is Ἀλασάρνα (Paton and Hicks (1891) no. 7.3; -γ Hsch. A2772) or Ἀλασάρνα (Strabo 14.2.19). The ethnic is Ἀλασαρίτας (Paton and Hicks (1891) 372–74 (all late)). Halasarna is called a polis in an inscription of C4I (Paton and Hicks (1891) no. 7.3; for the date, see Herzog (1942) 13–18 68B.6), and a chorion in Strabo 14.2.19 (657). There was a temple of C6–C4 apparently dedicated to Apollo Pythaios (Kantzia (1988) 176); Aleurs et al. (1990), more evidence now in the form of sherd inscribed ΑΠΟΛ(ωνι), but some doubts about the identification are expressed by Kokkorou-Aleuras et al. (1995–96) 318). The urban centre was occupied from C6 (Hope Simpson and Lazenby (1962) 171–72; see also Kokkorou-Aleuras et al. (1995–96) 324 for pottery dating c.575–550). Cults attested at the site include those of Apollo, Herakles, Leto, Artemis, Hekate Stratia, Aphrodite, Zeus Polieus, Athena Polias and the Dioskouroi (Kokkorou-Aleuras et al. (1995–96) 313–15, with refs.).

501. Kythnos (Kythnios)  Map 58. Lat. 37.55, long. 24.25. Size of territory: 2 (100 km²). Type: A. The toponym is Κύθνος, ἡ (Hdt. 7.90, 8.67.1; Strabo 10.5.3), denoting both the island and the town (Ps.-Skylax 58). The city-ethnic is Κύθνος (Hdt. 8.46.4; Dem. 13.34; Agora xvii 256 (C4)) or, once, Κυθνος (SEG 9.2.23). Artemidoros and Strabo agree in placing Kythnos among the Kyklades (Strabo 10.5.3). Kythnos is called a polis in the urban sense (Ps.-Skylax 58), and in Hdt. 8.46.1 it is subsumed under the heading polis where polis occurs in the political sense (Hdt. 8.42.1, 49.1). The external use of the city-ethnic is attested collectively in inscriptions (IG i² 264.43; SEG 25 357, Nemea (C4)) and in literary sources (Hdt. 8.46; Dem. 13.34), and individually in Athenian sepulchral inscriptions (IG ii² 9115; Agora xvii 516 (both C4)) and in a C5 list of sailors (IG i³ 1032.1.v.88–89).

The Kythnians contributed two ships to the Greek fleet at Salamis (Hdt. 8.46.4) and participated in the communal dedications at Delphi and Olympia after Plataia (ML 27.10; Paus. 5.23.2). Kythnos was a member of the Delian League, and may have been among the original members (ATL iii. 198–99). It belonged to the Island district (IG i³ 271.1.91) and is recorded in the tribute lists from 450/49 (IG i³ 263.1.v.27) to 416/15 (IG i³ 289.1.19) a total of eleven times, three times
completely restored, paying a *phoros* of first 3 tal. (*IG* i² 263.iv.27), raised to 6 tal. in, probably, 425/4 (*IG* i² 288.1.5). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (*IG* i³ 71.1.72) (6 tal.) and in 410/9 (*IG* i³ 100.1.2). Hypereides wrote a *Κυθνιακὸς λόγος* (fr. 138, Sauppe) and Aristotle a *Κυθνιοῖς πολιτεία* (Harp. Κρο). In C4 the Kythnians had a board of five strategoi, of whom three were elected from among those who had served as strategoi before (Vat. Gr. 2306.B.1.134–40). During the crisis of 330–326 Kythnos received 10,000 *medimmoi* of grain from Kyrene (no. 1028) (*SEG* 9.2.25).

The urban centre was situated in the north-western part of the island and was walled, probably by C4 (Mazarakis Ainian (1993), (1996) 251, 256–70, (1998) 368–70; Gounaris (1998)). A temple on the acropolis, which has produced material of the Archaic through the Hellenistic periods, has been attributed to Demeter, or, less probably, Artemis or Hera (Mazarakis Ainian (1998) 370–71); for a *temenos* on Kythnos controlled by the Athenian sanctuary of Demeter at Eleusis, see *IG* i³ 386.111.147. Other temples of uncertain identity have been discovered; one of these may be a sanctuary of Aphrodite, whose cult, long known from the Hellenistic period (*IG* v 123.100–20 with Themelis (1998)), can now be attested from a C4 dedication (*SEG* 47 1300; Mazarakis Ainian (1998) 372–73). A C4 sanctuary to the Samothrakian gods is attested epigraphically (*IG* xi¹ 1057 (C4l/C3e); see Hemberg (1950) 220; Mazarakis Ainian (1998) 372) and archaeologically (Mazarakis Ainian (1996) 252). The doubts of Cole (1984) 68 can now be dismissed. There is now evidence for a settlement starting in the Geometric period at the island of Vryokastraki (Mazarakis Ainian (1998) 374).

The island is said to have taken its name from one Kythnos (Steph. Byz. 392.2); later it was settled by Athenians under Kestor and Kephalenos (Dio Chrys. 80.26.9).

The Kythnians now seem to have coined in silver in C6 or C5e. Denominations: one-third stater to down to hemiobol. Types: *obv.* head of a wild boar, or Gorgoneion, or lily, or seated dog; *rev.* incuse square or plain flat surfaces (Kyrou and Artemis (1998)).

**LEMNOS** *(LEMNOS)* Map 56. Lat. 39.55, long. 29.15. Size of territory: 4 (478 km²). The toponym is *Λήμνος, η* (Hom. Od. 8.283; Hdt. 6.139.4; *IG* i³ 1466). The ethnic is *Λήμνιος* (Thuc. 3.5.1; *IG* i³ 261.1.3). Lemnos is called a *polis* in the political sense in the King’s Peace (*Xen. Hell.* 5.1.31). Lemnos is described as *δισπόλεις* in *Eth. Magn.* 279.6; cf. schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.601. The collective use of the ethnic is attested internally on coins: *AHMNI* (Head, *HN*² 262 (C4m)) and externally in a list of mercenaries (*IG* ii² 1956.91 (c.300)). For the individual and external use of the ethnic, see *Ἀντίδωρος Λήμνιος* (Hdt. 8.31.3); Antilochos, the philosopher opponent of Sokrates (*Diog. Laert. 2.46*); Apollodoros, a writer on farming (*Arist. Pol.* 1259α1); and *Λήμνιας* (*Isae. 6.13* and Theoris (*Dem. 25.79–80 (C4); see Collins (2001)).

Ancient sources mention many non-Greek peoples as inhabiting Lemnos before the arrival of the Greeks (see *IG* xi¹.8, pp. 2–3). C5i the Persians conquered Lemnos, exposed the island to an *andrapiodismos*, and appointed a *hyparchos* (*Hdt. 5.27.1–2*). The Lemnians are said to have had military forces and penteconters (*Hdt. 6.138.1*). In 499 Lemnos was seized by the Athenians (*Hdt. 6.137–40; *IG* i³ 552 *bis* and 1466 with Rausch (1999); the restoration of *IG* i³ 518 is uncertain; see also Salomon (1997) 31–37), and thereafter the Lemnians were organised into the Kleisthenic tribes and demes (*IG* i³ 552 *bis*; *IG* xi¹ suppl. 337 (C5e); cf. Jones, *POAG* 187–88). Colonists, however, though losing citizen rights in their metropolis, often copied its civic subdivision, and it seems likely that in C5 the Lemnians, though organised like the Athenians, were not Athenian citizens (Salomon (1997) 31–66), but in C5m they were probably supplemented with klerouchs (Graham (1983) 175–84, (2001) 325–26). For a brief period between 404 and 394/3, Lemnos was free of Athenian control; see Aeschin. 2.76; Andoc. 3.12. In C4, on the other hand, the Lemnians were indisputably Athenian klerouchs (*Agora* xix 13 *passim*; Cargill (1995) 59–60) and Athenian citizens (Dem. 4.34). It is a moot point whether it is possible to distinguish between Athenian klerouchs and Athenians permanently settled on the island, as argued by Salomon (1997) 91–155.

In 480 a Lemnian ship defected from the Persian fleet (*Hdt. 8.11.3*). The Lemnians are recorded once in the *ATL* (*IG* i³ 261.1.3 (452/1)). Thereafter all payments of *phoros* were made by the Hephaistieis and the Myrinaioi separately (*infra*). By the Peace of 404 Athens had to surrender Lemnos (Andoc. 3.12; Aeschin. 2.76–77), but by 392, after a short period of independence (Andoc. 3.12, 14, which Salomon (1997) 63–66 sees, however, as in reality a Spartan hegemony, rejecting the standard interpretation of *IG* xi¹.8 2 of Myrina), the Athenians had regained control of the island (*Xen. Hell.* 4.8.15), and Athenian possession was confirmed by the King’s Peace of 386 (*Xen. Hell.* 5.1.31). The grain law of 374/3 shows that Lemnos was an Athenian possession (*Hesperia* suppl. 29 5.6–8), in spite of the decision of 378/7 to renounce the klerouchies (*Diod. 15.29.8*). Lemnos was still Athenian in the 320s (*Arist. Ath. Pol.* 62.2; *IG* ii² 3207.28; cf. Cargill (1995) 63–64) and remained Athenian by the Peace of 322 (*Diod.*
502. Myrina (Myrinaios) Map 56. Lat. 39.50, long. 25.05. Size of territory: probably 3. Type: A. The toponym is Μύρινα, η (Hecat. fr. 138c; Hyp. 2.18; IG ii2 550.16; SEG 19 59 (307/6); IG xi1.8 4.7, 12 (C4m)). The city-ethnic is Μύριναιος (IG xi1.8 2.8). Myrina is called a polis in the political sense by Hypereides at 2.18, and in the urban and political senses combined by Dionysios of Chalkis (FGH iv 393 fr. 2 (C4f)). The collective use of the ethnic is attested internally in a proxeny decree of c.400 (IG xi1.8 2) and externally in the ATL (IG i1.267.iv.30). The only attestation of the individual use is in a sepulchral inscription of C2: Μύρινα (IG ii2 9975).

As an Athenian dependency Myrina is called ὁ δῆµος ὁ ἐν Ῥώμη (C4m); cf. Cargill (1995) 13. In IG xi1.8 2 ὁ δῆµος ὁ Μυριναῖος (ll. 2–3, usually dated 404–394/3; see also IG xi1.8 7.19 (C4l)) granting a citizen of Akrothooi (no. 560) proxenia with ateleia; the standard view, that this represents a briefly independent Myrina, has been rejected by Salomon (1997) 63–66. In the Athenian tribute lists Myrina is listed as Μυριναιοί (IG i1 267.iv.30, etc.). All attestations of civic subdivisions copy Athens: citizens were organised into the Kleisthenic phylai and demoi (IG xi1.8 5 (C4m); IG i1 116 (C5m)). Both when the Myriaiaians were part of the Athenian state (IG xi1.8 3–5 (C4m)) and when they were independent (IG xi1.8 2 (c.400) and 7 (c.318–307)), decrees were proposed and carried by the boule and the demos presided over by an epistates (IG xi1.8 5.5).

The Athenian siege of Myrina c.500 implies city walls (Hdt. 6.140.2). We hear of walls again in 307/6 (IG ii2 550; cf. Maier (1959–61) no. 54). The urban centre which covered an area of 2.55 ha lay on a peninsula outside modern Kastro. There are remains of an older acropolis wall in polygonal masonry; and the settlement was cut off from the island by a younger wall across the neck of the peninsula (Fredrich (1906a) 243–47; Sealey (1918–19) 159–60; cf. Lang (1996) 249). There were two sanctuaries of Artemis: one on the acropolis attested by remains (Fredrich (1906a) 246; see also Sealy (1918–19) 160–61) and boundary horoi (Segre (1932–33) 297–98 no. 5). An extra-mural sanctuary to Athena, probably as Selene, is attested by archaeological evidence from the Archaic period (Fredrich (1906a) 244, 246, identifying the archaeological remains as a temple associated with the Great Goddess; Archontidou-Arghyri (1994) 53; BCH 122 (1998) 912–13) and by horoi (Segre (1932–33) 294–97 no. 4 with Jeffery (1990) 299; SEG 45 1192, 40 745); archaeological evidence places its start in the Archaic period (Archontidou-Arghyri (1994); BCH 122 (1998) 912–13). Many decrees have been discovered at this sanctuary, which may well have been the Myriaiaians’ state archive and the goddess the protective deity (so Parker (1993); on Athena Lemnia, see further Steinhardt (2000)). Generally, see Archontidou-Arghyri (1994). A community of Chalkideans living in Myrina passed a decree honouring the Athenian epimeletes (IG xi1.8 4 (after 348; see SEG 45 1182)).

Myrina struck bronze coins from C4f onwards. Types: obv. head of Athena; rev. owl; legend: ΜΥΡΥΙ (Head, HN2 263; for the date, see Kroll and Walker (1993) 179).

503. Hephastia (Hephaistieus) Map 56. Lat. 39.55, long. 25.20. Size of territory: probably 3. Type: A. The toponym is Ἡφαιστία, η (Hyp. 2.18; fr. 7, Sauppe; IG i1 1672.277 (329/8; IG xi1.8 5.5)). The city-ethnic is Ἡφαιστεῖος (Hdt. 6.140.2) or (late) Ἡφαιστείας (IG xi1.8 28.13–14 (third century AD)). Hephastia is called a polis in the political sense by Hypereides at 2.18, and in the urban and political senses combined by Dionysios of Chalkis (FGH iv 393 fr. 2 (C4l)). The collective use of the ethnic is attested internally on coins (infra) and externally in the ATL (IG i1 267.iv.31). Individuals are described as ἐξ Ἡφαιστείας (IG ii2 8826 (C4f)).

As an Athenian dependency Hephastia is called τῶν [δῆµων τῶν Ἡφαιστείων τῶν Ἡφαιστείας (IG xi1.8 15.3–4 (C4s); cf. 26b), or just ὁ δῆµος ὁ ἐν Ἡφαιστείᾳ (Hyp. 2.18). In the ATL Hephastia is listed as Ἡφαιστεῖας (IG i1 267.iv.31, etc.). All attestations of civic subdivisions copy Athens: citizens were organised into the Kleisthenic phylai and demoi (IG i1 1477 (C5e); SEG 45 1181 (C4/l/C3e); SEG 45 1189 (C4)). A number of decrees concerning the Kabeireion were passed by the demoi of the initiated (ὁ δῆµος τῶν τετελεσµένων). The organisation of the ekkleisia is an exact copy of the Athenian ekkleisia (SEG 45 1181, 1187, 1189; cf. Cargill (1995) 181–82). The eponymous official was an archon (SEG 45 1181 (c.300)).

The name of the polis derives from Hephaistos, who is said to have landed on Lemnos after Zeus threw him out of Olympia (Hom. II.1.593); in a late inscription Hephastia is
called “the polis of Hephaistos” (IG xii.8 27.1–2). The Kabereion, the sanctuary of the Dioskouroi, started in C8 and was in continuous use thereafter (Akousilaos (FGrHist 2) fr. 20; Pherekydes (FGrHist 3) fr. 48, etc.; see Accame (1941–43) for the inscriptions; Hemberg (1950) 160–70; Beschi (1994), non vidi; cf. SEG 45 1194). Temples of Herakles and of course of Hephaistos are known (Fredrich (1906a) 251, 255; Sealey (1918–19) 168–69); the theatre is early Hellenistic (TGr ii. 244). A possible fort or settlement within the territory of the polis has been reported at Kaminia (Fredrich (1906a) 252–53). The famous Lemnian earth was mined here, though our earliest sources are late (Hasluck (1909–10)). In the territory of Hephaistia a number of horos inscriptions have been found, all modelled on the Athenian horoi (Finley (1985) nos. 103–10; SEG 45 1185–91). Recent Italian excavations have revealed town walls probably of C4 or later (see E. Carando, AStene forthcoming; AR (2000–2001) 111; A. Di Vita, AStene (1998/2000) 386, for the opinion that the walls are Archaic, perhaps as old as C2). They enclosed an area of 31.6 ha (Lang (1996) 56).

Hephaistia struck bronze coins from C4 onwards. Types: 

- obv. head of Athena in Corinthian helmet; rev. owl facing; 
- legend: ἩΦ.ΑΙΣΤΙ (Head, HN 3 262; for the date, see Kroll and Walker (1993) 179).

504. Leros (Lerios) Map 61. Lat. 37.05, long. 26.50. Size of territory: 2 (53 km²). Type: C. The toponym is Λέρος, ἦ (Thuc. 8.26.1; Hdt. 5.125). The city-ethnic is Λέριοι (Demodokos fr. 2.1–2, West; in Strabo 10.5.12 erroneously ascribed to Phokylides). The fragment runs: καί τὸ δῆ 

505. Melos (Melios) Map 58. Lat. 36.45, long. 24.25. Size of territory: 3 (151 km²). Type: A. The toponym is Μᾶλος (SEG 20 716.29 (c.330); I.Cret. ii xii.3 2.4 (C3)) or Μῆλος, ἦ (Thuc. 3.9.11; Isoc. 19.21; IG i 370.72, restored) denoting both the island and the town (Steph. Byz. 450.9–10). An alternative toponym is Ζεφύρια (Steph. Byz. 450.11; Plin. HN 4.70 = Arist. fr. 564). The city-ethnic is Μᾶλοι (IVO 272 = CEG 1 419 (C6); IG xi.13 1259.6 Tod 179; Ager (1996) no. 3; Magnetto (1997) no. 1 (C4s)) or Μῆλοι (Thuc. 3.9.1.2; IG i 711.65; I.Delos 104.73 (364/3)) or Μῆλας (IG ii² 9356 (C4m)). Melos was called a polis both in the urban sense (Andoc. 4.23) and in the political sense (Thuc. 5.87, 91.2, 112.2). Isokrates describes Melos as a polichnion (1.28), perhaps as part of his effort to minimise the atrocities committed in C5 by the Athenians. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on some coins of C5 (infra) and on an inscription of C2 (IG xi.13 1097) and externally in inscriptions (ML 27.7 (479); IG xi.13 1259 (C4s) = Tod 179.6; Ager (1996) no. 3; Magnetto (1997) 1–8 no. 1) and in literary sources (Thuc. 5.84.3; Dem. 58.56). For the individual and external use, see IVO 272 (C6); IG ii² 9356 (C4m); IG xi.5
801 (C3f)). The most famous Melians were the poet Melanippides, victorious in Athens in 494/3 (IG xii.5 444.61–62 = FGrHist 239 fr. 47), and Diagoras the Melian, condemned in Athens as athteos in 416/15; a price of 1 tal. was offered for his death (Ar. Av. 1073–74; Lys. 6.17; Diod. 13.6.7; see Woodbury (1965) and Janko (2001), (2002)). Patris is found in Thuc. 5.111.5.

Strabo, quoting Artemidoros, places Melos among the Kyklades (10.5.3). The Melians were allegedly colonists from Lakedaimon (no. 345) (Hdt. 8.48; Thuc. 5.84.2; Xen. Hell. 2.2.3; Diod. 12.65.2; cf. Malkin (1994) 74–76; Cartledge (2002) 93–94), and the Melians believed themselves that this colonisation took place 700 years before the Athenian attack in 416/15 (Thuc. 5.112.2; see Malkin (1994) 74–77). A C1 historian reports that the Milesians (no. 854) attacked Melos, perhaps in C8e or C7 (Kohon (FGrHist 26) fr. 1.44); perhaps this event, if historical, should be associated with the Parian and Milesian struggles in the Archaic period (see 765 and 1084 infra). The Melians refused Persian demands to submit in 490, and supplied troops and two pentekonters to the war effort in 480 (Hdt. 8.46.4, 48); they are recorded on the Serpent Column in Delphi (ML 27.7) and also appear in the dedication at Olympia (Paus. 5.23.2; cf. Hdt. 9.8.1). The Melians, however, did not join the Delian League (Thuc. 2.9.4). They are recorded as having contributed to the Spartan war fund (ML 67.1–7, 13–17, with Loomis (1992), perhaps in the earlier phases of the Peloponnesian War, perhaps around 410–405 (so Piéart (1995)). At about the same time the Athenians ravaged the island (Thuc. 3.91.1–3 (426/5)) and soon thereafter added the Melians to the assessment for 425/4 (IG i² 71.1.65) (15 tal.). Thucydides’ description of the famous Athenian siege of 416/15 shows Melian troops active, often quite successfully, on the island in opposition to the Athenian invaders (5.84, 114.1–2, 115.4, 116.2–4), but the town was betrayed, and at defeat the Athenians killed the adult male citizens and subjected the rest of the population to andropodismos (Thuc. 5.116.4; cf. also Isoc. 12.63; Andoc. 4.22). Five hundred Athenian colonists were installed in 415 (Thuc. 5.116.4; see Figueira (1991) 220). A tombstone of C5ι probably commemorates one of the Melian traitors who was afterwards rewarded with Athenian citizenship (IG xii.3 1187). It is to this period that most of our evidence about civic organisation dates (see Jones, POAG 214–15). The Spartans took Melos in 405 from the Athenians and allowed the population to return (Xen. Hell. 2.2.9; Plut. Lys. 14.4). In C4m Melos was a pirates’ nest, and Athens had the Melians fined 10 tal. for harbouring the pirates (Dem. 58.56). Soon after 338 the Melians were involved in a dispute with the Kimolians (no. 496) over the possession of the three small islands of Polyaiga, Etheirea and Libeia. In accordance with a decision of the synedrion of the League of Corinth, the dispute was submitted to arbitration by Argos (no. 347), and the Argives decided in favour of Kimolos (IG xii.3 1259 = Tod 179; Ager (1996) no. 3; Magnetto (1997) 1–8 no. 1). C.330, in consequence of an offence committed by, among others, a Melian Olympic victor, the Melians, alongside a number of Peloponnesian poleis, paid damages to envos sent from Kyrene (no. 1028) (SEG 20 716; for the context, see SEG 39 1717; for the date, see SEG 46 2198 p. 656).

The Aristotelian collection of politeiai seems to have included a Constitution of the Melians (fr. 564); but we know next to nothing about the Melian political institutions. In 416/15 Thucydides (5.84.4–86) notes the absence of a decision-making popular assembly (τὸ πολιτεῖον) combined with the presence of Melian magistrates (ἀρχαῖοι) and a council (συνεδρίον) described as “the few” (οἱ δικάγοι). The presumption is that Melos was oligarchically governed; but we cannot tell whether that was the normal situation or the result of the Athenian attack. The betrayal of Melos to the Athenians in 416 testifies to a stasis between a pro-Athenian and an anti-Athenian faction (Thuc. 5.116.3). A Melian proxenos has been restored in a C4m inscription from Karthaia (IG xii.5 542.30, but dubiously).

The urban centre of Melos must have been fortified in 424, when the Athenians under Nikias attacked the island (Thuc. 3.91.1–3, 94.1; Diod. 12.65.3), but the walls mentioned in Thucydides’ account were built by the Athenians as part of their operations; the isodomic sections may represent repair and enhancement of a pre-existing (C6l–C5e?) wall in Lesbian/polygonal masonry (Thuc. 5.114.1, 115.4, 116.2; Cherry and Sparkes (1982), with further refs.; Wagstaff and Cherry (1982b) 261). The agora mentioned by Thucydides in the same context (5.115.4) may actually refer not to the Melians’, but to a military agora serving the Athenian besiegers. However, Melos did have an agora in the Classical period, which has been identified archaeologically (Kenzler (1999) 112–13, with further refs.). A C6 inscription may attest to a cult of Athena (IG xii.3 1075 with Pontani (1937); Jeffery (1990) 320). A cult of Asklepios has been inferred for C4 (Semeria (1986) 954).

The Melian countryside appears to have supported a considerable number of settlements, some of which may have been large enough to be regarded as villages (Cherry (1982) 18 fig. 2.1, 22 fig. 2.6; Wagstaff and Cherry (1982a) 142–45). Growth of the urban centre to a maximum size of about 19 ha during the Classical period has been interpreted as

In Cēl (c. 515; Boutin (1986) 3) the Melians began to produce silver coins on the Milesian–Phoenician standard, although a stater on the Aiginetan standard has been attributed to the island (see Erxleben (1970) 72). (1) Silver, Cēl. Denomination: stater. Types: *obv.* ever; legend: *MAI*; *rev.* incuse square with diagonal bands. (2) Silver, Cēl. Denominations: stater, hemiobol. Types: *obv.* pomegranate with leaves; legend: *MAII* (sometimes retrograde); *rev.* incuse square with diagonal bands; legend: *MA*. Some staters have *rev.* triskeles or crescent; legend: *MAIOIN*. (3) Silver on the Rhodian standard, Cēl. Denominations: didrachm, drachm. Types: *obv.* pomegranate (both denominations); *rev.* on didrachms: trident, or kantharos, or ram’s head; legend: *MA*. On drachms: spearhead, or eagle on rock with crescent; legend: *MA*, or nacked archer shooting (Head, *HN*² 486–87; Kraay (1976) 45–49; *SGN Cop. Aegean Islands* 679–89). A hoard of about 100 staters found on Melos in 1907 (*IGCH* 27) has been argued to reflect anxieties about possible Athenian attacks c. 420 (Kraay (1964)).

The Melians colonised Kryassos in Karia, an event that cannot be closely dated (Plut. *Mor.* 246D–E; Polyaeon. 8.64; cf. Nigdelis (1990) 199; Malkin (1994) 76).

**507. Naxos** *(Naxios)* Map 61. Lat. 37.05, long. 25.25. Size of territory: 4 (430 km²). Type: A. The toponym is *Nάξιος*, η (Aesch. *Pers.* 885; Hdt. 5.28; Ant. 1.16; SEG 19 204. A3 (c. 375)), denoting both the island (Hdt. 5.31.2) and the town (Thuc. 1.137.2). The city-ethnic is *Nάξιος* (*I.Delos* 1.3 (c. 600); *IG* vii 3225.1 (c. 500); *IG* i 1357.3 = *CEG* 158 (510–500); Hdt. 8.46.3). Naxos is called a *polis* both in the urban sense (Hdt. 6.96; Arist. fr. 566, Gigon (rCe6)) and in the political sense (Hdt. 5.30.3; Thuc. 1.98.4; SEG 12.390.6–7, 32.44 (c. 320); cf. SEG 30 1070). The territorial sense is attested at Hdt. 5.30.3–4. In the Delphic *naopoioi* accounts the Naxians appear as contributors in a list headed by the formula: τάδε πόλεως καὶ ἰδιώται ἐπάρξαντο (*CID* ii 4.14–16). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins of *C4* (*infra*) and externally in inscriptions (ML 278 (479); *I.Delos* 98.9 (377/6); *CID* ii 4.16, 20, 21 (*CaF*)) and in literary sources (Archil. fr. 89.6, West; *Hdt.* 8.4.3; Thuc. 1.98.4; Arist. *Pol.* 1305b). The individual use is attested internally on a tombstone of *C4–C3* (*I.xii15.67*, but perhaps a *pierre errante*) and externally in inscriptions from Delos of *C7* (*I.Delos* 2), Athens of Cēl (IG i 1357 = *CEG* 1.58), Delphi of *CaF* (*CID* ii 4.120, 21, 24, 26), and Olympia of *CaS* (*IoO* 651) and in literary sources (Hdt. 1.61.4; Arist. *Ath.* Pol. 15.2; *Occ.* 13467: *Διόμηδις Νάξιος*). Patris is found in Arist. fr. 558, Rose.

Naxos is the largest Kykladic island (Strabo 10.5.3). In the Archaic period some of the wealthy Naxians lived in the *asty*...
and some in komai, of which one was called Αἰγοτάδαι (Arist. fr. 566). Steph. Byz. claims that on Naxos there was a polis named Νύσα (479.9) and another named Τραγεία (630.8), where a certain Tragios Apollo was worshipped; he cites Eupolis for the plural form Τραγέιαι (PCG fr. 487), but it is not wholly clear whether the plural form denotes the polis on Naxos (in which case we have testimony for it from C58) or the homonymous island (less likely). Herbst (1935) 2083 associates this sanctuary with a horos inscribed δορος χωρίου Απόλλωνος (IG xii.5 43 (C4–C3)); cf. also the remarks of F. Hiller von Gaertringen apud IG xii.5 50).

An inscription of C₄ gives the toponyms εν Ἐλαιοῦντι and ἐν Μέλαιν, persuasively identified with modern Melanes, so rich in sanctuaries (IG xii suppl. 194.16 with Hiller von Gaertringen’s comm. there, 14–15). Πολιγραφία was a district on the east coast (IG xii.5 test. 1415). The famous Naxian marble quarries had been opened by C7 and continued to operate throughout the Archaic and Classical periods (Kokkorou-Aleura (1992); Brun (1997) 407–8).

Naxos was said to have been occupied first by Thracians and then by Karians from Mt. Latmos under the leadership of Naxos, son of Polemon (Diod. 5.50.2–7, 51.1–2 and 3–4; schol. Dionys. Per. 525, GGM ii 451; Steph. Byz. 468.7–8). Later, Ionians from Athens colonised the island (Hdt. 8.46.3; Ael. VH 8.5; Paus. 7.3.3; Costa (1997) 51).

The Naxians played a predominant role in the central Aegean during the Archaic period; their activities left remains both in the decoration of Delos and in a continuing hostility to Paros (no. 509). The Naxians and the Parians fought on and off in Κήφ (cf. Kontoleon (1952) E2 col. 1 II. 4–32 (SEG15 517); Lanzillotta (1987) 71–88; Berranger (1992) 205–7; Costa (1997) 115–28); at least once, the Parians imposed a severe defeat on the Naxians (IG xii.5 445.4:5; the Parians). In C6 an oligarchy was followed by the tyranny of Lygdamis (Arist. Pol. 1105.39–41) after a major stasis (Arist. fr. 566). Helped by “the Naxian man Lygdamis” (Hdt. 11.6.4), Peisistratos in turn installed Lygdamis as tyrant on Naxos (540–524) (Hdt. 11.6.3–4, 64.1–2; Arist. Ath. Pol. 15.2–3; Arist. Oec. 1348b6–12; see also Ath. 348A–C; Costa (1996), (1997) 147–68). Lygdamis’ tyranny was replaced by an oligarchy of όι παχεῖς (Hdt. 5.30.1)—established perhaps with assistance of the Spartans who overthrew him (Plut. Mor. 859D)—until it in turn was overthrown c.500 by the demos (E. W. Robinson (1997) 117–18) after a new stasis (Gehrke, Stasis 123–24); the oligarchs fled to Miletos (no. 854) and contributed to the outbreak of the Ionian Revolt against the Persians in 494 (Hdt. 5.30). The so-called list of thalassocracies in Eusebios (Chronikon, p. 226, Schoene; M. Miller (1971) 5–6, 40–41) credits the Naxians with one in 515–505.

Naxos was subdue by Persia during the reign of Dareios (Aesch. Pers. 885). In 499 the Naxians are said to have controlled Paros (no. 509), Andros (no. 475) and the other Kyklades around it (Hdt. 5.31.2; Paros doubted by Lanzillotta (1987) 105–6). Led by Aristogaras and Megabates, the Persians attacked Naxos, but the Naxians learned about their plans beforehand and prepared for a siege by completing their walls and storing food and water, and the operation failed (Hdt. 5.34). Nine years later in 490 another Persian force successfully took the island when the Naxians abandoned their city and fled into the mountains; the Persians burned the city and temples and exposed the inhabitants they captured to an andrapodismos (Hdt. 6.96; see Costa (1997) 171–80). The Naxian ships (four, five or six) under Persian authority at Salamis defected to the Greek side (Hdt. 8.46.3; cf. Aesch. Pers. 879–887; for the numbers, Hdt. 8.46.3, four; Hellanikos (FGrHist 111 B 332a) fr. 28, six; Ephor. fr. 187, five, both cited at Plut. Mor. 869A).

The Naxians joined the Delian League in the summer of 477 as a πόλις συμμαχίας, contributing ships (Thuc. 1.98.4, 99). Naxos belonged to the Island district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 450/49 (IG i² 263.45.35, restored) to 416/15 (IG i² 289.1.27) a total of eleven times, three times completely restored, paying a phoros of 6 tal. 4,000 dr. (IG i² 264.111.25), raised to 9 tal. in or before 417/16 (IG i² 288.1.4). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i² 71.1.63) (15 tal.). C.475–470 (Rhodes (1985) 12–13) Naxos defected from the League but was reduced after a siege (Thuc. 1.98.4, 137.2; Polyxen. Strat. 1.30.8). In 453–448, 500 Athenian klerouchs were settled on Naxos (Plut. Per. 11.5–6; Diod. 11.88.3; Paus. 1.27.5; Pl. Euthphr. 4C; Aesch. 2.175; cf. Figueira (1991) 220). In C4e Naxos was allied with Sparta (no. 345), and in 376 an Athenian squadron under Chabrias laid siege to the city and defeated the Lakedaimonian auxiliary squadron in a major sea battle fought between Naxos and Paros (Diod. 15.34.3–5; SEG 19 204). Thereafter the Naxians may have joined the Second Athenian Naval League in the 370s (IDélοs 98.89 = IG ii² 1635.119; cf. Drehcr (1995) 219 with 137–38), but they are not recorded among the members listed in IG ii² 43. They struck a treaty with Athens some time before 353/2 (IG ii² 179 with Gauthier (1972) 168, 331). In 345/4 the Naxians awarded the Athenian demos a crown (IG ii² 1443.114).

Naxian military prowess is relatively well attested. The war with the Milesians (C6?), recorded in two different traditions, by Plutarch (Mor. 254B–F, probably based on the Aristotelian Constitution of Naxos (fr. 567.1)) and Parthenios, probably following Andriskos (FGrHist 500 fr. 761).
1.9), involved a siege in which the Naxians were locked up within the city walls and an expedition against the besiegers by Naxian forces. Polykrates the Samian tyrant borrowed troops from Lygdamis to secure his tyranny (Polyaen. Strat. 1.23.2). The Constitution of Naxos mentioned a _strategia_ of Lygdamis (fr. 566), and the Naxians are said to have been able to muster 8,000 hoplites and "many big ships" in 499 (Hdt. 5.30.4); a few years later they manned several triremes for the invasion of Greece (Hdt. 8.46.3; on the number, cf. supra).

The Aristotelian collection of constitutions included a _Ναξίων πολιτεία_ (fr. 566). In C4l decrees were passed by the _boule_ and/or the _demos_ (SEG 34 675.5–6, 10 (c.300)). They were published by the _grammatētes_ of the _boule_, and set up in the sanctuary of Apollo at the expense of a board of _tamiai_ (Matthaiou (1990–91) 114). In C2 the eponymous official was the priest of Dionysos (IG xii.1.5 128.23 in add. p. 308), but an inscription from Arkesine on Amorgos of 325–275 is dated by a board of _aisymnontes_ (IG xii.1 67B.36 = Migeotte (1984) 168–77 no. 49)). A court in Naxos (Δικαστήριον τηρίον IG xii.1 67B.36 = Migeotte (1984) 168–77 no. 49)) and Zeus Stratios (IG xii.1 38.2 (C1); see Trümpy, _Monat._ 72–73 and Loukopoulos (1989) 119).

The town of Naxos was walled by C6 (Andriskos (FGrHist 500) fr. 1.1; Hdt. 5.34), in the 470s (Thuc. 1.98.4, 137.2; Ar. _Vesp._ 355) and in 376 (Diod. 15.34.4). (At Aen. Tact. 22.20 _έπερ_ Νάξων is an unconjecturing.) Remains of an undated city wall were seen by Dugit (1867) 35–37, but are no longer visible. To judge from preserved tombs and other remains, the walled town seems to have covered an area of 20+ ha. Traces of occupation from the Geometric period have been discovered toward the northern end of the present town (ArchDelt 39 Chron. 292–95 and 29 Chron. 867–70). There was a Delion just outside the city walls in C6 (Andriskos (FGrHist 500) fr. 1.1); for confirmation of the date, see BCH 96 (1972) 772, re Geometric sherds from the site), which was probably at the site of the temple of Apollo Delios begun by Lygdamis c.530 that still dominates the harbour (Welter (1924); Gruben and Koenigs (1968), (1970); briefly Gruben (1986) 344–47; Koenigs (1972)). A _prytaneion_ and a theatre (restored) are attested in C5 (IG xii.1.5 35 with S. G. Miller (1978) 200–1 nos. 368–69), but a seat from the _koilion_ of, probably, the theatre has been recovered, and Gruben (1982a) 165–66 reports the discovery under the heading "Archaische Bauten." Pindar mentions a public cult of Hieros and Ephialtas (Pyth. 4.88; cf. IG xii.1.5 56); a _horos_ of Zeus Melosios of C4 (IG xii.1.5 48) and two of Apollo from C6e–C5s (Psarras (1999)) and C4–C3 (IG xii.5 42) indicate the existence of sanctuaries. Excavation has recovered a sanctuary dating from c.570 at Yria (Lambroinoudakis and Gruben (1987–88); Lambroinoudakis (1992); Gruben (1993) 99–105); this has recently been assigned to Dionysos and identified as the chief sanctuary of the island (Gruben (1997) 300); the unfinished statue at Apollon, now seen as Dionysos, may have been intended to stand by this temple like the colossalus of Apollo on Delos dedicated by the Naxians (ibid. 293–300). There is an Archaic sanctuary for Demeter at Sangri (Kontoleon (1954)); Lambroinoudakis et al. (1977) 382–86; Gruben (1993) 106–9), and another nearby at Gyroulos (Ergon (1977) 156–61, (1979) 24–25; _Prukt_ (1977) 382–86), which may be dedicated to Apollo (SEG 31 744). A sanctuary of Athena was located in the vicinity of modern Sangri (IG xii.1.5 40 (C6–C5) with test. 1421); Athena Poliouchos' sanctuary was situated northwest of the town at Enares (IG xii.1.5 41 with test. 1421). The sanctuary of Zeus Melosios was on the east side of Mt. Drios (the modern Ozia) (cf. Diod. 5.51.4), near Philoti (IG xii.1.5 48 with the map at IG xii.1.5 fasc. 2 p. xxiii). The grotto of the Nymphai Mychiens lay north-east of the town (IG xii.1.5 53).
Finally, the sanctuary of Otos and Ephialtas was at Melanes (IG xii.5 56).

Many communal dedications of the Naxians are attested from several sanctuaries. The Naxian Leonidas, honoured in Olympia by the Arkadian polis of Psophis (no. 294) (Paus. 6.16.5; IvO 294), dedicated out of his own funds a Leonideion in 330–320 (Paus. 5.15.2; IvO 651; Mallwitz (1972) 246–54). On Delos, the Naxians dedicated a palm (Ath. 502B with Bruneau (1990) 568–71) and the famous colossalus of Apollo dating to 590–580 (I.Délos 4 and 49; Bruneau and Ducat (1983) 125–28; Bruneau (1988) 577–82; Gruben (1997) 267–87). Excavation and identification of the oikos of the Naxians known from C4 texts (I.Délos 104–25.5, etc.) have shown that the building began in C7s (Courbin (1980); Bruneau and Ducat (1983) 119–23; Gruben (1997) 301–50). The Propylaia I and II of C5 have recently been claimed as Naxian work (Gruben (1997) 350–72). The Naxians dedicated a stoa in C66 (Hellmann and Fraisse (1979) 85–124; Bruneau and Ducat (1983) 146–47). The famous lions, one of the original sixteen now gracing St. Mark’s Square in Venice, were given in C71 (Gallet de Santerre (1959) 21–36; Bruneau and Ducat (1983) 171–74). A less spectacular dedication is the gold φιάλη καρποτηρίδα, attested by an inscription of 365/3 and, as has recently been shown, by Athenaios (I.Délos 104.34–35 with Bruneau (1990) 568–71; for the gold, see IG xi.2 161.B.31). At Delphi, the Naxians dedicated the famous Sphinx, for which they had received promanteia (Syll. 3 292 with 17a (from 332); Amandry (1953); a base reinscribed in C4 suggests another dedication, but may be related to the Sphinx; see Jacobm (1999) 69, and contributed funds to rebuilding the sanctuary after the earthquake of 373 (CID ii 4.1.16–17 for the polis as a whole, 20–27 for individual Naxians). The Naxians also participated in the communal dedications at Delphi and Olympia after Plataia (ML 27.8; Paus. 5.23.2; cf. Hdt. 9.81).

The Naxians may well have controlled some of the smaller islands to the south-east, although there is no direct evidence. These would include the archipelago of the Phakous(s)ai (Steph. Byz. 655.3–4; late inscriptions: IG xi.1.7 507–8), Herakleia (IG xi.1.7 509 with L. Robert (1949)) and Nikasia (Suda N 377; Plin. HN 4.68).

The Naxians minted coins from c.600, first silver staters and trihemiobols on the Aiginetan standard. Types: *obv.* kantharos with or without a crown; *rev.* incuse square. The coins with kantharos and crown were apparently replaced c.500 by coins with the plain kantharos, which had begun production a few years earlier. The Naxians continued to strike these types until their defection from the Delian League in c.475–470 (Nicolet-Pierre (1997)). In C4 they struck silver drachms and obols on the Rhodian standard as well as bronze coins. Types: *obv.* Dionysos; *rev.* kantharos; legend: ΝΑΞΙΩΝ or ΝΑ (Head, HN2 488; SNG Cop. Aegean Islands 702–9). A Naxian tetradrachm appears in the Delian accounts starting in 364/3 (I.Délos 104.66–67). For possible attribution of some half-staters on the Milesian/Phoenician standard to Naxos instead of Anaphe (no. 474), see Erxleben (1970) 69–70, 73.

Naxian participation in the colonisation of Naxos (no. 41) on Sicily is suggested by Hellan. fr. 82; it has sometimes been doubted, but now seems confirmed by an inscription (Guarducci (1985); for a good summary, see Costa (1997) 87–102). Naxian claims of colonisation on Amorgos (Steph. Byz. 86.14; schol. Dionys. Per. 525) may be Hellinicist inventions designed to justify the occupation of Aigiale (no. 471) and Minoa (no. 473) (Nigdelis (1990) 23).

508. Nisyros (Nisyros) Map 61. Lat. 36.35, long. 27.10. Size of territory: 2 (37 km², 49 km² including the islets, see infr�). Type: A. The toponym is Νήσυρος, ἦ (Hom. Il. 2.676; Theophr. De lap. 21; Diod. 5.54.3), denoting both the island (Ps.-Skylax 99) and the town (Strabo 10.5.17). The city-ethnic is Νήσυρος (Hdt. 7.99.2; IG1 270.1.9) or Νήσυρος (CID ii 4.1.11.61 (360/59), 5.1.51–60 (359/8)). Nisyros is attested as a *polis* in the political sense at Hdt. 7.99.2–3. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on C4 coins (infra) and in C3 inscriptions (IG xi.13 88.6), and externally in inscriptions and literary sources (Hdt. 7.99.2). The individual and external use is attested in the accounts of the Delphic Naopoioi (CID ii 4.1.11.61 (360/59), 5.1.51–60 (359/8)).

Ps.-Skylax 99 places Nisyros in Karia, but Steph. Byz. 477.7 among the Kyklades. The small islands off Nisyros (Strabo 10.5.16) were part of its territory. The island was supposed to have been created when Poseidon ripped off part of Kos and threw it into the sea (Paus. 1.2.4; Strabo 10.5.16; Apollod. Bibl. 1.6.2.4), a foundation myth reflected in the trident on the C4 coins (infra). Nisyros is said to have been colonised by Epidaurus (no. 348) (Hdt. 7.99.2–3). Kos (no. 497) may have controlled the island of Nisyros c.500 (Hdt. 7.99 with Hicks in Paton and Hicks (1891) p. xii); but if so, Nisyros was independent by c.478 (see infra). Two ships from Nisyros fought under Artemisia’s command at Salamis (Hdt. 7.99.2).

Nisyros was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionian district (IG1 p. 269.1.8), but in 429/8 to the island district (IG1 p. 282.11.20) and is recorded in the tribute lists from 452/1 (IG1 p. 261.11.4) to 428/7 (IG1 p. 283.11.30) a total of
nine times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 1 tal. 3,000 dr. (IG i2 261.iv.4), reduced to 1 tal. in or before 442/1 (IG i2 270.19). After the end of the Peloponnesian War Nisyros fell under Spartan authority, for in 394 Diodorus mentions the island among the states brought by Pharabolos and Konon to revolt (14.83.3). Throughout C4 Nisyros was independent (see Papachristodoulou (1989) 47).

The protective deity, appropriately for a volcanic island (see Buchholz and Althaus (1982) 17–18, 21–22), was probably Poseidon (see the coins; Ashton (1999a) 23 with (1999b) for the Knidian comparanda); in a Hellenistic inscription he bears the epithet Argeios (IG xii.3 103.13 = Syll. III 673). Strabo mentions a sanctuary of Poseidon (Strabo 10.5.16).

A remarkable law of C4s, inscribed on the outside of the city wall, declares that land lying 5 feet from the wall is public land (δαμόστων χαρίων) (IG xi.3 86 = Syll. III 936 = Maier (1959–61 no. 47)). The remains of the wall date to the earliest from after the earthquake of 413 (Buchholtz and Althaus (1982) 15–16; see Bean and Cook (1957) 118–19); it has been suggested to have been put up as part of Mausolos' strategy of fortifying sites under his control (Bean and Cook (1957) 142; Hornblower (1982) 331–32; Sherwin-White (1978) 70 n. 212 is sceptical). The wall enclosed an area of 10 ha (Hoepfner (1999) 134–35). A harbour is attested at Ps.-Skylax 99.

In C4 Nisyros struck coins in silver and bronze. (1) Silver drachms (only one genuine example known), which should probably be dated to C4m/e (Ashton (1999a) 23; (1999c)). Types: obv. head of Aphrodite; rev. Poseidon seated with trident; legend: ΝΙΣΥΡΙΟΝ. (2) Bronze. Types: obv. head of Helios, or Aphrodite, or unidentified female head; rev. Aphrodite with rose, or dolphin, or grapes, or eagle, or cow or bull, or dolphin and trident; legend: ΝΙ or ΝΙΣΥ (Head, HN² 635; SNG Cop. Caria 706–8, but 709 is not of Nisyros: see Ashton (1999a) 15–16).

509. Paros (Parios) Map 61. Lat. 37.05, long. 25.10. Size of territory: 3 (196 km²). Type: A. The toponym is Πάρος, † (Archil. fr. 89.22; Hymn. Hom. Ap. 44; Aesch. Pers. 884), denoting both the island (Hdt. 5.31.2) and the town (Ps.-Skylax 58). The city-ethnic is Πάροιος (IG xi.5 216 (C61); Thuc. 4.104.4; Pl. Ap. 20A–B). Paros is called a polis both in the urban sense (Hdt. 6.134.2; Isoc. 19.19; Ephor. fr. 63; Matthaiou and Kouragios (1992–98) 438–40 (C4s)) and in the political sense (IG xi.5 110.6, 111.6 (both C4e); Matthaiou (1992–98b) 430–31 no.3 (both C4m); Archil. fr. 13.2). The territorial sense is possibly attested in Archil. fr. 204. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in inscriptions (IG xi.5 110.6, 111.6 (both C4e)) and in abbreviated form on coins (infra), and externally in inscriptions (SEG 27 249 (C6l/C5e); IG i2 263.iv.24; LDelos 98B.5 (377/6)) and in literary sources (Hdt. 6.133.1–2; Pl. Menex. 245B). For the individual and external use, see Hdt. 1.12.2: Ἀρχιλόχος ὁ Πάρος; Lazzarini (1976) no. 304 (C6m); Syll. III 161; Arist. Pol. 1258b 40. Patris is found in Hdt. 6.335.2.

Strabo, citing Artemidoros, places Paros among the Kyklades (Strabo 10.5.3). Apart from the urban centre, Paros had many habitation sites in the Geometric and Archaic periods, and it remains unclear what relation they had to the main town centre of Archaic and later periods and to the formation of Paros as a unified polity. These settlements include (1) a fortified habitation site at Naoussa in the north-east quadrant of the island (Rubensohn (1901) 163–70, (1949) 1791; cf. also BCH 114 (1990) 818, not in Barr.); (2) an Archaic fortified site with a building identified by the excavator as a “temple” at Oikonomos (Schilardi (1973), (1975b) 93); (3) the Archaic “acropolis” at Koukounaries (Berranger (1992) 121; Reger (1997) 460), which has recently been claimed as a full-blown polis with Athena as its tutelary deity (Schilardi (1996)); (4) 'Υρίη (perhaps to be located at Marmara: Berranger (1992) 126; Rubensohn (1949) 1791, misprinted as Hydría in Barr.); (5) Myrsineai (IG xi.5 244) was perhaps a civic subdivision of the Archaic period (infra) and seems well fixed by modern Piskopiana (Rubensohn (1901) 175–76; Berranger (1992) 132); (6) at Dryos, recorded in Barr. conventionally as a settlement, perhaps of the Classical period, have been reported a tower and harbour fittings (Rubensohn (1901) 173–74, (1949) 1791). (7)–(8) We have from later periods names for a number of settlements on Paros; most of these are located only with some uncertainty, and none seems associated clearly with any of the settlements known archaeologically. They include Μάρπησα (Steph. Byz. 434.6; Rubensohn (1901) 158), and Τεμένεων (IG xi.5 116 (C4)), both unlocated.

Paros was said to have been colonised by Arkadia, with Paros as the oecist (Hercl. Lemb. fr. 25, from the Aristotelian Constitution of the Parians). The Athenians call the Parians their apoikoi in 373/2 (SEG 31 67.6).

From a study of the fragments of the poetry of Archilochos, Lanzillotta has concluded that Paros was ruled by an aristocracy controlled by a few families in the Archaic period (Lanzillotta (1987) 58–61; see also Berranger (1992) 328–31). It may be doubted that Paros was actually under the control of Naxos (no. 507) in 499 (as at Hdt. 5.31.2; cf. Lanzillotta (1987) 105–6). During the Archaic period the
Parions and the Naxians fought a series of wars which imply naval and land forces (cf. Berranger (1992) 205–7). It is in this context that a Milesian ambassador is said to have been rescued from a shipwreck by a dolphin (IG xi 1.5 445.10-19). C. 655–650 the Parions participated in arbitrating a dispute between Chalkis (no. 365) and Andros (no. 475) over Akanthos (no. 559) (Plut. Mor. 298A–B; Piccirilli (1973) 7–11 no. 2). C. 525 the Milesians (no. 854) requested Parian “state-reformers” (καταρτιστῆρες) to settle an internal dispute (Hdt. 5.28–29). Paros was subdued by Persia during the reign of Dareios (Aesch. 44 dr. in, 468). After the battle of Salamis, Themistokles led another Athenian expedition against the Parions, who deterred him with a bribe (Hdt. 8.112). Soon thereafter they joined the Delian League (AT L iii. 190, 198). Paros belonged to the Island district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 450/49 (IG i 3 263.14-24) to 416/15 (IG i 3 289.1.24) a total of eleven times, four times completely restored, paying a phoros of 16 tal., 1,200 dr. in 450/49 (IG i 3 263.14-24), raised to 18 tal. in 446/5 (IG i 3 266.4-25). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i 3 71.1.62) (30 tal.). The nature of the regime for most of C5 is unknown (Berranger-Auserve (2000) 93), though there was an oligarchy in the polis in 410/9 ablished by Theramenes when, supporting the demos, he restored democracy and imposed heavy fines on the oligarchs (Diod. 13.47.8). Probably soon after 407 the Parions helped effect a reconciliation between the Thasians (no. 526) and the Neapolitans (no. 634) (IG xi 1.5 109 with Pouilloux (1954) 178–92; Piccirilli (1973) 144-49 no. 33; Berranger-Auserve (2000) 94–95); a bas-relief found at Delphi depicts the reconciliation (Moretti (1953)). In C4 e Paros came under the control of one Pasinos (Ios. 19.18), and for a few years Paros was probably a tyranny or a narrow oligarchy (Gehrke, Status 125); but democracy was soon reintroduced: Plato (Menex. 425B) speaks of the Athenians fighting “on behalf of the Parions” after the reconstruction of the long walls, probably c.393; and shortly afterwards the Parions borrowed money from Apollo of Delos under the amphiktyony created by the Athenians (e.g. I.Delos 97.13 = IG ii 2 1634 (391/0)). That the Parions thereafter had a democratic government along Athenian lines is suggested most recently by the discovery of part of a kleroterion of Athenian style on the island, though the machine cannot be dated more closely than C4–C2 (Müller (1998)). The Parions joined the Second Athenian Naval League in 377/6 (IG ii 2 43.A.89). An important inscription of 373/2, a rare example of a decision of the synedrion of the League, has recently been interpreted as an effort by the League, through the appointment of diallagai, to resolve bitter internal political factionalism among the Parions (SEG 31 67 with now Dreher (1995) 109–54; cf. also Matthaiou (1992–98b) 435 n. 24). A Parian–Thasian sympo- liteia should not be inferred, as some have, from the singular of demos in the phrase περὶ τοῦ δῆμου[v] τού[µ]ν [πίοιον καὶ Θασίων in an inscription of roughly 350–330 (IG xi 1.5 114.10–12 with p. 308 and IG xi suppl. p. 105; L. Robert (1935) 313, (1960b) 525 n. 3; contra Berranger (1992) 311–12; on IG xi suppl. 412 = SEG I 416 (C6), see now Pouilloux (1989) and N. Ehrhardt (1987), non vidi; the objections of Juri Vinogradov, BE (1990) 499, have much less force after the work of the Polis Centre). The Parions awarded the Athenian boule a crown in 348/7 (IG ii 3 144.1.5–7). The Parions received 10,000 medimnoi of grain from Kyrene (no. 1028) c.330 (SEG 9 2.29 = Tod 196; cf. Marasco (1992)).

The Aristotelian collection of politeiai included a Constitution of the Parions (Herac. Lemb. 25). In C4 decrees were passed by the boule and the demos. They were published by the pryta nies (IG xi 1.5 110.10) or the grammates (IG xi 1.5 118.5) at the expense of a tamias (Matthaiou (1992–98b) 430-31 no. 3,10, 24). The eponymous official was the archon (IG xi 1.5 112.6–7 = Migeotte (1984) 213–15 no. 61 (C4)) from no later than the lifetime of Archilochos (IG xi 1.5 445.8–9). Other attested officials are theoerai and neokoros (IG xi 1.5 108 = LSCG 205–6 no. 111 (C5)), theo-propoi (Hdt. 6.135.2) and a hypostrategos (IG xi 1.5 1019A (C4–C5)), although we must wait till C3 to hear of the strategoi themselves, here of course a political, not military, office (IG xi 1.5 220). Archilochos does mention, however, a military strategos in C7 (Archil. fr. 114.1; cf. 95.1). Parian envoys to Athens (no. 361) are mentioned in the Naval Synedrion’s decree of 372 (SEG 31 67.13–14). Paros granted proxenia to citizens of Chios (no. 840) (IG xi 1.5 110–11 (C4e)) and Athens (IG xi 1.5 114 + p. 308; SEG 48 1135 (all C4m)) and Parions received proxenia from Anaphe (no. 474) (IG xi 1.3 251.15–17 (C4)).

Several Parion public enactments are preserved on inscriptions. They include a law of 475–450 forbidding throwing rubbish in a public road (IG xi 1.5 107 = LSCG 202–3 no. 108; Koerner (1993) 215–17 no. 57 and SEG 45 1142 for the date), a law of C5 forbidding cutting something, perhaps sacred trees (IG xi 1.5 108 = LSCG 205–6 no. 111;
In an inscription of the Roman period mentioned above, Zeus is attested. In Greek, Zeus is a god of many aspects, possibly named after one of his epithets. This allows interpretation in different ways, and it is possible to see multiple aspects of Zeus in various inscriptions.

The protective deity was Athena Poliouchos (IG xii.5 134.17 (C_4–C_3); the restoration of her epitaph at 1029.5 is very likely because of the stoicheion arrangement, but cf. Berranger (1992) 72–73, 187), who helped the Parians in C7 in battle (Archil. fr. 94). Temple A (c.530–520) on the Parian acropolis, where cult is attested from C7, may be hers (Gruben (1982b) 221, 229; Rubensohn (1949) 184; reservations: Berranger (1992) 71–73). Athena is also Kynthie (IG xii.5 210; cf. Berranger (1992) 266–67 no. 4, with a date of 525–500) and Pontie (SEG 28 707 (C_4)). Demeter was worshiped from C7 on Paros (Hymn. Hom. Dem. 491; see also Archil. fr. 169 and 322) and her Thesmophorion, still unlocated (Berranger (1992) 85–90), played an important role in a story in Herodotos (6.134.2); her priests seem to have been called Kαβαρρωι (Hsch. K8, but see Hemberg (1950) 171–72). Zeus is attested under multiple epithets: Aigiochos (IG xii.5 215.6 (C_5e); Berranger (1992) 267–69 no. 6), Elasteros (IG xii.5 1027 (C_50)), as restored by Berranger (1992) 278–80 no. 13; IG xii suppl. 208; BE (1963) 199; Matthaiou (1992–98) 424–26 no. 1 (an altar with inscription dated to C61) and 426–30 nos. 2–3 (which may be horoi of his sanctuary, see also Matthaiou (1999)), Eleutherios (SEG 26 978 (C_5)), once probably also as Patrois (IG xii suppl. 208 (C_4), following Berranger (1992) 186). There is also a horoi of Hypatos of C5 which may be an epitaph of Zeus (IG xii.5 183 = LSCG 203 no. 109, with Berranger (1992) 185). This inscription comes from Mount Kounados, where Zeus had a sanctuary that may be quite ancient. Apollo’s cult was widespread with multiple epithets: Hekebolos (IG xii.5 148 (C_57); the deity is restored on the basis of the epiteth); Delios (Hymn. Hom. Ap. 44; IG xii.5 214 (C_4), a horoi; five further examples in BE (1964) 341, and with Artemis and Leto as the Delian triad in C5 (Matthaiou and Kouragios (1992–98) 438 no. 2), Pythios (IG xii.5 134.8 + add. p. 309), whose Pythion was the archive for public documents (IG xii.5 110.9–11 (C_4)); it is uncertain whether the Pythion is to be identified with the temple, surely Apollo’s, located outside the city walls on a terrace above the Asklepieion and in use from C7 but reconstructed in C4f (Schuller (1982b) 245–46, 262–64; Berranger (1992) 97–103 for the doubts). Artemis appears without epithet and as Delios (IG xii.5 216 (C_5), 211 (C_4)), and there is evidence for the cult of Hermes (Ἀμαξείτης, Ergon (1960) 184). Aphrodite (Matthaiou and Kouragios (1992–98) 437–38 no. 1 (C_4f)), and Ge, although her cult may have been private rather than official (Despinis (1979) 228–29 (C_4m)). Worship of the Charites, attested in C2 (IG xii suppl. 206), would seem to go back much earlier (Apollo. Bibli. 3.15.7). Heracles, who had important mythological connections with Paros (Apollod. Bibli. 2.5.9.3–6), is mentioned as Kallinikos by Archilochos (fr. 324.1). Dionysos appears in a catalogue (IG xii.5 134.9). Asklepios (IG xii.5 119 (C_4), name not wholly clear) had a sanctuary outside the city, probably begun around C4f (Berranger (1992) 104–5; Semeria (1986) 953). Hestia’s cult, attested by an inscription of c.525–500 (IG xii.5 238 with Gruben (1982a) 673), was practiced in a building that has been identified as a prytaion (Gruben (1982a) 673).

The Parians consulted oracles as a community with some frequency throughout their history; instances relating to Apollo at Delphi before 323 are recounted in a Hellenistic account of the founding of Thasos (SEG 15 517.11.43–47, 50–52 with Anth. Pal. 14.113 and Berranger (1992) 178–80), in Herodotos (6.135.2–3) and in Diodorus (15,13.4, before founding the colony at Pharos, after 385; cf. Fontenrose (1978) 248–49 H14).

The polis centre was walled from perhaps as early as C7, but certainly in C6; the wall encompassed the hill that served as the Parian acropolis, and much of its course has now been traced. It enclosed an area of c.50 ha (Berranger (1992) 62–65; Schilardi (1975a) 197–203 with 198 fig. 1). More sections continue to be discovered (see Zapehiroupolou (1987) 490–91, (1990) 403, (1992) 541). Some additional archaeological finds in the polis centre are discussed in Kouragios.
(1996). The wall is mentioned in literary sources (Hdt. 6.133.2 (rC6½l); Ephor. fr. 63 (1489)). A C₄₅ _horos_ inscribed ὀρος πάλης was presumably set up to mark the line between the town (polis) and its hinterland (Hansen (1996) 37 with nn. 148 and 149) and/or between the town and its harbour (Gauthier in BE (1999) 420); for a different interpretation, see Matthaiou (1982–98b) 44–47. Paros had two harbours, one of which is described as closed (κλειστός, Ps.-Skylax 58). For remains of the harbour, see Berranger (1992) 57–58.

A _pyrтaneion_, mentioned in 207/6 (I.Magnesia 50.67–68), may have existed as early as C₅ and was rebuilt in C₄₅ (Gruben (1982a) 676–83; see IG xii.5.281.3 (undated)). Probable remains of a _bouleuterion_ of C₄ have been identified (Berranger-Auserve (2000) 101). Sanctuaries and cult sites include perhaps one of Poseidon up by Kargadousa (Rubensohn (1949) 1854; Schilardi (1975b) 95 (C₅ or C₄); Berranger (1992) 123)), sites of Eileithyaia, Zeus Hypatos, and perhaps Aphrodite (C₆–C₄) (Berranger (1992) 82–85), which may be identical with the sanctuary reported on Kounados hill (Rubensohn (1901) 181, 215) of C₆ or earlier date (Ohnesorg (1994); Hübner (1994)); Kore had a sanctuary in C₅ (IG xii.5.225 = LSCG 205 no. 110, with Berranger (1992) 93–95), but whether this should be identified with Temple B on the Parian acropolis (as Gruben (1982a) 174–79) is uncertain (Berranger (1992) 241); Apollo Delios was worshipped at the famous Delos a few kilometres north of town on a hill called Kynthia (Rubensohn (1962); cf. Schuller (1982a); Berranger (1992) 81–82; for a _horos_, see IG xii.5.214 (C₄)), which included a temple of Artemis (Schuller (1991)); a sanctuary of Apollo (possibly the Python, but see Berranger (1992) 97–103) and an Asklepieion were located on a hill east of town that may also house the Thesmophorion (Berranger (1992) 90–105), which was in any case outside the city walls (Hdt. 6.134.2), and another sanctuary for Demeter Karpophoros based on a dedication (Schilardi (1977) 376–77). Finally, there was the famous sanctuary of Archilochos, the Archilocheon, built about 350, where his poetry and a biography were inscribed and whose location is still a matter for uncertainty (though it is probably at Elitas, as often suggested: Ohnesorg (1982); cf. Berranger (1992) 108–12). Further from the central _polis_, a temple of Athena has been discovered at Koukounaries dating from c.700 into C₄ (Schilardi (1996) 42–53). Evidence of several temples of Archaic or Classical date has come to light near the bay of Marmara; that at least one sanctuary existed there is proved by an inscription of Classical date (IG xii.5.256; cf. Schnieringer (1982) and Berranger (1992) 125–29).

Paros struck silver coins on the Aiginetan standard from c.525. The earliest are staters. Types: _obv._ kneeling goat facing left accompanied by a fish/dolphin, or goat looking right, or goat within circle of pearls, or goat turning left, or leaping goat; _rev._ incuse square sometimes with star. These continued into C₅e, with the addition of two goats butting heads to the reverse types. c.510–480, drachems were struck. Types: _obv._ goat looking right, with or without a circle of pearls; legend on some: ΠΑ or ΠΑΠΙ; _rev._ incuse square, or goat looking back (Berranger (1992) 283–89). An epigram of Simonides (C6σ–C5f) refers to a statue of Artemis costing 200 Parian dr. (Simon. fr. 114, Diehl, from Diog. Laert. 4.45). Coinage was resumed in 357 on the Rhodian standard (after 338 according to Berranger-Auserve (2000) 109–10). Denominations: tetradrachms, didrachms, drachems. Silver types: _obv._ goat; legend on some: ΠΑΠ; _rev._ ear of grain, or wreaths of grain: legend: ΠΑ or ΠΑΠΙ or ΠΑΠΙΩΝ. Bronze types: _obv._ goat facing right or left, or female head (possibly Demeter); _rev._ ear of grain, or goat (Head, HN² 489; SNG Cop. Aegean Islands 715–20; Berranger (1992) 283–89; Sheedy (1996)).

The Parians colonised Parion (no. 756) in Asia Minor c.700 with the Milesians (no. 854) and the Erythrians (no. 845) (Strabo 13.1.14; Euseb. Chron. 2, 18th Olymp. 1; Berranger (1992) 168–69), and Thasos (no. 526) c.710–680 under the oecist Telesikes, the poet Archilochos’ father (Thuc. 4.104.4; Strabo 10.5.7 (487); Steph. Byz. 306.20–307.2; Berranger (1992) 170–84, esp. 176–78 on the date of 680 inferred from IG xii.5.444.48–49 (FGrHist 239); for Herakles’ mythological role, see Apollod. Bibl. 2.5.9.13). One thousand men are said to have been dispatched (IG xii.1.5 445.IV.22, quoting Archil. fr. 97). Continued close political relations between Paros and its colony Thasos are attested in an epigram of C6 in which a certain Akeratos boasts that he (alone) had held high office in both _poleis_ (IG xii suppl. 412; CEG 1 416; see Graham (1983) 74–76). It is possible that the Parians were involved in C6e or C5s in Eion (no. 630) (Lazaridis (1976); Berranger (1992) 169–70). At some time, but possibly later (the date remains very uncertain), Paros may have tried to found a colony at Anchiale in the Adriatic (Steph. Byz. 24.13; Berranger (1992) 162–64). Pharos (no. 84), originally called Paros (so Strabo 7.5.5), followed in 385/4 (Steph. Byz. 659.7, from Ephor. fr. 89; Diod. 15.4; Parke and Wormell (1956) 2.76 no. 177, 164, no. 429; L. Robert (1935); see also (1960b)).

Oliaros (Ὁλιάρος; Ps.-Skylax 48; Strabo 10.5.3) and Prepeinsithos (Πρεπείσινθος; Strabo 10.5.3), the two small islands west of Paros (Map 60, inset), have been suggested,
reasonably, as dependencies of Paros (Lanzillotta (1987) 190; Sherk (1990) 278). Steph. Byz. 708.s–12 reports that Oliaros was a colony (αποκίκια) of the Sidonians. IG XI.1.5 471 is from Siphnos, not Oliaros (cf. IG XI suppl. p. 111; SEG 33 680).

**Peparethos (Peparethos)** Map 55. Lat. 39.05, long. 23.45. Size of territory: 2 (97 km²). The toponym is Πεπαρήθιος, ἦ (Hymn. Hom. Ap. 32; Dem. 18.70), denoting both the island (Soph. Phil. 548–49) and one of the towns (Dem. 35.35; Steph. Byz. 516.23–24). The city-ethnic is Πεπαρήθιοι (IG ii² 270.111.10; Anaximenes (FGrHist 72) fr. 41 = Dem. 12.12). In the so-called Charter of the Second Athenian Naval League, Peparethos is listed under the heading polis (IG i³ 43.A.78 and 85). Peparethos is called a polis in the urban sense by Dem. 35.35 and in Ps.-Skylax 58, where the island is described as τρίπολος καὶ λιμένιν (cf. Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 156). The principal polis was Peparethos; the names of the other two poleis were Panormos (Diod. 15.95.2; Polyena. Strat. 6.2.) and Seleinous (IG ii.8 661.3). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form on coins (infra) and externally in inscriptions (CEG 1 325.2 = Ep. Delphi 111.4 179 (480/791)) and in literary sources (PL. Alc. 116D). For the individual and external use, see the Athenian naval list of C5I (IG i³ 1033.85–86).

Peparethos is listed among the Kyklades by Ps.-Skylax (58) and Diodorus (15.30.5, 95.1), whereas the island is described by Strabo at 9.5.16 as one of the islands off Magnesia, and at 2.5.21 it is classed with the islands lying off Greece as far as Makedonia and Thrace. According to Ps.-Skynmos 580 and 586, Peparethos was colonised by the Chalkidians from Euboea.

Fighting on the Greek side in the Persian War, the Peparethians captured two Karian ships at Salamis and dedicated one tenth of the booty to Apollo at Delphi (CEG 1 325 = Ep. Delphi 111.4 179). The Peparethians were members of the Delian League. They belonged to the Thracian district (IG i³ 269.111.10) and are recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i³ 259.111.18) to 415/14 (IG i³ 290.111.7) a total of seventeen times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of 3 tal. (IG i³ 261.111.5). They were assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.111.169). Under Spartan hegemony from the end of the Peloponnesian War until Chabrias’ expedition in the Aegean in 377/6 (Diod. 15.30.5), the Peparethians joined the Second Athenian Naval League in the 370s (IG ii² 43.A.85). In 362/1 (Hansen (1975) 95) the island was attacked by forces of Alexander of Pherai, which besieged Peparethos town. The Athenians dispatched assistance, trapped Alexander’s forces in Panormos and laid siege to the town; he extracted them after a successful sea battle in which one Peparethian and five Athenian triremes were captured (Diod. 15.95.1–2; Polyena. Strat. 6.2.1; Dreher (1995) 29–30). C.342 the Peparethians conquered Halonnesos, which by then was garrisoned by the Makedonians, but Philip of Makedon deprived them soon after of the possession of this island, and in 340 he attacked and ravaged Peparethos (Dem. 12.12–15, 18.70 with schol. no. 128, Dilts). In, probably, 338 Peparethos was made subject to Makedonia (Strabo 9.5.16).

The only piece of evidence we have about the political institutions is a casual remark in Plato that one may advise the Peparethians, probably in their assembly (Alc. 116D).

We hear of two communal dedications at Delphi: one of booty from Salamis in 480 (supra = Jacquesmin (1999) 346 no. 387), the other a gold crown of laurels recorded probably by Theopomp. fr. 248 and so C4 or earlier.

Hagnon Peparethios was Olympic victor in 568 (Olympionikai 97).

The Peparethians struck mostly anepigraphic silver coins on the Euboic standard c.520–480. Denominations: tetradrachms, didrachms, tetrobols. Types: obv. single and triple grape clusters, or grape cluster with four dolphins; rev. incuse square with a winged running figure (“Agon” or “Boreas”, Balcer (1967) 29), or head of Herakles, or crested Corinthian helmet, or rosette, or dolphin rider in incuse square, or Dionysos or Staphyllos. The last bears on the obv. the legend ΠΕΠΑ. A new series, all bronze, starts after c.350. Types: obv. Dionysos, or Athena; rev. kantharos, or thrysos, or grapes; legend: ΠΕΠΑ or ΠΕΠΑ (Head, HN² 312–13; Balcer (1967), (1975); Kraay (1976) 119–20; Wartenberg (1998) 368–69; SNG Cop. Thessaly 359–60).

### 510. Panormos

**Map 55. Lat. 39.05, long. 23.40. Size of territory: 1. Type: A. The toponym is Πανορμοῦς, ὁ (Diod. 15.95.2). Panormos is implicitly referred to as a polis in the urban sense by the term τρίπολος at Ps.-Skylax 58. It is the second polis of the island, known best from Diodorus’ narrative of a siege by Alexander of Pherai in 361/0 (Diod. 15.95.1–2; Polyena. 6.2.1). The site was fortified in C4m (see Diod. 15.95.2; Fredrich (1906) 117–21, but see Scrantson (1941) 170). Panormos is best regarded as a dependent polis of Peparethos.**

### 511. Peparethos

**Map 55. Lat. 39.05, long. 23.45. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Πεπαρήθιος, ἦ (Dem. 18.70); The city-ethnic is Πεπαρήθιοι (IG i³ 270.111.10). The urban centre of Peparethos was walled by 426 and had a ptyrantion (Thuc. 3.89.4; S. G. Miller (1978) nos. 384–86). A sanctuary of C4m dedicated to Asklepios lay about 1 km east of the modern town (Liagkouras (1962)). Six other...**
possible sanctuary sites have been identified, including two—a above the main town and at Panaghia Polemistria (Frediich (1906b) 115–16, 117)—that may have belonged to Athena Polias, who served as the protective deity (Herbst (1937) 556). Another of these sites, which includes a terrace with polygonal blocks, may date to C5 (Frediich (1906b) 127).

512. Seleinous Map 55. Lat. 39.10, long 23.40. Size of territory: 1. Type: A. No toponym is attested. The city-ethnic is Σελεινούσιος (IG vii.8 661 (Roman Imperial)). Seleinous is implicitly referred to as a polis in the urban sense by the term τρίπολις at Ps.-Skylax 58. The only explicit testimony for Seleinous as a polis is an inscription of Roman imperial date, at which time the island was under Athenian control (IG xii.8 661.3). It has been identified as a polis from C4 mainly because Ps.-Skylax says that Peparethos was triporate, and it is the only other known candidate. But city walls are preserved at Seleinous that have been dated to C4, and a temple has been reported (Frediich (1906b) 122–23; see Scranton (1941) 168 on the walls). Seleinous is best regarded as a dependent polis of Peparethos.

513. Pholegandros (Pholegandrios) Map 60 (inset). Lat. 36.40, long. 24.55. Size of territory: 2 (32 km$^2$). Type: B. The toponym is Φολέγανδρος, η (IG i³ 71.1.87; Strabo 10.5.1) or Φολέγανδρος (F.Delphes iii.1 497.15 (C4/C3e)). The city-ethnic is Φολέγανδρος (IG xii.5 9 (C4)); Solon fr. 2.1; Hsch. F 761). Pholegandros is not called a polis in any source, but deserves inclusion as being probably a polis because (1) Solon (fr. 2) mentions the possibility that, changing his patriis, he might become a Pholegandrioi or a Sikinites instead of an Athenaios; (2) because the island was a paying member of the Delian League (infra); and (3) because we possess a C4 proxeny decree passed by the Pholegandrioi; for the date, see Brun (1996) 299. The collective form of the city-ethnic appears internally in the proxeny decree (IG xii.5 9.15) and externally in the Solonian poem (fr. 2).

Steph. Byz. 669.17 assigns the island to the Sporades. Pholegandros was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Island district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 451/0 (IG i³ 261.1.22) to 416/15 (IG i³ 289.1.14) a total of eleven times, three times completely restored, paying a phoros of 1,000 dr. in 451/0, reduced to 300 dr. in 450/49 (IG i³ 263.4v.29), but raised to 500 dr. in or before 416/15 (IG i³ 289.1.14). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.1.82) for 1,000 dr.

The preserved fragments of Hyppereides’ speech entitled Deliakos logos (fr. xii, Sauppe) testify to a lawsuit c. 344/3 (Dem. 18.134) between the Rheneians and the Delians (no. 478) over responsibility for the death of Aiolian visitors to Delos whose bodies were found on Rheneia. It appears from the fragments that Rheneia did not even possess a harbour (limen) and that the distance from the landing-place facing Delos to the urban centre was 30 stadia (fr. 74). Much of the southern half of the island was under Delian control, whether as cemeteries for Delos or as estates belonging to Apollo (see supra 740). When Delos was purified in 426/5, all remains from the tombs were removed, presumably to Rheneia (Thuc. 3.104.2). Excavations at the urban centre of Rheneia, located on the west coast of the northern half of the island, revealed the remains of an undated temple of Herakles (Charre and Couilloud-Le Dinahet (1999) 135 n. 3).

514. Rheneia (Rheneiaus, Rheneus) Map 61. Lat. 37.25, long. 25.15. Size of territory: 1 (14 km$^2$). Type: A. 'Ρηνεία, ἡ (Thuc. 3.104.2; Hyp. fr. 74, Sauppe; IG i³ 402.11, 1460.20) or 'Ρηναία, ἡ (Hymn. Hom. Ap. 44 Hdt. 6.97.1; Strabo 10.5.5) or 'Ρηνίς, ἡ (Ps.-Skylax 58; Steph. Byz. 544.17). The toponym denotes both the island (Thuc. 3.194.2) and the city (Hyp. fr. 74). The city-ethnic is Ρηναιεύς (IG i³ 1636 A.4 (C4m)) or Ρηνεύς (Hyp. fr. 74). In Hyppereides’ Delian speech Rheneia is called a polis both in the urban and in the political sense (Hyp. fr. 74). The collective form of the city-ethnic is attest- ed externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i³ 262.1.22) and in Hyppereides’ Delian speech (fr. 74). The individual and external form is attested in inscriptions (I.Delos 104–3.4. A (CaJ); IG i³ 1636 A.4 (C4m)).

Rheneia is listed among the Kyklades in Ps.-Skylax 58, but Strabo does not mention it in his list (10.5.3). In C6s Rheneia was conquered by Polykrates of Samos, who dedicated the island to Apollo (Thuc. 1.13.6, 3.104.2). Rheneia was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Island district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 451/0 (IG i³ 261.1.22) to 416/15 (IG i³ 289.1.14) a total of eleven times, three times completely restored, paying a phoros of 1,000 dr. in 451/0, reduced to 300 dr. in 450/49 (IG i³ 263.4v.29), but raised to 500 dr. in or before 416/15 (IG i³ 289.1.14). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.1.82) for 1,000 dr.

The preserved fragments of Hyppereides’ speech entitled Deliakos logos (fr. xii, Sauppe) testify to a lawsuit c. 344/3 (Dem. 18.134) between the Rheneians and the Delians (no. 478) over responsibility for the death of Aiolian visitors to Delos whose bodies were found on Rheneia. It appears from the fragments that Rheneia did not even possess a harbour (limen) and that the distance from the landing-place facing Delos to the urban centre was 30 stadia (fr. 74). Much of the southern half of the island was under Delian control, whether as cemeteries for Delos or as estates belonging to Apollo (see supra 740). When Delos was purified in 426/5, all remains from the tombs were removed, presumably to Rheneia (Thuc. 3.104.2). Excavations at the urban centre of Rheneia, located on the west coast of the northern half of the island, revealed the remains of an undated temple of Herakles (Charre and Couilloud-Le Dinahet (1999) 135 n. 3).

515. Samothrace (Samothrax) Map 57. Lat. 40.30, long. 25.35. Size of territory: 3 (178 km$^2$). Type: A. The toponym is Σαμοθράκη, ἡ (Ar. Pux 277; Xen. Hell. 5.1.7), in the Ionian
dialect Σαµοθράκη (Hdt. 2.51.3), denoting both the island (Hdt. 2.51.3) and the town (Ps.-Skylax 67, Klausen). An alternative, allegedly earlier toponym is Λευκανία, ἡ (Arist. fr. 596–97). The city-ethnic is Σαµοθράκη (IG i³ 259.111.13; Herzog (1899) 17–21 no. 6.1 (C3); Ι.Μινδούς II 93b.5 (C3s)). Samothrace is called a polis in the political sense in an inscription of C4m or 350–325 (Fraser (1960) 21 no. 1.3–4), and is explicitly called a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 67. The MS has Σαµοθράκη κατα τοιάς και λιμήν. Klausen restores Σαµοθράκη κατα τοιάς και λιμήν, which seems to be a much more convincing restoration than κατα τοιάς Σαµοθράκη νήσος και λιμήν preferred in GGm by Müller following Voss (for κατα τοιάς και λιμήν, see Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 142). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in the C4 proryn decree (Fraser (1960) 21 no. 1.3–4, convincingly restored) and on coins of C5f (infra), and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i³ 263.111.25) and in literature (Hdt. 2.51.2–3; PCC, Adespota fr. 1063.15). For the individual and external use, see the Athenian naval list of C5f (IG i³ 1032.v1.84, as restored in IG112 1951).

Ps.-Skylax 67 places Samothrace in Thrace, and Strabo classes Samothrace with the islands lying off Greece as far as Makedonia and Thrace (2.5.21). Accounts of the colonisation of the island found in Classical sources derive from a combination of the toponyms Samos and Thrace, whether because Samothrace was settled by exiles from Samos (no. 864) and was near Thrace (Ant. fr. 1.1, Gernet; Paus. 7.4.3; Strabo 10.2.17 commenting on Hom. Il. 13.13) or because the island was settled first by Thracians and then by Samians (HeracL. Emb. 49; schol. Hom. Il. 24.78, both derived from Aristotle; Diod. 5.48.1); these Samians are said to have been expelled by a tyrant (HeracL. Emb. 49, derived from Aristotle; Suda Σεριż (citing Antiphon)); for a collection of all sources, see Graham (2002) 232–39. Herodotus reports that the Pelasgians who fled Athens settled there (2.51). A recent review of all the evidence places the arrival of Greeks from Samos in C6f (Graham (2002); for a date of 700 from the archaeological record, see Lazarides (1971) 18).

The Samothracians came under Persian domination in C5e, and at least one Samothran ship participated in the battle of Salamis on the Persian side (Hdt. 8.90.2). Samothrace was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district (IG i³ 272.11.63) and is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i³ 259.111.13) to 429/8 (IG i³ 282.11.31) a total of twenty-one times, three times completely restored, paying a phoros of 6 tal. (IG i³ 259.111.13), reduced to 2 tal. in 430/29 (IG i³ 281.11.16). It was presumably assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.111.158 (15 tal.), completely restored). Antiphon delivered a speech On the Tribute of the Samothrakians (fr. 1, Gernet), which should be associated either with the reduction in tribute in 430/29 (see Lazaridis (1971) 20) or with the new assessment of 425/4 (Gernet’s preface 161). In 404/3 the island fell under the control of the Spartans (anecdote in Plut. Mor. 229D), but in 389/8 the Athenians recovered the island (Xen. Hell. 5.1.7), and in the 370s the Samothracians joined the Second Athenian Naval League (IG ii² 43.B.8). By C5e at the latest, Samothrace controlled a peraia on the Thracian mainland opposite (Hdt. 7.59.2, 108.2) comprising the poleis of Drys (no. 644) (Ps.-Skylax 67), Masambrie (no. 647) (Hdt. 7.108.2), Sale (no. 649) (Hdt. 7.59.2 and Zone (no. 651) (Hdt. 7.59.2; Ps.-Skylax 67) and a fortification called Charakoma (Strabo 7 fr. 47, infra 871). They lost their peraia by 422/1; it was recovered after the end of the Peloponnesian War, then lost again in C4m (Gschntzer (1958) 32–34; IG x11.8 p. 40).

The Aristotelian collection of politeiai included a Constitution of the Samothrakians (frir. 596–97; HeracL. Emb. 49). But almost all the information we have about political institutions is Hellenistic or later. The only preserved public enactment of the Classical period is a grant of prozenia to a citizen of an unknown polis (Fraser (1960) 21 no. 1.6 (c.350–325)), and in 345/4 the Samothracians offered a series of crowns to Athens (no. 361) (IG ii² 1443.11.108–14). Diod. 5.48.1 reports a system of five phyiai; the reference is to primordial times, but the myth may be aetiological (Jones, POAG 186).

The protective deity appears to have been Athena (see Lehmann-Hartleben (1939) 144), whose sanctuary served as the civic archive, at least in the Hellenistic period (IG xi1.8 153.10–11 (C3)). But Samothrace was most famous for its great sanctuary of the Kabeiroi; earliest cult activity at the site has been dated to C7 or earlier, and building began in C6, with considerable elaboration in C4 (Hdt. 2.51.2–3; cf. Strabo 10.3.19–21; Hemberg (1950) 49–131; Lehmann (1969) 2.51–70; Lehmann and Spittle (1982) 269; Cole (1984) 10–20; for a collection of literary sources, see N. Lewis (1958) 63–112; for a synoptic overview of what we know of the cult, which included mysteries, see Burkert (1993)). The round building on Samothrace in the sanctuary, dated to 280–281 and sometimes regarded as a bouleuterion, is actually a cult structure (Gneisz (1990) 350–51 no. 58). Aphrodite and Potheos were worshipped within the sanctuary of the Great Gods (Lehmann and Spittle (1982) 1.277–89). A sanctuary to Artemis is reported to have been founded before the arrival of the Greek colonists (BCH 118 (1994) 779).
The urban centre was walled from C7–C6 (Scranton (1941) 31–33, 154; Lazaridis (1971) 19). The preserved walls of, probably, C6, with later repairs, enclose an area of c. 20 ha (H. Ehrhardt (1985) 25–30). Otherwise very little seems to have been published about the urban centre, as archaeological work has concentrated on the sanctuary. A harbour is recorded at Ps.-Skylax 67.


516. *Saros (Sarios) Map 60 (inset). Lat. 35.55, long. 27.15. Size of territory: 1 (23 km²). Type: B. No toponym is attested (Susini (1963–64) 245) but one is inferred from the ethnic Σάρος (IG i² 283, 111.21, 290.1.4). The Sarii were members of the Delian League and are recorded twice in the tribute lists, in 428/7 paying a phoros of 300 dr. (IG i² 283, 111.21) and in 415/4 paying a phoros of 200 dr. (IG i² 290.1.4). The Sarii are absent from the full panel of 441/0 (IG i² 271.1–11.64–86). Mattingly ((1996) 77 n. 27) has suggested that Saros may have been brought under Athenian control by Lysikles in 426.

A private dedication “to all gods”, is known from C4e (IG xii.1 1040; Susini (1963–64) 246 for date). It has been suggested that a village on Saros called τὸ Ἀργος must have had a Classical origin (Susini (1963–64) 244; cf. Hiller von Gaertringen (1892) 309; I.Lindos p. 1013), but no ancient remains have been found there (Hope Simpson and Lazenby (1962) 168).

It has sometimes been argued that Saros was one of the entities included under Karpathos (Papachristodoulou (1989) 45), but this seems unlikely. Karpathos had three poleis according to Ps.-Skylax, and all are accounted for by written and archaeological evidence placing them on the island. Strabo alone (10.5.17) attributes four poleis to the island of Karpathos, but to accept his view as attesting to Saros as a fourth polis requires identifying his Nisyros as Saros (so Dawkins (1902–3) 204, followed by Bürchner (1919) 2003), or supposing that Saros had two poleis (as pointed out by Susini (1963–64) 245; see also Fraser and Bean (1954) 141–42). This is convoluted, and it is easier and better simply to see Strabo's four as an error (Reger (1997) 453 and supra 745). It is just possible that Saros could have been part of Brykous (no. 487), for the two are never listed together in ATL. If so, they will have been separated later, when Karpathos and Saros were incorporated into the Rhodian state, for both Σάρος and Βρυκούντιος appear as demotics (IG xii.1 1010–1011, 220–23, etc.). However, the evidence of the tribute lists is fragmentary and inconclusive. While certainty in this matter is perhaps impossible, it seems simplest to suppose that Saros was in fact a separate entity in C3 and C4.

517. Seriphos (Seriphios) Map 60 (inset). Lat. 37.10, long. 24.30. Size of territory: 2 (75 km²). Type: A. The toponym is Σέριψος, Ἰ (Catinus, PCG fr. 225; Isoc. 19.9; SEG 36 331.A.11 (323/2)), denoting both the island (Pind. Pyth. 12.12) and the town (Ps.-Skylax 58). The city-ethnic is Σερίψος (IG i³ 262.1.20; Pl. Resp. 329E–330A). Seriphos is called a polis both in the urban sense (Ps.-Skylax 58) and in the political sense (Isoc. 19.9), and in the accounts of the Delian amphiktyynes the Seriphians are recorded under the heading αἵδε τῶν πόλεων (IDelos 98A.12 = IG i ii 1635 (377/6–375/4)). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form on C5 coins (Head, HN² 490) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i³ 262.1.20) and as the title of a comedy by Kratinos (Catinus, PCG frs. 218–32). For the individual and external use, see the Karthaian C4m list of proxeini, of whom at least one is a citizen of Seriphos (IG xii.1 5542.48), and Plato’s report of the exchange of words between Themistokles and an unnamed Seriphian (Pl. Resp. 329E; Plut. Them. 18.3).

Stephanos assigns the island to the Sporades, whereas Strabo 10.5.3, quoting Artemidoro, assigns it to the Kyklades. Seriphos was considered a small polis, and its almost proverbial insignificance is reflected in several sources (Pl. Resp. 329E–330A; Isoc. 19.9; Stob. Flor. 3.39.29); for the ancient (and modern) insignificance of Seriphos, see Brun (1993a).

Seriphos was allegedly colonised by Ionians from Athens (Hdt. 8.48). In 490 the Seriphians refused the Persian demand to surrender, and Seriphos fought on the Greek side in the Persian War, contributing one ship (Hdt. 8.46.4, 48). Seriphos was a member of the Delian League and probably among the original members (ATL iii. 198). It belonged to the Island district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 451/0 (IG i³ 262.1.20) to 416/5 (IG i³ 280.1.11) a total of fourteen times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 2 tal. in 451/0 (IG i³ 262.1.20) but 1 tal. in all subsequent years (IG i³ 264.iv.2). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.1.76) for 2 tal. Seriphos may have been a member of the
Second Athenian Naval League (I.Délos 98.A.12; Cargill (1981) 37; but see Dreher (1995) 24.1, 245–47). In C4S Seriphos had a theatrodokos to host theoroi from Nemea (SEG 36 331.A.11–13 (331/0–313)).

There are virtually no remains of the ancient town of Seriphos, which lay beneath modern Seriphos (cf. BCH 119 (1995) 998). The temenos of Perseus and altars of Diktys and Klymene which Pausanias says were erected by the Athenians (2.18.1) perhaps belong to C5.

Seriphos apparently minted staters in C6 on the Aginian standard with a frog on the obverse; see IGCH no. 4 and Erxleben (1970) 73.

518. Sikinos (Sikinetos) Map 60 (inset). Lat. 36.40, long. 25.05. Size of territory: 2 (43 km²). Type: A. The toponym is Σικινήτης, Ἡ (IG xii suppl. 177.6 (C4l); Strabo 10.5.1; Steph. Byz. 568.17), denoting both the island (Ap. Rhod. 1.624) and the town (Ps.-Sklaxy 48). The city-ethnic is Σικινήτης Ἡ (Solon fr. 2.1; IG ii 171.9.10). Sikinos is called a polis both in the urban sense (Ps.-Sklaxy 48) and in the political sense (IG xii 4.25.4; for the date, see Rhodes, DGS 289). Solon refers to it by implication as a patris (fr. 2.2). The collective use of the city-ethnic appears internally on C3 coins (Head, HN ii 491) and in a proxeny decree of C4l (IG xii suppl. 177.2.5) and externally in inscriptions (IG i3 287.1.16; IG ii 2 43.B.31) and in literature (Solon fr. 2.1).

Sikinos is usually placed among the Kyklades (Lauffer (1989) 614), but Steph. Byz. 568.17, citing Strabo (10.5.1), calls it “an island by Krete.” Apart from the urban centre at modern Ag. Marina, no other settlements are known.

Sikinos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Island district and is recorded in the tribute lists in 418/7 (IG i3 287.1.16; 417/6 (IG i3 288.1.6) and 416/15 (IG i3 289.1.17) paying a phoros of 500 dr. It is absent from the full panel of 441/0 (IG i3 271.1–111.89–101). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.1.90) for 1,000 dr. Sikinos joined the Second Athenian Naval League in the 370s (IG ii 2 43.B.31).

Sikinos was also described as a thea (IG xii suppl. 177 (C4l)) and to one of Paros (no. 509) (IG xi 115.24 (C4l/C3e)). Our only source for the political institutions is the proxeny decree for the Parian (IG xii 11.5.24). Decrees were passed by the boule and the demos (ll. 2–3; cf. ll. 12–13); they were published by a board of archontes (ll. 19–20) and set up in the sanctuary of Apollo Pythios (l. 18) at the expense of a board of praktores (l. 21).

For the urban centre, walls and an agora are mentioned (Lauffer (1989) 614–15), but the remains have not been studied carefully.

519. Siphnos (Siphnios) Map 60 (inset). Lat. 37.00, long. 24.45. Size of territory: 2 (74 km²). Type: A. The toponym is Σίφνος, Ἡ (Hdt. 3.58.1; Isoc. 19.7), denoting both the island (Theophr. Lap. 42) and the town (Hdt. 3.57.4; Ps.-Sklaxy 58). The city-ethnic is Σίφνος (Hdt. 3.57; IG iv 839.6 (C4)). Siphnos is called a polis both in the urban sense (Hdt. 3.58.1; Isoc. 19.39, 39–39) and in the political sense (Isoc. 19.10; IG iv 839.5–6 (C4)). The Siphnians are listed as one of the poleis providing ships for the Greek fleet at Salamis (Hdt. 8.42.1, 46.4, 48, 49.1). The territorial sense may be a connotation at Isoc. 19.20. In Siphnos was found a copy of the Athenian Coinage Decree (IG xi 5 480 = IG i3 1453E), to be set up in the agora of all the poleis of the Delian League (ll. 4–5).

Siphnos is called an asty at Hdt. 3.58.4. The collective use of the city-ethnic appears internally in abbreviated form on coins (infra) and externally in inscriptions (IG i3 263.14v.20; I.Délos 98.A.12 (377/6); Agora xv 50.10 (365–355)) and in literary sources (Hdt. 3.57.2, 8.46; Dem. 13.34). For the individual and external use, see IG xii 15.612.2 = CEG 1 410 (C6l); IG i3 1032.163 (405). Patris is found in Isoc. 19.7 and 23.

Strabo, quoting Artemidoros, lists Siphnos among the Kyklades (10.5.3; cf. Steph. Byz. 454.6). The Siphnian countryside is littered with towers (N. G. Ashton (1991)); the famous mines, which began to be exploited in C6, have been well studied (Wagner and Weisgerber (1985)). The Siphnians distributed the income from these mines each year among themselves (Hdt. 3.57.2). Late sources report settlements called Αἴπολλονία (Steph. Byz. 106.11) and Μίνωνία (Steph. Byz. 454.6), both undated and unlocated. We do not know the name of the large settlement at Ag. Andreas occupied from the Geometric through the Hellenistic period; it is possible that this settlement rivalled the main one at modern Kastro for a while before Siphnos was consolidated as a single polis (Philippaki (1973); cf. Rege (1997) 459–60).

Siphnos was allegedly colonised by Ionians from Athens (Hdt. 8.48). Herodotus extols Siphnian wealth in C6, famous enough to tempt Samians who needed money in their fight against Polykrates; after destroying the Siphnians’ countryside, defeating them in battle, and besieging the asty, the Samians exacted 100 tal. (Hdt. 3.57–58). In 490 the Siphnians refused the Persian demand to surrender (Hdt. 8.46.4). Siphnos fought on the Greek side in the Persian War, contributing one ship (Hdt. 8.46.4, 48) and is recorded on the Serpent Column in Delphi (ML 27.10).

Siphnos was a member of the Delian League and probably among the original members (AtL ii. 198). It belonged to the Island district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 450/49 (IG i3 263.14v.20) to 416/15 (IG i3 289.1.26) a total of
eleven times, four times completely restored, paying a phoros of 3 tal. in all years (IG I² 263.14v.20). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG I² 71.1.66) for 9 tal. Siphnos joined the Second Athenian Naval League in the 370s (IG I² 43.B.30), and in 370/69 the Siphnians dedicated a crown to Athena in Athens (IG I² 1425.125). A treaty between the Siphnians and the Athenians (no. 361) regulated capital crimes, among other matters (Agora xvi 50 (c.360–350)). To the same period belongs a treaty between Siphnos and Kalaureia (no. 360) (IG IV 839). During the initial phases of Alexander’s war against the Persian Empire, Datames held the island, which was used as a forward naval base (Arr. Anab. 2.2.4.13-4).

In C5 the Siphnian constitution was democratic; but in, probably, 405/4 an oligarchic (Isoc. 19.13.38) government was set up supported by a Lakedaimonian (?) garrison. The oligarchs were in turn expelled by the democratic exiles, probably in 394/3 (Isoc. 19.19–20). Supported by some mercenaries, the oligarchic exiles ventured an attack on the island, but they were defeated in a battle fought outside the town (Isoc. 19.38–39), and the constitution was still democratic in C4m (Agora xvi 50.9–10 = SEG 17.19 (365–355)). For the reconstruction of this stasis, see Blass (1892) ii 235–36; Gehlke, Stasis 151).

Our only source for this Siphnian political institutions in the Classical period is Isokrates’ Aigenetan speech in which we hear of Siphnian nomosion adoption and inheritance (13.15), a system of liturgies incumbent on the wealthy (36), and the office of basileus (36). An embassy to Siphnos, sent by Samian exiles in the 520s, is mentioned at Hdt. 3.58.1. The existence of a prytaneion (infra) implies prytaneis.

Communal cults include one for the Nymphs (IG XII.3 483), who had a cult site. The Siphnians consulted the oracle at Delphi c.520 (Hdt. 3.57.3–58.1; Paus. 10.11.2; Suda Σ31; Fontenrose (1978) 307 Q 115) and built the famous Siphnian Treasury with a tenth of the income from their mines (Hdt. 3.57.2; Daux and Hansen (1987); Jacquemin (1999) 352 no. 441; Neer (2001).

The polis site was on the east coast of the island and was presumably walled by c.500 (Brock and Macworth Young (1949) 2). By c.525 the Siphnians had a prytaneion built of Parian marble (Hdt. 3.57.4) and an agora (Hdt. 3.57.4) where probably the Athenian Coinage Decree was set up (supra).

The Siphnians struck silver coins on the Aiginetan standard starting in C6. (1) Staters and hemidrachms, C6. Types: obv. eagle flying; rev. incuse square. (2) Silver staters and fractions on the Aiginetan standard, some drachms on the Attic standard, C5. Types: obv. head of Apollo; rev. eagle flying in incuse square accompanied by barley; legend: ΣΙΦ reversed and with three-bar sigma. (3) In C4 the Siphnians coined in both silver and bronze. Types: obv. Apollo (silver); Artemis (bronze); rev. eagle flying with serpent in beak; legend: ΣΙΦ (Head, HN² 491; Erxleben (1970) 73–74; SNG Cop. Aegean Islands 744–50).

520. Skiathos (Skiathios) Map 55. Lat. 39.10, long. 23.27. Size of territory: 2 (50 km²). Type: A. The toponym is Σκίαθος, ἡ (Simonides fr. 1; Hdt. 7.179; IG I² 1623.A35 (332/2)). The city-ethnic is Σκίαθος (IG I² 266.115; CID 13.1 (C4f); Theopomp. fr. 375). In the so-called Charter of the Second Athenian Naval League, Skiathos is listed under the heading polis (IG I² 43.A.78, 86). For polis used in the urban sense, see Ps.-Skylax 58, where Skiathos is described as δῖπολις καὶ λιµήν (cf. Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 56–57). One of these towns was the Palaiaskiathos whose citizen Οἰνάδης ὁ Παλαιασκάθιος was honoured by the Athenians in 408/7 (IG I² 109). That the territory of this town and the island were coterminous may be inferred from the language of the Athenian decree, which praises him for treating well Athenians who arrived “into Skiathos” (IG I² 110.7–8, 10–12). But there was clearly confusion in Athens between Skiathians and Palaiaskiathians, because the decree includes an amendment to the effect that Oinrades be named Παλαιασκάθιος instead of Σκίαθος (IG I² 110.26–31). The collective use of the ethnic is attested internally on coins of C4s (infra) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG I² 266.11.5). For the individual and external use, see the Athenian C5l proxeny decree (IG I² 110.29).

Skiathos is listed among the Kyklades by Ps.-Skylax 58 and Diod. 15.30.5, whereas the island is described in Strabo 9.5.16 as one of the islands off Magnesia. According to Ps.-Sikynnos 580 and 586, Skiathos was colonised by the Chalkidians from Euboia.

In 480 the Greeks stationed three ships by Skiathos to watch over the Persian fleet; signal fires lit on the island communicated information back to the Greeks at Artemision (Hdt. 7.179–83). The Skiathians were members of the Delian League. They belonged to the Thracian district (IG I² 269.11.30) and are recorded in the tribute lists from 450/49 (IG I² 263.111.40) to 415/4 (IG I² 290.111.14) a total of fourteen times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of 1,000 dr. (IG I² 266.11.5). By 408/7 there was an Athenian archon on Skiathos charged in the Athenian decree mentioned above with seeing to it that the Palaiaskiathians not be mistreated (IG I² 110.19–20). Under Spartan hegemony from the end of the Peloponnesian War until Chabrias’
expedition in the Aegean in 377/6 (Diod. 15.30.5), the Skiathians joined the Second Athenian Naval League in the 370s (IG ii² 43.A.86). In 351 Demostenes praised Skiathos and other nearby islands for the logistical support they offered the Athenian fleet (4.32); in 345/4 an Athenian garrison stationed on Skiathos offered the Athenian demos a crown (IG ii² 1443.11.106–8; Dreher 1995 n. 55), and ships were sent to Skiathos commanded by a strategos (IG ii² 1623.35–49). Inscriptions from Delphi include a treaty between the Delphians (no. 177) and Skiathians about consultation of the oracle (CID 13 = Staatsverträge 295). The treaty opens with a reference to the Skiathian demos and colonists (apoiwatoi).

The town of Skiathos was probably located at modern Skiathos town (cf. Fredrich 1906b 103; see also Reger 1997 483 n. 25). There are no remains of any other settlement on the island. A Samian funerary inscription of C3 has been found on Skiathos (Johnston 1998).

The Skiathians seem to have begun to strike bronze coins in C4m. Types: obv. head of Apollo or Hermes, or Gorgon head facing; rev. caduceus; legend: ΣΚΙΑΘΟΙ or ΣΚ (Head, HN² 313; SNG Cop. Thessaly 366–67).

**521. Skyros (Skyrios)** Map 55. Lat. 38.55, long. 24.35. Size of territory 4 (223 km²). Type: A. The toponym is Σκύρος, ἦ (Soph. Phil. 240; IG xi.8 668.5 (C4)), denoting both the island and the town (Ps.-Skylax 58). The city-ethnic is Σκύρος (Hdt. 7.183.3; Stephanis 1988 no. 1797 (C4)). Skyros is called a polis both in the urban sense (Ps.-Skylax 58) and in the political sense (Xen. Hell. 5.1.31). Two lost tragedies both entitled Σκύροι testify to the collective and external use of the city-ethnic (Soph. frr. 507–10 and Eur. frr. 683–86, Nauck), which is also known from inscriptions (IG i.3 285.1v.107–10). The individual and external use of the city-ethnic is attested in Hdt. 7.183.3; the internal in an undated sepulchral inscription (IG xi.8 676).

Skyros was originally inhabited by Pelasgians (IG xi.8 p.175). The island was seized by the Athenians under Kimon (Diod. 11.60.2; Ephor. fr. 191; Plut. Cim. 8.3–7) in, probably, 476/5 (Plut. Thes. 36.1). The inhabitants were subjected to andrapodismos, and Skyros was resettled with Athenians (Thuc. 1.98.2), apparently described as klerouchs by Ephor. fr. 191 = Diod. 11.60.2: κατεκλημένοις, see also Graham (1983) 184–85; Cargill (1995) 6. By contrast with the Lemnians and Imbrians, the Skyrians are never mentioned as members of the Delian League, and so, probably, remained Athenian citizens. For the view that Skyros may have been a colony, see Figueira (1991) 217, 221; Salomon (1997) 68 takes no position on Skyros.

Athens had to surrender Skyros in the Peace of 404 (Andoc. 3.12; Aeschin. 2.76–77), but by 392, after a short period of independence (Andoc. 3.12, 14), the Athenians had regained control of the island (Xen. Hell. 4.8.15), and Athenian possession was confirmed by the King’s Peace of 386 (Xen. Hell. 5.1.31). The grain law of 374/3 shows that Skyros was still an Athenian possession (Hesperia suppl. 29 5.6–8), in spite of the decision of 378/7 to renounce the klerouchies (Diod. 15.29.8). Philip II must have recognised Skyros as an Athenian possession in 338 (Paus. 1.25.3), for Skyros was still Athenian in the 320s (Arist. Ath. Pol. 62.2), and remained Athenian by the Peace of 322 (Diod. 18.18.4; see Cargill (1995) 42–58).

The only preserved C4 decree passed by the Skyrian klerouchies (IG xi.8 668) indicates that the C4 population of Skyros was divided into Athenians and inhabitants (Il. 4–5; τῶν δήμου ἄνδρων καὶ τῶν κατοικοῦντων ἐν Σκύρῳ with καὶ to be restored in l.2), who seem to have had the same status as Athenian metics (Dem. 52.3, 9). Such civic subdivisions as are attested belong to the Athenians (IG xi.8 669; Cargill (1995) 389 no. 1124; Jones, POAG 188). The only important river was called the Kephissos, an obvious echo of the Athenian Kephissus (Plut. Themist. 15). Achilleion has been taken as the name of the main settlement, and not as a settlement, because of the important river was called the Kephissos, an obvious echo of Attica (Strabo 9.3.16). Considerable remains of the main city fortification walls are preserved; they have been dated, exclusively on style, to C4; the walls enclosed an area of 4.5 ha, including a separately fortified acropolis of 0.5 ha (Fredrich 1906c 262–71). The reference at Diod. 11.60.2 to a siege of Skyros indicates that the city was fortified in C5e. Remains of a small temple have been reported (Fredrich 1906c 275–76). A C4 horos inscription has been found (Finley 1985) no. 111: πρᾶσις ἐπὶ λύσει. Plutarch notes a settlement named Κρήσιον (Cim. 8.3), which has been identified with extensive ruins on the south-west coast (Fredrich 1906c 274). A scholiast to Diodorus repeats this name and adds another: Smyros: Σκύροι μὲν Αχίλλειοι καὶ Κρήσιον (schol. Diod. 1.326). Achillesion has been taken as the name of the main anchorage on the north-east side of the island, south of the main settlement, and not as a settlement, because of the absence of ancient remains there (Fredrich 1906c 273–74). No coins appear to be known (Erxleben 1970 120).

**522. Syme (Symaios)** Map 61. Lat. 36.35, long. 27.50. Size of territory: 2 (58 km²). Type: A. The toponym is Σύμια, ἦ (Hom. II. 2.671; Hdt. 1.174.3; Thuc. 8.41.4; IG i.3 278.1v.28), in the Doric dialect Σύμα (IG xi.3 suppl. 1269.7 (C2)), denoting both the island and the town (Steph. Byz. 591.17–18). The
city-ethnic is Συμαιος (IG i³ 282.11.45). In the Athenian tribute lists Syme is recorded among those by πόλεις ἄνω ή πρώτη (IG i³ 278.vi.18–21, 28). The collective use of the city-ethnic is found in the tribute lists (IG i³ 282.11.45).

According to Diodorus (5.53.1–4), Syme was settled by Lakedaimonians and Argives, later joined by Knidians and Rhodians. Syme was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district (IG i³ 71.11.148) and is recorded in the tribute lists either by toponym (IG i³ 278.vi.28) or by city-ethnic (IG i³ 282.11.45) from 434/3 (IG i³ 278.vi.28) to 429/8 (IG i³ 282.11.45) a total of five times, three times completely restored, paying a phoros of 1,800 dr. (IG i³ 278.vi.28). The first four payments are recorded among those by poleis that private persons had inscribed (IG i³ 278.vi.18–21); the fifth payment is assessed by the boule and the dikasterion (IG i³ 282.11.43–44). Syme was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.11.148) for 3,000 dr. Two fragments of the Athenian Coinage Decree were found on Syme (IG i³ 1453A, D). In 412/11 the Peloponnesians defeated the Athenians in a naval battle fought off Syme (Thuc. 8.41–43).

The town in the north-eastern part of the island had a walled acropolis with a sanctuary of Athena. There are traces of two circuits in polygonal masonry with interval towers, probably of the Hellenistic period (Zschietzschmann 1931) 1098; Hope Simpson and Lazenby (1962) 168–69, (1970) 63–64). The lower wall enclosed an area of c.0.3 ha. The only inscription antedating the Hellenistic period seems to be a C4 tombstone set over a soldier killed in battle (IG xii.3 9 = CEG ii 694).

Coins sometimes assigned to Syme (see Erxleben (1970) 93) can now be assigned rather to Syangela (no. 931) in Karia on the basis of new finds (Yarkin (1975), (1977)).

523. Syros (Syrios) Map 60 (inset). Lat. 37.26, long. 24.56. Size of territory: 3 (85 km²). Type: A. The toponym is Σύρος, ἱ (SEG 19 204A.3 (c.375); I. Delos 104–11A.2.1= IG ii² 1638.A.21 (359/8); Theopomp. fr. 111; Strabo 10.5.3, 8; Steph. Byz. 230.1), denoting both the island (Strabo 10.5.3) and the town (Ps.-Skylax 58). The city-ethnic is Σύρος (IG i³ 261.1v.31; Arist. Hist. an. 557v). In Ps.-Skylax 58, where polis is used in the urban sense, Syros is one of the toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις αἰδε; Syros is called a polis in the political sense at Theopomp. fr. 111 (rCαf according to Jacoby’s commentary), and in the accounts of the Delian amphiktyones, where polis is used in the political sense, the Syrians are recorded under the heading αἰδε τῶν πόλεων (I.Delos 97.13 (Cαf)). The collective use of the city-ethnic appears internally on its Hellenistic coins (Head, HN² 492) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i³ 261.1v.31) and in the accounts of the Delian amphiktyones (IG ii² 1635.1–2 (377–373)). The individual and external use of the ethnic appears in Aristotle (Hist. an. 557v), referring to the C6 poet Pherekydes of Syros, and in Theopomp. fr. 111.

Strabo, citing Artemidoros, lists Syros among the Kyklades (10.5.3). Homeric Syrie (Σύριη in Od. 15.403) is erroneously identified with Syros by both Zschietzschmann (1932b) 1790 and Meyer (1975).

Syros was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Island district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 452/1 (IG i³ 261.1v.31) to 416/15 (IG i³ 289.1.30) a total of twelve times, four times completely restored, paying a phoros of 1,500 dr. in 452/1, reduced to 1,000 dr. (IG i³ 270.v.33) in or before 448/7 (IG i³ 264.11.17), but raised again to 1,500 dr. in or before 435/2 (IG i³ 279.1.80). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.1.80) (1 tal.). Syros may have joined the Second Athenian Naval League in the 370s (I.Delos 98A.11–12, B3=IG ii² 1635A.11–12, 113 (377–375); SEG 19 204 (375); cf. Dreher (1995) 201 n. 22), but is not recorded among the members listed in IG ii² 43. In the thirteenth book of his Philippika Theopompos reports that a Syrian citizen, Kallikon, betrayed Syros to the Samians (fr. 111). Jacoby ad loc. dates the incident to Cαf. The Cαf list of proxenoi of Karthia (no. 492) included at least two from Syros (IG xii.1 542.46).

The principal civic divisions were three tribes (IG xii.1 654 (undated), with Jones, POAG 211), the names of two of which are known: the Naxiatai (IG xii.1 652 (C2), with Gauthier (1996) 35–43) and the Galessioi (I.Delos 98B.18 (C4)). Galesa, which must have been the centre of the tribe of the same name, was located on the western side of the island; this suggests that the Syrian tribes were territorially based. Delian Apollo owned some property on the island (I.Delos 104–11A.21).

The chief gods were very likely the Kabeiroi, although the inscription that supposedly attests to a sanctuary remains enigmatic (IG xii.1 673 with commentary there by Hiller von Gaertringen (undated); see also Nicolet-Pierre and Amandry (1992) 305–6 n. 32, for a late coin referring to this cult; Head, HN² 492; Hemberg (1950) 182–84). Archaeological material from the Geometric to Roman periods that might be associated with such a sanctuary has been reported (Manthos (1979)). The ancient polis lies beneath the modern city of Ermoupolis and is therefore unexplored (Leekley and Noyes (1975) 51).

Syrian drachmas (Σύρειαι δραχμαί) are recorded in Delian accounts of Cαf (I.Delos 104.105 (364/3)); in consequence,
Head’s date of c.300 for the start of Syrian coinage is too late by at least 65 years (Head, *HN*² 492). But the known coins attributed to the pre-Hellenistic period have now been shown to be modern forgeries (Nicolet-Pierre and Amandry (1992)).

525. Telos (Telios) Map 61. Lat. 36.30, long. 27.20. Size of territory: 2 (65 km²). Type: B. The toponym is *Τήλος*, ἦ (Hdt. 7.153.1; Ps.-Skylax 99; IG i² 71.11.145). An alternative toponym is Ἀὐαθδώσα (Hsch. 14280; Steph. Byz. 621.1; cf. Callim. fr. 581). The city-ethnic is *Τήλος* (IG i² 284.12; RivFil 70 15.1 (c.300)). Telos is not explicitly called a *polis* until C3 (IG XII.3 29.6), but an unpublished arbitration of c.300 strongly suggests *polis* status in C4s (*infra*), and membership of the Delian League indicates *polis* status in C5s. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in the arbitration of c.300 (*supra*) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (*supra*). The external and individual use is attested in an epitaph from Mesambria Pontica (*SEG* 47 1075 (C5–C4)).

Ps.-Skylax 99 lists Telos in his chapter on Karia among the inhabited islands near Rhodes. According to Strabo, it belonged to the Sporades (10.5.14), whereas Steph. Byz. assigns it to the Kyklades (620.22).

Telos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionian district (*IG* i² 71.11.145) and is recorded in the tribute lists by city-ethnic (*IG* i² 284.12), but in the assessment decree of 425/4 by toponym (*IG* i² 71.11.145). It is recorded twice, in 427/6 or 426/5 (*IG* i² 284.12) and in 415/4 (*IG* i² 290.1.27) paying an unknown amount. Telos was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (*IG* i² 71.11.145) (2 tal.) and in 410/9 (*IG* i² 100.11.5 (1 tal.), but city-ethnic almost completely restored. Telos was under Spartan control from 404 until liberated in 394 by Pharmabazes and Konon; it remained independent of Rhodes (no. 1000) throughout C4 (Diod. 14.84.3 with L. Robert (1969–90) 1569–74; for absorption by Rhodes in C3, see Papachristodoulou (1989) 46–47).

An unpublished Koan arbitration for Telos of c.300 includes a civic oath in which the citizens swear to stand by the existing political organisation (*politeuma*), to preserve the *damokratia*, and not to oppose the *damos* (RivFil 70 no. 15; cf. Rhodes, *DGS* 290).

The cult of Athena Polias and Zeus Polieus is epigraphically attested in C3e (*IG* xi.13 40.9; cf. *SEG* 3 715.8 (second century AD)) and probably to be connected with the obverse types of the C4 coins (*infra*; Fiehn (1934) 420). A C4 dedication inscribed *Ποτείδα* [α] *νος* testifies to a cult of Poseidon (*IG* xi.13 37).

The town was situated in the northern part of the island and was apparently the only settlement. So far no traces have been found of villages, hamlets or even isolated farmsteads (Hoepfner (1999) 170). Remains of the city walls are still extant (Dawkins (1905–6) 1–3); they have been dated to the Hellenistic period (Hope Simpson and Lazenby (1970) 63–66) or in C4 (Scranton (1941) 172; Hoepfner (1999) 174) and seen as part of Mausolos’ building programme (Bean and Cook (1957) 142; Hornblower (1982) 331–32; sceptical: Sherwin-White (1978) 70 n. 212). On the acropolis are remains of a tower and the sanctuary of Athena Polias (Fiehn (1934) 427; Luffer (1989) 653). The walls enclosed an area of just over 10 ha, but the town lay on a steep slope and most of the houses had to be built on terraces. There cannot have been more than 1,50 households in the town (Hoepfner (1999) 185).

Telos struck bronze coins in C4s. Types: *obv.* head of Zeus, or of Athena (on some, head of Athena with aegis outspread behind); legend: ΔΑΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑΣ; rev. crab; legend: ΤΗΛΙ and sometimes magistrate’s name (Head, *HN* 642).

Telos joined Lindos in colonising Gela (Hdt. 7.153.1; see *supra* 192).

525. Tenos (Teniens) Map 60 (inset). Lat. 37.30; long. 25.10. Size of territory: 3 (195 km²). Type: A. The toponym is *Τήνιος*, ἦ (Hdt. 4.33.2), denoting the island (Aesch. *Pers.* 885), the town (Ps.-Skylax 58) and the political community (Eupolis fr. 245, *PCG*). According to Arist. fr. 612, alternative toponyms were ‘Ὑδρόσσασα and Ὄφιούσσασα. The city-ethnic is *Τήνιος* (*IG* II 1635A.20 (297/6–297/3); Thuc. 8.69.3). Steph. Byz. 622.4–6 records *Τηνέως* as a variant form, perhaps attested in a C4s inscription from Kyrene (*SEG* 9.2.15: Τ[ηνέως] αῖ = Tod 196; cf. *SEG* 42165 and *infra*).

Tenos is implicitly called a *polis* in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 58 (Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 142), and the Tenians appear under the heading *polis* used in the political sense in the so-called Charter of the Second Athenian Naval League (*IG* II 43.32, 70, 78, B17) and in the accounts of the Delian *amphiktyonies* (*I.Delos* 98A12, Ba4 = *IG* II 1655 (297/6–297/3)); cf. also Hdt. 4.33.2. After C4m the prepositional group ἐκ Πόλεις denotes one of the *phyllai* (Étienne (1990) 22), but the noun *πόλεις* is still being used in its usual sense, denoting the political community (*IG* xi.1.7 798.6 (C3)). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form on coins of C4s (*infra*) and externally on the Serpent Column at Delphi (ML 27.7), in the Athenian tribute lists (*IG* II 263.A.19), on Delos (*I.Delos* 98A12 (297/6)) and in Thucydides (7.57.4). Several inscriptions of C4 give the external individual ethnic (*IG* II 16446; *IG* xi.5 542.45; *I.Delos* 98A20). *Patris* is found in *IG* II 1646b.38 (307/6).
Strabo, citing Artemidoros, places Tenos among the Kyklades (Strabo 10.5.3). Tenos was settled by Ionians c.1000 (Lauffer (1989) 655). The island seems to have fallen under the control of Eretria (no. 370) in C8; this control would have ended by c.650 (Strabo 10.1.10). The Persians captured the island in 490 (as implied by Hdt. 6.96–97; cf. Aesch. Pers. 885). Tenians served in Xerxes’ fleet at Salamis (Hdt. 8.66.2), but desertion to the Greek side by one commander earned the Tenians a place on the Serpent Column at Delphi (Hdt. 8.82.1; ML 27.7); they appear also in the dedication at Olympia (Paus.5.23.2).

Tenos was a member of the Delian League, and may have been among the original members (ATL iii. 198–99). It belonged to the Island district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 450/49 (IG i2 263.19.iv.19) to 416/5 (IG i2 289.1.29) a total of twelve times, twice completely restored, paying a _phoros_ of first 3 tal. (IG i2 263.iv.19), reduced to 2 tal. (IG i2 271.189) in or before 443/2 (IG i2 269.v.15). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i2 71.1.73) of 10 tal. They were still paying members in 413, and naval forces, probably with marines, participated in the Sicilian expedition (Thuc. 7.57.4). In 411 a contingent of soldiers from Tenos supported the Four Hundred in Athens (Thuc. 8.69.3), and from this Gehrke, Stasis 159 infers that Tenos must have been one of the _poleis_ in which the constitution was changed from a democracy to an oligarchy after the oligarchic revolution in Athens (cf. Thuc. 8.64.1).

The Tenians joined the Second Athenian Naval League in the 370s (IG ii2 43B.17); one, Bion, served as Tenian envoy to Athens (no. 361) in connection with League business c.370–340 (IGII2 279 with D. M. Lewis (1954) 50). Other Tenian envoys to Athens are mentioned in a later inscription in which Tenians residing in Attica were awarded _isoteleia_ in C48 (IGII2 660 with Peçirka (1966) 93–95). Tenos was subjected in 362 to _andrapodismos_ by Alexander of Pherai (Dem. 50.4). The location of the town in C4m (intra) and the reorganisation of the civic subdivisions were probably caused by the _andrapodismos_ and carried out in connection with a repopulation of the island (Étienné (1984) 211). If _τ[...]_ at SEG 9 2.15 refers to Tenos, the Tenians received 20,000 _medimnoi_ of grain from Kyrene (no. 1028) during the grain crisis of 330–326 (see SEG 92 1663; Gasperini (1996) 103 improperly corrects the text to read _T[...]πυκένοις_; Brun (1993b) 187–88 rejects both restorations and prefers to leave the text unmended; but, given the multiple odd ethnics in this inscription, it would not be surprising if the Kyrenaics simply got it wrong).

Pace Hiller von Gaertringen (IG xi1.5 xxiii, 1516) and Gigon (no. 138), there is no evidence to support the view that the Aristotelian collection of _politeiai_ included a constitution of the Tenians. The eponymous official was the archon (IG xi1.5 872.1); the theory that the office lasted only six months rather than a year is to be rejected (Gauthier (1992) against Étienné (1990) 42–45). _Prytaneis_ are restored in an Athenian decree of C4m (IG ii2 279.2–3; cf. D. M. Lewis (1954) 50; Peçirka (1966) 53–54). _Astraponomoi_ appear in the register of sales of land of C4e (IG xi1.5 872.1). Citizens from Tenos were appointed _proxenoi_ by Karthaia (no. 492) (IG xi1.5 542.45 (C4m)) and by Chios (no. 840) (PEP Chios 50 (C4)).

The Tenian citizens were subdivided into, presumably, ten territorial _phylai_. These tribes may have been created or reorganised as part of a large-scale civic reform of C4m in which the moving of the urban centre was an important element (Étienné (1990) 45–47). The names of Tenian tribes are attested epigraphically, typically in the form of philetics added to name and patronymic; all are known from the large register of sales of land of C4l (IG xi1.5 872); after each one listed below, only additional references to earlier attestations are noted: _Γυρα(ιείς) (873.9, 12 (C4s), 875.17 (C4s)); Δωνα(κείς) (873.9 (C4s)); Έλειθυ(αείς) (875.31 (C4s)); Έσχα(πιώτης) (873.3 (C4s), 875.15 (C4s)); Πρακλείδης (876.4 (C4l)); Θεσσείς (875.9, 16 (C4s)); Θρυσίος (876.1 (C4l)); Ικακυθείς (875.30 (C4s)); Κλαμενές (872.109 (C4l); _εκΠολεως_ (872, 875.2 (C4s)). The name of an “eleventh” tribe, _Σησταίας_, seems to be a false reading (Étienné (1990) 46). The tribe called _εκΠολεως_ refers to Tenians registered in the former _polis_ site at Xombourgo (see _supra_) and probably embraced the majority of the inhabitants of the new _asty_ on the seashore (so Étienné (1990) 22).

Inhabitants were registered in one of at least eleven _tonoi_, neighbourhoods, of the _asty_ (IG xi1.5 872.6, 21, 25, 36, 44, 72, 123 with Étienné (1990) 22–23). As many as twenty-three _toponyms_ are attested, mostly in the large register of sales of land (IG xi1.5 872); their locations throughout the island have been debated (Étienné (1990) 24–30; Psarras (1994)). The Thryesioi were probably located in the central part of the island at modern Komi, persuasively identified with the _Κόμη_ recorded in IG xi1.5 872.19 (Étienné (1990) 29). From the toponym it can be inferred that ancient Kome was a village. There is no evidence of any other nucleated settlement on Tenos.

A different gentilician civic subdivision was into _πάτραι_. By contrast with the _phylai_, the _patrai_ may be seen as an aristocratic holdover: the law of introduction, _νόμος εἶσαγωγῆς_, which very likely regulates induction into the
patrai, insists on legitimacy through the male line and sets an age restriction of at least 50 years (IG xii suppl. 303 with Étienne (1990) 40–42 no. 2). A decree of the patra of the Androkleidai survives (Étienne (1990) 37–39 no. 1 (C4e–C3s)).

The huge register of sales of land (IG xii.5 872) and a few small related inscriptions (873–79) provide us with valuable information about ownership of landed property, inheritance and size of families (often more than two adult children in a family); see the analysis in Étienne (1990) 51–84.

The protective deities were Poseidon and Amphitrite, whose sanctuary lay on the sea 2.5 km west of the post-C4m urban centre (see infra). There was probably a cult and a sanctuary of Demeter Thesmophoros from c.700 (see infra). An inscription of C4m attests to a cult of Ge, possibly private only (Despinis (1979) 228–29).

The Tenian calendar is known most completely through IG xii.5 872. The names of nine months are given. Some are identical with the Athenian months, but apart from Tēn, there was probably a cult and a sanctuary of Demeter Thesmophoros from c.700 (see infra). The city-ethnic is Θάσος, η (IG 11 1144.43, 130 (465/4); SEG 38 851 B.22 (407); Archil. fr. 228.1; Thuc. 8.64.2), denoting both the island (Arist. Hist. an. 549b16) and the town (Archestratos fr. 5.9, Olson and Sens). The city-ethnic is Θάσος (IG xii.8 264.11 = Koerner (1993) no. 71 (C4e); Thuc. 1.100.2). Thasos is called a polis both in the urban centre (Archil. fr. 49.7; Thuc. 8.64.3, 4, first occurrence; Dem. 35.35; Ps.-Skylax 67; Duchêne (1992) 125 no. 24.1, 15 (C5m)) and in the political sense (IG xii.8 356.2 = CEG 1 415 (C6l); IG xii suppl. 412.2 = CEG 1 416 (C6l); SEG 42 785 passim (C5f); ML 83 passim (C5l); SEG 26 1029.5 (C4s); Hdt. 6.44.1; Thuc. 8.64.4, second occurrence); the first occurrence at Thuc. 8.64.4 has the territorial sense as a connotation. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins (infra) and amphora stamps (Garlan (1999) 17–20) and in inscriptions (IG xii suppl. 412.1 = CEG 416 (C6l); ML 83, 11.7, before 407 (Graham and Smith (1989)); IG xii.8 264.11 (C4e)) and externally in both literary texts (Archil. fr. 20; Thuc. 1.100.2; Dem. 20.59) and inscriptions (IG 11 101.31 (410/9); IG xii.4 109 (C5); Moretti (1953); SEG 43 486.33 (C4m)). The individual and external use is attested in inscriptions (IG 11 1373–74 (c.407); IG 11v.2 1122.7 (C4m/C4s)) and in literary sources (Lys. 13.54; Dem. 20.61; Arist. Poet. 1448b12). Patris is found in Dem. 20.59.

Ps.-Skylax 67 places Thasos in Thrace, and Strabo classes Thasos among the islands lying off Greece as far as Makedonia and Thrace (2.5.21). Though Herodotos mentions a Phoenician colony on Thasos (2.44.4; cf. also Paus. 5.25.12), the island was more famously colonised by the Parians (no. 509) under Telesikes in 710–680 (Thuc. 4.104.4; Strabo 10.5.7; Steph. Byz. 306.14); for a foundation date of C7m, see Graham (2001) 228–29, 365–402. Archilochos has a good deal to say about the circumstances of the early colony (fr. 92–112). An inscription of C5 mentions as archegetes one Sotion (Pouilloux (1954) 335 no. 127; cf. Leschhorn (1984) 56–60 and the useful summary in Pouilloux (1982)); Hippoc. Epid. 1 case 5 mentions the archegetes.
In Col Thasos was controlled by the tyrant Symmachos, expelled by the Spartans (Plut. Mor. 859D; Salviat (1979) 123–25; Bowen (1992) 119). The Thasians were probably under an oligarchy in the earlier part of C5 (Pouilloux (1954) 43). They had an income from their mines on the island and the peraia ranging between 200 and 300 tal./year c.500 (Hdt. 6.46.3). Histiaios attacked the island in 494, but was repelled by the arrival of a Phoenician fleet (Hdt. 6.28). In 492 the Thasians surrendered to Mardonios and remained under Persian control until 479 (Hdt. 6.44.1). They joined the Delian League as contributors of ships, but revolted in 466/5; the Athenians besieged the island for three years before finally defeating the rebels. The Thasians were forced to pull down their walls, to surrender their fleet, to pay an indemnity, to pay phoros in the future and to cede their possessions on the mainland (Thuc. 1.100–1; Plut. Kim. 14.1–2). Polyaen. 2.33, 8.67; IG II 1 114.B.111.43, 130; cf. Pébarthe (1999)). Thasians appear thereafter serving in the Athenian fleet (IG II 1 1032.431), and Athenians owned property on Thasos (IG II 1 426.45, 144). The Thasians became paying members of the Delian League. They belonged to the Thracian district (IG II 1 272.11.56) and are recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG II 1 259.v.14) to 429/8 (IG II 1 282.11.17) a total of fourteen times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of 3 tal. (IG II 1 259.v.14), raised to 30 tal. in 446/5 (IG II 1 266.111.8) or the year before when the Thasians are recorded three times (IG II 1 265.1.94, 107, 11.66, restored). The Thasians were assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG II 1 71.111.155) of 60 tal.

In 411, in the wake of the revolution of the Four Hundred, the Athenian strategos Dietriephe abolished the democracy in Thasos (Thuc. 8.64.2) and established an oligarchy, called ἀριστοκρατία and εὐνομία by the Athenians in 411 (643, 5) but διοικησία by Thucydides (64.5) and by the Athenians in 407 in a contemporary inscription (SEG 38 851.A.4, 19, B.2–3, 20). But soon afterwards the anti-Athenian faction got the upper hand, and the Thasians defected from Athens with the help of a squadron commanded by Timolaos of Corinth (Hell. Oxy. 10.4–5; IG XII.8 402). The polis brought back its old institutions, restored its fortification walls and fleet (Thuc. 8.643–5), and accepted a Lakedaimonian harvest (Xen. Hell. 1.1.32). They punished Athenian supporters (IG XII.8 263; ML 83; cf. Pouilloux (1954) 139–42 no. 18; on the date of this inscription as C5I but not autumn 411 or spring 410, see Graham and Smith (1989)). In the following year a stasis among the Thasians resulted in a short-lived expulsion of the pro-Lakedaimonian faction (Xen. Hell. 1.1.32; Gehrke, Stasis 161). Thasos must have defected once again, for in 410/9 the Thasian colony Neapolis (no. 634) was besieged by Thasians and Peloponnescians, but resisted with Athenian support (IG II 1 101 = ML 89; see Pouilloux (1954) 155–60), and in the spring of 407 the Athenians under Thrasyboulos recovered the island after a siege and restored the democracy (Xen. Hell. 1.4.9; Diod. 13.7.1), called explicitly δημοκρατία in a contemporary inscription (SEG 38 851.A.7 = Grandjean and Salviat (1988)). The Parians facilitated a reconciliation between the Thasians and the Neopolitans probably soon after 407 (IG XII.1 309 as reinterpreted by Pouilloux (1954) 178–92; Piccirilli (1973) 144–49 no. 33; see also the bas-relief from Delphi: Moretti (1953)). Thasos’ mainland possessions were apparently recovered only gradually, in 410–407 and the 390s (Brunet (1997)).

With Spartan victory at the end of the war, a squadron under Eteonikos captured Thasos (Xen. Hell. 2.2.5). In Polyaenus the conquest is ascribed to Lysandros, and we are told that, after a battle, he tricked Athenian sympathisers who had taken refuge in the temple of Herakles to surrender, whereupon they were executed (Polyaen. Strat. 1.45.4; the story is questioned by Gehrke, Stasis 162–63). Thasians who supported the democracy (IG II 1 6) and had been exiled from Thasos for supporting Athens (IG II 1 33.6–7 with Pouilloux (1954) 203, and Polyaen. Strat. 1.45.4) were honoured by the Athenians in C5I and C4e (IG II 1 6, 17, 24, 25, 33; cf. SEG 15 83–87, with Pouilloux (1954) 203; Salviat (1979) 120–25 and Karamoutzou-Teza (1987)).

The Spartans controlled Thasos from 404, but, with the help of a pro–Athenian faction, the Athenians recovered the island for themselves in 389/8 (Dem. 20.59; IG II 1 17). A few years later the pro-Athenians were expelled and found refuge in Athens (IG II 1 24, 33; Dem. 20.61; cf. Osborne (1981–83) ii.48–57). But in c.375 the Thasians joined the Second Athenian Naval League (IG II 1 43.B.4; [Θέας] 101). Philip II gained control of Thasos in (probably) 340/39 with the help of Thasian supporters (Dem. 18.197). The Thasians belonged to the League of Corinth in 338 (IG II 1 236.b.5 = Staatsverträge 403).

Thasian proxeis in Athens (no. 361) are attested in C4e (IG II 1 24.b.16), and in the same period Thasians are honoured with Athenian citizenship (IG II 1 17). The Thasians granted proxenia to a citizen from an unknown polis (IG XI 11 suppl. 352 (C4I)) and to a citizen from Olynthos (no. 588) (Ετ. Thas. 5 p. 223 no. 576 (C4I/C3E)), and Thasians were granted proxenia by Athens (IG II 1 6 (C5I/C4e), with Walbank (1978) 324–28 no. 61 (doubts about the identity of the family as Thasian) and Grandjean and Salviat (1988)). Thasian theorodokoi are recorded as hosts of theoroi from
Epidaurus (no. 348) in 359 (IG IV 2.1 94.31) and as hosts of theorei from Argos (no. 347) in c.330 (SEG 23 189.11.20). The Thasians gave the Athenians a gold crown in 354/3 (IG II 2.14 370.11–10, 1458.15–16).

Many public enactments are known from Thasos. There are several wine laws. The earliest dates from c.460 (SEG 36 790 = Koerner (1993) no. 66); later parts belong to C5l and C4e (IG xii suppl. 347.1–11 = Koerner (1993) nos. 68–69; cf. SEG 36 791 and Salvat (1986)). A law regulating the cleanliness of the streets was passed in the 480–460s (SEG 42 785 = Duchêne (1992); cf. Graham (1998) with Gauthier in BE (1999) 428). A law on commerce of 425–415 regulated exports and imposed fines (SEG 36 792 = Koerner (1993) no. 67). The revolutionary government of 411–408 established rewards for informers in the last years of the Peloponnesian War (ML 83 = Koerner (1993) no. 70). A decree of C5l/C4e set up funerary honours for those who died for the fatherland (Pouilloux (1954) 371–80 no. 141). A law set out conditions for accepting foreigners into the civic body of Thasos soon after the end of the Peloponnesian War (IG xii.8 264 = Koerner (1993) no. 71, pace Pouilloux (1954) 204–13). A sacred law of C5m regulated a cult of Herakles (IG xii suppl. 414 = Duchêne (1992) 124–25 no. 23); another, dated (perhaps over-precisely?) to 430–420, deals with a cult instituted by an individual (SEG 38 853). A law from C4l seems to give a complete list of the city’s festivals (SEG 17 415; Salvat (1958b)).

At least from C5l on, public enactments were passed by the boule and/or the demos. The only preserved attestation is a law about naturalisation passed in C5l by the boule, with a major amendment passed by the demos (IG xii.8 264 = Koerner (1993) no. 71). For C4l example of a decision presumably made by (boule and) demos, see IG xii suppl. 352.5.

Lists of theorei beginning about C6m (IG xii.8 273–330, 283, 285) refer to the government of the Three Hundred and Sixty (IG xii.8 276.5–7 (rC6l)); this may be a boule, with a member for every day of the year (Salvati (1979)). The wine law of C5f (SEG 36 790.8), the denunciation law of C5l (ML 83,3) and a C5l decision about confiscation of property (IG xii.8 263,7) all mention a board of “Three Hundred”, presumably a lawcourt (ML p. 264; Koerner (1993) 246, 264).

The usual Thasian eponymous official was the archon, who served with two colleagues (ML 83,1.6: SEG 38 851.B.22–23 (both C5l)); many fragments of archon lists survive, starting in C6 (but inscribed in C4): Pouilloux (1954) 259–75 nos. 28–34 and Dunant and Pouilloux (1957) nos. 199–220 with p. 104; Sherk (1990) 292–94). But during the period of Athenian domination from 463, only a single archon served (Salvati (1984) 243–46). In 397 the Spartan Lichas occupied the office (Salvati (1983)). The theorei appear also occasionally as eponymous officials (IG xii.8 263.11 (412/11)). The archons forming a board of unknown number attested by c.480–460 are not to be confused with the eponymous officials (SEG 42 785.27; Duchêne (1992) 64–68). Inscriptions provide evidence of a raft of public officials, including polemarchoi (Pouilloux (1954) 371–80 no. 141 (c.400)), theorei (IG xii.8 263 (C5l)), prostatatai (IG xii.8 264.13 = Koerner (1993) no. 71, with Pouilloux (1954) 204–13), a grammateus, once called “of the boule” (IG xii.8 264.13 = Koerner (1993) no. 71 with Pouilloux (1954) 204–13, 371–80 no. 141 (c.400)), agoranomoi and gynaikonomoi (Pouilloux (1954) 371–80 no. 141 (c.400); Salvati (1958a) 319–23 no. 1 (C4), and epistatai (SEG 42 785.29–30; Duchêne (1992) 68–71). Apolologi are known from dedications (Bernard and Salvati (1962) no. 10=Duchêne (1992) 124 no. 23; Salvati (1957)). Karpolologi appear in the famous law on commerce (SEG 36 792.2, 9 with Pouilloux (1954) 121–34, date: 425–415).

Inscriptions of C5l–C4e attest to groups designated by plural patronymic names: e.g. Φαστάδαι (Rolley (1965) 441–42 no. 1). They are usually identified with the πατριαi known from C3 grants of citizenship (IG xii suppl. 355.4) and are interpreted by Jones, POAG 184–86 as civic subdivisions of an “essentially private nature”. He argues too that one of the groups, the Γελεώντες (Rolley (1965) 449 no. 8), was in fact not a patria but a larger subdivision, possibly a phyle, contra Grandjean and Salvati (2000) 221.

Many communal cults and sanctuaries are attested for Thasos (brief surveys in Schachter (1992) 22–25; Cole (1995) 309–12). From the earliest written records we can see that Thasos was not identified with a single primary divinity, but with a constellation of divinities who catered to the needs of the community. Four of these divinities—Artemis (Hekate), Herakles, Apollo (Pythios) and Athena (Poliouchos)—seem to have been more prominent than others. Thasos therefore had not one major sanctuary, but four. Apollo Pythios and Athena Poliouchos were located on the double summit, and Artemis and Herakles in the lower area (Cole (1995) 310). (1) Artemis, whose Artemision (Hippoc. Epid. 3.17a) was begun in C6m (Grandjean and Salvati (2000) 89–91), was sometimes known by various epithets, including Hekate (SEG 42 785.49 (C5f)). (2) Herakles sometimes bore the epithet Thasios (IG xii suppl. 414); he is attested in C6l as one of the protective divinities of Thasos (IG xii.8 264.16, 351.3); his cult was supposed to have been founded by the Phoenicians, and his temple existed by 480–460 (Hdt. 2.44.4; Hippoc. Epid. 3.17a; Polyena. Strat.
The Thasians are known as a community to have consulted Apollo at Delphi twice in C5 (Paus. 6.11.7–9). They made a communal dedication of a statue of Herakles at Olympia after their liberation from the Persians in 479/8 (Paus. 5.25.12–13). Thanks to Pausanias (6.11.2–9), we know a good deal about the athlete-hero Theogenes, whose cult had begun by the start of C4. His victories included two in the Olympic Games (in 480 and 476: Olympionikai 201 and 215), ten in the Isthmian, nine in the Nemean, and three in the Pythian (Pouilloux 1994) with the other sources; on the date of SEG 18 359 as 346, see Holzman (1994) 152; Grandjean and Salvati (2000) 73–76; statues of him were erected at Delphi (Syll. 36 A 139; Jacquemin (1999) 354 no. 459) and Olympia (Syll. 36 B).

The Thasian calendar was of the Ionian type and was virtually identical with that of Paros (Salvati 1992 263; Trümpe, Monat. 65–72).

The city itself, at the north-east corner of the island, was oriented towards the sea and exploited the natural landscape, rising gradually on a series of terraces to a striking and steep acropolis. There were two major centres. The lower city developed around the agora and harbour. To the south, the upper city was organised around the acropolis. The major sanctuaries determined the pattern of settlement and the orientation of major streets. There were two primary areas of habitation: one near the Artemision, the other near the Herakleion (Grandjean 1988 i 312–23, 336–46).

In C6l the city was surrounded by a defence circuit (Grandjean and Salvati 2000 94–139) with gates named after specific divinities (IG xii 0.356; Picard (1962)). The walls enclosed an area of almost 70 ha. Following the attack of Histaioi in 494, the Thasians used their great wealth to strengthen their existing fortification walls (Hdt. 6.46.2). In 491 Dareios ordered these walls to be torn down and the Thasian fleet conveyed to Abdera (Hdt. 6.46.1). These walls must have been rebuilt (or perhaps the order was never fully carried out), for the Thasian urban centre was fortified in 463, when the Athenians ordered the walls to be torn down again after the Thasian Revolt (Thuc. 1.101.3). In 411 the Thasians rebuilt their walls (Thuc. 8.64.4). These walls are mentioned in an inscription of C4l–C5l (Ét. Thas. 5 223 no. 376 = Maier (1959–61) no. 55), and ruins of them, with gates and towers, are still to be seen in the city (Grandjean and Salvati 1999, (1995), (1990), (1993)).

Thasian public architecture included a prytaneion, attested as early as C5f (SEG 42 785, 43–44) and frequently thereafter (IG xii 0.262.1 (C5l); restored, see SEG 38 851); Theophr. De Odoribus 51; cf. S. G. Miller (1978) no. 439; Duchêne
The theatre claimed by Grandjean and Salvat (2000) 105 after Hippoc. *Epid.* 1.20 seems to be a misreading; Arist. *Poet.* 1448r12 attests to a Thasian actor, but this does not prove that a pre-Hellenistic theatre existed on Thasos; the earliest evidence seems to be *I.Lampsakos* 1.21 (c.300), *IG* xii suppl. 354,a.21–2 (c.300) and the Hellenistic archaeological remains (*TGR* ii. 303–4). By Cs5 Thasos had an agora (Grandjean 1988 480–85; Duchêne (1992) 101–4; Grandjean and Salvat (2000) 62–64; for an “agora of liars”, see Hippoc. *Epid.* 3 cases 8 and 12). From C4m the agora was flanked with stoas, and in the north-eastern corner was a building of C4l with offices for magistrates (Grandjean and Salvat (2000) 62–71). Most extraordinary is the epigraphic attestation of a building called the ἀργυραμοιβήιον in c.480–460, where Thasian civic officials oversaw the exchange and circulation of money (Duchêne (1992) 19–20 II. 41–42, 79–85). Next to it stood a συμπόσιον (Duchêne (1992) 19–20 II. 41–42, pp. 79–85). Thasos had two harbours, one of which is described as κλείστος (Ps.-Skylyas 67). The Thasians had military facilities for their ships by c.500 (Grandjean and Salvat (2000) 52–57).

We know a fair amount about settlement patterns in the Thasian countryside, thanks in part to a remarkable inscription found at Aliki (see *infra*) which gives directions and distances around the island (Salviat and Servais (1964)). The inscription mentions two places. The first from the city (*polis*), Αἴνυρα, was known already from Herodotos in connection with the Thasian mines (6.47.2) and must be a region rather than a village (Salviat and Servais (1964) 282 with n. 1; which is not to say that there might not also have been a settlement with the same name). The other is called τὸ Διασιόν τὸ ἐν ΔηµητρίΩ, which was a sanctuary of Zeus located at a place, probably a settlement, called Demetron (ibid. 285); if this place has been rightly located, the village’s god will have been Apollo Komaios (ibid. 287). Koinyra (Hdt. 6.47.2) was a village with mines nearby (*Barr. C*). The modern village of Aliki lies at the site of an ancient settlement with a sanctuary that began in C7m, soon after the Parian colonisation of the island; Grandjean and Salvat (2000) 161–68, and of important marble mines that began to be exploited in C6 (*Barr. AC*). Remains of a Classical settlement have been found at modern Koukos, near the southern tip of the island (*Barr. C*). The name Αἶγγροκλῆς may derive from the Thasian river Angros (Hdt. 4.49.2 with L. Robert (1938) 201–2). The mines and quarries found in many places on the island were exploited from at least C6 (Muller (1979); des Courtils *et al.* (1982); Weisgerber and Wagner (1988a), (1988b); Bodini *et al.* (1980)). The remains of many towers no doubt represent farmsteads (Bon (1930); Osborne (1986)), but there is also a lighthouse (pharos) constructed in C6e in memory of Akeratos (*IG* xii.8 683 with Koželj and Wurch-Koželj (1989)). Ateliers of amphorae continue to be found throughout the Thasian countryside (Garlan (1999) 2–4).

The Thasians struck silver coins on the so-called Thrakio–Makedonian standard from C6l (perhaps first in 520–510) up until C5l. It is hard to find much sign of the defeat of the Thasians by the Athenians on Thasian coinage (Duchêne (1992) 87). The coins have been sorted into three general groups on the basis of variations in details of the types, especially in the appearance of the maenad; the date of the groups is imprecise, but they fall roughly in order from C6l/C5e through C5 to perhaps 412–404 for the third group. Types: *obv.* satyr/Silenos with a maenad (stater, trite), or satyr alone (hemihekte), or head of satyr (hekte), or two dolphins (quarter hekte), or dolphin (eighth hekte); *rev.* incuse square (all denominations). Anepigraphic till C5e, when legends appear: ΘΑΣΙΩΝ (hekte), ΘΑΣΙΩΝ (hemihekte), ΘΑΣΙΩΝ (quarter and eighth hekte). After an apparent pause in minting (404–391), a new coinage on a new system (but the same standard) starts (probably) in 390, with the return of democracy to Thasos, and runs to c.335; some modifications were introduced c.360. The new coinage includes issues in gold and bronze along with silver. Denominations now include tetradrachms and drachmas (replacing the old trite of the stater) in gold and silver; didrachms, triobols, hemiobols and chalkous in bronze. Types: *obv.* Dionysos, bearded or juvenile (gold, silver), or head of Herakles (bronze); *rev.* Herakles as archer; legend: ΘΑΣΙΩΝ (gold, silver), or Silenos with kantharos or amphora (gold), or Herakles’ symbols (bow, club, star); legend: ΘΑΣΙΩΝ (bronze; Pouilloux (1954) 216–17; Picard (1982), (1987); Duchêne (1992) 85–87; Grandjean and Salvat (2000) 303–9; SNG Cop. Thrace 1007–35).

The Thasians are said to have colonised the Hedonian city of Myrkinos (no. 633), Galepsos (no. 631) and Oisyme (no. 635); cf. Thuc. 4.107.3 and 5.61.1. An inscription attests to their colonisation of Neapolis (no. 634) (*IG* i’ 101.7 = ML 89:7; ἄτοκοι ὀντες Θασίων (110/9)) (*infra* 863). For the Thasian *peraia*, see Hdt. 6.46.2–3, 7.109.2; Dem. 50.47; Diod. 11.68.4, 16.3.7. Thasian magistrates in the *peraia* are attested c.400 (*IG* xii suppl. 347=Salviat (1986) 147–48; cf. Loukopoulou (1989) 62,185).

**527. Thera** (Theraios) Map 61. Lat. 36.20; long. 25.30. Size of territory: 2 (83 km²). Type: A. The toponym is Θήρα, η
(Pind. Pyth. 4.20; Arist. Pol. 1290b11; IG x11.7 6.6; F.Delphes 111.1 497.12 (C4/C3e)), in the Ionic dialect Θήρη (Hdt. 4.147.4); the toponym denotes both the island and the town (Strabo 8.3.19). The city-ethnic is Θήραιας (ML 5.6 (C4f); Pind. Pyth. 4.10). Thera is called a polis in the political sense (ML 5.37 (C7); Arist. Pol. 1290b11–12); the territorial sense seems to be a connotation at Hdt. 4.150.2. At Pind. Pyth. 4.20 Thera is called a matropolis. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in a C4f version of what claims to be a Theraian decree of C7s (ML 5.25) and in abbreviated form on bronze coins of C4 (infra); it is attested externally in inscriptions (IG i 71.6.8 (425/4); ML 5.2 (C4)) and in literary sources (Hdt. 4.150.1). The individual and external use is found in Athenian C5 inscriptions (IG i 30.5 (C5m), IG i 977–86 (C5s)) and in literary sources (Hdt. 4.154.3).

Thera was regarded as one of the Kyklades (Thuc. 2.9.4); for Strabo it is one of the islands near Crete (10.5.1). The names of a number of smaller settlements around Thera are known, and some of them have been located and explored archaeologically. Oia (IG x13.3 suppl. 1291.10) shows traces of settlement from the Archaic period to the end of Antiquity (see especially IG x13.3 526), and Eleusis has produced evidence of settlement from the Classical period (Hiller von Gaertringen (1899–1909) 1.299–308). There may have been a settlement of Archaic and Classical date at modern Perissa (Sperling (1973) 30–31).

Thera was generally recognised to be a colony of Sparta (no. 345) under the oecist Theras (Hdt. 4.147–49; Pind. Pyth. 4.251–59 and 5.72–76; Paus. 3.1.7–8, cf. IG x11.3 382 (C4); Malkin (1994) 89–111); in C4f Akesandros claimed that the oecist was called Samos and that a descendant called Aristoteles led the colony to Kyrene (no. 1028) ((FGH Hist 469) fr. 5a). The early and better version attributes the foundation of Kyrene, around 631, to Battos (Hdt. 4.150–58; Pind. Pyth. 4.4–4, 5.85–95; ML 5; see Malkin (1987) 60–69; on the oath in ML 5, see now Dobias-Lalou (1994), who argues that the text was Theraian). In Herodotos’ version, it was a severe and prolonged drought that drove the Theras to consult Apollo at Delphi and dispatch colonists. Menekles of Barka (C2) claims rather that stasis on Thera drove one of the factions off the island, but this may be a reflection of Hellenistic history making or of C4e problems on the island ((FGH Hist 270) fr. 6; cf. Ager (2001) 107). The Theras at Kyrene maintained their identity separately from settlers from the Peloponnesos and Crete until C6 (Hdt. 4.161.3).

Hostile to Athens in 431 (Thuc. 2.9.4), the Theraians are recorded as paying members of the Delian League from 430/29 (IG i 3 281.11.54, completely restored) or 429/8 (IG i 3 282.111.23, partially restored) to at least 418/17 (IG i 3 287.1.10) and possibly 416/5 (IG i 3 289.1.10, completely restored). Metallyng (1996) 77 argues that IG i 3 282 should be dated rather to 427/6 and that Thera was added to the Athenian sphere of authority at that date. Thera belonged to the Island district and was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i 3 71.6.8) (5 tal.); cf. the decree of 426/5 (IG i 3 68) in which Thera, paired with Samos, was denied the privilege of electing ekloges to collect the tribute, perhaps as a punishment (IV i 3 68 21–24).

Thera fell under Spartan hegemony after the Peloponnesian War and may have continued to be under that authority until Chabrias’ expedition in the Aegean in 377/6 (Diod. 15.30.5). Part of the Theraian state, [Θηρεία]παῖων [ὁ Θηρεία]όμοιος (IG ii 4.3.1–2), may have joined the Second Athenian Naval League in the early 370s (Coleman and Bradeen (1967); but cf. Cargill (1981) 45–47: [-c.2-]paíōn [ὁ δήμος], which is restored in IG ii 2 as [Kερκον] paíōn; the expression here has recently been interpreted to reflect stasis on the island between oligarchic and democratic factions (Ager (2001); see infra). The Kyrenaians (no. 1028) renewed in C4f the isopoliteia the Therians had long enjoyed at Kyrene (ML 5.12–13 (C4f)). The Therians received grain from Kyrene during the crisis of c.330–326 (SEG 9 2.17; cf. Marasco (1992) and Gasperini (1996) 106 n. 18).

As befits a colony of Sparta (see supra), the eponymous official on Thera was a board of three ephoroi (IG x11.3 336 (C3 but presumably to be interpreted retrospectively)). In the Archaic period Thera had a king (Hdt. 4.150.2). From Arist. Pol. 1290b11–14 it can be inferred that, in an earlier period, Thera had been an oligarchy in which citizen rights were restricted to the descendants of the original colonists. The presumption is that Thera in C4s had become a democracy. It cannot be established when the constitution was changed from monarchy to oligarchy and from oligarchy to democracy.

Recently stasis between oligarchic and democratic factions has been suggested for the 370s; evidence includes the restoration of [Θηρεία]παῖων [ὁ δήμος] at IG ii 43B.1–2 (see supra), the appearance of an ekklesia in an inscription of C4 (IG x13.3 suppl. 1289, infra), and the unlikely assumption that, in the famous inscription from Kyrene (ML 5), the polis referred to in line 3 is Thera and not Kyrene itself; see on all this Ager (2001) 101–13, with other arguments; but it is better to be cautious here (Dreher (1995) 13–14 n. 14).

There is no basis for Gigon’s view that the Aristotelian collection of politetiai included a Constitution of the Therians (no. 62). Damniorgoi are known from inscriptions of c.500(? and C4 (IG x11.3 450.2–3, 16–17; Jeffery (1990) 323 for the date; IG x11.3 suppl. 1289 (C4)); the later inscription may also attest
to an assembly (ἐκκλησία) functioning as a court in criminal actions (IG xi.3 suppl. 1289). Public enactments include a sacrificial regulation c.500(? apparently regulating sacrifice to Athena (IG xiii.3 450 with Jeffery (1990) 333), another of C4e (IG xiii.3 452; LSCG no. 133; Gialelis (1997) 50–51 (but cf. SEG 45 1104)), and a law regulating sacrifice to the Mother of the Gods (IG xiii.3 436 (C4)). The Theraians may have had an agreement or treaty with the Athenians (no. 361) in C4f (IG ii² 179c with Ager (2001) 101, 109–10). A Theraian citizen received proxenia from Arkesine (no. 472) (IG xii.7 6 (C4)).

Theraian citizens were organised into phylai (Hdt. 4.148, 1), obviously the three Dorian phylai all attested on the island: Hyleis (IG xii.3 378 (C4)), Dymanes (IG xii.3 377 (C4), restored) and Pamphyloi (IG xii.3 626 (Roman), abbreviated). The seven chori noted by Herodotos (4.153) should perhaps be associated with the toponyms of Eleusis, Melainaï and Oía (so Jones, POAG 215–16).

The patron deities were Zens Polias and Athena Polias (IG xii.3 suppl. 1362 (C5?; for the date, see at IG xiii.3 427 with IG xii.3 495 (first century AD) IG xiii.3 427 may also refer to Zeus Polias). Other communal cults included those of Artemis(?) Soteira (IG xii.3 155a (no date)) and Zeus Damatrios (?) (IG xii.3 418 with Kose (1997); SEG 45 1105). A wide variety of deities is mentioned in rock-cut inscriptions of Archaic and Classical date (IG xii.3 350–83, 399–406, suppl. 1312–13, 1316–18). The Theraians consulted Apollo at Delphi in connection with the founding of a colony at Kyrene (Hdt. 4.155.3; ML 5.10–11, 24–25; cf. Fontenrose (1978) 283–85 Q45–9, Q51). As for the calendar, two months are attested in C4, Artamitios and Hyakinthios (IG xii.3 452 = LSCG no. 133; IG xii.3 436); the first is known in Kyrene too, the second shows Thera’s connection with Lakedaimon (Trümpy, Monat. 186).

We have no information on whether Thera was walled before the Hellenistic period (W. Dörpfeld argued in favour of an early fortification wall in Hiller von Gaertringen (1899–1909) i.190–96, but withdrew his interpretation of the evidence in iii.160–61; cf. Sperling (1973) 90); the ruins seen today date mostly from the massive Hellenistic rebuilding of the city in connection with its use as a major Ptolemaic base (Bagnall (1976) 123–34). A basilike stoa (IG xii.3 326.18–20 (second century AD)) has been thought “conceivably . . . archaic” (Hansen and Fischer-Hansen (1994) 80), but was rebuilt in any case and dedicated in 161/60 by P. Mummianus Sisenna Rutilius (see now Dietz (1993)); it is possible that the original structure was erected by or in honour of the island’s Ptolemaic hegemons. A temple of Apollo Karneios, which may have been the chief archive of the city, is known from c.600 (Hiller von Gaertringen (1899–1909) i.275–83, iii.63–70; Sperling (1973) 82–84) and one of Apollo Pythisos from C6 (IG xii.3 322.20 (C2)). Thera had an agora of Archaic and Classical date (Witschel (1997) 24–25). A sanctuary of Athena existed from at least C5 at modern Skaros (IG xii.3 411; Sperling (1973) 35–36). Property belonging to the Mother of the Gods is attested by an inscription of C4 (IG xii.3 436; Sperling (1973) 33–34).

The island of Therasia lies opposite Thera, across the flooded caldera of the volcano that exploded in about 1648 to create the topography of this little archipelago. (The smaller islands in the caldera were created by post-Classical eruptions; see Forsyth (1992).) Although there is some evidence to suggest that Therasia had an independent political existence for a time in C3 (an ethnic in IG xii.2 120.48 (236) with L. Robert (1946) 93), there is no evidence for the Archaic or Classical periods to suggest that it was anything more than a dependency of Thera at best, or simply a part of the territory of Thera at least. For the toponym Therasia (Θηρασία), see Strabo 1.3.16, 10.5.1; Plut. Mor. 399C; Steph. Byz. 313.18–20; Ptol. Geog. 3.15.28. Ruins reported on the north-west part of the island have been associated with the polis of Ptolemy (3.15.28; cf. Sperling (1973) 40–41).

Anepigraphic silver staters of C7 on the Aiginetan standard have sometimes been assigned to Thera. Types: obv: two dolphins swimming right and left; rev: incuse square (Head HN² 480; Boutin (1986) 1–6 reasserts the attribution; accepted by Sheedy (1998a) 321). Otherwise Thera seems to have coined only in bronze starting in C4. Types: obv: head of Apollo, facing or in profile, or head of Zeus, or head of Hermes, or female head; rev: rushing bull sometimes with dolphins, or three dolphins, or lyre, or fulmen, or caduceus; legend: ΘΗ or ΘΗΠ (Head, HN² 493; SNG Cop. Aegean Islands 789–91).
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I. The Region

The name of the region is Μακεδονία—η (Hdt. 5.17.1; Thuc. 1.58.1; Hatzopoulos (1996b) ii. no. 1.89). It is derived from the ethnic Μακεδόν (Hdt. 5.18.2; Thuc. 1.57.2; IG i³ 89.26), in the Thessalian dialect Μακετούν (SEG 27 202.10); the feminine form is normally Μακέτα (IG ii² 9258). As Makedonia is simply the land of the Makedones, its extent followed Makedonian expansion. By the time of Alexander's accession, it ranged from the foothills of the Pierian mountains to the whole region between Mt. Pindos and the Strymon valley, and between the Peneios and roughly the present Greek frontier. To the south Makedonia bordered on Thessaly. Its southernmost cities were, from east to west, Herakleion and Balla in Pieria, Aiane in Elemia, Aiginion in Tymphaia. To the west it bordered on Epeiros, and its westernmost city was Argos Orestikon in Orestis. To the north-west it bordered on Illyria, and its north-westernmost city was Herakleia in Lynkos. To the north of Makedonia lay Paionia (including Pelagonia). The northernmost Makedonian cities, from west to east, were Styberra in Derriopos, Idomene in Parorbelia, and Herakleia in Sintike. To the east Makedonia bordered on Thrace and, until the annexation of the plain of Philippi in late Hellenistic times, its easternmost cities, from north to south, were Serrhai in Odomantike, the Bisaltic Pentapolis, and Amphipolis in Edonis. In Roman times, Makedonia reached the Nestos valley in the east and encompassed Pelagonia and Paonia as far north as Mt. Golesniça.

The Makedonian expansion was a gradual process, but the strongest impetus both to conquest and to colonisation was given by Philip II (360–336), who also systematically divided Makedonia into self-governing cities, each with its civic territory, and into administrative districts (see Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 167–260). For practical reasons, the “greater Makedonia” of the reign of Philip II and his Temenid and Antigonid successors has been subdivided into (a) a western part comprising the Old Kingdom, cradle of the Makedonian power, and Upper Makedonia—that is to say all Makedonian territories west of the Axios—and (b) an eastern part consisting of the new territories between the Axios and the plain of Philippi, which were incorporated into Makedonia proper by Philip II and his successors. The former areas had been almost entirely settled by Makedonians (who had subjected and mostly driven out or exterminated the indigenous populations), at least since the end of the Archaic period, whereas the latter were colonised in later times, and their former inhabitants had in most cases been permitted to remain in their old homes. Both of these parts, however, were integrated into a unified state, the citizens of which shared the same politeia and formed τὴν ... χώραν τὴν Μακεδόνων (SEG 12 374.6), Makedonia proper, as opposed to the external possessions of the Makedonian kings south of the Peneios, Mt. Olympos and the Kambounian mountains, west of Mt. Pindos and Lake Lychnitis, north of the present Greek frontier and east of the Strymon valley. The “greater Makedonia” created by Philip II was subdivided into four administrative districts called ethne in our sources: from west to east, Upper Makedonia (between Mt. Pindos and Mt. Bermion), Bottia (between Mt. Bermion and the Axios), Amphaxitis (between the Axios and modern Mt. Bertiskos) and Paroreia and Parastrymonia, also known as the First Meris (between Mt. Bertiskos and the plain of Philippi). Within these large administrative districts subsisted older regional names, often derived from the ethnika of their actual or former inhabitants: Elemia, Orestis, Tymphaia-Parauaia, Lynkos, Derriopos in Upper Makedonia; Pieria, Bottia (or Emathia), Almopia in the administrative district of Bottia; Mygdonia, Krestonia, Parorbelia, Bottike, Chalkidike, Anthemous, Krousis in Amphaxitis; Sintike, Odomantike, Bisaltia, Edonis, Pieris in the First Meris. Eordaia, although geographically part of Upper Makedonia, was considered from the political point of view as being part of Bottia since it had always belonged to the Temenid kingdom.
The collective use of the ethnic is attested externally for the first time in the C3l treaty between Perdikkas II and Athens (IG1 89.26) and internally in the C4l list of priests of Asklepios from Kalindoa (Hatzopoulos (1996b) ii. no. 6.2.6) and in the dedication of Kassandros from Dion, also C4l (ibid. no. 23). For the oldest individual and external use, see, perhaps, IG i² 422.1.79–80 (414/13) (a slave) and SEG 34 355.4–6 (365). As expected, we find no individual and internal use, since for a Makedonian within Makedonia the ethnic Μακεδων would normally be superfluous.

The region Makedonia is described by the term χώρα-η (Hatzopoulos (1996b) ii. no. 1.A6 (C46, restored) and 58.6 (243). If not from C3l (Thuc. 2.99.6, implicitly), from C4f onwards the term χθνος is used for the people (Ps.-Skylax 66).

Makedonia attracted the interest of city-state writers and developed an indigenous literary tradition only from the reign of Philip II onwards, when it became the dominant power in Greek politics. For this reason, evidence about Makedonian cities is relatively late, although by then urban settlements already had a long history in the area. Thus, many cities attested for the first time in the Hellenistic period most probably existed in the previous period too. Since the rules set down for the present project stipulate that only cities attested as such in the Archaic and Classical periods should be included in the Inventory, cities first appearing in Hellenistic times have been separated from the rest and are listed below along with other doubtful cases. On the other hand, toponyms which have been erroneously regarded as denoting cities by ancient authors or modern scholars have been entirely omitted; the same applies to settlements (mostly villages) first attested in Roman times, or which are mere lexigraphical entries without indication of their— even approximate—location and/or date, although many of them, as their dialectal forms show, surely existed in earlier periods.

A special problem arises from urban settlements in Upper Makedonia, particularly Aiane in Elemia, Bokeria in Eordaia, and Herakleia in Lynkos, which are sometimes actually described, expressis verbis, as poleis. From the administrative point of view, however, the equivalent of the Lower Makedonian poleis was not the urban settlement but each of the Upper Makedonian ethne such as the Orestai or the Elemiotai, comprising both cities and villages. After some hesitation, I have decided to include Aiane, for which there is enough evidence to allow it to qualify as a polis type C, but to exclude Bokeria and Herakleia from the Inventory itself and instead to list them with the other non-polis settlements.

Finally, I have decided not to consider unidentified ancient settlements. Makedonia is a vast country which has not been surveyed methodically. We know of many trapeza, which are a certain sign of a settlement in historical times. However, the absence of systematic investigation does not allow us to date these settlements precisely, even less to determine their status. A random inclusion of such cases would only contribute to creating an inexact image of the settlement pattern without enhancing our understanding of the polis phenomenon in Makedonia.

In Makedonia west of the Axios I have counted forty-two settlements attested either in Archaic and Classical or in Hellenistic times but which can most probably be dated to earlier periods: Agassai, Aiane, Aigeai, Aiginion in Pieria, Aiginion in Tymphaia, Alebaia, Alkomena, Alliance, Aloros, Argos Orestikon, Arnisa, Balla, Beroia, Bokeria, Bryanion, Dion, Edessa, Euia, Europos, Gaimeon, Galadrai, Genderrhos, Gortynia, Greia, Herakleia Lynkou, Herakleion, Ichnai, Keletro, Kyrrhos, Leibethra, Marinia, Methone, Mieza, Nea[---], Pella, Petra, Phylakai, Pimpleia, Pydna, Erytria, Styberra and Tyrrissa. Of these, five almost certainly (Gaimeon, Genderrhos, Greia, Nea[---] and Pimpleia) and one most probably (Arnisa) did not enjoy polis status. Of the remaining thirty-six, only seventeen (those in italics) can be positively dated to the pre-Hellenistic period and qualify certainly (type A), probably (type B), or possibly (type C) as poleis and are described in the Inventory below. Two (Bokeria and Herakleia) were, probably, the principal town in a whole region. The remaining seventeen settlements, which are first attested in the Hellenistic period, along with the six villages mentioned above, are listed here in alphabetical order. The principal towns in Eordaia (Bokeria) and Lynkos (Herakleia) have been given a somewhat fuller treatment than the others.

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis

*Agassai (Agassae, Ἀκεσαῖ?)* Livy 44.7.5, 45.27.1 (urbs); Steph. Byz. 59.3 (πόλις); ethnikon Ἀκεσαῖος or Ἀκεσάιτης? (Steph. Byz. 59.3); unlocated settlement, somewhere in Pieria (Papazoglou (1988) 118–19; Hammond (1972) 139 n. 1; Hatzopoulos (1996b) 109–10 n. 8). Barr. 50, H.

*Aiginion (Aeginium)* Livy 44.46.3 (oppidum) and 45.27.1–3 (urbs); Plin. HN 4.33; unidentified location, somewhere in Pieria (Papazoglou (1988) 119–20). Barr. 50, R.
Aiginion (Ἀϊγίνων) Livy 32.15.4, 36.13.6; Strabo 7.7.9; Gonnio no. 358.6 (Θήμος (2cm)); cf. IG 1.x.2.344 (πόλις), 329 (πόλις) (c. AD 200, when it was no longer part of Makedonia, but belonged to Thessaly). Capital of Tymphaia-Parauia. Gonnio pp. 35–36. Barr. 54. H.

Alkomena (Ἄλκομενα) Strabo 7.7.9 (πόλις); Steph. Byz. 75.15 (πόλις); IG x.2.2 348 (κόμη Αδ 192/3); ethnikon: Αλκομένευς (Arr. Ind. 18.6); Αλκομέναι (IG x.2.2 348). At Bucin near Bela Cerka in Derriopos. Papazoglou (1988) 302–3; Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 85–87, 411–16). Alkomena was apparently one of the urban centres of Derriopos, which as a whole constituted a political entity (cf. SEG 46 807: ἐν Δερρίῳ...βουλευτήριον). Barr. 49, HR.

Argos Orestikon (Ἀργος Ὀρεστικόν) Strabo 7.7.8 (πόλις); App. Syr. 63; Steph. Byz. 113.1 (πόλις); ethnikon: Ἀργεσταῖος (Livy 27.33.1 (Argestaeum campum)). Most probably at modern Argos Orestikon (Papazoglou (1988) 236–38). Barr. 49, HR.

Arnisa (Ἀρνίσα) Thuc. 4.128.3. At Vegor or, less probably, at Petrai/Gradista, in Eordaia (Papazoglou (1988) 161–64; Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 94, n. 4). Barr. 49, C.


Bokeria (Βοκέρια) EAM 109 (C4/C3, stadium stone); ethnikon: Βοκέρριος (AG 9.149; Papazoglou (1988) 164–66 and J. and L. Robert, BE (1971) no. 392 mistakenly write Βοκέρριος) or Βοκερρίαοι (Boccerus, in an unpublished boundary stone of the Roman period; cf. BE (1997) 364). At Pharangi in Eordaia (cf. Petsas (1966–67) 351, no. 245; Mackay (1976)); probable remnants of a circuit wall (Hammond and Hatzopoulos (1982) 143). Bokeria was the principal urban centre of the ethnos of the Eordaioi, who as a whole constituted a political unit equivalent to the poleis of coastal Makedonia (cf. the βουλή Ἡρακλείας ( SEG 48 800)). Barr. 50, HR.

Bryanion (Βρύανων) Livy 31.39.5; Strabo 7.7.9 (πόλις). Unidentified location in Derriopos (Papazoglou (1988) 303). Barr. 49 (Graïešte?), CHR.

Euia, Euboa (Εὐία, Εὔβοια) Diod. 19.11.2; Strabo 10.1.15 (πόλις); Steph. Byz. 284.2 (πόλις); ethnikon: Εὔβαστης (EAM 87 (181–180); Livy 42.51.4); cf. the Εὔβαστική πόλις in Beroia (I.Beraia 41). At Polymylos in Eordaia (I.Beroia 41 with comm.; Karamitrou-Mentesidi and Vatali (1997)). Barr. 50 (Euboa at Sevastiana?), L.


Genderhos (Γένδερρος) Varvitas (1977) 10 (κόμης) (C3); ethnikon: Γενδέρραιος (ibid.), Γενδέρρος (SEG 27 258, app. crit.). Unidentified location near Kyrrhos in Bottia, possibly at Mandalon (Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 112). Barr. 50 tentatively puts it at Mylotopos (following Papazoglou (1988) 154) but indicates no date.

Gortynia (Γορτύνια) Thuc. 2.100.3; Ptol. Geog. 3.12.36 (πόλις); Plin. HN 4.34; Strabo 7 fr. 4 (πόλις); Steph. Byz. 212.1. Perhaps located at Vardarski Rid, near Gavgeje, where recent excavations have revealed several building phases of a walled settlement; most important are the C6–C5e and the C5m–C4 phases, the latter with remains of a monumental public building (Mitrevski (1996)). Papazoglou (1988) 181–82. Barr. 50, CHRL.


Heraklea (Ἡράκλεια) Polyb. 34.12.7 (δια Ἡρακλείας καὶ Λυγκηστῶν); IG 491.13.35 (ἐπὶ τοῦ Λύγου); SEG 15 380 (πόλις Αἱρέων); perhaps one of the poleis mentioned by Demosthenes at 4.48; IG x.2.2 53 (polis (second century AD)); IG x.2.2 73 (polis (second century AD)); ethnikon: Ἡρακλεώτης (SEG 15 380; IG x.2.2 74). Near Bitola in Lynkestis. Not Heraklea alone, but the ethnos of the Lynkestai as a whole constituted a political unit equivalent to the poleis of Lower Makedonia. For the evidence from the Roman period, see Papazoglou (1988) 259–68, Mikulich (1974) 199–202, Gounaropoulou and Hatzopoulos (1985) 14–22 and IG x.2.2 pp. 29–74. Barr. 49, CHRL.


Nea[...–] (Nea[---]) SEG 24 524 (C3). Unknown location in Bottia, probably a kome of Mieza. Not in Barr.
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\section{The \textit{Polis}}

\subsection{528. \textit{Aiane} (Aiaiai\(\mathcal{\o}os\))}

\begin{footnotesize}

Maps 49–50. Lat. 40.10, long. 21.50. Size of territory: ? Type: C. The toponym is \textit{Alav\(\mathcal{\o}\)}, \(\eta\) (\textit{EAM} 47, Steph. Byz. 37.7; later spelt \textit{E\(\alpha\)v\(\mathcal{\o}\)\(\nu\) (\textit{EAM} 15)); possibly \textit{Aeane} in Livy 43.21.5 (\textit{Megas} (1976)). The city-ethnic \textit{Aiaiai\(\mathcal{\o}\)os} is given by Steph. Byz. 37.9.

Aiane is called a \textit{polis} in the political sense in \textit{EAM} 15, which dates from the second century AD. The ethnic is attested only by Steph. Byz., but there is no reason to doubt its authenticity.

Although Aiane, as the recent excavations at Megale Rachi have shown, was the capital of the kings of Elemia from Archaic times, it is not mentioned in the surviving historical works with the possible exception of Livy 43.21.5 in connection with the first military operations of the Third Makedonian War (\textit{Megas} (1976)).

The three monumental buildings discovered on the top and on the slopes of the acropolis, one of which is certainly a portico belonging to an agora complex, as well as the urban planning of the residential area, show that Aiane had the external aspect of a \textit{polis} from the 6th century BC, to which the oldest of these buildings belong (Karamitrou-Mentesidi (1993), (1994), (1996a) 16–32, (1996b) 25–29). The power of the Elemiote kings, which in the \textit{C4e} equalled that of the Temenids of Lower Makedonia, goes a long way to explain the early promotion of their residence to a full-blown city comparable to Aigeai. After the annexation of Upper

\end{footnotesize}
Makedonia to the Temenid kingdom and its reorganisation by Philip II, Aiane remained the capital of Elemia, although from the administrative point of view not Aiane alone but the whole of Elemia with its other towns and villages constituted a political unit equal to the poleis of Lower Makedonia (Hatzopoulos 1996b) ii. 89–91.

At Aiane probably were struck the bronze coins of King Derdas in the C4e. Types: obv. galloping horseman, or youthful Apollo, or youthful Herakles; rev. club and spearhead, or galloping horseman; legend: ΔΕΠΔΑΙΟΝ (Liami (1998)).

529. Aigeai (Aigaioi) Map 50. Lat. 40.30, long. 22.15. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Αἰγειαί, aī (IG iv 617.15) or Αἰγεία (Diod. 16.92.1) or Αἰγειαί (Dyllos (FGHist 73) fr. 1) or Αἰγειαί (Diod. 19.52.5; I.Leukapotera 103) or Αἰγαί (Diod. 16.3.5) or Αἰγεία (Theophr. fr. 5.27; Syll. 269L) or Αἰγεία (Ptol. Geog. 3.12.36). The city-ethnic is Αἰγείας (Plut. Pyrrh. 26.11; IG xii.8 206.12 (C1l), later spelled 'Εγέιας (I.Leukapotera 73 (AD 229)). Aigeai is called a poleis in the urban sense by Euphorion fr. 33, van Groningen (104) and Plut. Pyrrh. 26.11 (1274). A combined description of the urban and political aspects of the community is found in the phrase ἀστύ κτίζε πόληος (where asty is Aigeai and the poleis is the Makedonian state), referring to the foundation of Aigeai in C7 and attested in a Delphic oracle of c.500 (Diod. 7.16; for the date see Hatzopoulos (1996b) 464–65). The epiteth μηλοβότειρα shows that the toponym was used for the territory as well as for the urban centre (Steph. Byz. 39.1; cf. Just. 7.1.10). The political sense is implicit in the designation of Makedonians as belonging to the citizen body of Aigeai (cf. Syll. 269L and I.Magnesia 10.11–12: Αἰχμαλώτου Μήλοβοτειρᾶ Μακεδονίων Αἰγείας; for the date, see Gauthier, Prakt (1984) 98). The earliest attestation of the individual use of the city-ethnic occurs in IG xii.8 206.12 (C1l), but in Plut. Alex. 41.9 a C4 Makedonian citizen is called Εὐρύλοχος Αἰγείας.

The territory of Aigeai bordered on that of Beroia to the west and Aloros to the east. The marshes of the mouth of the Haliakmon formed its northern limit, and the heights of the Pierians its southern one. Thus it extended over c.12.5 km from the gorges of the Haliakmon to the river-bed of the Krasopoulis, and over c.5 km of arable territory between the mountain and the marshes (62.5 km²). The territory of Aigeai comprised several minor settlements, of which only one has been identified: Blaganoi (Hatzopoulos (1987a), (1990) 59–60). Although situated on the right bank of the Haliakmon, Aigeai did not belong to Pieria, but, just like Aloros, to Bottia (Diod. 7.16) or Emathia (Ptol. Geog. 3.12.36), as this region was called in later times (Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 239–47, (1996a)).

According to its foundation legend, Aigeai was originally a Phrygian (Brygian) city called Edessa, and the name Aigeai was first given to it by its Greek Makedonian conquerors (Euphorion fr. 33, van Groningen: Just. 7.1.10 (rC7)). From then on it was the Temenid capital, and it remained a part-time royal residence even after the transfer of the usual residence to Pella under King Amyntas III (Hatzopoulos (1987b)); in particular, it retained its character of royal cemetery at least until the end of the Temenid dynasty.

Citizens of Aigeai are known to have been proxenoi of several cities: Delphi (no. 177) (Syll. 269L (c.300 or 272)), Histiaia (no. 372) (IG xii.9 1187.30 (c.266)) and Magnesia on the Maiandrus (no. 852), where the recipient also received citizenship (I.Magnesia 10 (C3)).

Aigeai does not appear in the list of the theodorokoi of Nemea (in 323), but its name can be safely restored on the Argive list of contributors (IGIV 617.15 (c.300)), which could be a reference to theori (cf. Perlman (2000) 74). Its main deities were Zeus (Arr. Anab. 1.11.1) and Herakles Patroos (Hatzopoulos (1996b) ii. no. 30). Eukleia (Saatsoglou-Paliadeli (1879), (1992)) and the Mother of the Gods (Drougou (1996)) were also popular.

Excavations at Vergina-Palatitsia, begun by L. Heuzey in the middle of the nineteenth century and continued since by C. Romaios, and by M. Andronicos and his students, have unearthed, besides the extensive cemetery (Kottaridi (1992)), two palaces, a theatre, an agora, several sanctuaries and other facilities. The great palace (104.5 × 88.5 m), built around a peristyle court, with porticoes on the north and east sides, an extended balcony beyond the north portico and a monumental gate on the east side, belongs to the C4s, but the smaller one, to the west, seems to be earlier and may be the very structure decorated by Zeuxis in C3 (Andronicos (1984) 38–46; Ginouvés (1993) 84–88; Saatsoglou-Paliadeli (2001)). The C4s theatre (TGR ii. 317) lay immediately to the north of the palace. Stone benches rose only to the second row (Drougou (1997)). The theatre is mentioned by Diodorus in his account of the murder of Philip in 336 (Diod. 16.92.5ff). The agora of the city lay to the north of the theatre; it comprised the C4m temple dedicated to Eukleia (Saatsoglou-Paliadeli (1996)). To the north-east of the palace a sanctuary of the Mother of the Gods was discovered, the earliest building phase of which belongs to C4l (Drougou (1996)).
On the acropolis, south of the palace, which dominated the city, no major public buildings have been found (Phaklaris (1996) 70–74).

The C4I circuit wall roughly forms a triangle, with its apex to the south on the acropolis and its base on a line joining the two streams on either side of the acropolis hill probably to the south of the Rhomaios tomb. It is a pseudo-isodomic structure of local stone with towers at irregular intervals. Monumental gates opened from the acropolis to the south, towards Pieria, to the north towards the city, and west of the theatre towards Upper Makedonia (Andronicos et al. (1983) 42–45, (1987) 146–48; Phaklaris (1996) 69–70).

According to legend, Aigeai were founded by the Temenid Perdikkas or Karanos or Archelaos, alone or with an army of Argive colonists in the C7m or C8e (Hammond and Griffith (1979) 3–14).

530. Alebaia Map 50. Unlocated (but see Hatzopoulos (2003) for a possible identification with Bravas). Type: A (rC7). The toponym is Ἀλεβαίη, ἦ (Hdt. 8.137.1) Ἀλ(α)βαιοι (sc. τοῦ οἴκου) (I.Leukopetra 12.4 (AD 171/2)), Ἀλεβία (κώμη: I.Leukopetra 106.14 (AD 253/4)). The city-ethnic is unattested but was presumably Ἀλβαίοις (I.Leukopetra 12.4). Alebaia is called a polis, in the urban sense, exclusively in Hdt. 8.137.1, in the mythical context of the foundation of the Makedonian state by the Temenids. It is not clear whether Herodotos is considering (A)lebaia to be a polis in his own time or only in the C7, when the legend he narrates is dated. It is clear, however, that by the Roman period (A)lebaia was not an independent polis but a kome of Elemia, and it is probable that even earlier not (A)lebaia alone but the whole etnos of the Elemiotai constituted a political unit equivalent to the polis of Lower Makedonia.

531. Allante (Allantaioi) Map 50. Lat. 40.45, long. 22.35. (Allante was most probably situated at Nea Chalkedon (Gounaropoulos and Hatzopoulos (1985) 56–61). Military action during the First World War and the construction of a modern settlement after 1922 have destroyed practically all ancient remains.) Size of territory: ? Type: B. The toponym is Ἀλλανταῖος, ἦ (Thuc. 2.160.3) or Ἀλλαντάοι, τό (Theopomp. fr. 33; BCH 45 (1921) 171.64 (230–220)) or Ἀλλάντη (SEG 36 331B.21) or Ἀλλάντη (Steph. Byz. 76.1). The city-ethnic is Ἀλλαντάοις (SEG 35 137.1 (c.AD 198)) or Ἀλλαντάοι (Steph. Byz. 76.3 suggests Ἀλλαντάοις; Pliny’s Allantenses (HN 4.35) is not helpful. The only classification in literary sources of Allante as a polis is in Steph. Byz. 76.1. The only epigraphic attestation of a πόλις Ἀλλαντάοις is on a c.AD 198 milestone from Allante (SEG 35 753.12), where the term polis is used in the political sense. Allante is called a chorion in Thuc. 2.100.3. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested both internally (SEG 35 753.12) and externally (IG IV 617.17).

The territory of Allante bordered on that of Pella to the north-west, Ichnai to the north and Herakleia to the east, across the Axios; to the south it reached the ancient shoreline. Allante was probably a C5e Makedonian foundation designed to cut off the then Paionian city of Ichnai from the sea (Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 111).

Allantaian theorodokoi were appointed to host theoroi from Nemea (SEG 36 331.B.21 (331/30–313)). If the ethnic is correctly restored in IG IV 617.17, Allante is recorded on the Argive list of contributors of C4I, which may be connected with the dispatching of theoroi (cf.Perlman (2000) 74).

532. Aloros (Alorites) Maps 49–50. Lat. 40.35, long. 22.30. Size of territory: ? Type: A. The toponym is Ἀλωρος, ἦ (Ps.-Sklaxon 66; Strabo 7 fr. 20), and the city-ethnic Ἀλωριτής (Diod. 15.71.1). Aloros is called a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Sklaxon 66 (C4m). The individual use of the ethnic is attested externally in Diod. 15.71.1 (r368) and Arr. Ind. 18.6 (r3208).

The territory of Aloros bordered on that of Aigeai to the west and Methone to the south, while to the north it must have been delimited by the marshes of Lake Loudiakes.

Traces of a circuit wall of poros blocks c.1 km long have been spotted (Hatzopoulos (1987b) 38). Excavations begun in 1988 (Apostolou (1998)) have revealed a C4 two-room building, probably a temple, with an adjoining Archaic structure, probably an altar (Apostolou (1991)).

533. Beroia (Beroiaios) Maps 49–50. Lat. 40.30; long. 22.10. Size of territory: 4. Type: A. The toponym is Βεροια, ἦ (Thuc. 1.61.4), later spelled Βέροια (App. Syr. 57 and late Roman sources). The city-ethnic is Βεροιαὶ (unpublished C4s inscription from the Peraibian trîpolis; Polyz. 28.8.2); Βεροῖος in I.Leukopetra 31.5; Βεροῖοι in I.Leukopetra 84.4–5 or Βεροῖοι (Polyz. 27.8.6); Βεροῖοι (IG IV.1 96.22) is probably a mistake. Beroia is first attested as a polis in the political sense in a C4 dedication (I.Beroia 29 = Hatzopoulos (1996b) no. 73) and is called a polis in the urban sense in Ps.-Skymnos 626 (C2). The term chorion is used by Thuc. 1.61.4, and the term polisma by App. Syr. 57. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in an honorific inscription (I.Beroia 59 (C1)). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in a consecration from the sanctuary of Leukopetra (I.Leukopetra 31.5 (AD 192/3)) and externally in an unpublished dedication from...
the Perrhaibian Tripolis (cf. Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 156, n. 15 (C4s)) and in a C3f Epidaurian list of 
theorodokai (IG IV 1.96.22).

The territory of Beroia bordered on that of Mieza to the north, Pella to the north-east, Aigaei to the south-east and on the regions of Eordaia to the north-west and Elemia to the south-west. Among the secondary settlements of the original territory of Beroia, we know the names of Kyneoei, Auranonton, Kannonea and Droga (Hatzopoulos (1990)).

The constitution of Beroia, like the constitution of all the cities of Macedon, had a pronounced aristocratic character. Not only slaves, but also freedmen, their sons, male prostitutes and craftsmen were excluded from civic life (Gauthier and Hatzopoulos (1993) 78–87), and full enfranchisement probably was subject to a minimum census in landed property (Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 209 n. 1). The chief executive official was the epistates (Hatzopoulos (1996b) ii. no. 73), who—at least later—was assisted by a board of magistrates who may have been called tagoi (Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 156).

The patron deity of Beroia was Herakles Kynagidas, who was revered as the ancestor of the royal family—not only of the Temenids, but also later of the Antigonids (Edson (1934) 226–32; Allamani-Souri (1993b); Hatzopoulos (1994a) 102–11). The cult of Asklepios was also important (Voutiras (1993) 257), and his priest was eponymous, as in all Macedonian cities (Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 152–54). His cult was, at least later, associated with those of Apollo and Hygieia (I.Beroia 16 (C5s)). The cult of Dionysos was an ancient one (cf. the epistylion of the theatre bearing a dedication to the god, I.Beroia 21 (C4l)); with the epithets Agrius, Eirkryptos, Pseudanor it is attested only in Imperial times, but, given its archaic character, it certainly had much earlier origins (Hatzopoulos (1994a) 65–85). From the Hellenistic period are attested cults of Athena (I.Beroia 17), Ennodia (I.Beroia 23), Hermes (I.Beroia 24), Pan (I.Beroia 37) and Atargatis (I.Beroia 19). Beroia is recorded on the Argive list of contributors (IG IV 617.17 (C4l)), which may be connected with the dispatching of theoroi (cf. Perlman (2000) 74).

The failure of the Athenians to capture Beroia in 432 (Thuc. 1.61.4) probably implies that at least part of the city, such as the acropolis situated in the western extremity, was already fortified. Traces of a C4l circuit wall made of local poros have been discovered in different parts of the modern town (Petkos (1997) 272). There were at least three gates, one of which bore the name Εὔνιαστήκης (I.Beroia 41; cf. Brocas-Deflussieux (1999) 37–41). The continuous habitation of the site from the Iron Age to the present (cf. Allamani-Souri (1993a); Allamani-Souri and Apostolou (1992) 97) have left very few traces of the ancient town plan. It is presumed that the ancient agora and main road axes correspond to the modern civic centre and road system (Brocas-Deflussieux (1999) 99–101). The stadion has been located in the eastern outskirts of the city. Epigraphic finds have permitted the location of the gymnasion—first attested in the Hellenistic period—in the same area south of the stadion (Brocas-Deflussieux (1999) 87–90). A late Classical or early Hellenistic epistylion with a dedication to Dionysos (I.Beroia 21) provides evidence for the functioning of the theatre in that period.

534. Dion (Diestes) Maps 49–50. Lat. 40.10, long. 22.30. Size of territory: 4. Type: [A]. The toponym is Διόν, τό (Thuc. 4.78.6; Staatsverträge 308.9), Δέιον (SEG 31 630). The city-ethnic is Διέων (SEG 48 785; Steph. Byz. 522.3) or Διάστης (Paus. 9.30.8) or Δέιον (Oikonomos (1915) no. 4) or Δείος (Steph. Byz. 232.5). The form Δείος attested on coins (Hatzopoulos and Psoma (1999) 10–12) has nothing to do with Makedonian Dion.

In Ps.-Skylax, the chapter about Makedonia (66) opens with πρώτη πόλις Μακεδονίας Ἰππάκλειον, Δέιον . . . Thus, Dion is implicitly classified as a polis in the urban sense in C4f, and explicit references are found in later sources, both literary (Paus. 10.13.5 (rC6l/C5e); cf. CID 1 1) and epigraphical (Oikonomos (1915) no. 4 (early second century AD)). Thuc. 4.78.6 calls Dion a polisma. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in a Cze letter of Philip V to the city (SEG 48 785). In the same letter polite occurs (cf. the χήραι πολιτείας in a Hellenistic catalogue of names: Pandermalis (2002) 381–82).

The territory of Classical Dion bordered on that of Leibethra to the south, Pydna to the north-east and possibly Phylakai to the north-west. We know the name of only one of its secondary settlements: Pimpleia, called κόμε by Strabo at 7 fr. 17, which was famous because of its connection with the legend of Orpheus and the cult of the Muses (Schmidt (1950)).

Dion was the religious centre of Makedonia at least from C5 and probably much earlier (cf. Diod. 17.16.3). The patron deity of Dion was Olympian Zeus, to whom the city owed its name (Just. 24.2.8) and who was venerated along with the Muses (Diod. 7.16.3). Other communal cults were those of Demeter, Dionysos, the Mother of the Gods, Aphrodite, Baubo, Orpheus, Athena, Eileithyia, Asklepios and Hermes. Sarapis and Isis are also attested from early Hellenistic times onwards (Pandermalis (1977), (1993); Hatzopoulos (1994b))
The most important religious but also political event at Dion, and in Makedonia as a whole, was the *panegyris* of Olympia held in the month of Dios and lasting nine days (Diod. 17.16.4). Among other contests it included the *pentathlon*, the *dolichos* and the *taurotheria* (Hatzopoulos 1996b) i. 129 n. 2; cf. *BE* (1978) no. 232). Dion maintained close relations with Delphi from the Archaic period (*CID* i 11 (C6/C5c); cf. Paus. 10.13.5 and Mari (2002) 29–31).

From a C4m fiscal law (Hatzopoulos 1996b) ii. no. 56) and a C4l decree (ibid. no. 57), both unpublished, we are informed that Dion had fewer than ten archontes and at least two *tamiæ*.

The site of Dion comprises the sanctuaries area in the open plain and the walled city to its north. The latter occupies an area of 0.43 ha, which justifies the descriptions of Thuc. 4.78.6 (*πάλαια*um) and Livy 44.7.3 (*urbem non magnum*). The rectangular grid-line of the street planning, leaving an open space for the agora, is contemporary with the erection of the walls (Stephanidou-Tiveriou (1998) 216–23). These, 2.60–3.30 m wide, date from C4l and were probably built by Kassandros (after 305?). In their pre-Roman phase they had a regular rectangular perimeter of c.2.625 m and about sixty towers. Of a probable total of at least six or seven gates, four have been identified so far. One of the northern ones, leading to two consecutive courtyards, was probably the main entry to the city. The walls were built from local conglomerate stone. Above the stone substructure rose a brick superstructure of indeterminate height (Stephanidou-Tiveriou (1988)). In the open plain several sanctuaries have been located: two *megaron*-shaped temples of Demeter adjacent to each other (in which the Mother of the Gods, Baubo and Hypolymida Aphrodite were probably worshipped as well) date from C6l (Pingiatoglou (1996); Pandermalis (1999) 60–73); near the theatre lay the small C5 temple of Asklepios (Pandermalis (1999) 84–87); finally, the famous temple and temenos of Olympian Zeus has now been located in the south-eastern part of the sanctuaries area (Pandermalis (1999) 44–59, (2000) 291–92). Other important public buildings in the open plain are the C4e theatre, which was rebuilt in Hellenistic times (Karadechos (1986) 337–40) and the C6l *stadium* (Leake (1835) 409 and now Pandermalis (1999) 76, 80–81).

535. *Edessa* (Edessaios) Maps 49–50. Lat. 40.45, long. 22.05. Size of territory: ? Type: C. The toponym is Ἥδεσσα, ἥ (IG iv 617.16 (C4l); Strabo 7.7.4). The city-ethnic is Ἕδεσσαιος (*F. Delphes* 111.3 207.2 (C3m)), also spelt Ἕδεσσαίος (Tataki (1994) no. 56). Edessa is called a *polis* in Diod. 31.8.8 (r167), probably in the political, urban and territorial senses combined. For late attestations of the urban sense, see *Ptol. Geo*. 3.12.39 (cf. 17), and for the political sense, see Demitsas no. 3 (second or third century AD). The term *polismin* is attested in App. *Syr*. 57, and the term *polites* in Antoninus (1879) 227, no. 26. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in *SEG* 36 615.4 (c.AD 200). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in Cormack (1973) no. 4 (second century AD) and externally in *F.Delphes* 111.3 207.2 (C3m).

The territory of Edessa bordered on the region of Almopia to the north, on the territories of Kyrhlos to the east, on those of Marinia and Skydra to the south, and on the region of Eordaia to the west (Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 112).

The constitution of Edessa is known to us only from inscriptions of the Roman period (e.g. *SEG* 24 531.6 (AD 180/1)), which is also the earliest attested public enactment; Antoninus (1879) 227, no. 26). Edessaians were granted *proxenia* by Delphi (*F.Delphes* 111.3 207.2 (C3m)) and Haliartos (*IG* vii 2848.4 (C3?)), and received citizenship from Larisa (*SEG* 27 202 (220–210)). Edessa is recorded on the Argive list of contributors of C4l, which may be connected with the dispatching of *theoroi* (*IG* iv 617.16; cf. Perlman (2000) 74).

The cult of Herakles is mentioned by Hesychius, s.v. Ἕδεσσαιοι, and is attested epigraphically (Struck (1902) 310 no. 15 and, with the epithet *Kynamigas*, in two unpublished C2s and C3m inscriptions). From the same period date inscriptions referring to the cults of Zeus Hypsistos (P. Chrysostomou (1989–91) 30–34) and Parthenos (Hatzopoulos (1995)). Evidence for other cults is of later date.

A probably C4l (A. Chrysostomou (1988) 60, (1996) 174) wall enclosed both the acropolis (triangular perimeter, one tower on the north-west apex of the triangle and one on each of the west and north sides) and the lower city (polygonal perimeter, 2.4–3 m wide) covering an area of 3.5 and 23 ha respectively (A. Chrysostomou (1987), (1996)). The walls are mentioned by Polyae. 2.29.2 (r174). The only public monuments known are the temple of Ma and its stoas, which are epigraphically attested (Hatzopoulos (1995) 126). The site has been occupied continuously since the Bronze Age, which accounts for the lack of Archaic and Classical remains (A. Chrysostomou (1996) 180–82); however, Livy 45.30.5 refers to Edessa as among the *urbes nobles* of central Makedonia in 167, and it was presumably already so in the Classical period.
536. **Europos** (Europaos)  Map 50. Lat. 40.55, long. 22.35. Size of territory: ? Type: B. The toponym is Εὐρωπός, ἦ (Thuc. 2.100.3; Strabo 7.7.9; cf. Kotzias, AA 54 (1939) 257 (inscribed tiles)), Ὄρμος (App. Syr. 57; BCH 45 (1921) 17, 111.62). The city-ethnic is Εὐρωπαίος (F.Delphes 111.4 405.3 (C3ε)) or Εὐρώποις (I. Oropos 98 (C3l)). Europos is called a polis in the urban sense in Ptol. Geog. 3.12.36 (cf. 17) and in the political sense in two honorific decrees for Roman generals (SEG 41 570 (c.110), 42 575 (c.39–38)). Thuc. 2.100.3 calls Europos a chorion. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in SEG 41 570 (c.110) and externally in the C4l contribution list from Argos (IG iv 617.17). For the earliest individual use of the city-ethnic, see the proxenia decree from Delphi (F.Delphes 111.4 405.3 (C4l)).

The territory of Europos bordered on those of Pella to the south-west, Ichnai to the south-east and Gortynia to the north.

Citizens of Europos received the proxenia at Delphi (F.Delphes 111.4 405.3 (C4l)). A cult of Artemis Elaphelbos is attested in a C3 inscription (SEG 43 399). The Europaians are recorded in the Argive list of contributors of C4l, which may be connected with the dispatching of theoroi (IG iv 617.17; cf. Perlman (2000) 74).

Europos was most probably a walled city in 429, since Sitalkes besieged it but was unable to capture it (Thuc. 2.100.3). Of its public buildings we know only of an aqueduct mentioned in an inscription of Imperial times (SEG 38 608). Ongoing excavations aim to delimit the settlement; sporadic finds, such as an unpublished late Archaic kouros (Savvopoulou (1988) 137), testify to Europos’ importance as a trading centre of the Axios valley.

537. **Herakleion** (Herakleioi)  Map 50. Lat. 40.00, long. 22.40. Size of territory: 3: Type: A. The toponym is Ἡράκλειον, τό (Damastes (FGrHist 5) fr. 4.3; Ps.-Skylax 66; IG i3 77.V.21 (Ἑράκλειον)), Ἡράκλεια, ἦ (Steph. Byz. 304.3). The city-ethnic is Ἡρακλείωτης (Gonnoi 93). Herakleion is called a polis in the urban sense in Ps.-Skylax 66. The collective use of the ethnic is attested externally in Gonnoi 93B.24 (C3l)).

The territory of Herakleion bordered on that of Gonnoi to the south-west (see the dossier in Gonnoi 93–107), Leibethra on the north and possibly Homolion, beyond the Peneios, before the foundation of Phila on the mouth of that river in Hellenistic times.

Herakleion became a member of the Delian League some time between 430/29 and 425/4 or, at least, the Athenians claimed its membership and had it assessed for a tribute of 1,000 drachmas (IG i3 71.IV.108, completely restored; 77.V.21).

Herakleion appears as a walled city in 169 (Polyb. 28.11.1; Livy 44.9.1–9), but its fortifications most probably date from C5, since the city could successfully challenge the authority of Perdikkas II and remain a member of the Delian League for years. Presumably, the walls covered the entire hill, since Heuzey (1860) 92–93 saw remains of them at the bottom of the hill, near the river bank.

538. **Ichnai** (Ichnaios)  Map 50. Lat. 40.45, long. 22.35. (On the location of Ichnai on the right bank of the Axios, see Hatzopoulos (2001) 59–60.) Size of territory: ? Type: A. The toponym is Ἰχναῖος, αἱ (Hdt. 7.123.3; BCH 45 (1921) 17.111.63), Ἰχναῖα (Eratosthenes according to Steph. Byz. 342.17, but probably referring to the Thessalian Ichnai; cf. Steph. Byz. 152.16). The city-ethnic is Ἰχναίοις (IG ii2 8944 (undated)). Ichnai is called a polis in the urban sense in Hdt. 7.123.3 and in the political sense in a treaty (?) between that city and Dikaia (?) (Struck (1902) 310 no. 15.2 (undated)). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins of C3e (infra) and in inscriptions (Struck (1902) 309 no. 14.6 and 310 no. 15.2). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested in a Delphic C3m proxeny decree (F.Delphes 111.3 207.3 (C3m)) and in an undated Attic sepulchral inscription (IG ii2 8944).

The name of the territory of Ichnai might be Ἰχναῖων χώρα (Hsch. s.v. Ἰχναίαν, unless the reference is to the homonymous Thessalian city). It bordered on the territories of Pella to the south–west, Allante to the south, Tyrissa to the north-west, and probably Herakleia in Mygdonia to the east, across the Axios. The probable site of the urban centre has been totally destroyed by intense agricultural activity (ArchDelt 49 (1994) Chron. 455).

Two fragments of an inscription of unknown date might belong to a treaty between Ichnai and Dikaia (Papazoglou (1988) 155–56). A citizen of Ichnai was awarded proxenia by Delphi (F.Delphes 111.3 207.3 (C3m)); another Ichnaians was appointed theorodokos for theoroi arriving from the same city (BCH 45 (1921) 17.111.63 (c.220)).

Judging by the onomastic evidence, Ichnai must have been originally a Paionian settlement which already in Archaic times received an influx of Southern Greek colonists. After the Makedonian conquest, settlers from the Old Kingdom were added to its population (cf. Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 107 n. 1). It seems that citizens of Ichnai, in their turn, participated in the Makedonian colonisation of Amphipolis (Hatzopoulos (1991) 86).
Before the Macedonian conquest, Ichnai struck silver staters and octadrachms (c.490–480). Types: *obv.* male figure, usually between two bulls, or beside a horse; *rev.* wheel, or cross in an incuse square; legend: *[IX]NAI[ON], IXNAI, IXNAON, IXNAION* (Gaebler 1935) 63–65; Price and Waggoner (1975) 29–30, 117; Papazoglou (1988) 155; *SNG Cop. Macedonia* 183–84).

539. **Kyrrhos** (Kyrrhестes) Map 50. Lat. 40.50, long. 22.15. Size of territory: 4? Type: B. The toponym is *Κύρρος, ή* (Thuc. 2.100.4; Steph. Byz. 430.17; Vavritsas (1977) 8), *Κύρης* (Diod. 18.4.5, MSS, apparently a mistake), *Κύριος* (in the MS of Ptol. *Geog* 3.12.36; cf. the form *Scuro* (*It. Baud* 606.3). The city-ethnic is *Κυρρέστης* (*SEG* 40 520; Plin. *HN* 4.34: *Cyrrestae*, cf. *SEG* 27 258 (Roman)) or *Κυρραῖος* (*SEG* 43 435.3 (early third century AD)). The only attestations of Kyrrhos as a *polis* (in the urban sense) are Plin. *HN* 4.34 and Ptol. *Geog* 3.12.36 (cf. 17), but its mention alongside Dion and Amphipolis in Alexander’s *kome* that Genderrhos was a *thessal* east. An unpublished C3 decree from Gonnoi (Diod. *HN* 4.34: *Cyrrestae*, cf. *SEG* 27 258 (Roman)) or *Κυρραῖος* (*SEG* 43 435.3 (early third century AD)). The only attestations of Kyrrhos as a *polis* (in the urban sense) are Plin. *HN* 4.34 and Ptol. *Geog* 3.12.36 (cf. 17), but its mention alongside Dion and Amphipolis in Alexander’s *kome* that Genderrhos was a *kome* of Kyrrhos. The name of another *meros* (*kome*) of the city, Mandarai, is preserved in Steph. *Byz*. 430.17.

The earliest public enactment of Kyrrhos is an unpublished C3 decree concerning public works in the vicinity and in the agora of the city (Vavritsas (1977)).

Kyrrhos was renowned for its sanctuary of Athena Kyrrhestis, which is also attested epigraphically (*SEG* 27 258 (Roman)), was transferred to the homonymous city in Syria. Other communal cults were those of Artemis Agrotera (attested by Roman evidence: *SEG* 30 533–54, 35 750, 43 404–5) and of Zeus Hyspitostos (P. Chrysostomou (1989–91) 40–41).

540. **Leibethra** (Leibethrios) Map 50. Lat. 40.50, long. 22.30. Size of territory: 3. Type: C. The toponym is *Λείβηθρα, τά* (Aesch. fr. 83a.9; BCH 45 (1921) 17 111.53) or *Λείβηθρον* (Strabo 10.3.17) or *Λείβηθρα* (Paus. 9.30.9). The city-ethnic is *Λείβηθριός* (Arist. fr. 552; Gonnoi 2.6) or *Λείβηθριος* (Paus. 9.30.11).

Leibethra is called a *polis* in the urban sense in Paus. 9.30.9, referring to the mythical period. The term *patris* is used in *Orph. Argonaut* 1.34. Alternative site-classifications are *ethnos* (Arist. fr. 552), *chorion* or *oros* (Strabo 10.3.17), *topos* (Hsch., sv. *λείβηθρον*) and *σχοπτή* (*Lyc. Alex. 275*). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on an inscribed weight of one mina (*SEG* 27 283 (undated)) and externally in Arist. fr. 563 and in a C3* decree from Gonnoi (Gonnoi 2.6).

Originally populated by Thracian Pieres, Leibethra and this part of Pieria were conquered by the Macedonians c.C7 (Strabo 10.3.17; cf. Hammond (1972) 417).

According to the legend mentioned by Pausanias (9.30.11), the city was destroyed by the river Sys. The topography of the site and the remains of the walls make such a “destruction” by the four torrents in the area quite possible (Kotzias (1948–49) 33–34), although the continued existence of the city is secured by Classical (Pritchett (1991) 127) and Hellenistic (Kotzias (1948–49) 34) remains, by the mention of the city in the C3 inscription from Gonnoi (*Gonnoi* 2.6) and by the C3 Delphic list of *theorodokoi* (*BCH* 45 (1921) 17 111.53).

The territory of Leibethra probably extended from the mountainous area of Lower Olympus to the valley of Sys (Helly (1973) 35–36; Gonnoi 5). The city bordered on Gonnoi to the south-west, presumably on Herakleion to the south, and Dion to the north.

The cults of Orpheus, the Nymphs, the Muses and Dionysos are attested in literary sources (Kotzias (1948–49) 26–28). The cult of the latter deity has now found a possible archaeological confirmation (*SEG* 27 283).

The legend of the city’s destruction mentions the existence of walls (Paus. 9.30.11). Kotzias ((1948–49) 33–34), who
excavated the site, discovered part of a circuit of 1.5 m-wide walls. According to Pritchett (1991 127), the circuit was no more than 500 m long. Recent work has confirmed that the acropolis (1.5 ha) was walled and that the site was not abandoned until C1 (ArchDelt 50 (1995) Chron. 497–98).

541. Methone (Methonaios) Maps 49–50. Lat. 40.30, long. 22.35. Size of territory: 3? Type: A. The toponym is Μεθώνη, ἡ (Thuc. 6.7.3; IG 11 130), Μεθώνα (IG 9v.1 1941b.8). The city-ethnic is Μεθωναίος (IG 1v.6 61; Thuc. 4.129–4; Arist. frr. 551–52). Methone is called a polis both in the urban sense (Dem. 9.26; Ps.-Skylax 66) and in the political sense (IG 1v.6 61.44–45; Plut. Mor. 298B, probably derived from Aristotle’s treatise). In Din. 1.14 polis is used in both senses simultaneously. The politai of Methone are mentioned in Diod. 16.34.5 (1354), and there was an Aristotelian Methonaion politeia (frr. 551–52). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form on coins (infra) and externally in IG 1v.6 61.1. For the individual and external use of the city-ethnic, see e.g. IG 11 9330 (C51).

According to Thuc. 6.7.3, Methone bordered on Makedonia (ἡν ἰδίου Μακεδονία), and its territory (ὅς χώρας τῆς Μεθώνας) is mentioned in IG 1v.6 61.22. The territory of Classical Methone bordered on that of Pydna to the south and Aloros to the north-west. The size of the territory must have been close to 100 km², perhaps a little more. After 354 it must have been added to that of Pydna (Hatzopoulos 1996b) i. 181.

Methone was originally a Thracian settlement. It was colonised by Eretrians c.730 (Hammond 1972) 425–26 and joined the Delian League after 431 (for the date and the erroneous restoration of the ethnic in IG 1v.6 280.11.67, see Piérart (1988)). It belonged to the Thracian district and is registered in the tribute lists from 430/29 (IG 1v.6 281.11.33, restored) to 415/14 (IG 1v.6 290.11.18) a total of three times, paying a phoros of 3 tal. (IG 1v.6 282.11.53). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG 1v.6 71.11.157 (5 tal.), ethnic completely restored).

In 364 or 363 it was captured by the Athenian Timotheos (Din. 1.14 = 3.17) and became an ally of Athens but probably without becoming a member of the Second Athenian Naval League (Dreher (1995) 26). Methone was conquered and destroyed by Philip II in 354 (Dem. 4.4; Diod. 16.31.6 and 34.4–5). The inhabitants were allowed to leave the city with one garment each; the city itself was razed to the ground, and its territory distributed to Macedonian settlers. A few decades later, old Methone was succeeded by a new settlement 1 km to the north-west of the former city, which, however, did not enjoy the status of polis but was probably a kome of Pydna (Hatzopoulos et al. (1990); for the origin of the new settlers, see Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 180–81).

Our only information about the constitutional arrangements of Methone concerns its magistrates, the archontes and the polemarchos mentioned in Arist. frr. 551. A Methonaian theorodokos hosted the theoroi from Epidauros (no. 348) (IG 9v.1 194.8) c.360. Another Methonaian is known to have been granted citizenship in Ephesos (I.Ephesos 48 (C41)).

Methone was a walled city in 354 (Dem. 1.9; Theopomp. fr. 52; Polyain. 4.2.15; Just. Epit. 7.6.14). No remains of the walls are visible today.

Methone struck only one type of bronze coinage in C4f. Types: obv. female head to the r.; rev. lion breaking spear; legend: ΜΕΘΩ (Gaebler (1935) 78–79; Psoma (2001) 115).

542. Mieza (Miezaios/Miezeus) Map 50. Lat. 40.40, long. 22.05. Size of territory: ? Type: B. The toponym is Μιεζα, ἡ (Plut. Alex. 7.4), Μέζα (BCH 45 (1921) 17, 111.59), Μεζα (in the MS of Ptol. Geog. 3.12.36); the alternative name Στρυµόνιον given by Steph. Byz. 452.1 (perhaps quoting Theagenes (FGrHist 774) fr. 7) is probably an epithet. The city-ethnic is Μιεζαῖοι (Theagenes (FGrHist 774) fr. 7), later spelt Μιεζέος (I.Leukopetra 7.18–9), or Μιεζεύς (Arr. Ind. 18.6 (1325)).

Mieza is called a polis in the urban sense by Steph. Byz. 452.1, possibly quoting Theagenes (FGrHist 774) fr.7 (C3); cf. Ptol. Geog. 3.12.36 (cf. 17). For the individual use of the city-ethnic, see Arr. Ind. 18.6.

The territory of Mieza is called Μιεζευτής τόπος in I.Leukopetra 7.18–9; we know the names of two settlements that were probably the konai, Gaineion and Nea [---] (SEG 24 524 (C3)). It bordered on the territory of Beroia to the south, Marinia to the north-west, and Skydra to the northeast.

Among the magistrates, the eponymous priest of Asklepios, the epistates, tagoi and dikastai are attested in the Hellenistic period (SEG 24 524 (C2f)), and at least the priest of Asklepios and the epistates are likely to have existed since C4 (Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 156). The cults of Asklepios (SEG 24 524 (C2f)), the Nymphs (Plut. Alex. 7.4), Artemis (SEG 24 525–26), Herakles Kallinikos (Demitsas (1896) no. 18) and the river god Olganos (Kallipolitis (1952)) are attested in Mieza.

Although the archaeological complex of Leukadia–Kopanos–Naoussa was well known from the nineteenth century, only most recently have excavations started at the very site of the ancient city (Rhomiptopoulou (1997)). A large
(over 106 m long) C₄ stoa, which might form part of a Asklepieion complex, has come to light (Allamani-Souri and Misaeliidou (1992) 203–12; Allamani-Souri et al. (2002)). Moreover, the school that Aristotle founded in Mieza (Plut. Alex. 7.4) is almost certainly to be identified with the building complex at Isvoria, to the south-west of the civic centre, where three caves are joined by elaborate peripatoi, niches, stoas and staircases (Siganidou and Trochides (1990), with earlier refs.).

543. Pella (Pellaios) Maps 49–50. Lat. 40.45, long. 22.30. Size of territory: 4 (P. Chrysostomou (1990) 223). Type: A. The toponym is Πέλλα, ἡ (Hdt. 7.123.3; Thuc. 2.99.4; Syll. 267A.4), earlier (or as an epithet?) Βούνομος or Βούνονεία (Steph. Byz. 515.7–8). The city-ethnic is Πελλαῖος (Arvanitopoulos (1909) no. 16; Arr. Anab. 3.5.3). The alternative forms Πελληνός of Plut. Mor. 339B and Πελληρός of Steph. Byz. 515.9–10 are otherwise unknown. Pella is called a polis in the urban sense in Hdt. 7.123.3 and Ps.-Skylax 66. At Xen. Hell. 5.2.13, μεγίστη τῶν ἐν Μακεδονίας πόλεων is used about Pella both in the personal-political and in the urban sense. The earliest attestation of polis in a purely political sense is in the asylia decree for Kos (SEG 12 374.9 (243)).

In a verse dedication of Queen Eurydika, wife of Amyntas II, πολίτης is used about the female citizens, presumably of Pella (Plut. Mor. 14B with BE (1984) 249). Pella is called a polisma in App. Syr. 57 and a metropolis in Strabo 16.2.10. Ps.-Skylax 66 writes: πόλις καὶ βασιλείαν ἐν αὐτῇ (C₄m). πατρίς is used about Pella in a C₄s epigram from Delphi (SEG 18 222a), in AG 7.139 (C₁) and in Strabo 16.2.10. Demosthenes’ description of Pella as a χωρίῳ ἀδὰς ἐϕ... καὶ μυκρῷ (18.68 (rC₄e)) is clearly a rhetorical distortion (cf. Xen. Hell. 5.2.13). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in the C₂f coinage of the city (Gaebler (1935) 93–97) and externally in the asylia decree for Kos (SEG 12 374 (243)). For the individual use of the city-ethnic, see Arr. Ind. 18.3 (r325), and Arvanitopoulos (1909) no. 16 (C₃e).

Pella’s extensive territory, Πελλαία (Strabo 7 fr. 20), bordered on the territories of Allante to the south-east, Ichnai to the east, Tyrissa to the north, and Kyrhos to the north-west and to the west. We know the sites of five secondary settlements, at Archontikon, Damianon B, Agrosykia, Leptokarya B and Ag. Nikolaos (Krya Vrysi), and two suburbs, one to the north-west and one to the west of the city (P. Chrysostomou (1990); Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 111–12).

Pella, originally a Paionian settlement, received an important Ionian influx from early Archaic times. It became a member of the Chalkidian Federation for a brief period in the 380s (Xen. Hell. 5.2.13). The transfer of the royal residence to the city in the reign of Amyntas III was accompanied by a significant Makedonian migration which transformed the character of the city, as the onomastics and the archaeological remains show (Hammond and Griffith (1979) 56; Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 171–73).

There is no evidence for the Classical constitution of Pella; in C₃ there is evidence of an archon, an epistates (SEG 48 818), a boule and a demos (SEG 48 817) as well as tamiai (SEG 12 374). In C₄s (Syll. 3 267; SEG 18 222a) and in C₃m (F.Delphes III.3 207.2) several citizens of Pella received the proxenia of Delphi.

The patron divinity of Pella was Athena Alkidemos (Livy 42.51.2; cf. Gaebler (1935) 93–97). Among other cults, those of Apollo, Artemis, Asklepios, Dionysos, Zeus Meilichios, Herakles Kynagidas, Herakles Phylakos, the Muses and Pan are attested from epigraphic, literary and archaeological sources (SEG 24 540; Papakonstantinou-Diamantourou (1971) 38–51; P. Chrysostomou (1989) 105–6). Moreover, the C₄l sanctuaries of the Mother of the Gods, of Demeter and of Darron have been uncovered in or near the city (Lilimpaki-Akamati (1987), (1990), (1991), (1996), (2000), (2002)). For none of the cults do we have evidence from the Classical period. A Pellaian theorodokos was appointed to host theoroi from Nemea (SEG 36 331.112–24) (323–317); for the identification of the theorodokos, see Knoeppler (2001) 187–90). A citizen of Pella was victorious in the Isthmian and Pythian Games (SEG 18 222a (C₄8)).

Pella was the largest city of Makedonia; for a general description, see Lilimpaki-Akamati (2002). The rectangular C₄s wall is of mudbrick upon a stone foundation and pre-dates the C₄l grid plan of the town (Siganidou (1987a)). The city had two citadels. The acropolis, situated on the northern hill and covering an area of 6 ha, is entirely occupied by the palatial complex. At the southern end of the city the islet Phakos in Lake Loudiake, which was connected with the mainland via a drawbridge, qualified as an αἰκή and housed the central Makedonian treasury (Strabo 7 fr. 20). The city was built on a regular Hippodamian grid line with two main north–south roads and one west–east road crossing them in the agora area (Siganidou (1990)). The 200 × 182 m-wide agora is surrounded by stoas: the north one probably housed the seat of the politarchs, while on the north-west side of the agora probably lay the city archive; along with the building complex around it, the agora covers an area of ten blocks in the centre of the city (Akamatis (1999)). The palace of the Makedonian kings (central complex C₄f) covers the entire acropolis area (6 ha) north of the agora. It consists of
three building complexes, along an east–west axis. Each building complex is composed of two buildings, one to the south, towards the city, and one to the north. All three southern buildings have a large peristyle court. The northern buildings of the west and central complex have bathing facilities. A long *sta* of more than 153 m with a 15 m-wide propylon forms the southern façade of the central and east complex facing the city (Siganidou (1987b), (1996); Ginouves (1994) 88–91; P. Chrysostomou (1996)). Other public buildings uncovered are a large C4 tholos, probably a *heroon* of Herakles and used as *bouleuterion* by the Macedonian Council (Hadzisteliou-Price (1973)) and the sanctuaries of the Mother of the Gods and Aphrodite in the agora area, of Demeter in the south–east quarter of the city, and of Daron in the south-west quarter (Lilimbaki-Akamati (1987), (1990), (1991), (1996), (2000)). A theatre is mentioned by Plutarch in a C4s context (*Mor. 1096B*).

544. Pydna (Pydna关口) Maps 49–50. Lat. 40.25, long. 22.35. Size of territory: 3 or 4. Type: A. The toponym is *Πυθνα*, ἥ (Thuc. 1.61.2; Gomni 98.7). *Πῦνα* (IG ii² 329.13 = Staatsverträge 403), *Κῦνα*, which is considered to be the authentic form of the name (*Theagenes* (FGHist 774) fr. 5 = Steph. Byz. 390.8–10). The city-ethnic is *Πυδναιος* (Dem. 1.5; Hatzopoulos (1996b) ii. no. 55), *Πυναιός*, *Πυναιός* (only on coins: Tselekas (1996) 14); Πυναίος (IG ii² 339.b.3). Pydna is called a *polis* in the urban sense at Ps.-Skylax 66 and is listed as a *polis* in the urban and political senses simultaneously at Din. 1.14 = 3.17. The term *asty* is attested in Polyaen. 4.11.3 (1317), and the term *polichnion* in a scholion on Arist. Rh. 1411–17. The earliest epigraphical attestation of the πόλις Πυδναιον is in an honorific decree of c.169 (Hatzopoulos (1996b) ii. no. 55). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins (*infra*) and externally perhaps on a fragmentary *asylia* decree (SEG 12 374.16 (243)). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in an honorific decree (Hatzopoulos (1996b) ii. no. 55.2 (c.169)) and externally in a C4s Athenian proxeny decree (IG ii² 339.b.3 (333)).

The territory of Classical Pydna bordered on that of Methone to the north and of Dion to the south, and may have covered over 200 km².

As the recent excavations have shown, Pydna was not a colonial foundation but a Macedonian settlement (Bessios and Pappa (1996) 5). Already in the reign of Alexander I it belonged to the Makedonian kingdom (Thuc. 1.137.1). In 432 it was unsuccessfully besieged by the Athenians (Thuc. 1.61). In 410 it rebelled against King Archelaos and seceded from the kingdom, but it was besieged again, and captured after a long siege. Its inhabitants were transferred some 4 km inland, perhaps to modern Kitros (Diod. 13.49.2). Apparently the old site was reoccupied already in C4e (Bessios (1990) 241), and in the reign of Amyntas III Pydna seems for a time to have again successfully seceded from the kingdom, since it struck its own coins; but in the reign of Alexander II, at the latest, it seems to have returned to the fold of the kingdom (Hatzopoulos (1985) 253 n. 66; for a different interpretation of the numismatic evidence, see Tselekas (1996) 19–24). In 364 or 363 it was captured by Timotheos (Din. 1.14 = 3.17; for the date see Diod. 15.81.6) and became an ally of Athens, but probably without becoming a member of the Second Athenian Naval League (Dreher (1995) 26). In 357 it was besieged and captured by Philip II (Dem. 1.9; Diod. 16.8.3), presumably by being betrayed to the Makedonians (Dem. 20.63, see Hammond and Griffith (1979) 242–44); it thereafter remained an integral part of the Makedonian kingdom.

Only two temples are attested in the Classical period: that of Athena (IG ii² 329.13 = Staatsverträge 403 (336)) and that posthumously erected in honour of Amyntas III (Habicht (1970) 11–12). Pydnaian *theorodokoi* received *theoroi* from Epidaurus c.360 (IG iv² 94.1.1.7).

Pydna was a walled city at least from 432 (Thuc. 1.61.3, implicitly; cf. Diod. 19.49.1 (1317)), but probably already in C5e (Bessios and Pappa (1996) 5–6). Traces of the walls were seen by Hammond (1984) 377). The area enclosed by the walls was c.25 ha, making Pydna one of the largest Makedonian cities in C5e, undoubtedly because of the importance of its harbour (Bessios and Pappa (1996) 6).

Pydna struck bronze coins in C4f. (1) During the reign of Amyntas III, types: *obv.* head of young Herakles wearing lion skin to the r.; *rev.* eagle with closed wings to the r. devouring serpent which it holds with its talons; legend: ΠΥ∆ΝΑΙΩΝ or ΠΥΝ∆ΑΙΩΝ and once ΠΥΝ∆ΑΙΩΝ. (2) C.364–357: *obv.* female head facing l. or r., wearing ear-ring and necklace, her hair in a sphendone; *rev.* owl to the r., standing on olive branch; legend: ΠΥΝ∆ΑΙΩΝ (Gaebler (1935) 105–6; Tselekas (1996) 14, 26–30; SNG Cop. Macedonia 317).
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I. The Region

The region “from the Axios river to the Strymon river” is wholly artificial and consisted, in Antiquity, of a number of smaller regions of various ethnic affiliations. These regions were situated in two broader regions: Μακεδονία (Makedonia, Hdt. 5.17; Makedonia, Thuc. 6.7.3) and Thrace (Θρηίκη, Hdt. 8.185.1; Θράκη, Thuc. 1.100.2). About these two regions, see the introductions by M. B. Hatzopoulos (794–95) and L. D. Loukopoulou (854–56). Until C6 the border between Makedonia and Thrace was roughly the river Axios, but after that the border seems to have fluctuated. Thucydides, for instance, evidently locates Pydna (no. 544) and Therme (no. 552) in Makedonia (1.61.2), but in the Athenian tribute lists the poleis of the Chalkidic peninsula and even Methone (no. 541), north of Pydna, are included in the Θράκτειος φόρος (probably for practical purposes). By the time of Philip II the river Strymon constituted the border between Makedonia and Thrace was roughly the river Axios, but after that the border seems to have fluctuated. Thucydides, for instance, evidently locates Pydna (no. 544) and Therme (no. 552) in Makedonia (1.61.2), but in the Athenian tribute lists the poleis of the Chalkidic peninsula and even Methone (no. 541), north of Pydna, are included in the Θράκτειος φόρος (probably for practical purposes). By the time of Philip II the river Strymon constituted the border between Makedonia and Thrace (Flensted-Jensen 2000 121–25). Within these two larger regions there were a number of smaller regions.

2. Bisaltia

Bisaltia (Βισαλτίη, Hdt. 7.115.1; Βισαλτία, Thuc. 2.99.6) was the district west of the lower Strymon, up to Herakleia Sintika (no. 549). According to Hdt. 7.115.1, Bisaltia was the coast west of the Strymon and the land above the coast. The river Strymon constituted the border between Bisaltia and Edonia (Papazoglou 1988 351). In C5 the Bisaltians were ruled by a Thracian king (Hdt. 8.116.1). It seems that the Bisaltians were not driven out of their district when the Temenids took over large parts of what became Makedonia (Thuc. 2.99, esp. 2.99.4). The Bisaltians struck coins on the Phoenician standard in the Archaic period. Denominations: octadrachms, tetrodrachms, drachms, octobols and tetrobols. Types: obv. naked warrior with two spears and horse; legend: ΒΙΣΑΛΤΙΚΟΝ; rev. quadripartite incuse square (Gaebler 1935 48–50; SNG Cop. Macedonia 135). The coins without legend are indistinguishable from those of Alexander I (Head, HN2 200). There were three poleis in Bisaltia (nos. 553–55), of which one, Argilos (no. 554), was considered a colony of Andros (no. 475) (Thuc. 4.103.3). Thuc. 4.109.4 mentions that there were Bisaltians in Athos in his day.

3. The Chalkidic Peninsula

There was no name in antiquity for the Chalkidic peninsula as a whole. It is possible that Hekataios called it ἡ ἐν Θράκης χερρόνησος (see Zahrnt 1971 44f; cf. Flensted-Jensen 2000 122 n. 3) and Thucydides refers to it as τὰ ἐπὶ Θράκης (e.g. at 1.59.1; cf. Xen. Hell. 5.2.24). Traditionally, the Chalkidic peninsula was colonised during C8 and C7, by the Corinthians (no. 227), the Andrians (no. 475) and the Eretrians (no. 370), but it was clearly inhabited by Greeks prior to that period (cf. Mende (no. 584) and Torone (no. 620)).

Until C4 the northern parts of the Chalkidic peninsula, i.e. Anthemous (no. 562) and Mygdonia, belonged to Makedonia, whereas the rest was considered part of Thrace.

Cities founded after the Makedonian expansion are not considered in the present chapter. Accordingly, the following cities do not appear in the discussion: Antigoneia, Stratoniike, Kassandraeia, Ouranopolis and Thessalonike.

PERNILLE FLENSTED-JENSEN

THRACE FROM AXIOS TO STRYMON
In 356 Philip took Poteidaia (no. 598), and in 348 Olynthos (no. 588) was taken and destroyed, a fate it probably shared with Stagir (no. 613). Dem. 9.26 asserts that Philip destroyed thirty-two cities, which is probably an exaggeration (see useful discussion in Hammond and Griffith (1979) 365–79). The whole region, up to the river Strymon, was incorporated into Makedonia. Some inscriptions are evidence that the territory of (former?) poleis were given to Makedonians (Syll. 332 (306–297); SEG 38 619 (c.285)), but some scholars argue that the region was left more or less intact (Borza (1990) 219). Thus, in the Archaic and Classical periods the region as a whole was inhabited by Greeks, Makedonians and probably also various Thracian peoples (Thuc. 4.109; Hatzopoulos (1989)). The Chalkidic peninsula had only a few large and well-known poleis—Akanthos (no. 559), Olynthos (no. 588), Mende (no. 584), Skione (no. 609), Torone (no. 620) and Poteidaia (no. 598)—and a large number of smaller poleis which in many cases must have been situated within a few kilometres of each other.

### 3.1 Krousai

The western coast of the Chalkidic peninsula was called χώρη Κρουσαία (Hdt. 7.123.2) or Κρουσαίς γῆ (Thuc. 2.79.4; cf. Strabo 7 fr. 21: Κρουσίας). According to Hdt. 7.123.2, there were seven poleis in Krousai. Only one, Aineia (no. 557), is relatively well known. Dionysios of Halikarnassos mentions οἱ Κρουσαίοι and calls them an ἔθνος Θράκων (Ant. Rom. 1.47, 49). According to Dionyssios (Ant. Rom. 1.48), they inhabited Pallene at the time of Aineai, and he may have this information from Hellanikos (cf. FGrHist 4 fr. 31). The Krousaians may have been the original inhabitants of Krousai. If so, they were Hellenised relatively early. The Inventory describes seven poleis situated in Krousai (nos. 557, 572–73, 577, 581–82, 611).

### 3.2 Bottike

The name of the region was Βοττικῆ (Thuc. 1.65.2), which was derived from the ethnic Βοττιαιός (Hdt. 8.127). Bottike was the region inhabited by the Bottaiains, who, according to Hdt. 8.127 and Thuc. 2.99.3, were expelled from the Makedonian district Bottiaia in C7 or C6. In C5 their chief polis was Spartolos (no. 612) (Thuc. 2.79). To the west Bottike bordered on Krousai, to the north on Makedonia, to the east on Chalkidike, and to the south on the territory of Poteidaia.

In C5 the Bottaiains were members of the Delian League—normally they are represented by Spartolos in the Athenian tribute lists (e.g. IG 12 277.v.15), but in 446/5 the entry in the Athenian tribute lists is ΒΟΤΤΙΑΙΟΙ καὶ οἱ ΒΟΤΤΙΑΙΟΙ (IG 12 266.11.19). In 432 the Bottaiains revolted from Athens (Thuc. 1.58), but c.422 they entered into an alliance with the Athenians (IG 1 76). It seems from the inscription that they had probably formed a confederacy (Flensted-Jensen (1995) 126–28). The Bottaiains struck silver coins on the Phoenician standard, and also bronze coins, c.430–c.348. Denominations: tetradrachms, tetralobols and hemiobols. Types: obv. head of Apollo, or Demeter; rev. lyre; legend: ΒΟΤΤΙΑΙΩΝ or ΒΟΤΤΙΑΙΕΩΝ (Psoma (1996); SNG Cap. Macedon 140–45). There were between six and twelve Bottaiain poleis (see Flensted-Jensen (1995); cf. nos. 558, 575–76, 579, 595, 599, 606, 612, 619, 621). In addition, it may be noted that according to Hdt. 8.127, Olynthos (no. 588) was originally a Bottaiain community: after their defeat, the Persians (whose dependency Olynthos was) feared that the city would revolt, and consequently it was conquered by Artabazos, subjected to an υπερηφανείαν and handed over to Kritoboulou of Torone and the Chalkidians (Flensted-Jensen (1995) 122).

### 3.3 Chalkidike

The name of the region was Χαλκιδική (Thuc. 1.65.2). Hdt. 7.185 calls the inhabitants τὸ Χαλκιδικῶν γένος, but other authors call them οἱ ἐπὶ Θράκης Χαλκιδεῖς (Thuc. 2.79.1; Diod. 12.50.3).

Chalkidike was the area inhabited by the Chalkidians. By excluding all the areas which were demonstrably not Chalkidian, Harrison (1912) 96 concluded that Chalkidike covered the area north of Sithonia in C5. The exact borders of Chalkidike are not known, nor which towns were Chalkidian. However, the Chalkidians themselves are mentioned twice by Herodotos: at 7.185 he lists them among many tribes that supplied Xerxes with auxiliaries in 480. He uses the curious phrase τὸ Χαλκιδικῶν γένος about them. At 8.127 Herodotos tells us that Artabazos suspected that the inhabitants of Olynthos (no. 588), then belonging to the Bottaiains, would revolt and therefore he killed the population of Olynthos and gave the town to the Chalkidians and Kritoboulou from Torone. Thus, from 479 Olynthos was a Chalkidian town.

In 432 the Chalkidians, the Bottaiains and Poteidaia (no. 598) made an agreement with Perdikkas (Thuc. 1.58, 62–63) and revolted from Athens. Furthermore, at the instigation of Perdikkas, the Chalkidians left their poleis along the coast (τὰς ἐπὶ θαλάσσης πόλεις) in order to create one strong
city at Olynthos. It is evident from Thucydides’ description that the Chalkidians possessed several poleis and that at least some of them were situated on the littoral. Scholars do not agree as to the political significance of the synoecism; some hold that it was a purely military measure, whereas others think that the move brought a political change (Demand (1990) 77–83 with refs.).

In the following years the political life of the Chalkidians was rather tumultuous: in 431 Perdikkas became reconciled with the Athenians (Phormion) and made an expedition against the Chalkidians (Thuc. 2.29), and in the following year Hagnon campaigned against the Chalkidians (2.58). Despite new campaigns, led by Xenophon in 429, the Athenians were not able to subjugate the Chalkidians. In 425 they were still unvanquished (Thuc. 4.7). In 424/3 Brasidas campaigned in the Chalkidic peninsula and won over many more poleis. Perdikkas and the Chalkidians were again on good terms (Thuc. 4.78–79). Some of the poleis which were probably or possibly Chalkidian are treated in separate sections in the Peace of Nikias of 421: Stolos (no. 614) and Olynthos (no. 588) are mentioned at Thuc. 5.18.5, Mekyberna (no. 583), Sane (no. 600) and Singos (no. 605) at Thuc. 5.18.6, and Sermylia (no. 604) along with Skione (no. 609) and Torone (no. 620) at Thuc. 5.18.8. But the recalcitrant Chalkidians refused to accept the peace terms, and they were still enemies of the Athenians in 416 (Thuc. 4.83.4). However, in 415 the Spartans urged the Chalkidians to assist Perdikkas, but they refused, because they had a ten-day truce with the Athenians (Thuc. 6.7.4).

Next followed 20 years in which virtually nothing is known about the Chalkidians. When they re-entered the arena, in 395, they concluded a treaty with the Boiotians, the Athenians, the Corinthians and the Argives, to fight on their side in the Corinthian War (Isae. 5.46; Diod. 14.82.3). A few years later, probably in 393 (Zahrnt (1971) 81 n. 4), they were allied with Amyntas III (Tod 111 = Staatsverträge 231).1 The famous alliance will not be discussed in detail here, but it will be noted that from a political point of view it is of interest that the Chalkidians were evidently no longer on good terms with the Bottiaians, since it was clearly stipulated that neither the Chalkidians nor Perdikkas were to enter into alliance with them (except by common action). Other communities mentioned in that section are Mende (no. 584), Amphipolis (no. 553) and Akanthos (no. 559).

In 393/2, and probably again in 383/2, Amyntas III gave some land to the Chalkidians (Diod. 14.92.3, 15.19.3; Ellis (1969)). At this time, i.e. in 383, it seems that the Chalkidians were a prominent power, because in that year Akanthos (no. 559) and Apollonia (no. 545) sent envoys to Sparta to ask for help against the expanding federation (Xen. Hell. 5.2.11). At the time the federation evidently covered the western part of the Chalkidic peninsula all the way to Pella (no. 543). This resulted in the so-called Olynthian War, after which the federation was suppressed or dissolved (Xen. 5.3.26; Diod. 15.23.3; siege mentioned by Isoc. 4.126). However, the federation was formed again shortly after: the Chalkidians are listed in the Charter of the Second Athenian Naval League (restored: [Χαλκικῆς ἀπὸ Θρᾴκης]), which they left again at some point before 365 (IG ii² 43.5–6; cf. Cargill (1981) 42; Dreher (1995) 186–87). A few years later the Chalkidians entered into an alliance with the Athenians, as is attested by the very fragmentary treaty Staatsverträge 250, probably dating to the middle of the 370s (Zahrnt (1971) 127). However, the alliance did not last long, as we find the Athenians allied with Amyntas some time between 375 and 373 (IG ii² 102). Aristotle, in two somewhat obscure passages, states that some Chalkidian settlers (ἐποικισμοι), led by a certain Kleotimos, expelled the majority of the Amphipolitans (Pol. 1303a3, 1306a2). This may be seen in connection with the fact that the Chalkidians held Amphipolis (no. 553) c.363 (Dem. 23.149; Zahrnt (1971) 101). In 357/6 the Chalkidians entered into an alliance with Grabos, king of the Illyrians (SEG 37 567 with refs.), but shortly afterwards they entered into a new alliance, this time with Philip II (Robinson (1934) = Tod 158; cf. Hammond and Griffith (1979) 243–46). Philip ejected the Athenians from Poteidaia (no. 598) and handed it over to the Chalkidians (Dem. 2.7, 2.14, 6.20). The Chalkidians’ alliance with Philip did not last long, because in 352 they concluded a treaty with the Athenians (Staatsverträge 317), and a few years later they entered into an alliance according to which the Athenians were to aid the Chalkidians against Philip (Staatsverträge 323). However, in 348 Olynthos (no. 588) was betrayed to Philip, who destroyed the city completely (Hyp. fr. 19; Dem. 9.26, 19.266; cf. App. B Civ. 4.102). According to Dem. 9.26, Philip destroyed thirty-two towns in Thrace, apart from Olynthos, Methone (no. 541) and Apollonia (no. 545), while Hyp. fr. 76 says that the Chalkidians had forty poleis—both numbers probably exaggerated. IG ii² 4.4 is an inscription from Myrina (no. 502), showing that (some of) the Chalkidians sought refuge there after the destruction of Olynthos (Χαλκικῶν οἱ ἐν Μυρίνῃς). The Chalkidians

1 Zahrnt (1971) 122–24 argues that the inscription is in fact two treaties, to be dated c.393 and 382 respectively.
may also have been listed in the peace treaty of 338/7 between Philip and the Greeks (Tod 177). Line 31 reads: "---ἀ]πὸ Θρᾴκης καὶ [---] Φωκέων.

When did the Chalkidians form a state? A body known as ὁι Χαλκιδεῖς is mentioned by Herodotos and Thucydidès. Furthermore, these Chalkidians were settled in poleis. Was there a change in the political structure after 432? The vocabulary of Thucydidès does not change; he still calls them ὁι Χαλκιδεῖς after 432, and his description of the synoecism does not indicate that there was a political change. However, in 424 we hear of a Στρόφακος προμένον ὁι Χαλκιδεῶν (Thuc. 4.78.1; see Gerolymatos (1986) 30), and about ὁι Χαλκιδεῶν πρόσβεις (Thuc. 4.83.3). Furthermore, in 422 the Chalkidians entered into an alliance with Argos (no. 347): ὁι ἔπι Θρᾴκης Χαλκιδεῖς Ἀργείων ξύμμαχοι (Thuc. 5.31.6). All this shows that the Chalkidians had some kind of common political organisation. The C3 coins inscribed Χαλκιδεῶν are sometimes taken as an indication of the formation of the federation (SNG Cop. Macedonia 233–49). Coins inscribed with a (tribal) ethnic are not in themselves proof that the tribe had formed a federal state, but in this case they may be. Shortly before the synoecism Olynthos struck coins inscribed with ΟΛΥΝ, but these were struck for a short period only and were replaced by coins inscribed with Χαλκιδεῶν (for the dates of the coins, see Robinson and Clement (1938) 112ff; Westermark (1988); see also s.v. Olynthos (no. 588)). Thus, there cannot be much doubt that the Chalkidians constituted a state, which was formed in 432 or during the subsequent years.

But what kind of state was formed? Some scholars believe that it was a federal state (West (1918) 31, 140; Larsen (1968) 59 with n. 1), whereas others argue that it was an oligarchy (Zahrnt (1961) 94; Larsen (1968) 58ff, esp. 76), while others argue that it was a democracy (Gehrke, Stasis 124).

In C4 there is more information available about the organisation of the Chalkidian Federation. From Xen. Hell. 5.2.12 it is known that in 438 there were common laws and sympoliteia, common citizenship (Hell. 5.2.18), epigamia and enktesis (Hell. 5.2.19). Furthermore, the Chalkidians possessed a federal army (Xen. Hell. 5.2.14). Xenophon does not specify which cities in the Chalkidic peninsula had become members of the Federation, except Poteidaia (no. 598) (Xen. Hell. 5.2.15), but it is evident that it included several cities, some of them large (Xen. Hell. 5.2.12). They had also captured several cities in Makedonia, among them Pella (no. 543) (Xen. Hell. 5.2.13). Finally, Xen. Hell. 5.2.16 mentions that the Federation had revenues from many harbours and emporia, and that it was a populous state. Furthermore, the existence of eponymous federal priests is attested (Hatzopoulos (1964a) 186, 388–89). Last but not least, Aristotle may have written a politeia of the Chalkidians (Arist. fr. 44). In this connection it is of interest that several possible members struck (bronze) coins in C4, probably in C4f. They are Sermylia (no. 604), the Skapsaians (no. 608), Torone (no. 620) and possibly Gale(psos) (no. 571). This could indicate that civic mints existed alongside the federal mint.

In C4 the Federation was called οἱ Χαλκιδεῖς in official documents, such as the alliance of Amyntas and the Chalkidians, the Charter of the Second Athenian Naval League, etc., but it was often called ΟΛΥΝθωτοι in literary sources (e.g. Xen. Hell. 5.2.13; Dem. 1.5; see, however, Arist. Pol. 1274b23). Diodorus and Isaios, referring to the same events, call them οἱ Χαλκιδεῖς οἱ προς τῇ Θρᾴκῃ and οἱ ΟΛΥΝθωτοι respectively (Diod. 14.82.3; Isae. 5.46).

### 3.4 Pallene, Sithonia and Athos

The three peninsulas of (a) Pallene, (b) Sithonia, and (c) Athos are natural geographical subdivisions. (a) There were eight poleis in Pallene (Hdt. 7.123.3; nos. 556, 553, 584, 586, 598, 601, 609, 616), which, according to Herodotos, was formerly called Phlegra. One poleis, Poteidaia (no. 598), was a colony of Corinth (no. 227) (Thuc. 1.56.2); Mende (no. 584) was probably a colony of Eretria (no. 370) (Thuc. 4.123.1); Neapolis (no. 586) was probably a colony of Mende (IG 13 263.111.26–27); and the inhabitants of Skione (no. 609) claimed that they were colonists from Achaia (Thuc. 4.120.1).
(b) Athos had six poleis (Hdt. 7.22.3; nos. 560, 569, 580, 587, 606, 618) including Sane (no. 600) on the isthmus. Sane may have been a colony of Andros (no. 475) (Thuc. 4.109.3), whereas the other five poleis had a mixed, bilingual population in C5 (Thuc. 4.109.3; see Papapoulopoulos (1996) 170).

(c) Sithonia is more difficult to define. Herodotos, who is our only source to name the area Sithonia—apart from Steph. Byz., who simply paraphrases Herodotos—includes Torone (no. 620), Gale (psos) (no. 571), Sermylia (no. 604), Mekyberna (no. 583) and Olynths (no. 588) in the area of Sithonia (7.122), which means that “Sithonia” was the western part of the peninsula and the area north of it. The poleis on the eastern side of the peninsula (Singos (no. 605) and Sarte (no. 602)) were located, according to Hdt. 7.122, “in the bay [of Singos].”

3.5 The Edonians

It is highly probable that the Edonians, a Thracian tribe ruled by a king, inhabited at least part of the Chalkidic peninsula. Thuc. 4.109.4 mentions that there were Edonians in Athos. The Edonian king Getas struck silver octadrachms around 500. Some of the coins bear the legend ΘΕΤΑΣ ἩΔΟΝΕОН ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ (Gaebler (1935) 144).

4. Unlocated

Four poleis—Aison (no. 623), Brea (no. 624), Kossaia (no. 625) and Okolon (no. 626)—have been included in the present chapter. They are all unlocated, but in all four cases it is known that they were situated somewhere in Thrace.

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis


Ampeles (Ἀμπέλος) The cape of Sithonia was called Ampelos (Hdt. 7.122). Ampelos is called oppidum and polis by Pliny and Hesychios respectively (Plin. HN 4.37; Hsch. A3778). Hdt. 7.122 calls it simply Τοροναίη ἀκρη, and for that reason Zahrnt (1971) 152 is right in thinking that there never existed a polis Ampelos. Unlocated. Barr. 51, C.

*Apollonia (Ἀπόλλωνια) Unlocated. In Barr. 51 dated C, but the only evidence is Plin. HN 4.37.


Chalkis (Χαλκίς) The only source for this Chalkis is Steph. Byz. 685.2–5, who locates it on Athos and quotes Eudoxos (fr. 309, Lasserre), according to whom it was the name of a gulf, not a settlement. Unlocated. Barr. 51, C.

Kallipolitai (Καλλιπολίται) link with the so-called Holomondas inscription (SEG 40 542–32), which probably originates from the north-western part of the Chalkidic peninsula and dates to 4th century BC (Hatzopoulos and Loukopoulos (1992) 123–45). Vokotopoulos (1996)). The inscription deals with boundaries between various communities. A number of ethnics occur: Παραιτιός (2–3), Ράμιδος (14), Κισσέτας (15), Ωβαίως (43, restored), (παρασιλίως) (28) and Καλλιπολίτας (32). The Kallipolitai are said by Hatzopoulos and Loukopoulos (1992) 30–31 to be known from the Athenian tribute lists, and it is true that some Kallipolitai are recorded under the headings αὐταὶ and πάντα from 434/3 onwards (see e.g. IG 1 279,11–8). Hatzopoulos and Loukopoulos suggest that *Kallipolis belongs in the Thracian panel (like some other communities in the rubrics), and tentatively suggest that *Kallipolis and Kalindoia (no. 575) are identical. But the Kallipolis recorded in the tribute lists belong in the Hellespontine phoros (see no. 744). Furthermore, it is unlikely that *Kallipolis and Kalindoia are identical unless that city actually had two names, of which only one (Kalindoia) is attested as a toponym. Therefore, Vokotopoulos (1996) 215 suggests that *Kallipolis may be identified with a mound near Ormylia (not far from ancient Sermylia), because that mound “preserves the name of Kallipolis . . . the place-name could well have survived since the ancient period, as have many other place-names in Chalcidice”. It is not impossible that the name has been preserved since Antiquity, although perhaps unlikely. Barr. 50, C.

Kerdylion (Κερδυλίον) In the territory of Argilos (no. 554) (Thuc. 5.6.3). A site in the vicinity of Nea Kerdylia has been identified with the Kerdylion of Thucydides. Here a part of a Classical circuit wall has been found along with a gate (ArchDelt 41 (1986) Chron. 177–78). Barr. 51, C.


Panormos (Πανορμός) In Barr. 51 dated C, but the only evidence is Ptol. Geog. 3.12.9.
(Paraipioi) (Παραίπιοι) See Kallipolitai (supra). Unlocated. Barr. 50, C.

Parthenopolis  At Parthenonas, about 5 km inland from the presumed site of Gale(possos) (no. 571), and thus possibly in its territory, a worship area (4 × 8 m, oriented north–south) has been excavated. The area was in use from C7 to C3, and inscribed sherds attest to the nature of the area: for instance, a sherd from a C5e Attic vessel with the inscription άπειρος τον Μύγδονο σπατάλων, ός Θεαγένης ἐν Μακεδονίκοις ἀπὸ δέ τῶν θυγατέρων Διόσκουρος τοῦ Μύγδονος παιδός, ὥς Θεαγένης ἐν Μακεδονίκοις ἀπὸ δέ τῶν θυγατέρων διὰ τὸ ἄγριον αὐτῶν τῆς διαίτης καὶ τὸ ἀμίκτων ἐκτησε πάλιν κυλ’ (504.8ff). Although the mention of Grastos and Mygdon indicates that Parthenopolis had some connection with Krestonia and Mygdonia, this piece of evidence is not sufficient to identify the worship area with the Parthenopolis mentioned by Stephanos. Barr. 51, C.

Physka (Φύσκα) Thuc. 2.99.5; Theagenes (FGrHist 774) fr. 15; Steph. Byz. 675.12 (πόλις). In Ptol. Geog. 3.12.33 listed under Mygdonia. Barr. 51, undated, but C is attested by Thuc. 2.99.5.

Physkelle, Myskella (Miscella) In Barr. 50 dated C, but there is no other evidence than Plin. HN 4.37 and Pomponius Mela 2.34.

Rhaikelos (Ῥαίκηλος) Arist. Ath. Pol. 15.2 (χωριόν); Lycoph. Alex. 1236; Steph. Byz. 543.2 (πόλις). Fortified village or strong point near the Thermaic Gulf (Edson (1947) 89–91). Barr. AC.

(Rhamioi) (Ῥαμίοι) See Kallipolitai (supra). Unlocated. Barr. 50, C.

Trapezous (Τραπεζοῦς) Syll.3 332.5–6 (306–297); SEG 38 619.12 (285–284), area or territory near Olynthos. Barr. 50, C.

2. Unidentified Settlements

Ag. Ioannis, near Nikiti Traces of an early settlement no later than C7; fifty-seven graves from the Archaic and Classical periods (ArchDelt 32 (1977) Chron. 204). Remains of a Classical house, pieces of tile roof. Also forty-five graves from the Iron Age (900–750) (ArchDelt 43 (1988) Chron. 361–62; cf. ArchDelt 39 (1984) Chron. 224). Of the forty-five graves, forty were inhumations in pithoi, and five were cremations. Some of the inhumations were placed inside perimeter walls. The cemetery was used in the Iron Age and the Archaic period (Trakosopoulou-Salakidou (1988)). Not in Barr.

Anchialos Excavations at Anchialos (north-west of Thessaloniki) have been conducted. Layers from the late Mycenaean period and Iron Age were reached, while a big pit contained sherds from the Classical period. The pottery was partly imported, partly local ware. The excavators argue that Anchialos can be identified with Sindos (no. 551), and Chalastre (no. 548) with the site at Ag. Athanasios (Tiverios (1992), pace Hatzopoulos (1996a) 107 nn. 2 and 3; idem (1996b) 602 no. 262). A single inscription has been found at Anchialos. A C5m Attic black-figured sherd is incised with the name Ἕρωνθώνιος in Ionic lettering (Panayotou (1996) 150 n. 39). Not in Barr.

Epanomí Four late Archaic and Classical graves were excavated in 1989 (Tsibidou-Auloniti (1989)). Not in Barr.

Koukos About 4 km from Torone (no. 620), at modern Koukos, a hill-top site has been investigated. There are remains of a fortification wall, a settlement and a cemetery. The original height of the wall, which is preserved to a height of 60–80 cm, was probably more than 2 m, and the average width is 1.25 m. The extensive settlement was probably crowded, and apparently there was no urban planning. The area tested covers 274 m². The settlement, which was used in the early Iron Age, and probably later, was built in six phases. Remains of walls of ten or eleven buildings have been found, all oriented in different directions. They probably all date to the early Iron Age. The most substantial building consists of a porch and one long chamber, 5 × 14 + m. In the cemetery ninety-eight graves have been found, apparently with cremation as the only rite. There are three types of grave: (1) cist graves (forty-nine), (2) pit graves (fifteen), and (3) pithoi (thirty-four). There are two types of pottery: (1) handmade northern types, of which some are Chalkidian, and some are like the early Iron Age types found at e.g. Vergina; part of a bowl, of the “pre-Persian” type known from Olynthos (no. 588), was found; (2) wheel-made types, related to late Protogeometric and sub-Protogeometric styles at Euboia and the surrounding areas. Other finds
include fibulae, beads, bracelets, knives and stone tools. A mould and other finds show that metal working took place at Koukos. The site was probably abandoned about 700. (Carington-Smith and Vokotopoulou (1988), (1989), (1990), (1992), (1992–93); ArchDelt 42 (1987) 370–71; Snodgrass (1994)). Not in Barr.


Ossa An urban settlement (in ancient Bisaltia) with a fortification wall and a citadel, which was founded in C4 (Adam-Veleni (1988)). Not in Barr.


Thermi At modern Thermi (the so-called table of Sedhes, a few km south of Thessaloniki) a cemetery has been excavated. The 303 graves date from C8e to C4. The oldest pottery dates to C8–C7, and similar pottery has been found at Vergina, Dion, Kozani and other places. There is also C6 Corinthian pottery, pottery of Ionian type, C6m–C5e Chalkidian ware, along with Attic black-figure pottery and pottery dating to C5–C4. The male graves contained weapons, and the female jewellery (ArchDelt 45 (1990) Chron. 308–9). Moschonisioti (1988) has examined ninety-nine graves dating from C6e to C5e. The male graves faced west, the female east. 70 per cent of the men were buried with weapons, while the women were buried with jewellery. Among the finds was a C5e coin from Dikaia (no. 568). Not in Barr.

II. The Poleis

1. Mygdonia

545. Apollonia (Apolloniates) Map 50. Lat. 40.40, long. 23.30. Size of territory: probably 2 or 3. Type: A.α. The toponym is Ἀπόλλωνια, Ἡ (Ps.-Skylax 66; Plut. Lyce. 31.5; IG iv2.1 94.1.b.16 (359)). The city-ethnic is Ἀπόλλωνιατής (Xen. Hell. 5.2.13). Apollonia is called a polis in the political and urban senses combined by Xen. Hell. 5.2.11 (Hansen (2000a) 210), and in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 66 (Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 142) and Dem. 9.26. The collective use of the city-ethnic (abbreviated as ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΑ) is attested internally on coins (infra) and externally at Xen. Hell. 5.2.13. It appears from Xen. Hell. 5.3.11 that the toponym Ἀπόλλωνια could denote the territory as well as the town.

There has been some discussion as to how many Apolloniases there were in the Chalkidic peninsula and where exactly they were located. Hatzopoulos (1994) has come to the conclusion that there was only one Apollonia, and that it was located near the southern shores of Lake Bolbe, i.e. in ancient Mygdonia; see also Flensted-Jensen (1997) 117–21.

Xen. Hell. 5.2.11 calls Apollonia and Akanthos (no. 559) the two largest poleis around Olynthos (no. 588), and relates how in 382 they sent envoys to Sparta (no. 345) to ask for help against the expanding Chalkidian Federation. Apollonia is recorded in the Epidaurian list of theorodokoi of 359 (IGiv2.1 194.1.b.15).

Remains of an undated city wall are reported by Hatzopoulos (1994) 178. Xen. Hell. 5.3.6 mentions Apollonia's proasteion and its gates. According to Dem. 9.26, Apollonia was destroyed by Philip II, though when is unknown.

Apollonia strikes coins in C4, and after 187 (Gaebler (1926), (1935) 46–47). Obv. head of Apollo; rev. aquatic bird, or fish; legend: ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΑ.

Since Apollonia is called Ἠ Χαλκιδική by Hegesandros (FHG p. 420 fr. 40), it is generally assumed that Apollonia could have been founded by the Chalkidians (West (1923) 49 n. 2; Hatzopoulos (1994) 165), when they were given a piece of land near Lake Bolbe in 432 (Thuc. 1.58.2).

546. Arethousa (Arethousiens) Map 51. Lat. 40.40, long. 23.40. Size of territory: probably 2 or 3. Type: Α.α. The toponym is Ἀρέθουσα, Ἡ (Ps.-Skylax 66; Plut. Lyce. 31.5; IG iv2.1 94.1.b.16 (359)). The city-ethnic is Ἀρέθουσιος ἀπὸ Θρόμενος (Syll. 268G (C4m) = F.Delphes 11.1.396), and after the Makedonian expansion as Ἀρέθουσιος (probably a misspelling) Μακεδών (Syll. 269 (c.300) = F.Delphes 11.1.186 (188))).

Arethousa is called a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 66 (Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 142). The political sense is attested in IG iv2 43.78 and 83, where Arethousa under the heading πολις αὐτῆς is listed as one of the members of the Second Athenian Naval League. The collective city-ethnic is attested externally in a C4m inventory of crowns donated to Athens in Athens (IGiv2.1 1437.1.18; cf. SEG 28 112). The individual city-ethnic is attested externally in a Delphic proxeny decree of C4m (Syll. 2 268G).
Arethousa was located in Mygdonia, on the eastern shore of Lake Bolbe (Strabo 7 fr. 36; cf. Ps.-Skylax 66), which was part of Makedonia in 432 (Thuc. 1.58.2). Arethousa may well have existed in C5 (although no sources confirm that), and if it did, it must have gained independence from Makedonia at some time in the beginning of C4, for a brief period.

Arethousa was a member of the Second Athenian Naval League (IG II² 43.82). It seems certain that this was Arethousa in Chalkidike, not the one in Euboia (Dreher ii² 43). Arethousa is recorded in the Epidaurian list of theorodokoi of 360/59 (IG IV² 1.94.1.b.16).

In the cemetery (see infra) a judicial lead tablet has been found (Moschonisiot et al. 1997)). The tablet dates from c.300. There is no doubt that the rather mutilated text concerns judicial matters: the verb καταγράφω ("register, enrol") occurs several times, in B4 δικαστάς δόσα ἐγνυπράφω[ν] can be read, and in Δ2 τῶν συνθηκῶν (195–96).

The recently excavated remains of an ancient town near modern Rentina have been identified with Arethousa by the excavator (Moschonisiot 1992). One hundred and twenty-nine graves have been excavated, yielding pottery, jewellery, etc. The graves date from C4m to C5m. Part of a circuit wall was excavated, along with the foundation of a C4l circular tower. There are reports of "Archaic and Classical finds" from a neighbouring hill, which has been identified with Bormiskos (no. 547). However, as the excavator points out (Moschonisiot 1992 410), it is remarkable to find two towns located within such a short distance (and on the same side of the river), and since there are no Archaic or Classical finds from the hill that has been identified with Arethousa, we may simply suggest (as already in RES.v.1) that Bormiskos and Arethousa are connected; that for some reason the inhabitants of Bormiskos left the settlement and moved to the neighbouring hill.

547. Bormiskos  Map 51. Lat. 40.40, long. 23.40. Size of territory: 2. Type: C? Bormiskos was located near the Gulf of Strymon, where Lake Bolbe runs into the sea (Thuc. 4.103.1), which (at least in 452) was a part of Makedonia (Thuc. 1.58.2). The toponym is Βορμίσκος (Thuc. 4.103.1) or Βορμίσκος (IG I² 77.7.26). Apart from Steph. Byz. 176.4–5, there is no attestation of the city-ethnic.

Thuc. 4.103.1 mentions that Brasidas stopped at Bormiskos, but he does not give it any site-classification (and Stephanos calls it a chorion at 176.1). However, Bormiskos was assessed at 1,000 dr. in 422/1 (IG I² 77.7.26). Furthermore, it may have been recorded in the assessment decree of 425/4 (the toponym is restored in IG I² 71.113). Consequently, Bormiskos was probably a member of the Delian League, and thus a political community.

548. Chalestre  Map 50. Lat. 40.40, long. 22.45. Size of territory: ? Type: Αγ. The toponym is Χαλάστρη (Hecat. fr. 146) or Χαλέστρη (Hdt. 7.123.3). Apart from Steph. Byz. 679.8, the city-ethnic is attested only in a very late source: IG x.2.1 815, a second to third century AD graveostone which in the first line has Χαλέστρη [os] (with dots under all the letters except -εσ-). Hecat. fr. 146 calls Chalestre a polis in the urban sense (cf. Hansen 1997 b 19). Hdt. 7.123.3 locates Chalestre in Mygdonia, in the Thermaic Gulf.

Modern Sindos is probably identical with ancient Chalestre (Hatzopoulos 1996a 197). At the site a rich cemetery, containing 121 graves, has been excavated. Although half of the graves had been robbed in Antiquity, the finds were still remarkable. Most of the graves were rectangular pits, but there were also some cists and sarcophagi. In the graves were found weapons and other military equipment, and a large amount of Makedonia jewellery of exceptional quality. Most of the vessels, however, were imported ware from southern Greece. The finds date the cemetery to the period C6m to C5e (Macedonians 162 with tables 153–76). At the settlement have been found a floor with C8 pottery, mudbrick walls destroyed in C7, successive building strata dating from C7 to c.570 (Tiverios 1990). A gold ring, dating to C5m, is inscribed with the word δόρον in Ionic script (Panayotou 1996 150 n. 39).

Chalestre is called a polis in the urban sense by Hekataios (fr. 146) and Herodotos (7.123.3). Hekataios calls it a πόλις Θρήκεων and juxtaposes the town with Therme, which is called a πόλις Ελλήνων Θρήκων. The evidence suggests that it was a Thracian polis in close contact with the Greek world, in which case it should be deleted from this Inventory as a non-Greek polis. Hatzopoulos, however, thinks that Chalestre was probably a mixed settlement (1996a 107).

549. Herakleia  (Herakleotes) Not in Barr. Lat. 40.45, long. 22.40 (cf. Gounaropoulou and Hatzopoulos 1985 62–71). Size of territory: ? Type: Ca? The toponym Ηράκλεια is known only from late sources (Demitsas 150.10 (Hell. or Roman)). The city-ethnic is Ηρακλεωτής (SEG 27 299 (C4e)), attested at Pella. All sources concerning Herakleia are late (e.g. a second century AD milestone mentioning Ηρακλεωτῶν (SEG 35 754.A12–13)), but the existence of a C4f city-ethnic indicates that the town existed in the Classical period (see Hatzopoulos 1996a 176), and Steph. Byz. mentions a Ηράκλεια Μακεδονίας,
Ἀµύντου τοῦ Φιλίππου κτίσµα (304,3). Herakleia may have been situated on the eastern bank of the river Axios (Hatzopoulos (1996a) 176).

A burial mound near modern Ag. Athanasios (northwest of Thessaloniki) turned out to be an extended Archaic and Hellenistic cemetery. It is probably the cemetery of Herakleia (if the site near the river Axios is Herakleia). In the excavated area ten graves were found; eight of them dated to C6, one to C4,5, and one to C3e. The Archaic graves are similar to those found at Sindos and Ag. Paraskevi. Most of the pottery was Corinthian, but an intact Chian chalice was also found (Tsibidou-Auloniti (1992)).

550. Lete (Letaios) Map 50. Lat. 40.45; long. 23.00. Size of territory: ? Type: B:β. The toponym is Λήτη (SEG 36 331.19 (323/2); Steph. Byz. 413,19, possibly quoting Theagenes (C3?) or Λήτη (Harp. Λήτη, quoting Hyp. fr. 87, Sauppe). The city-ethnic is Ληταίος (SEG 24 544 (C4–C3)). Lete is called a polis in late sources only (Syll.7 700 (second century AD); Harp. Λήτη), but polis status in the Archaic and Classical periods is indicated by the C6–C5 mint and the Nemean theodorokos (infra). The collective city-ethnic is used internally on Archaic coins (infra). The individual city-ethnic is used externally on a gravestone from Pella (SEG 24 544 (C4–C3)).

In the C4s list of Nemean theodorokoi Lete is placed after the heading Makedonia (SEG 36 331.19), but it cannot have become a part of Makedonia proper until after c.480, since no city of Makedonia proper minted its own coins until C2 (Hatzopoulos (1996a) 172). Lete is recorded in the Nemean list of theodorokoi of 333/2 (SEG 36 331.19).

Lete struck silver coins on the so-called Babylonian standard c.530–480. Denominations: stater, ¼ stater, and 1½ obols. Types: obv. Silen and nymph; rev. incuse square; legend: sometimes ΛΕΤΑΙΟΝ (Head, HN 2 197–98; Gaebler (1935) 67–72; SNG Cap. Macedonia 191–94). However, Kraay ((1976) 148–49) does not believe that all the coins attributed to Lete were actually issued by Lete: “Another important coinage of this area . . . has long passed under the name of ‘Lete’, on the strength of a tentative reading of an obscure coin-legend. Lete . . . certainly minted a few coins clearly inscribed with its ethnic, but it is unlikely to have been responsible for the considerable coinage under discussion.” See also Smith (2000).

At the site of ancient Lete two cemeteries have been found, one consisting of four C4L graves and one of twenty C4m–C3e graves (Tsakalou-Tzanavari (1989)). Judging from the onomastical material, Lete probably had a mixed Greco–barbarian population until its conquest by the Makedonians; the considerable influx of Makedonians that followed did not lead to the extinction of the native element (Hatzopoulos (1996a) 211–13).

551. Sindos (Sindonaios?) Map 50. Lat. 40.40, long. 22.45. Size of territory: ? Type: A:β. The toponym is Σινδός (Hdt. 7.123,3) or Σίνδοι (schol. Ap. Rhod. 4.4,322; Steph. Byz. 569.27). The corresponding city-ethnic may be Σινδοναῖοι (Steph. Byz. 570.3: Σινδοναῖοι, Θρακίκων ἐθνός, ὡς Εκαταῖος ἐν Εὐρώπη = Hecat. fr. 147). Sindos is called a polis in the urban sense by Hdt. 7.123-3.

Hdt. 7.123,3 locates Sindos in Mygdonia, in the Thermaic Gulf. Hatzopoulos thinks that Sindos was situated at modern Thessaloniki ((1996a) 107 n. 3). Papazoglou (1988) 201 suggests that Sindos was one of the settlements that contributed to the foundation of Thessalonike in 316/15.

At modern Thessaloniki—at the so-called Toubba—have been found remains of buildings, built in several phases dating from C10 to C4 (Souereph (1990), (1992)). The excavations clearly show that there was an important settlement at the site before the foundation of Thessalonike in 316/15.

Sindos was probably a mixed settlement (Hatzopoulos (1996a) 107).

552. Therme Map 50. Lat. 40.35, long. 22.55. Size of territory: ? Type: A:β. The toponym is Θέρµη, η (Hdt. 7.124). Apart from Steph. Byz. 310.1, there is no attestation of the city-ethnic. Therme is called a polis in the urban sense by Hecat. fr. 146 (cf. Hansen (1997b) 19); Hdt. 7.124; and Ps.-Skylax 66 (cf. Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 151). There is no evidence that it was a polis in the political sense as well. Theopomp. fr. 140 seems to have called it a Thracian polisma (cf. Hansen (2000b) 144–45).

Hdt. 7.123,3 locates Therme in Mygdonia, on the Thermaic Gulf. The exact location of Therme is unknown, although many scholars hold that it was the predecessor of Thessalonike (Vickers (1981) with refs.), and others that it was situated to the south of it, at Mikro Karabournaki (Borza (1990) 105 n. 21; Hatzopoulos (1996a) 107 n. 4).

According to Hdt. 7.124, Therme was a base for the Persian fleet in 480. In 432 Therme was captured by the Athenians (Thuc. 1.61.2), but it was given back to Perdikkas shortly after (Thuc. 2.29.6). Furthermore, Therme was one of the three places occupied by the pretender to the throne, Pausanias, in 368 (Aeschin. 2.27). Some Archaic coins attributed by Head, HN 2 203 to Therme (cf. Zahrnt (1971) 188 n. 196) have recently been reattributed to Argilos (Liampi (1994)).
Therme is believed by archaeologists to have been located near modern Karabournaki; Rhomaios examined the site in the 1920s and found C6 sherds of Rhodian, Corinthian and Attic pottery, as well as seventeen graves of unknown date (they had been robbed several times) and traces of habitation, also undated, along with prehistoric Makedonian pottery. Rhomaios assumed that the site was inhabited from C81 to C3s (BCH 54 (1930) 497–98). More recent investigations have confirmed Rhomaios’ findings: remains of a settlement have been found during excavations, and the latest phase seems datable to c.500. The pottery, both imported and local, dates from C8 to C5. Remains of C6l brick and stone walls of houses have been found (Tiverios et al. (1999)). In 1998 the remains of a semi-subterranean dwelling were found; similar buildings have been found in other areas on the fringes of the Greek world, e.g. the Euxine (Tiverios et al. 1998) 225). For the sherds of the Mycenaean period and later, see Tiverios (1987). About 150 m to the east of the settlement a cemetery has been located, and so far twenty-eight graves dating to C6–C5 have been excavated (Pandermalis and Trakosopoulou (1994)).

Therme was called a πόλις Ἐλλήνων Θρακίων by Hecat. fr. 146 = Steph. Byz. 67.5–6 (cf. Theopomp. fr. 140: Θρακίων πολίσαι (apud Harp.)), even though it seems to have belonged to Makedonia all the time, except in 432/1. Perhaps it was originally a mixed settlement that was taken over by the Makedonians at an early period (see Hatzopoulos (1996a) 107). Therme is also mentioned by Ps.-Sky lax 66, who specifically calls it a polis (on the distinction between polis and polis Hellenis in Ps.-Sky lax, see Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 151; for a different interpretation, see Hatzopoulos (1996a) 473).

2. Bisaltia

553. Amphipolis (Amphipolites) Map 51. Lat. 40.50, long. 23.50. Size of territory: ? Type: Α. The toponym is Ἀμφιπόλεις, ἦ (Thuc. 1.106.4; Tod 150.5 (357)). The city-ethnic is Ἀμφιπολίτης (Thuc. 4.104.4; Tod 111.20 (380s)). Amphipolis is called a polis both in the urban sense (Thuc. 4.102.4; Isoc. 5.2; Dem. 12.22; Aeschin. 2.27–28) and in the political sense (Thuc. 4.106.3; Dem. 1.5.8). The urban centre is called polisma at Thuc. 4.103.5. The territory of Amphipolis (called chorai) is mentioned at Aeschin. 2.27 and Tod 150.4 (called ge). The collective city-ethnic is used internally on C6l coins (infra), and in a decree of 357 (Tod 150.4–5), and externally in a treaty between the Chalkidians and Amyntas (Tod 111.20). For the individual and external use, see Ἑπισθενής Άμφιπολίτης, the commander of the peltasts of the Ten Thousand (Xen. An. 1.10.7) and the Athenian C4 honorific decree for an Amphipolitan (IG n2 421.5).

The site of Amphipolis was originally an Edonian settlement called Ἐννέα Ὀδοι. In 497 Aristogoras of Miletos tried in vain to settle the place (Thuc. 4.102.2; Diod. 12.68.3), and in 465 the Athenians made another abortive attempt to settle it with 10,000 colonists (Thuc. 1.100.3, 4.102.2; Diod. 12.68.2; schol. Aeschin. 2.34). They did not succeed until 437/6, when they founded a colony just south of Ennea Hodoi and called it Amphipolis (Thuc. 4.102.3; Diod. 12.68.2; schol. Aeschin. 2.34). Hagnon was the oecist. Later Brasidas was celebrated as the oecist of Amphipolis (Thuc. 5.11.1, alluded to at Dem. 12.21; see Malkin (1987) 228–32, (1994) 136–37).

The population of Amphipolis consisted of Greeks from different areas of Greece (Thuc. 4.106.1), among them a group of Argilians (Thuc. 4.103.3) and one of Athenians (Diod. 12.32.2). Apparently some additional Chalkidian settlers (στασις), led by a certain Kleotimos, caused a stasis and had the majority of the population expelled (Arist. Pol. 1303b2–3, 1306a2). This may be connected with the fact that the Chalkidians held Amphipolis c.363 (Dem. 23.149; see Zahnrt (1971) 101). Expulsion of Athenians is also mentioned at Dem. 12.21.

In 424 Brasidas marched against Amphipolis (Thuc. 4.103; Diod. 12.68.3); his arrival triggered a stasis between a ruling pro-Athenian faction and an anti-Athenian faction of “traitors”; Brasidas won the town over by an agreement whereby the pro-Athenian faction was allowed to leave (Thuc. 4.103.5–106.3). For the history of Amphipolis in the 420s, see Hornblower (1996) 319–42, 435–57. Amphipolis was evidently an enemy of Makedonia and the Chalkidians c.393 (Tod 111.19). In 370/69 the Spartans and other Greeks, along with Amyntas, voted that Amphipolis should be given back to the Athenians (Aeschin. 2.32), who accordingly sent Iphikrates to Amphipolis in the following year in order to take the city (Aeschin. 2.27), but he did not succeed. In the following years the Athenians made several attempts to take Amphipolis (see Papastavrou (1936) 24–31 with refs.). In 360 Philip withdrew the Macedonian garrison placed in Amphipolis by Perdikkas III and left the city autonemos (Diod. 16.3.5). He abandoned his claim to Amphipolis (Diod. 16.4.1), a measure which the Athenians later took to be a promise to restore Amphipolis to them (Dem. 2.6, 23.116). However, in 357 he laid siege to Amphipolis (Dem. 23.116) and captured the city (Dem. 12.21; Diod. 16.8.2).
Philon and Stratokles were exiled from Amphipolis in 357/6 (Tod 150 = Syll. 3, 194). Stratokles is probably the envoy who, along with Hierax (see Theopomp. fr. 42), was sent to Athens in 357 to request them to take over Amphipolis (Dem. 1.8). For the history of Amphipolis 395–357, see Hammond and Griffith (1979) 230–42.

Being originally an Athenian foundation, Amphipolis probably had a democratic constitution. Thuc. 4.104.4 mentions a strategos named Eukles who functioned as phylax tou choriou. There is no evidence that the constitution changed after Brasidas’ conquest in 424, although he appointed Klearidas as governor (archon) of the city (Thuc. 4.132.3). However, when Kleetimos brought in the Chalkidian settlers, Amphipolis seems to have been ruled by the wealthy (euporoi), and in order to obtain tyrannic powers, he attempted a coup d’état (Arist. Pol. 1305b40–1306a4). Whether or not he succeeded is unknown, but a decree (pephisma) of 357 was passed by the demos (ἐδοξοσεν τεωι δήμου), which points to a democratic constitution (Tod 150 = Syll. 3, 194). C4 deeds of sale show that an epistates served as eponymous official (SEG 41 562.8), and Tod 190.17 (357) refers to a board of prostatatai. For constitution and officials, see also Papastavru (1936) 47–50. A priest of Asklepios is mentioned in several C4m deeds of sale (Hatzopoulos (1991) = SEG 41 555–66). A man from Amphipolis was granted proxenia at Kos in C4l (Iscr. Cos ED 190). Amphipolis is recorded in the Epidaurian catalogue of theodorodokoi of 360/59 (IG IV 1.9.41.1.18) as well as in the Nemean of 323/2 (SEG 36 331B.17).

The urban centre of Amphipolis has been excavated, but, apart from the fortifications, most of the remains are Hellenistic or later (D. Lazaridis (1993)).

Thucydides mentions the agora (5.11.1) and the city wall of Amphipolis (4.102.4, 104.1), along with the gates (4.104.4). There were houses in the proasteion (Thuc. 4.103.5; Dio. 12.68.1). The city walls have been excavated. They are built in isodomic or pseudo-isodomic masonry and stand to a height of 7.25 m in some places (AAA 8.1 (1975) 56–76). The circumference of the city wall is 7,450 m, and that of the acropolis 2,220 m (Lorber (1990) 9; cf. D. Lazaridis (1993) 24–52). The city wall encloses an area of 250 ha, the acropolis wall an area of 37 ha. The gymnasion of Amphipolis goes back to C4 (K. Lazaridis (1988), (1989)). There was a monument to Rhesos and a temple for his mother Kleio at Amphipolis (Marsyas, FGH 135 fr. 7; see Malkin (1987) 81–84). A temple of Athena is mentioned by Thuc. 5.10.2. A temple of Apollo and Strymon is recorded in Syll. 3 194,15. Lorber surveys the archaeological remains (ibid. 11–14).

Amphipolis struck silver coins on the Phoenician standard (and rare gold coins on the Attic, c.400) from c.431 to c.357 (Gaebler (1935) 30f; Head, HN 2 214ff; SNG Cop. Macedonia 37–41) or from 370 to 354 (Lorber (1990) 107). Denominations: tetradrachms, drachms, hemidrachms, tetrobols, triobols and obols. Types: obv. head of Apollo; rev. race-torch in a raised frame; legend: ΑΜΦΙΠΟΛΙΤΩΝ or ΑΜΦΙΠΟΛΙΤΩΝ (rare). Amphipolis struck bronze coins as well (SNG Cop. Macedonia 42–49).

554. Argilos (Argilios) Map 51. Lat. 40.45, long. 23.50. Size of territory: 2. Type: Α:α. The toponym is Ἀργίλος (Hdt. 7.115.1) or Ἀρκίλος (IG IV 1.94.1.18 (359)). The city-ethnic is Ἀργίλους (IG l 270.11.21) or Ἀρκίλους (C5e–C4 coins, infra). Argilos is called a polis both in the urban sense (Hdt. 7.115.1; Thuc. 4.103.4) and in the political sense (Thuc. 4.103.4, 5.18.5; Peace of Nikias). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form on C5e–C4 coins (infra) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG l 271.11.56). For the individual and external use, see Thuc. 1.132.5 (4167).

In C5 Argilos was considered a colony of Andros (Thuc. 4.103.3). The existence of Argilos is not attested in written sources prior to 480, but if it was an Andrian colony, it may have been founded in C7, since it is generally assumed that Andros established its colonies c.655 (Lauffer (1989) 114, probably on the basis of Eusebius, who gives 655 as the foundation year of Akanthos and Stagiros, Chron. 95b).

According to Hdt. 7.115.1, Argilos was located in Bisaltia. In the territory of Argilos, across the river from Amphipolis, was a place called Kerdylion (Thuc. 5.6.3). A site in the vicinity of Nea Kerdyllia has been identified with this Kerdylon. Here a section of a Classical circuit wall has been found along with a gate (ArchDelt 41 (1986) Chron. 177–78). At Vrasna, also in the territory of Argilos, a five-sided phorion with towers has been excavated. The phorion dates to C4 (one coin of Philip II was found inside it), and its perimeter was c.70 m (Adam-Veleni (1992)).

Argilos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded from 454/3 (IG l 259.11.22) to 429/8 (IG l 282.11.9) a total of twelve times. In 454/3 it paid the enormous sum of 10½ tal. (IG l 259.11.22). Some scholars find it unbelievable that Argilos could have paid that much and want to correct the amount to 1½ tal. (Lewis in IG l 1), while others think that the amount can be explained (Isaac (1986) 53–54). From 446/5 (IG l 266.11.30) to 438/7 (IG l 274.41.15) Argilos paid 1 tal., and after that
1,000 dr. (IG i² 279.11.54). Argilos is absent from the full panel of 432/1 (IG i² 280.11.37–67), which may mean that it took part in the revolt of 432, but it is listed in 430/29 (IG i² 281.11.24) and 429/8 (IG i² 282.11.9). It was probably assessed in 425/4 (IG i² 71.11.177: [Ἀ]ργιλος [ἀ]υταί). Argilos followed Brasidas (Thuc. 4.103.4), along with the two other Andrian colonies in the area (sc. Akanthos (no. 559) and Stagiros (no. 613); Sane (no. 600), the fourth Andrian colony, remained a loyal member of the Delian League). In the Peace of Nikias it is stipulated that Argilos be autonemos and liable to the tribute assessed by Aristides (Thuc. 5.18.5).

Argilos is recorded in the Epidaurian list of theorodokoi of c.359 (IG iv² 1.94.1.b.17).

There was an Aristotelian politeia of the Argilians (no. 23 = Heracl. Lemb. 75). A C 4 deed of sale shows that an epistates served as eponymous official (Hatzopoulos (1991) 14–19 = SEG 24 583.1–2, supposedly from Argilos: Hatzopoulos (1996a) 192).

Apparantly a group of Argilians resided in Amphipolis and acquired citizenship there (Thuc. 4.103.4). Thucydides uses the verb ἐμπολιτεύω about them, but it is uncertain whether this means that they had retained their civil rights in Argilos or whether they had lost their citizenship in Argilos when they settled in Amphipolis (Hornblower (1996) 329).

Argilos was situated on a hill about 4 km west of the Strymon estuary. On the southern side of the hill there were houses, of which the earliest date from C6m, and on the eastern side a cemetery. Parts of the city wall have been found near the coast. The earliest finds are sherds dated to C7m. According to the excavators, the city flourished in C6–C5, but it lost some of its territory to Amphipolis when that city was founded in 437, and Argilos had ceased to exist by C3. They also claim that Argilos was destroyed by Philip and that only the acropolis was inhabited after that. A large square building of the Hellenistic period may be the seat of some member of the royal Macedonian retinue (Bonias and Perrault (1996)). East of the settlement three graves have been found, dating from C4l/C3e.

Some late Archaic coins, formerly attributed to Therme (Head, HN² 203), have recently been attributed to Argilos (Liampi (1994)). Argilos struck silver coins in C5e and bronze coins in C4. (1) Silver: denominations: tetrobols, obols and hemiobols; obv. foerpart of Pegasos; rev. incuse square; legend: APKI (SNG Cop. Macedonia 343–45). (2) Bronze: obv. head of Apollo; rev. APKI between bow and arrow (Liampi (1994) 29–31).

555. Traïlos (Traidios) Map 51. Lat. 40.50, long. 23.45. Size of territory: ? Type: Bβ. The toponym is Τραϊλός (IG i² 77.v.25) or Τράγιλα (IG iv² 1.94.1.b.19 (359)) or, later, Τράγιλας (Steph. Byz. 630.11; see Masson (1995)). The city-ethnic is Τραϊλός (Syll. 3 239B.35 (363/4)) or, on C5 coins, Τράϊλος (infra). The only source in which Traïlos is called a polis is Steph. Byz. 630.11, but polis status in the Archaic and Classical periods is indicated by membership of the Delian League, the C5–C4 mint, and the appointment of a theorodokos in C4m (infra). The collective city-ethnic is used internally on coins (infra). The external individual use of the city-ethnic is found in CID II 4.1.35 (360). Traïlos was the home town of the C4 mythographer Asklepiades ((FGrHist 12) Ti = Steph. Byz. 630.12–13).

Traïlos has been identified with the site at modern Aidonichori, c.12 km north-west of Amphipolis. A C6–C4m cemetery has been found, along with a large C4s–C3e building (Nikolaidou-Patera (1989), (1990). See also Isaac (1986) 5–6), who summarises the result of the excavations carried out in 1971, and Koukouli-Chrysanthaki (1985).

Traïlos may have been a member of the Delian League. It was assessed at 1 tal. in 422/1 (IG i² 77.v.25), but it may also have been assessed in 425/4 (IG i² 71.11.112—the toponym is restored, but the amount (1 tal.) is legible).

Traïlos is recorded in the Epidaurian list of theorodokoi of 360/59 (IG iv² 1.94.1.b.20).

Traïlos struck silver coins on the Phoenician standard in C5 and bronze coins in C4f. Denomination: hemiobol. Types: obv. corn-ear, or bunch of grapes, or head of Hermes; rev. incuse square with ΤΡΑΙ, or ΤΡΑΙΛΙΟΝ around a rose (Head, HN² 217; Gaebler (1935) 31–32; Robinson and Clement (1938); SNG Cop. Macedonia 445–53).

The onomastic material from Traïlos does not support the view that it was originally a barbarian town (Hatzopoulos (1996a) 214, pace, e.g., Hammond and Griffith (1979) 121 n. 5).

3. The Chalkidic Peninsula

556. Aige (Aigantios) Map 51. Lat. 40.00, long. 23.40. Size of territory: 2. Type: Aa. The toponym is Αἰγή (Hdt. 7.123.1). The city-ethnic is Αἰγάντιος (IG i² 269.111.5). The only source in which Aige is explicitly called a polis is Steph. Byz. 38.9–39.1; but at 7.123.1 Herodotos uses the pronoun αὐτας about Aige and seven other poleis on Pallene, and it is an almost certain inference that the noun to be supplied is πόλεις. The collective city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i² 269.111.5).

THRAE FROM AXIOS TO STRYMON 821
Hdt. 7.123.1 locates Aige on Pallene, between Neapolis and Therambo. According to Hdt. 7.123.1, Xerxes received ships and troops from Aige in 480, which indicates that it may have been a polis at that time. Aige was probably one of Poteidaia’s allies when that city fought against the Persians in 479 (Hdt. 8.128). Aige was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i³ 259.111.17) to 415/14 (IG i³ 290.111.9) a total of eighteen times, paying either 2,000 dr. (IG i³ 259.111.17) or 3,000 dr. (IG i³ 262.1.6). After C4 Aige is not heard of. It is possible that it was absorbed by one of its larger neighbours.

557. Aineia (Aineiates) Map 50. Lat. 40.30, long. 22.50. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A-a. The toponym is Αἰνεια (Hdt. 7.123.2) or Αἴνεια (Perlan 2000) 177–78, E.1b.10 (360/59). The city-ethnic is Αἴνειατης (IG i³ 262.11.12) or Αἴνειατης (IG i³ 278.v.18), or Αἴνειατης (IG i³ 281.11.20), all attested in the Athenian tribute lists. On C5/C6 coins the variants ΑΙΝΕΙΑΤΩΝ, ΑΙΝΕΗΤΩΝ and ΑΙΝΕΙΑΤΩΝ are found (Gaebler 1935) 22).

Aineia is called a <polis> Hellenis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 66 (cf. Flensd-Jensen and Hansen 1996 142). Hdt. 7.123.2–3 calls it a polis mainly in the urban, but probably also in the political sense (cf. Hansen 2000a) 175–76. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins of C4 (Gaebler 1935) 22, and externally on the Athenian tribute lists (e.g. IG i³ 278.v.18).

According to Hdt. 7.123.2, Aineia was a polis in Krousis which in 480 provided Xerxes with troops. Aineia was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and is registered in the tribute lists from 451/50 (IG i³ 262.11.12) to 429/8 (IG i³ 282.11.24) a total of sixteen times, once completely restored, paying 3 tal. (IG i³ 266.11.34) until 430/9, when the tribute was lowered to 1,000 dr. (IG i³ 281.11.20). Aineia is recorded in the Epidaurian list of theo- rodokoi of 360/59 (Perlman 2000) 177–78, E.1b.10. Aineia existed down to the time of Kassandros, when it was destroyed together with twenty-five other settlements, all synoecised into Thessalonike (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 1.49.4; Strabo 7 frr. 21, 24). Livy, however, mentions Aineia three times in a C2 context (40.4.9, 45.27.4, 30.4), and it is recorded in the list of Delphic theo- rodokoi of 230–220 (BCH 45 (1921) 18, 111.75).

The urban centre of Aineia must have been at modern Nea Michaniona, where there are abundant sherds and other remains of C5–C4 (Zahrnt 1971) 143). A rescue excavation has revealed twenty graves, all except one dating to C4, the exception being a C5 burial; between 1979 and 1982 three burial mounds were excavated; they belong to a well-known cemetery of the Archaic and Classical periods (TSigarida 1994)).

Aineia struck silver coins on the Euboic standard from C6 to c.424, and on the Phoenician standard from c.424 to c.350. Denominations: tetradrachms, tetrobols and diobols. Types: obv: Aineias, Anchises, Kreusa and Askanios; legend: ΑΙΝΕΑΣ, rev: incuse square. Later coins have obv: head of Athena, or head of Aineias; rev: bull; legend: ΑΙΝΕΑΣ or ΑΙΝΕΙΑΤΩΝ, or ΑΙΝΕΗΤΩΝ. In C5/C6 Aineia struck bronze coins with the same types and legends (Head, HN2 214; Gaebler 1935) 20–22; SNG Cop. Macedonia 33–35).

Aineia was said to have been founded by Aineias. C6 coins depict Aineias carrying Anchises on his shoulders, behind Kreusa, who carries a small girl on her shoulders (Gaebler 1935) 20; cf. Kraay (1976) 134 with no. 469). The legend on the coin is, remarkably, ΑΙΝΕΑΣ, interpreted as the name of the city Aineia in the genitive (Gaebler 1935) 21), although it could also be the name Aineias in the nominative. Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 1.47.6, 48.1, 49.4 also credits Aineias with the foundation of Aineia, and he evidently has this piece of information from Hellanikos (FGrHist 4) fr. 31.

558. Aioleion (Aiolites) Map 50. Lat. 40.30, long. 23.10: Aioleion was situated in Bottike (infra), but the precise location of the town is unknown; Barr.’s recording of Aioleion south of Spartolos (no. 612) and north of Pleume (no. 595) is just a guess; see Zahrnt (1971) 145. Size of territory: ? Type: A-a. The toponym is Αἰολίτης (IG i³ 76.6.53 (c.422) = Tod 68; restored: Αἰολίτης—though Αἴολίτης is equally possible) or Αἴολιτα (Theopomp. fr. 144, apud Steph. Byz. 53.2). The city-ethnic is Αἰολίτης (IG i³ 278.v.17). Aioleion is listed after the heading αἴολεις πόλεις in a treaty of c.422 (IG i³ 76.4.44, 53), and in the Athenian tribute lists the city-ethnic occurs twice after the heading πόλεις αὐτῆς φόρον ταξάμενα (IG i³ 278.v.15–7, 279.11.76–77 and 84) and once after the heading ταύτης (sc. πόλεως) ἥταξαν οἱ τάκται (IG i³ 282.11.34–36, 42); in all four cases polis is used in the political sense. At Theopomp. fr. 144 Aioleion is attested as a polis in the political and urban senses simultaneously. The collective city-ethnic is used externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i³ 278.v.17).

Aioleion was a Bottiaian polis (Flensd-Jensen 1995 117–18), but its exact location is unknown. C.422 the Bottiaians entered into an alliance with the Athenians (Tod 68 = IG i³ 76). The same inscription seems to show that the Bottiaians had formed a confederacy at that time (Flensd-
Jensen (1995) 126–28. If they did, Aioleion must have been one of the members (cf. IG i² 76.53).

Aioleion was a member of the Delian League, and it is recorded in the tribute lists three times, in 434/3 (IG i³ 278.vI.7), 433/2 (IG i³ 279.II.84) and 429/8 (IG i³ 282.II.42), paying 500 dr. in all three years. It is absent from the full panel of 432/1 (IG i³ 280.II.37–67) but was assessed for tribute in 422/1 (IG i³ 77.vI.17) (500 dr.). In C4 Aioleion may have been a member of the Chalkidian Federation (Flensted-Jensen 1995) 117.

559. Akanthos (Akanthios) Map 51. Lat. 40.25, long. 23.50. Size of territory: 3. Type: Α.α. The toponym is Ἀκάνθος, ἦ (Thuc. 4.114;3; IG iV².1 94.1.11.22 (360/59)). The city-ethnic is Ἀκάνθιος (Xen. Hell. 5.2.11; IG i³ 266.II.29). Akanthos is called a polis both in the urban sense (Ps.-Skylax 66; cf. Flensted-Jensen and Hansen 1996) 142) and in the political sense (Thuc. 4.85.6, 5.18.5; Peace of Nikias). At Thuc. 5.18.6: Peace of Nikias, the territorial sense is a connotation, and at Xen. Hell. 5.2.11 polis is used in the urban and political senses combined (Hansen 2000) 210). The collective city-ethnic is used internally on C5 coins (infra) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i³ 266.II.29). The individual city-ethnic is used externally by Xen. Hell. 5.2.12. Patris is found in Amphis fr. 36, KA.

Munro (1896) 313 describes a fragment of an undated inscription which is probably a boundary stone; only OP ΔΗ ΑΚ is left; it could be restored ὅρος δήµων Ακάνθιος, pace CIG add. 2007k, where it is interpreted ὃρος Δήµητρος Ἀκάνθιος.

Akanthos may have been a colony of Andros (Thuc. 4.84.1; Strabo 7 fr. 31; Ps.-Skymnos 647), probably founded in C7e (Panayotou 1991) 127). Although one C7e graffito found at Akanthos was inscribed in the Andrian alphabet (SEG 36 580), a preliminary examination of the grave material from Akanthos does not in itself indicate that Akanthos was an Andrian colony (H. Trakosopoulou per litt.). The first time Akanthos is mentioned in a literary source is in connection with Xerxes’ march in 480; from Hdt. 7.116 it appears that Akanthos entertained Xerxes and his army in 480. Herodotus does not call Akanthos a polis, but Xerxes declared that there existed xenia between Akanthos and himself, which indicates status as a political unit.

Akanthos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded from 450/49 (IG i³ 263.III.34) to 429/8 (IG i³ 282.II.13) a total of eleven times, paying 5 tal. in 450/49 (IG i³ 263.III.34) (amount not implausibly restored) and thereafter 3 tal. (IG i³ 266.II.29). In 424 Brasidas made an expedition against Akanthos (Thuc. 4.84). His arrival triggered a stasis between two opposing factions: Chalkidian supporters of Brasidas and the demos (Thuc. 4.84.2). The Akanthians voted to revolt against the Athenians and make a treaty with Brasidas (Thuc. 4.88.1; cf. Syll. 79). According to Diod. 12.67.2, Akanthos was the first town that Brasidas persuaded to break away from Athens. In 423 Akanthos sent troops into Lynkestis with Brasidas (Thuc. 4.123.1). In the Peace of Nikias it is stipulated that Akanthos be autonomos and pay the tribute as fixed by Aisteides (Thuc. 5.18.5). The Akanthians were enemies of the Chalkidians in the 380s, according to the second of the treaties between Amyntas III and the Chalkidians (Syll. 135; Zahrnt (1971) 122ff). That Akanthos was not a member of the Chalkidian Federation is also clear from Xenophon’s description at Hell. 5.2.11 of how in 382 Akanthos sent envoys to Sparta to obtain aid from Sparta in order to avoid being incorporated into the expanding Chalkidian Federation. It is highly probable that Ass(è)ra (no. 564), Akanthos’ nearest neighbour to the west, was now a member of the Chalkidian Federation (see infra). Apparently, Akanthos was a not unimportant town in 382: Xenophon calls Akanthos and Apollonia “the largest of the poleis around Olynthos,” and emphasises that the Akanthians still had their patrioi nomoi and called themselves autopollitai (Hell. 5.2.14).

About 349 Akanthos sent envoys to Athens to ask for help against Philip (IG ii² 210 + 259; Schweigert (1937) 329–32). Akanthos was not one of the poleis in the Chalkidian peninsula destroyed by Philip. Not only does it appear on the C3 Delphic list of theorodokoi (BCH 45 (1921) 111.86), but it is also mentioned by Livy (31.45.16 (1200)), and the cemetery at Akanthos was in use continuously from the Archaic through to the Roman period.

Since the treaty with Brasidas in 424 was decided by a secret vote (Thuc. 4.88.1) taken among the plethos (Thuc. 4.84.2), Akanthos probably had a democratic constitution, at least at the time of the Peloponnesian War (Grayson (1972) 64). Akanthos is recorded in the Epidaurian list of theorodokoi in 360/59 (IG iv².1 94.1.11.22). The Akanthians had a treasury in Delphi erected in C6 and rebuilt in 423 (Syll. 79; Plut. Lys. 1.1; Bommelaer (1991) no. 303).

The acropolis of Akanthos was situated on a hill overlooking the sea and the cemetery, which was situated near the coast. The site is partly covered by modern Ierissos. On the acropolis not much has been found: there are remains of walls believed to be the walls surrounding the acropolis. They were built in two phases; the oldest part is on the east
side of the hill. A stretch of c.30 m, c.8 m in height, has been found. The next phase is either late Classical or early Hellenistic. On the south part of the hill there are remains of a square tower or possibly a gate (Trakospongou-Salakidou (1996) 299–300). On top of the hill are the remains of a temple, which is contemporary with the oldest part of the wall, i.e. probably early Classical (ibid. 301–2). Remains of one other, early Hellenistic, building have been found: the quality and decoration of the building suggest that it may have been a pyrtaneion (ArchDelt 39 (1984) Chron. 223). The cemetery has hitherto yielded more than 9,000 graves, covering the period C7I to the third century AD. The majority of the graves are from the Classical period (Trakospongou-Salakidou (1996) 297ff). In 1998 some 400 graves which had been uncovered in 1979 were published (Kaltas (1998)). The area covered by the cemetery is estimated to be at least 60 km². The earliest pottery is C7I Ionian pottery along with pottery from Aiolis and the islands along the coast of Asia Minor. From C6M Attic pottery is the most common type, Corinthian the second most common. Of interest are three sherds from Panathenaic amphoras, showing that Akanthians had participated in and been victorious in the Panathenaic Games. Furthermore, a C5 I bronze strigil inscribed with ΔΕΜΟΣΙΗ has been found. It has been suggested that the strigil "belonged to the city of Akanthos, and had probably been registered in the gymnasium under the number five" (Macedonians (1994) 76 pl. 9).

Akanthos struck silver coins on the Euboic standard from c.500 (or perhaps already from c.530; see Desneux (1949)) to c.424 and on the Phoenician standard from c.424 to c.350. Denominations: tetradrachms, triobotls, triobols, diobols and obols. (1) Silver coins: obv. lion and bull, or bull, or lion, or head of Athena; legend: sometimes magistrate’s name; rev. quadripartite incuse square; legend: AKANΘΙΟΝ. (2) Silver coins c.392 to c.379: obv. head of Apollo; rev. quadripartite incuse square; legend: AKΑΝΘΙΟΝ. (3) Bronze coins, all after c.400: obv. head of Athena; rev. quadripartite square; legend: ΑΚΑΝ (Head, ΗΝ² 204–5; Gaebler (1935) 23–29; Lorber (1990) 72–73; SNG Cop. Macedonia 1–24).

560. Akrothooi (Akrothoios) Map 51. Lat. 40.10, long. 24.20 (but see Zahrt (1971) 150–51). Size of territory: 2. Type: Α:Β. The toponym is Ακρόθωος (Hdt. 7.22.3) or Ακρόθος (Thuc. 4.109.3). Strabo 7 fr. 35 and Steph. Byz. 63.13 have Ακρόθος. The city-ethnic is Ακροθωούς (IG i3 77.V.33–34) or Ακροθώος (Ps.-Skylax 66). Hdt. 7.22.3 and Ps.-Skylax 66 (cf. Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 142) call Akrothooi a polis in the urban sense, whereas Thuc. 4.109.3–5 probably uses polis in the political sense, using polisma about the settlement. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in a C2 proxeny decree passed by the Akrothorians’ boule and demos (SEG 46 710) and externally in the Athenian assessment decree of 422/1 (infra).

Akrothooi was located on Athos (Hdt. 7.22.3; Thuc. 4.109.3). It was probably a member of the Delian League, because it revolted from Athens and joined Brasidas in 423 (Thuc. 4.109.4), but it never occurs in the tribute lists, only in the assessment decree of 422/1 (IG i3 77.V.33–34).

Strabo (7 frr. 33, 35) says that the five poleis on Athos were settled by Pelasgians from Lemnos. According to Thuc. 4.109.3–4, Akrothooi had a mixed (i.e. barbarian–Hellenic) bilingual population, but about a century later it is called a <polis> Hellenis by Ps.-Skylax 66 (Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 151).

561. Alapta (Alaptes) Unlocated. Type: Α:Α. The toponym is Αλαπτα (Ps.-Skylax 66). The city-ethnic is ΑΛΑΠΤΗΣ (Galen. Ling. Hipp. 19.74). Alapta is mentioned by Ps.-Skylax 66 (Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 142), who calls it a <polis> Hellenis. The only other source to mention Alapta is Galenos, who uses the ethnic, but calls Alapta a chorion in Thrace.

562. Anthemous (Anthemountios) Map 50. Lat. 40.25, long. 23.45. Size of territory: ? Type: Κα:Α. The toponym is Ανθεµούς (Aeschin. 2.27). Ε (Thuc. 2.99.6) or Η (Dem. 6.20). The city-ethnic is Ανθεµοντιός (Harp. A143) or Ανθεµοντιός (Steph. Byz. 96.8; cf. Arr. Anab. 2.9.3). Anthemous is classified as a polis in late lexicographers only: viz. Harp. A143; Steph. Byz. 96.7; Suda A2491; and Hsch. A5118. But in Aeschin. 2.27 Anthemous is juxtaposed with Thermo and Strepsa, both of which were poleis: εἰληφότος δὲ Ανθεµοντιόν Καὶ Θέρµαν Καὶ Στρέψαν καὶ Άλλ' Άτα χωρία (sc. Παυσανίου). For chorion used about a polis, see Hansen (1995) 44 n. 167. Thus, on analogy with Thermo and Strepsa, Anthemous may have been a classical polis.

Hatzopoulos and Loukopoulou (1987) 59 n. 155 locate Anthemous near the church of Ag. Paraskevi 3.5 km to the south of modern Galatista (cf. Wace (1913–14); Edson (1935) 171–72). At the site near Galatista a number of late inscriptions (the earliest being from c.180) have been found, among them two decrees and an ephichic list (Hatzopoulos and Loukopoulou (1987) 34–67).

Hdt. 5.94.1 and Thuc. 2.99.6, 100.4 both know Anthemous, but clearly as a district of Makedonia. From Aeschin. 2.27 (χωρίον) it appears that Anthemous was an urban centre (or perhaps a fortress). In C4 Anthemous was
fought over by the Makedonians and the Chalkidians, and belonged to the Chalkidians at least once (Dem. 14.92-3 (1393), 15.39.2 (1385)). Anthemous provided Alexander with an ile (Att. Anab. 2.9.3). The sources seem to indicate that Anthemous was originally a district which belonged to the Makedonian king, and that the town Anthemous emerged during C.4.

563. Aphytis (Aphytaia) Map 50. Lat. 40.05, long. 23.30. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is ΑΦΥΤΗΣ, ἦ (IG iv.2.1 94.1.b.24 (360/59); Xen. Hell. 5.3.19; Paus. 3.18.3), gen. -εως (Thuc. 1.64.2), -εως (Theopomp. fr. 141). Steph. Byz. (151.1) gives ἈΦΥΤΗΣ ἢ ἈΦΥΤΙΣ ἢ ἈΦΥΤΟΣ. The city-ethnic is ΑΦΥΤΑΙΟΣ (IG i.3 281.11.10).

In Ps.-Skylax 66 Aphytis is one of the toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις αἵδε ἐν τ/etas-ΧιΞταῆ Παλλήν/etas-ΧιΞταη ‘Ελληνίδες, where polis is used in the urban sense. At 7.123.1 Herodotus uses the pronoun αὗτας about Aphytis and seven other poleis on Pallene, and it is an almost certain inference that the noun to be supplied is πόλεις. For polis in the political sense, see Arist. Pol. 1319*10 and 14, where Aphytis is listed as one of two examples after the heading ἐν πόλαισι πόλεως νεομοιοθετημένων. The collective city-ethnic is used externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i.3 281.11.10), and internally on coins (infra). For the individual and external use of the city-ethnic, see IG i.3 1052.vi.83, 99.

According to Hdt. 7.123, Aphytis was located on Pallene between Poteidaia and Neapolis (cf. Thuc. 1.64.2; Strabo 7 fr. 27), i.e. at modern Athytos. Arist. Pol. 1319*15–16 states that the Aphytaians had a small territory even though the population was large.

Aphytis supplied Xerxes with troops and ships in 480, which indicates that at that time it was a polis in the political sense (Hdt. 7.123.1). Aphytis was a member of the Delian League and seems to have been a loyal member for the whole period: it belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded from 452/1 (IG i.3 261.1.2); it is present in the full panel of 430/9 (IG i.3 281.11.10) and also appears on the last list of 415/14 (IG i.3 290.11.5). It appears a total of sixteen times, once completely restored, paying 3 tal. from 452/1 (IG i.3 261.1.2) to 447/6 (IG i.3 265.1.24), 1 tal. from 446/5 (IG i.3 266.11.22) to 440/9 (IG i.3 272.1.47), and 3 tal. again from 435/4 (IG i.3 277.14.14) to 429/8 (IG i.3 282.11.11). It was assessed in 425/4 (IG i.3 71.11.168). In an area of general rebellion, Aphytis remained a loyal Athenian ally: it served as an Athenian base in 432 (Thuc. 1.64.2), and it was also rewarded for its loyalty: an Athenian decree (IG i.3 62 (c.428/7)) granted Aphytis the privilege of importing a certain amount of grain. It appears from the inscription that there were (Athenian?) archontes in Aphytis (Meritt (1944) 211–29), and that envoys were sent from Aphytis to Athens c.428 (IG i.3 63.8). Aphytis was besieged, but not conquered, by Lysander in 405/4 (Paus. 3.18.3). The continued importance of Aphytis is apparent from the fact that it is recorded in the Epidaurian list of theorodokoi (IG iv.2.1 94.1.b.24 (360/59)). Aphytis was probably synoecised into Kassandreia (Hatzopoulos 1996)) 121, 199–200, 255).

There was an Aristotelian politeia of the Aphytaians (no. 29 = Heracl. Lemb. 72). There was a census requirement for citizenship in C.4s, but it was so low that it was passed even by the poor (Arist. Pol. 1319*14–19).

There was a temple of Dionysos at Aphytis (Xen. Hell. 5.3.19), and according to Paus. 3.18.3 the Aphytaians worshipped Ammon, whose head adorns their coins (infra). Excavations have revealed the ruins of a C.4s temple, presumably of Zeus Ammon (AAA 4 (1971) 356–67; BCH 96 (1972) 730, 736). Furthermore, south of the temple was found a sanctuary of Dionysos (an inscribed C.3 sherd reads Διὸνυσος (SEG 30 586)) and the Nymphs, inside which were sherds from C.8s onwards.

For the archaeological remains at modern Athytos, dating from C.8s to the Classical period, see ArchDelt 32 (1977) Chron. 202; ArchDelt 34 (1979) Chron. 279. Parts of a defence wall from the Classical period have been found (ArchDelt 32 (1977) Chron. 202 with photo). Inside the sanctuary of Dionysos were found C.8s pottery, which indicates that Aphytis was found in C.8s (AAA 4 (1971) 356–77). At Nea Kallithea, 3 km south of Athytos, have been found sherds etc., probably from the Classical period (ArchDelt 24 (1969) Chron. 312). Twenty-one graves dating from C.6m–C.5l have been found at Aphytis (Misiadiou-Despotidou (2001)).

Aphytis struck coins on the Phoenician standard from C.5m (Gaebler (1935) 44–46; Robinson and Clement (1938) 273), or from c.424 (ArchDelt 41 (1986) Chron. 148) to C.4m. Head, however, does not believe that Aphytis struck coins while a member of the Delian League, and dates all coins of Aphytis to the period before 358 (HN2 209–10). (1) Silver, C.5: denomination: tetrobolis. Types: ovb. head of Zeus Ammon, or Are helmeted; rev. kantharos, or eagle(s), or linear square with vine; legend: ΑΦΥ ή ΑΦΥΤΑΙΩΝ. (2) Bronze, C.4f. Types: ovb. Zeus Ammon, or Apollo Karneios; rev. kantharos, or eagle(s); legend: ΑΦΥ ή ΑΦΥΤΑΙΩΝ (Head, HN2 209–10; Gaebler (1935) 44–46; SNG Cop. Macedonia 123–28).

According to Theopomp. fr. 141 (apud Steph. Byz. 698.15), Aphytis founded a place called Chytropolis. Stephanos calls it
that they participated in the Revolt of 432/1, it may be inferred that they revolted in 432, along with Poteidaia (no. 598), the Chalkidians and the Bottiaians (Thuc. 1.58.2), and thus, that they lived somewhere in the Chalkidic peninsula.

567. Chytropolis (Chytropolites) Map 51. Unlocated. Type: C.a. The toponym is Χυτρόπολις (Theopomp. fr. 141 apud Steph. Byz. 698.16–18); the city-ethnic is Χυτροπολίτης (ibid.). According to Stephanos, Chytropolis was called a chemon by Theopompus, but Theopompus also mentioned that it was settled (ἀπεικόσια) by Aphytis. Furthermore, he called the inhabitants Chytropolitai. It is difficult to determine whether Chytropolis was a polis, and if so, where it was located. Zahrnt (1971) 254 suggests that it was situated within the territory of Aphytis.

568. Dikaia (Dikaiopolites) Map 50. Lat. 40.30, long. 22.55. Size of territory: ? Type: [A]:a. The toponym is Δίκαια (IG i 266.11.27; Kraay (1976) no. 392). The city-ethnic is Δικαιοπολίτης (IG i 279.11.55–56). The Dikaiopolitai are listed once under the heading Ηαιδέ τον πόλεων in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i 281.11.31f) and again under the heading πόλεις αὐτῶν. The city-ethnic is attested internally on coins (infra) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i 279.11.55–56).
In the Epidaurian list of *theorodokoi*, Dikaia is listed between Aineia and Potidaia (*IG* ii.3 94.1.11 (360/59)), and Herodotos mentions it after Therme (*HN* 4.36). It is not, however, mentioned by Ps.-Skylax in their descriptions of the coast of the Chalkidic peninsula, so it may be inferred that Dikaia was situated inland, somewhere in the north-western part of the Chalkidic peninsula; see also Viviers (1987) 194–95.

Dikaia was colonised from Eretria (*IG* i.² 282.11.55–56) and the earliest coins of Dikaia bear Eretrian types (bull/octopus; see Allan (1940) 34). Dikaia was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (*IG* i.³ 259.4.iv.19–20) to 429/8 (*IG* i.² 282.11.55–56) a total of sixteen times, once completely restored. It is absent from the full panel of 432/1 (*IG* i.² 280.11.37–67), which may indicate that it participated in the Revolt of 432 (Thuc. 1.58); but it is recorded in the lists of 430/29 and 429/8 after the heading ἀΐδε τῶν πόλεων αὐτῆς τῆς ἀσπαξίας ἀπήγαγον (*IG* i.² 281.11.35, 282.11.55–56, paying 4 tal. in 454/3 (*IG* i.³ 259.4.iv.19–20) and 5 tal. in 453/2 (*IG* i.² 260.12.7, ethnic partly restored). In 435/4 it paid 1 tal. (*IG* i.³ 277.vi.15–16). In 430/29 and in 429/8, however, it paid the quota only, i.e. 100 dr. In all other years the amount is restored by the editors. Dikaia became a member of the Second Athenian Naval League (*IG* ii.² 43.3.B.32–33). C.349 Dikaia may have sent envoys to Athens (the text is restored Διεύς, l.4) to ask for help against Philip (*IG* ii.² 210 + 259; Schweigert (1937) 329–32).

A C.4 coin found in 1928 may be attributed to Dikaia: *obv.* Athena; *rev.* tripod; legend: ΔΙΕΩΝ. It is uncertain whether the coin was issued in Dion in Pieria or Dion on Akte, but Robinson and Clement prefer Dion on Akte ((1938) 282; cf. Hatzopoulos (1996a) 172).

According to Strabo (7 frr. 33, 35), Dion and the four other *poleis* of Athos were founded by Pelasgians from Lemnos. Thuc. 4.109.3 informs us that in his day Dion had a mixed (i.e. barbarian–Hellenic) bilingual population, but a century later Dion is called a *<polis>* *Hellenis* by Ps.-Skylax 66 (Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1998) 151).

**569. Dion** (Dieus) Map 51. Lat. 40.20, long. 24.10. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A/B. The toponym is Διος, τό (*Hdt.* 7.22.3; Thuc. 4.109.3). The city-ethnic is Διεύς (*IG* i.³ 269.11.35; Thuc. 5.35.1).

Dion is called a *polis* in the urban sense by *Hdt.* 7.22.3 and Ps.-Skylax 66 (Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 142), whereas *Thuc.* 4.109.3–5 probably uses *polis* in the political sense, using *polis* as about the settlement. The collective and external use of the city-ethnic is attested in the Athenian tribute lists (e.g. *IG* i.³ 269.11.35). Dion was situated on Athos (*IG* i.² 272.11.59; *Hdt.* 7.22.3; Thuc. 4.109.3).

Dion was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded from 454/3 (*IG* i.³ 259.11.26, restored) to 429/8 (*IG* i.³ 282.11.22) a total of seventeen times, three times completely restored, paying 1 tal. throughout the period (*IG* i.³ 269.11.35). In 454/3 it formed a syntelic group with Sane and Olophyxos. During the Peloponnesian War Dion withstood an attack from Brasidas in 423, and consequently its territory was ravaged (Thuc. 4.109.5). The incident indicates that Dion was fortified. In 421 Dion took Thyssos, which was situated about 10 km from Dion on the opposite coast of the peninsula (Thuc. 5.35.1). Thyssos was an Athenian ally at that time, and Dion may have been so too, since it is known that it did not revolt against Athens and join the Chalkidians until 417 (Thuc. 5.82.1). Dion was also a member of the Second Athenian Naval League (*IG* ii.² 43.B.32–33). C.349 Dion may have sent envoys to Athens (the text is restored Διεύς, l.4) to ask for help against Philip (*IG* ii.² 210 + 259; Schweigert (1937) 329–32).

**570. Eion** Not in *Barr*. Maps 50–51. Unlocated. Size of territory: ? Type: Ca. Only the toponym *Ἡιὼν* is known (Thuc. 4.7). Virtually nothing is known of Eion, which Thuc. 4.7 calls a *Μενδαίων ἀποικία*, perhaps indicating that it was a *polis*. It is not the same as its better-known namesake on the Thracian coast: Stephan. Byz. distinguishes between the two and calls this one πόλις ἐν χερρονήσῳ, ὥσις Ὁσιουκτίδης and then adds: οὐ καὶ ἄλλη πρὸς τῇ Πιερίᾳ (cf. *Eust.* II. 2.92). It is clear from Thuc. 4.7 that Eion was an enemy of the Athenians in 425, but whether that means that it was once a member of the Delian League and had revolted in 432, or that it had never been a member, is unknown. It never occurs in the Athenian tribute lists. In 425 the Athenians took Eion by treachery, which indicates that it was fortified (Thuc. 4.7).

**571. Galepsos** (Galaios) Map 51. Lat. 40.10, long. 23.40. Size of territory: 2 or 3. Type: A: a. The toponym is
The city-ethnic is 

\( \text{Γαληψός} \) (Thuc. 4.107.4), so that the toponym is in fact 

\( \text{Γαληψός} \) and not Galepsos (Kinch (1894) 149), followed by Zahrt (1971) 178, pace Lepper (1962) 35); there may, however, be numismatic evidence in support of Herodotos’ form if the coins inscribed \( \text{ΓΑΛΗΨΙΩΝ} \) (infra) were struck by the present community. Hdt. 7.122 calls Gale(p sos) a polis principally in the urban, but probably also in the political sense. The political sense is attested in \( \text{IG i}^3 \text{ 278.vi1.5} \), and \( \text{IG i}^3 \text{ 279.i.76} \), 78, where the Galaians are listed under the heading \( \text{πόλεις αἰδές} \). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (\( \text{IG i}^3 \text{ 278.vi1.8} \)). The undated Athenian grave inscription with the ethnikon Galepsos \( \text{(SEG 32 297)} \) probably belongs to Galepsos (no. 631) in the Thasian peraia.

According to Hdt. 7.122, Gale(p sos) was situated on Sithonia between Torone and Sermylia. Zahrt (1971) 178 locates Gal(e)psos south of Neos Marmaras, where a pithos grave containing Archaic Attic and Corinthian pottery has been found (ArchDelt 42 (1987) Chron. 371). For a sanctuary presumably in its territory, see supra 815 on Parthenopolis.

Gale(p sos) supplied Xerxes with troops and ships in 480 (Hdt. 7.122). It was a member of the Delian League. The Galaians belonged to the Thracian district and are recorded for the first time in 436/5 (\( \text{IG i}^3 \text{ 276.v.26} \)) and in the subsequent three years. In 435/4 the Galaians are recorded as \( \text{ἀντικεῖσθαι} \) (\( \text{IG i}^3 \text{ 277.v.31} \)). In 434/3 (\( \text{IG i}^3 \text{ 278.vi1.8} \)) and in 433/2 (\( \text{IG i}^3 \text{ 279.i.78} \)) they are listed after the heading \( \text{πόλεις αὑστά φόρον ταξάμενα}, \) paying 500 dr. in 436/5 and 435/4, and 3,000 dr. in 434/3 and 433/2. Since Gale(p sos) is not recorded in the lists after 432/1, it may have participated in the Revolt of 432 (Thuc. 1.58.2) and was presumably one of the poleis that took part in the synoecism of Olynths (no. 588) in 432 (Thuc. 1.58.2; Zahrt (1971) 54). The wording of Thuc. 1.58.2 (\( \text{πόλεις} \ldots \text{καταβαλόντας} \ldots \text{καθαιροῦντες τὰς πόλεις} \)) suggests that the city was destroyed in connection with the synoecism. It was assessed at 10 dr. in 422/1 (\( \text{IG i}^3 \text{ 77.v.24} \)).

In the early 1970s a bronze coin (a) was found at the presumed site of Gale(p sos) (Demetriadi (1974)). Type: obv. young male head; rev. forepart of goat looking back; legend: \( \text{ΓΑΛΗΨΙΩΝ} \). One other specimen (b), bought from a coin dealer, is known. The coins have been dated tentatively to C4f. The provenance of the coin found on Sithonia is the reason why these two coins have been attributed to the Gale(p sos) under discussion and not to its namesake in the Thasian peraia (no. 631). Demetriadi (1974) claims that no coins from the Thracian Gale(p sos) are known. However, in 1936 Bon published a coin (c) found during the excavations of Thasos and now (at least in 1936) in the Numismatic Museum in Athens, which she claims was struck at Galepsos (no. 631) in the Thasian peraia. There is absolutely no doubt that Bon and Demetriadi describe the same coin type. The diameters of (a) and (b) are 14 and 15 mm respectively, and the diameter of (c) is 13 mm. All three have on the obv. an identical head of a young man (Dionysos?) wearing an ivy wreath. On the rev., coins (b) and (c) have the forepart of a goat (again the types are identical) facing 1, and on (a) the goat faces r. All three have the legend \( \text{ΓΑΛΗΨΙΩΝ} \). Hatzopoulos attributes the coins to Galepsos in the Thasian peraia (in conversation).
Haisa was a member of the Delian League. However, it occurs only once in the tribute lists: *viz.* in 434/3 (IG i² 278.vi.33), where it pays along with the Tindaians (no. 619), Kithas (no. 579), Smila (no. 611) and Gigonos (no. 572). They pay 3,000 dr. altogether. The toponym is completely restored in the assessment decree of 425/4 (IG i² 71.iv.85), but the amount (3,000 dr.) is legible. Haisa may have been listed in the assessment decree of 422/1 (the heading in IG i³ 77.v.41–42 is restored [πόλες] [Κροσσίδος]).

Excavations at Nea Kallikrateia have revealed potsherds from the early Iron Age and the Geometric period (ArchDelt 31 (1976) Chron. 247), and remains of a C5 settlement (ArchDelt 29 (1973–74) Chron. 697, 677–78). According to the excavators, the site is of at least C81. It was occupied until the beginning of Christian times. The site has not yet been positively identified with Haisa (ArchDelt 32 (1977) Chron. 202). Additional finds (C5 graves) are mentioned in ArchDelt 33 (1978) Chron. 236, 34 (1979) Chron. 279.

574. Istasos  Map 51. Unlocated. Type: C?: The toponym is Τσατσος (IG i³ 77.v.16). Istasos may have been a member of the Delian League. In 422/1 it was assessed at 500 dr. (IG i³ 77.v.16), but is unattested in the tribute lists. The editors of the Athenian tribute lists (ATL i. 538) identify Istasos with Pistasos (s.v.).

575. Kalindoia Map 50. Lat. 40.35, long. 23.20. Size of territory: ? Type: [A]:α. The toponym is Καλίνδοια (IG i³ 76.45 = Tod 68 (422); IGiv².1 94.1.b.13 (360/59)); Steph. Byz. 75.7 gives Ἀλινίδοια. Apart from Steph. Byz. 75.8, there is no attestation of the city-ethnic. Kalindoia is listed under the heading αἰδε πόλεις in a treaty of c.422 (IG i³ 76.44, 45), where polis is used in the political sense.

Kalindoia was situated in northern Bottike, perhaps on the border with Mygdonia, but it was clearly a Bottiaian polis (Flensted-Jensen (1995) 112–15). C.422 the Bottiaians entered into an alliance with the Athenians (Tod 68 = IG i³ 76). The same inscription seems to show that the Bottiaians had formed a confederacy at that time (Flensted-Jensen (1995) 126–28). If so, Kamakai must have been one of the members (cf. Tod 68.48). Its territory was given to the Macedonians in 323/2 by Alexander (SEG 36 626.4–8).

Kalindoia was a member of the Delian League; it belonged to the Thracian district, but it is recorded only once in the tribute lists, namely in 421/20 (IG i³ 285.111.11), paying only 600 dr. About the same time the Bottiaians had probably formed a confederacy of which Kamakai was a member (IG i³ 76).

577. Kampsa Map 50. Unlocated. Type: A:α? The toponym is Κάψα (Hdt. 7.123.2) or Κάνια (Steph. Byz. 370.18). KA is the legend on coins of C5e (Head, HN² 212) and may represent the city-ethnic *Καυμιάοις or *Καύλιαος, the latter being the city-ethnic suggested by Steph. Byz. 370.19. Hdt. 7.123.2–3 calls Kampsa a polis mainly in the urban sense, but probably in the political sense too (cf. Hansen (2000a) 175–76).

Kamps was located in Krousis (Hdt. 7.123.2). Some scholars have argued that the Skapsaiai recorded in the Athenian tribute lists are the inhabitants of Kamps (Zahrnt (1971) 232, followed by Barr.). Kamps may have struck silver coins before 480 (on the attribution to Kamps, see Flensted-Jensen (1997) 122–25). Denomination: tetrobols. Types: obv. ithyphallic ass and kylix; rev. mill-sail pattern and KA in two of four triangles (Head, HN² 212; Gaebler (1935) 66–67; SNG Cop. Macedonia 146). For the type, see Wroth (1900) 275–76. The reverse punch is the same as that used for some of the coins of Mende (Gaebler (1935) 66–67). Likewise, an ithyphallic ass is also depicted on the earliest coins of Mende, though it is not the same die.

At modern Kalamoto (possibly the site of Kalindoia) pottery from the Classical through the Roman periods has been found, along with seven pits containing Archaic sherds (Sismanides and Keramaris (1992)).
578. Kissos (Kisseites) Unlocated. Type: C:α? The toponym is Κίσσος (Strabo 7 frr. 21, 24). The city-ethnic is Κίσσα-είτης (SEG 40 542.14 (C4)). The only literary source to mention Kissos is Strabo, who says (frr. 21, 24) that Kassandros founded Thessalonike by synoecising Kissos and other polismata and polichnia respectively. However, the city-ethnic is known from an inscription (SEG 40 542) which can be dated either to c.350 and assigned to north-western Chalkidike (Hatzopoulou and Loukopoulou (1992) 123–45), or to 294/3 and assigned to south-eastern Chalkidike (Vokotopoulou (1996)). The inscription concerns the boundaries of various communities.

An ancient settlement at the top of Mt. Chortiatis in north-western Chalkidike has been investigated by Bakalakis (1956). It consists of a circuit wall (250 × 40 m) with remains of houses. The pottery found at the settlement dates it to C4. Hammond thinks that this must be ancient Kissos (Hammond (1972) 187; cf. Edson (1947) 89).

579. Kithas Map 50. Lat. 40.25, long. 23.05. Size of territory: ? Type: A? Only the toponym Κίθας is known, from an Athenian tribute list in which Kithas is recorded under the heading πόλεις ἃς οἱ ἰδιῶται ἐνέγραψαν (IG 13 278.11.18–21, 30), where polis is used in the political sense. Kithas may have been a Bottaian polis (Flensted-Jensen (1995) 123–24).

Kithas was a member of the Delian League. However, it is recorded only once in the tribute lists, in 434/3 (IG 13 278.11.30), paying 3,000 dr. along with the Tindaians (no. 619), Smila (no. 611), Gigonos (no. 572) and Haisa (no. 573). The toponym is completely restored (but the amount is legible) in the assessment decree of 425/4 (IG 13 71.4.83).

580. Kleonai Map 51. Lat. 40.10, long. 24.15. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: Α:β. The toponym is Κλεωναὶ, αἱ (Hdt. 7.22.3; IG 13 278.11.23 (C5)). Hdt. 7.22.3 and Ps.-Skylax 66 (cf. Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 142) call Kleonai a polis in the urban sense, whereas Thuc. 4.109.3–5 probably uses polis in the political sense, using polisma about the settlement. In the Athenian tribute lists Kleonai is twice recorded under the heading πόλεις (IG 13 278.11.18–21, 23 and 279.II.89–92, 93). Hdt. 7.22.3 locates it on Athos.

Kleonai was a member of the Delian League. It is recorded four times, in 434/3 (IG 13 278.11.23), 433/2 (279.II.93), 430/9 (281.III.62, completely restored) and 429/8 (281.II.49), always with its toponym. In 434/3 and 433/2 it is listed under the heading πόλεις ἃς οἱ ἰδιῶται ἐνέγραψαν φόρον φέρεων (IG 13 278.11.23, 279.II.93), in 430/9 (IG 13 281.III.62) under the heading ταίδε η βουλη καὶ οἱ πεντακόσιοι καὶ χίλιοι ἔταξαν (but here the name is completely, and the amount partly, restored), and in 429/8 under the heading ταίδε βουλή ἄν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ ἔταξαν (IG 13 282.II.49; the amount is completely, and the name partly, restored; it seems plausible, however, that Κ[...][ov[...]] should be restored K[λε]ον[α]ι). Kleonai paid 500 dr. in all four years. The editors of the Athenian tribute lists have suggested that the poleis listed after the headings αὐταί and ἰδιῶται were either cases of apotaxis or they were isolated or peripheral towns that had not been members of the Delian League (ATL i. 455). If Kleonai was a case of apotaxis, we must assume that it had previously paid along with one of the poleis in its immediate vicinity—for instance Thyssos (no. 618), Dion (no. 569) or Olophyxos (no. 587)—and we could reasonably (albeit not necessarily) have expected the payments by these towns to be lower in 434. But there are no such changes in the payments of Thyssos, Dion or Olophyxos, so it is equally likely that Kleonai belongs to the group of poleis which were isolated and peripheral. The year 434/3 was probably the first year of a new assessment period, but Kleonai was not assessed by the normal procedure: it was added to the list of those already assessed. The same thing happened in the following year (433/2), but in 430/9 it was assessed by the boule and a court of 1,500. The editors of the tribute lists interpret this as a sanctioning of Kleonai’s assessment (ATL i. 457). In 424/3 it joined Brasidas (Thuc. 4.109.4), but in 422/1 it was assessed at 100 dr. (IG 13 77.V.14).

According to Aristotle (Heracl. Lemb. 62), Kleonai was colonised by Chalkidians from Elymniaos (in Euboea = no. 365; see Bakhuisen (1976) 15), whereas Strabo (7 fr. 35) says that Pelasgians from Lemnos settled the five poleis on Athos. Thuc. 4.109.3 says that Kleonai had a mixed bilingual (i.e. Hellenic–barbarian) population, but about a century later Ps.-Skylax 66 calls it a polis Hellenis (Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 151).

581. Kombreia Map 50. Unlocated. Type: A? The toponym is Κομβρεῖα (Hdt. 7.123.2). Kinch (1894) 152 has suggested that the ending -βρεῖα is the Thracian word βρεῖα (meaning “town”) found in, e.g., Selymbria (see Detschew (1957) s.v. -bria), and some MSS do in fact have Κομβρία. The city-ethnic is Κομβρεῖας (SEG 38 681.14, an ephoric inscription of the first century AD; see Papazoglou (1988) 419). It is significant that the city-ethnic occurs several centuries later than the latest reference to the town. This may mean that the town existed from c.500 until the first century AD, but it may also mean that the (former) city-ethnic was
used as a name, just as the city-ethnic *'Ολυνθός* is attested long after the city Olynthus was destroyed (s.v. Olynthus).

Hdt. 7.123.2–3 calls Kombreia a *polis* mainly in the urban sense, but probably in the political sense too (cf. Hansen (2000a) 175–76). Kombreia was situated in Krousias and provided Xerxes with troops in 480 (Hdt. 7.123.2).

582. Lipaxos Map 50. Unlocated. Type: A? The toponym is *Λίπαξος* (Hdt. 7.123.2). Apart from Steph. Byz. 418.7, the city-ethnic is not attested. Hecat. fr. 149 (*apud* Steph. Byz. 418.7) mentioned Lipaxos, but it is not clear whether he also called it a *polis* (cf. Hansen (1997b)). Hdt. 7.123.2–3 calls Lipaxos a *polis* mainly in the urban sense, but probably in the political sense too (cf. Hansen (2000a) 175–76). Hdt. 7.123.2 locates Lipaxos in Krousias and says that it supplied Xerxes with troops in 480.

583. Mekyberna (Mekybernaioi) Map 50. Lat. 40.15, long. 23.25. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: Aσ. The toponym is *Μηκύβερνα*, Ἰ (Hdt. 7.122; Harp. *Μηκύβερνα* or *Μηκύβερνα* (Strabo 7 fr. 29). The city-ethnic is *Μηκύβερναιος* (Thuc. 5.18.6) or *Μεκύβερναιος* (IG i3 263.111.15; cf. Strabo 7 fr. 29, who gives the corresponding toponym).

Mekyberna is called a *polis* in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 66 (Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 142) and in the urban and political senses combined by Hdt. 7.122. At Thuc. 5.18.6 (Peace of Nikias) the territorial sense is a connotation. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (e.g. *IG* i3 263.111.15).

Hdt. 7.122 locates Mekyberna between Sermylia (no. 604) and Olynthus (no. 588) on Sithonia. According to Harp. *Μηκύβερνα* it was located 20 stades (3.6 km) from Olynthus, and excavations confirm this (Mylonas (1943) 78). It is not known who founded Mekyberna or when it was founded. The earliest attestation of Mekyberna is in Hecat. fr. 150; but the settlement identified with Mekyberna goes back to the early Archaic period (*infra*). Mekyberna supplied troops and ships to Xerxes in 480 (Hdt. 7.122).

Mekyberna was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (*IG* i3 259.v.10), in which year it formed a syntelic group along with Stolos (no. 614) and the Polichnians (no. 596). It is recorded for the last time in the list of 433/2 (*IG* i3 279.11.46), which probably means that it took part in the Revolt of 432 (Thuc. 1.58). It was assessed for tribute in 422/1 (*IG* i3 77.v.23, 10 dr.). Mekyberna is recorded in the tribute lists sixteen times, twice completely restored, paying 1 tal. in 450/49 (*IG* i3 263.111.15) and in 447/6 (*IG* i3 265.1.12), 4,000 dr. from 446/5 (*IG* i3 266.11.23) to 440/39 (*IG* i3 272.11.45), and 1 tal. again from 436/5 (*IG* i3 277.v.19) to 433/2 (*IG* i3 279.11.46).

According to the Peace of Nikias (Thuc. 5.18.6), the Mekybernians, the Sanians (no. 600) and the Singaians (no. 605) were to live in their own *poleis* (*οἶκες* τὰς πόλεις τὰς ἑαυτῶν)—many take this to mean that Mekyberna had taken part in the synoecism of Olynthos in 432 (in which connection it was probably razed; cf. the wording of Thuc. 1.58.2: *πόλεις* . . . καταβαλόντας καθαιροῦντες τὰς πόλεις) and was now to be re-established as a *polis* (Demand (1990) 76–77). Mekyberna was garrisoned by the Athenians, but in 420 it was captured by the Olynthians (Thuc. 5.39.1; cf. Diod. 12.77.5). In 349, before attacking Olynthus, Philip captured Mekyberna by treachery (Diod. 16.53.2). Robinson (Robinson and Clement (1938) 373–74; cf. Robinson (1952) 403) thinks that the city was not destroyed by Philip, and that it was still inhabited in Alexander's time (down to Kassandros). Ps.-Skymnos 641 refers to it as no longer in existence.

Strabo (7 fr. 29) calls Mekyberna *επινεων Ολυνθούν* which may be insignificant, but an underwater survey has shown that it is very likely that Mekyberna was actually the harbour town of Olynthos (AA 21 (1988) 102–1; see also Mylonas (1943) 78). The ancient site near the harbour dates to the period 432–316.

During the excavations of Olynthus, Robinson (1935) 229–31 found “the Hippodamian plan of the town [Mekyberna]”, along with shops and houses. Seven streets have been found, unpaved and c.2.5 m wide (Mylonas (1943) 82). The houses differ very much in size, layout, etc. from those excavated at Olynthos (ibid. 84). Contrary to what has been found at Olynthos, there were no drainage avenues at Mekyberna (ibid.). The settlement goes back to the early Archaic period (ibid. 86).

584. Mende (Mendaioi) Map 51. Lat. 40.00, long. 23.25. Size of territory: 2. Type: Aσ. The toponym is *Μένδη*, Ἰ (Hdt. 7.123.1; Thuc. 4.121.2) or *Μένδα* (IG iv.2.1 94.1.2.26 (360/59)). The city-ethnic is *Μένδαιοι* (SEG 13 333 (C4)). On Archaic coins it is sometimes *ΜΙΝΔΑΟΝ* or *ΜΙΝΔΑΙΟΝ* (Gaebler (1935) 73–74). Mende is attested as a *polis* both in the urban sense (Thuc. 4.129.3) and in the political sense (Thuc. 4.121.2; Arist. *Oec. 1350*8, 14); in Ps.-Skylax 66 Mende is the second of the toponyms listed after the heading *πόλεις Αιδοὶ ἐν ἔν Παλλήνη Ελληνιδοῖς*, where *polis* is used in the urban sense. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins of *Csf* (*infra*) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (e.g. *IG* i3 270.111.20) and in
literary sources (Thuc. 4.123.2; Arist. Oec. 1350*6). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested externally on a C4m Megarion gravestone (SEG 13 313) and in Plato's reference to ἶπτυμοιοις ὁ Μενδαῖος (Prt. 315E).

The territory, called γη, is mentioned by Thuc. 4.130.2, who says that it bordered on that of Skione (no. 609) and was ravaged by Nikias. Hdt. 7.123.1 locates Mende on Pallene between Skione and Same (no. 601) (cf. Ps.-Skylax 66). About 4 km from Mende, on a promontory, a sanctuary of Poseidon was found in 1989, with building remains of Cel–C5 and pottery of C6e (Vokotopoulou (1989), (1990a), (1991)). It is probably identical with the Ποσειδώνιον situated in the territory of Mende (Thuc. 4.129.3).

No literary source gives the date of the colonisation of Mende, but according to the sources the site was a colony from Eretria (Thuc. 4.123.1; cf. Harp. s.v. Μενδη). This is supported by the archaeological remains: the late Mycenaean and early Geometric pottery found at the site of ancient Mende is similar to that found at Lefkandi (ArchDelt 42 (1987) Chron. 368–69, pace Papadopoulos (1996)). Furthermore, peculiar stone-paved circles (diameter 1.80 m), similar to those found at Lefkandi, have been found inside house H, which dates to C8, along with pendant semicircle skyphoi (ArchDelt 45 (1990) Chron. 315 and fig. 141a; Vokotopoulou (1990a)). Most scholars think that Mende was founded in C8 (Boardman (1980) 229). However, it seems that the site of Mende was occupied long before the colonisation took place, and that it had links with Euboia from a very early period. For interpretations of the finds, see Snodgrass (1994) and Papadopoulos (1996) 163–65.

According to Hdt. 7.123.1, Mende supplied troops and ships to Xerxes in 480. Mende was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i³ 259.111.15) to 415/4 (IG i³ 290.111.10) a total of nineteen times, paying between 5 tal. (IG i³ 268.111.5) and 15 tal. (IG i³ 259.111.15), but mostly 8 tal. (IG i³ 262.17). In 423 Mende joined Brasidas, even though Athens and Sparta had already concluded an armistice (Thuc. 4.123; cf. Diod. 12.72.7). The uprising was instigated by an oligarchic faction which seems to have forced the majority to accept the defection (Thuc. 4.123.2, cf. 4.121.2); an oligarchic constitution was adopted (4.130.7); a Peloponnesian garrison was placed in the city, and Brasidas had the women and children sent to Olynthos (no. 588) (Thuc. 4.123.4). The Athenians sent a force of 50 triremes, 1,000 hoplites and a higher number of light-armed soldiers against Mende (4.129.2). They took the proasteion, ravaged the territory, and eventually captured the city, when the Mendaian demos took up arms against the oligarchs and the Peloponnesian garrison and opened the gates (Thuc. 4.129–30). Having arranged a siege of the oligarchs and the Peloponnesians (4.131.3), who made a last stand on the acropolis, the Athenians left a garrison in Mende, ordering that the Mendaian restore their (democratic) constitution and prosecute the leaders of the Revolt (Thuc. 4.130.7; Gehrke, Στάσις 111–12).

From the treaty of the 380s between Amyntas III and the Chalkidians, it appears that the Mendaian were enemies of the Chalkidians (Syll. 135.19 = Tod 111), and Mende is known to have been at war with Olynthos at some point in C4 (Arist. Oec. 1350*11–14). Mende was probably not destroyed by Philip, but it may have lost its polis status. It is called a vicus maritimus of Kassandraeia c.200 (Livy 31.45.14).

In C4 Θeotimides, a citizen of Mende was granted pro-xenia by Elis (no. 251) (SEG 15 241). About the same time, perhaps a little earlier, some Mendaian were granted pro-xenia in Delphi (no. 177) (SEG 31 557; BCH 105 (1981) 433–40). Mende is recorded in the Epidaurian list of theorodokoi of 360/59 (IG iv² 23.1.26).

Thuc. 4.130.6–7 and 131.3 mentions that Mende had a fortified acropolis. A Geometric wall surrounding the presumed acropolis of Mende has been found (AR 1992–93 54). Thucydides also mentions the walls (4.130.3) and gates (4.130.2, 5) of Mende, along with the proasteion (4.130.1). The harbours of Mende are mentioned at Arist. Oec. 1350*6. Excavations at Mende have revealed various remains: a destruction layer from C4m can perhaps be connected with the Makedonian invasion in 356 or 348 (ArchDelt 41 (1986) Chron. 148). Pits (probably used for storage) filled with debris from the Mycenaean to the Geometric periods show that the site of Mende was inhabited from an early period (ArchDelt 41 (1986) Chron. 149). Two houses have been excavated in the proasteion, which seems to have been occupied continuously from C8 to C4 (ArchDelt 41 (1986) Chron. 147, 42 (1987) Chron. 369). Underneath house Θ (C8m) were found six more habitations layers, the earliest of C9m (Vokotopoulou (1990a)). A cemetery has been found near the coast. It was in use from C8 to C7/C6e. By 990, 214 graves had been found.

Mende struck silver coins on the Euboic standard c.500–424 and on the Phoenician standard c.424–358. Denominations: tetradrachms, tetrobol, obols, hemiobols, tritermoria and tetartemoria. (1) Silver, 500–450: types: obv. ithyphallic ass with crown on back; legend: ΜΕΝ, ΜΙΝ, ΜΙΝΔΑΙΟΝ or ΜΙΝΔΑΙΩΝ (sometimes no legend); rev. various forms of incuse square. (2) Silver, 450–424: types:
obv. Silenos and an ass; rev. vine with clusters of grapes; legend: MENΔAION. (3) Silver, 424–358: types: obv. Silenos, or head of Dionysos; rev. various types; legend: MENΔAION, MENΔAIH or MENΔA. (4) Bronze, C4: obv. Dionysos wearing ivy wreath; rev. amphora sometimes with ivy; legend: ΜΕ, ΜΕΝ or MENΔAIΩΝ. (Head, HN2 210: mintage period c.500–538; Gaebler (1935) 72–78; mintage period C6L–C4m; SNG Cop. Macedonia 198–221. See also Regling (1923) and Noe (1926). For an interpretation of the types, see Knoblauch (1998)).

Mende colonised Neapolis (no. 586) (IG 11 263.111.26–27), which was situated c.12 km from Mende on the opposite coast of Pallene, and Eion (no. 570) (Thuc. 4.7), the location of which is unknown.

585. Milkoros (Milkorios) Map 51. Unlocated. Type: [A];? The toponym Μιλκόρος is known only from Steph. Byz. 453.11 quoting Theopomp. fr. 152, presumably referring to the year 347 (Shrimpton (1991) 240). The city-ethnic is Μιλκόριος (IG 11 277.11.31) or Μιλκόριος (IG 11 279.11.85). In the Athenian tribute lists of 434/3 (IG 11 278.11.5–6, 9) and 433/2 (IG 11 279.11.76–77, 85) the Milkorians are recorded after the heading πόλεις αυτής φόρων ταξιάρχει. Steph. Byz. 453.11 describes Milkoros as a Χαλκιδική πόλις εν Θράκε. He may have used Theopompos (cf. fr. 152) as a source for this information, which is ambiguous, since “Chalkidian” can refer to either (a) the geographical position of the Milkorians, (b) membership of the Chalkidian Federation, or (c) ethnic affiliation. The editors of the Athenian tribute lists state that Milkoros must be a member of the Chalkidic state but that its precise location is not known (ATL i. 520).

Milkoros was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded three times in the tribute lists, in 435/4 (IG 11 277.11.31, ἀντακτοι), in 434/3 (IG 11 278.11.9) and in 433/2 (IG 11 279.11.85). Some scholars believe that it took part in the Revolt of 432 (e.g. Zahrnt (1971) 205). It paid 1,000 dr. in 435/4, and 500 dr. in the following two years.

586. Neapolis (Neopolites) Map 50. Lat. 40.00, long. 23.30. Size of territory: 2. Type: Α;β. The toponym is Νέη Πόλις (Hdt. 7.123.1), or Νεάπολις (IG 11 267.11.29). The city-ethnic is Νεοπολίτης (IG 11 259.11.28). The citizens are sometimes called Νεοπολίται ή Παλλένες (IG 11 262.1.9–10) in order to distinguish them from the other Neopolitans in the Thasian peraia (see infra no. 634), and sometimes they are identified politically as the Νεοπολίται Μενδαίων ἀποκυκλο (IG 11 263.11.26–27) or simply the Νεοπολίται Μενδαίων (IG 11 281.11.13). The classification of Neapolis as a polis seems to follow from the toponym, but at Hdt. 7.123.1 polis is used explicitly about the community, in the urban and political senses simultaneously (cf. Hansen (2000a) 175–76). The collective city-ethnic is used externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG 11 263.111.26–27).

Neapolis was probably a colony from Mende (no. 584) (IG 11 263.111.26–27). Hdt. 7.123.1 locates the city between Aphytis (no. 563) and Aige (no. 556) on Pallene and says that Neapolis supplied troops and ships to Xerxes in 480. Neapolis was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG 11 259.111.28) to, perhaps, 435/14 (IG 11 290.111.6: in this case it is not certain whether the Neapolis listed is the Thasian Neapolis (no. 634) or Neapolis on Pallene) a total of twenty (or perhaps twenty-one) times, paying 3,000 dr. in all years (IG 11 259.111.28).

A settlement of C6–C5, at modern Polychron, has been excavated since 1987, and it has been suggested that Polychron is ancient Neapolis (AR (1988–89) 73, (1989–90) 52), although it may also be Aige (Vokotopoulou (1993) 95). The following have been found at Polychron: sherds from the Archaic and Classical periods, a C5 kiln, remains of C6 buildings, two cemeteries dating to C6–C4m (ArchDelt 42 (1987) Chron. 369–70; Vokotopoulou (1990b)). The place was probably abandoned in C4s (ArchDelt 43 (1988) Chron. 364). An inscribed sherd, c.500, bears the word δεμοσία (SEG 39 614; photo in Vokotopoulou et al. (1988) fig. 16). The ancient settlement was located on the slopes of a hill, and the houses were placed on terraces. The walls were either parallel to the terraces or vertical retaining walls (Vokotopoulou et al. (1989)).

587. Olophyxos (Olophyxios) Map 51. Lat. 40.20, long. 24.10. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: Α;β. The toponym is Ὀλόφυξος, ἢ (Hdt. 7.22.3; schol. Ar. Av. 1042) or, once, Ὀλόφυξις (Strabo 7 fr. 33) or Ὀλόφυξεις (Ps.-Skylax 66, emended to Ὀλόφυξεις). The city-ethnic is Ὀλόφυκες (IG 11 268.11.23; Ar. Av. 1041) or sometimes Ὀλόφυκες ἐξ Ἡθο (IG 11 281.11.22). Hdt. 7.22.3 and Ps.-Skylax 66 (cf. Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 142) call Olophyxos a polis in the urban sense, whereas Thuc. 4.109.3–5 probably uses polis in the political sense, using polisma about the settlement. The collective city-ethnic is used internally on coins (infra) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG 11 268.11.23).

Olophyxos was located on Athos (Hdt. 7.22.3; Thuc. 4.109.3; IG 11 281.11.22). Zahrnt (1971) 184, 208 suggests that it was situated at modern Vatopediou or Ivron (on the northern side of the peninsula).
Olophyxos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded from 454/3, paying together with Sane (no. 600) and Dion (no. 569) (IG i¹ 259.11.25–26) and then, paying separately, until 429/8 (IG i¹ 282.11.26) a total of sixteen times, three times completely restored, paying 2,000 dr. (IG i¹ 262.1.26) except in 448/7, when it paid 1,500 dr. (IG i¹ 264.11.25). In 424/3 Olophyxos revolted from Athens at the instigation of Brasidas (Thuc. 4.109.4).

Strabo says that Olophyxos and the other four poleis on Athos (nos. 560, 569, 580, 618) were settled by Pelasgians from Lemnos (7 fr. 35). According to Thuc. 4.109.3–4, Olophyxos had a mixed (i.e. barbarian–Hellenic) bilingual population, but about a century later it is called a <.polis> Hellenis by Ps.-Skylax 66 (Flensted-Jensen and Hansen 1996 151).

Olophyxos struck bronze coins, c. 350. Types: obv. female head; rev. eagle; legend: ΟΛΟΦΥΞΙΩΝ (Gaebler (1935) 83–84; Head, ΗΝ² 206).

588. Olynthos (Olynthos) Map 50. Lat. 40.15, long. 23.25. Size of territory: 5, after 432 2.630 km², in C 4 larger. Type: Axa. The toponym is Ὀλυνθος, f (Thuc. 1.63.1; Dem. 9.56). The city-ethnic is 'Ολυνθος (Dem. 1.7; SEG 21 982 (C4)). Olynthos is called a polis both in the urban sense (Hdt. 8.127; Thuc. 1.58.2; Dem. 9.11; Xen. Hell. 5.3.3; Ps.-Skylax 66; cf. Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 142), and in the political sense (Thuc. 5.18.5; Peace of Nikias; Dem. 3.7). At Thuc. 5.18.6 the territorial sense is a connotation. The collective city-ethnic is used externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i¹ 271.11.50), and internally on coins (Gaebler (1935) 84 (c.432–420)) and sling-bullets (Robinson (1941) no. 2220) with the legend ΟΛΥΝ. The individual city-ethnic is used externally in funerary inscriptions from Attika (SEG 21 982 (C4)) and Thasos (no. 526) (IG xi¹.8 434 (c.400)). The use of the city-ethnic is attested long after Olynthos was destroyed (SEG 19 595, from Thasos (C4–C3); IG xi¹.3 42, from Telos (C2); Syll. 3 751, from Mytilene (C1); see Gude (1933) 39–50 (a complete Prosopographia Olynthia) and Papazoglou (1988) 426–27). Demosthenes (1.5, 9.56) and Hypereides (Hyp. fr. 80, Sauppe) use patriis about Olynthos, and Dem. 9.56 refers to the politai of Olynthos (9.56).

The name of Olynthos’ territory was ‘Ολυνθια (Xen. Hell. 5.3.18; SEG 38 619.11 (c.285); Theophr. Caus. Pl. 1.20.4). After the synoecism in 432 (Thuc. 1.58.2) the size of the territory was perhaps 630 km², but in the 380s it was much larger (Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994) 71).

According to Dem. 19.263, the military strength of Olynthos before the synoecism was 400 cavalry and in all some 5,000 men in service, corresponding to some 7,000 adult male citizens; see Hansen (1985) 9–13, 18–20. (Xenophon’s figures for 382 (Hell. 5.2.14) are corrupt. Demosthenes’ 1,000 horse and 10,000 foot in 348 (19.266) are the army of the Chalkidic Confederacy, not that of Olynthos.) Given the growth of Olynthos in the following period, a total of 7,000 citizens before the synoecism matches Diodorus’ information that, in 357, Olynthos had a large population (16.8.4) and that, in 348, it was a myriandros polis i.e. a polis with 10,000 citizens (32.4.2). In the period 432–380 the population living in the urban centre of Olynthos (see infra) was probably less than 5,000, and in 370–348 less than 10,000 (Hansen 1997a 30; cf. Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994) 72).

Olynthos supplied Xerxes with troops and ships in 480 (Hdt. 7.122). Hdt. 8.127 says that Olynthos belonged to the Bottaiains before 479, and that it was handed over to the Chalkidians in 479. This is confirmed by the pottery found during the excavations of Olynthos. Above the destruction layer of 479 the sherds were Attic red-figure, but underneath the destruction layer was found pottery “that bears no resemblance to the ware produced at the same time in Attica” (Robinson (1933b) 15–16). In 424 Olynthos is called “Chalkidian” by Thuc. 4.123.4 (see Hornblower (1997)).

Olynthos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded from 454/3 (IG i¹ 259.v.6, forming a syntelic group with Ass(er)a (no. 564) and the Skablaains (no. 607)) to 433/2 (IG i¹ 279.11.45) a total of eleven times, paying 2 tal. (IG i¹ 263.11.30). In 432 the Chalkidians (represented by Olynthos in the tribute lists) revolted from Athens, along with Poteidaia (no. 598) and the Bottaiains, at the instigation of Perdikkas, who also suggested that the Chalkidians abandon their poleis on the coast and create a larger and stronger city at Olynthos (Thuc. 1.57.5, 58.2; cf. Diod. 12.34.2). In the Peace of Nikias Olynthos is declared autonomos and liable to the tribute assessed by Aristeides (Thuc. 5.18.5).

Olynthos was the leading member of the Chalkidian Federation, which was formed some time after 432 (West 1918 31 and Larsen 1968 62 suggest 432; Gude (1933) 23 and Zahrnt (1971) 80ff after 400; cf. Demand (1990) 196 n. 28). It is uncertain whether the federation was formed simultaneously with the synoecism of Olynthos, or later. In official documents the name of the federation is οἱ Χαλκίδες (Syll. 3 135.3), but in literature it is often οἱ Ὀλυνθοὶ (Xen. Hell. 5.2.13). In the Corinthian War the Chalkidians seem to have fought on Athens’ side (Isae. 5.46; Diod. 14.82.3). In the 380s the Federation evidently covered...
the western part of the Chalkidic peninsula all the way to Pella (no. 543). Apollonia (no. 545) and Akanthos (no. 559)

saw the Federation encroaching on their lands and sent envoys to Sparta to ask for help against it (Xen. Hell. 5.2.11ff).

This resulted in the so-called Olynthian War, after which the Chalkidians had to surrender to the Spartans (Xen. 5.3.1–10, 18–19, 26; Diod. 15.19.3, 21.1–23.3; siege mentioned by Isoc. 4.126; Diod. 15.23.3 with Stylianou (1998) 209–26). The Federation was suppressed or dissolved, but formed again shortly after: the Chalkidians are listed as members of the Second Athenian Naval League (IG ii 2.43.5–6; cf. Dreher (1995) 186–87). The original members of the Chalkidian Federation are not known, but possible candidates are Ass(er)a (no. 564), Gale(psos) (no. 571), Mekyberna (no. 583), Milkoros (no. 585), Piloros (no. 593), Singos (no. 605), Skablaioi (no. 607) and Stolos (no. 614). In 356 Philip II concluded an alliance with the Chalkidic Federation (Toit 158) whereby Poteidaia (no. 598), when conquered, and Anthemous (no. 562) were ceded to Olynthos (Dem. 2.7, 20; 6.20, 23, 107; Diod. 16.8.3–5). But in 349 the Olynthians concluded an alliance with Athens (Dem. 1 and 2; Philoch. fr. 49). Philip attacked Olynthos, won two battles and laid siege to the city. The Athenians sent three auxiliary forces; but in August 348, Olynthos was betrayed to Philip by the leaders of its cavalry (Dem. 9.11, 19.263–67; Diod. 16.53.2; Philoch. frfr. 49–51; Suda K 356; see Hammond and Griffith (1979) 324 n.1).

Olynthos experienced andrapodismos twice, in 479 and in 348: when in 479 the Olynthians were suspected of revolting against the Persians, the inhabitants were killed and the city given to the Chalkidians (Hdt. 8.127). The town was probably burnt (Robinson (1933b) 15). The city was synoecised in 432, when the coastal poleis in the neighbourhood of Olynthos were abandoned and the inhabitants moved to Olynthos (Thuc. 1.58; Moggii, Sin. 173–88), thus causing the formerly small town to be enlarged (Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994) 74–76 fig. 55). In the years after 379 the urban centre of Olynthos was considerably enlarged (ibid. 92), presumably the result of a new synoikismos by which more Chalkidians were moved to Olynthos (Dem. 19.265). Xenophon calls Olynthos “the largest poleis of Thrace” (Hell. 5.2.12). In 348 the city was completely destroyed by Philip (Dem. 9.26, 9.56; Hyp. fr. 80, Sauppe), and the inhabitants suffered andrapodismos once more (Diod. 16.53.3), although some of them evidently managed to flee, e.g. to Lemnian Myrina (no. 502) (IG xi 1.8.4). Diod. 19.52.2 (316) mentions surviving Olynthians too. According to Theophrastos (apud Harp. 162.10–11), the Olynthians living in Athens after the destruction of Olynthos were isoteleis. Even though it seems clear that Olynthos was razed to the ground in 348, it must have been refounded, though not necessarily as a polis: a couple are recorded as living ὁ τῶν ὀλύνθων in the imperial period (SEG 38 625), and Hatzopoulos (1988b) 64–65 argues that Olynthos was a kome of Kassandraia at that time.

The character of the Olynthian constitution is unknown: some scholars think that Olynthos was an oligarchy (Zahrnt (1971) 94; Larsen (1968) 58ff, esp. 76), whereas others argue that it was a democracy (Gehrke, Stasis 124). Theopomp. fr. 143 mentions the boule, and Xen. Hell. 5.2.17 a popular assembly (demos) whose decisions are described as psephismita (5.2.15). Dem. 9.56 reports how the assembly (ὁ δήμος ὀ τῶν ὀλύνθων) imposed a sentence of exile. Not much is known about Olynthian officials; but hipparchoi are known to have been elected by show of hands (Dem. 9.66).

Olynthos is recorded in the Epidaurian list of theocracydiokoi of 360/9 (IGiii 2.491.1.b.14). Olynthos is sometimes thought to represent the Chalkidian Federation in the list (e.g. Zahrnt (1971) 103). Hegias of Olynthos was granted citizenship by Ephesos (no. 844) in C4l/C3e (SEG 39 1156).

Olynthos was excavated in the 1930s. The town was situated on a table-shaped hill, about 3.5 km from the coast. Down to c.432 Olynthos was a relatively small town (it probably covered c.6 ha: Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994) 74), occupying the southern part of the elevation on which the city was built. In 432 the city was greatly enlarged (to cover c.27 ha) and during the first 20 years of C4 it was enlarged once more: this time houses were built outside the city walls (ibid. 76–91 figs. 55 and 56). The old part of the city did not have a grid plan, but the new town was laid out in rectangular fashion in blocks of up to ten houses of the so-called pastas type (ibid. 34–38 and figs. 23 and 24; Wycherley (1976) 87–92). The elevation on which Olynthos was situated is about 600 m long, and runs almost exactly north–south. Nearly the whole north hill is divided into sections by streets (Robinson and Graham (1938) 185ff). On the urban organisation of Olynthos, see also Cahill (2002).

Not many public buildings have been identified, exceptions being the agora (Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994) 78), along with a C5l bouleterion (Gneisz (1990) 341, no. 48 (C5l)) and a public building that has been variously identified as a pryttaneion (ibid. 342, no. 49 (C5e)) or a bouleterion (S. G. Miller (1978) 131–32). The south room accommodated c.250 persons (McDonald (1943) 236), which indicates that it may have been a dikasterion.

The city walls of Olynthos are mentioned by Thuc. 1.63.2 and Xen. Hell. 5.3.5, who also mentions towers. However,
hardly anything is left. The city walls were built of mudbrick, mostly on a rubble foundation. No sherds or any other evidence useful for dating the wall have been found (Robinson and Graham (1938) 39–44).

There are a few remains of a free-standing fountain house with an underground aqueduct made of terracotta pipes. It is one of the best-preserved Greek aqueducts. Robinson argues that it was completed before 400, or perhaps even before 420, and that the source of the aqueduct was at modern Polygyros, about 15 km to the north-east of Olynthos (Robinson (1946) 95–114; on the water management, see Crouch (1993) 171–76).

Remains of what may have been an Archaic temple (destroyed in 479) have been found (Robinson (1930) 16–17). The excavations at Olynthos brought to light not only vases, mosaics, etc., but also more curious things, such as ear-picks, tweezers and fish-hooks (Robinson (1941) 354–55, 355–56, 365–74). At least eight Panathenaic vases have been identified, indicating that Olynthians must have participated and been victorious in the Panatheniac Games (Robinson (1933b) 87–90 nos. 97–100, (1950) 9, 59–66 nos. 11–14).

Around the city were three cemeteries (Robinson (1942)). The largest is the so-called Riverside cemetery, containing 528 graves, the cemeteries to the east and north being much smaller. There were altogether 598 graves. The Riverside cemetery is the earliest of the three, although no grave can be dated earlier than C6l. Graves in the eastern cemetery date to C5l, and those in the northern one to C4f (ibid. 137).

Six month names are known, principally from C4m deeds of sale (Hatzopoulos (1989a) 40–66, 80), attesting to a clear affinity between the Olynthian calendar and that of the Euboian cities (Trümpy, Monat. 42–43).

Olynthos started striking silver coins on the Phoenician standard c.433. Denominations: tetradrachms, octobols, tetrobols and diobols. Types: obv. horse; rev. eagle holding snake; legend: ΟΛ or ΟΛΥΝ. From 432, or perhaps later, down to 348, the coins have obv. head of Apollo; rev. a kithara; legend: ΧΑΛΚΙΔΕΩΝ. Some have magistrates’ names on rev. The Chalkidians also struck gold and bronze coins in C4 (Head, HN2 207; Gaebler (1935) 84–89; Robinson and Clement (1938) 1–210; Westermarck (1988); SNG Cap. Macedonia 233–49). Some C5f coins inscribed ΧΑΛΚΙΔΕΩΝ must be attributed to Chalkis (LSAG 82–85, 364), rather than to Olynthos (no. 365) (Head, HN2 207).

589. Osbaioi) Map 50. Unlocated. Type: C.? Only the city-ethnic is known: Ὀσβαῖος (SEG 40 534 (c.400)). The individual city-ethnic is used externally on a gravestone from Beroia (SEG 40 534), and the collective city-ethnic is used externally (?) in an inscription concerning borders (SEG 40 542.26, 32). There is some dispute as to the provenance and date of this inscription. Vokotopoulou (1996) assigns it to south-eastern Chalkidike and dates it to 394/3, whereas Hatzopoulos and Loukopoulou (1992) 123–45 assign it to north-western Chalkidike and date it to c.350.

Since the ethnic is known exclusively from these two inscriptions, there is no way of telling whether Osbaioi is a sub-ethnic, a city-ethnic or a regional ethnic (for these distinctions, see Hansen (1996) esp. 182–90), although Hatzopoulos (1996a) 202 seems certain that it is a city-ethnic.

590. Othoros (Othorios) Map 51. Unlocated. Type: [A]?: The toponym is Ὄθορος (IG v1 278.vi.35). The city-ethnic is Ὄθοριος (IG v1 269.iii.27). In the Athenian tribute list of 434/3 Othoros is recorded after the heading πόλεις ἀσ’ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἑκάστας ἄνδρας ψήφων ἔρχεται (IG v1 278.vi.18–21,35). The location of Othoros is not known. It disappears from the tribute lists in 434/3, which indicates that Othoros took part in the Revolt of 432 (Thuc. 1.58) and was, therefore, situated somewhere on the Chalkidic peninsula (see Edson (1947) 99). However, the editors of the Athenian tribute lists think it may have been situated near Methone (ATL i. 489).

Othoros was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 448/7 (IG i 264.ii.11) to 434/3 (IG v1 278.vi.35) a total of nine times, three times completely restored. It is recorded once by toponym (IG v1 278.vi.35), and otherwise by city-ethnic, paying between 500 (IG v1 278.vi.35) and 700 dr. (IG v1 269.iii.27). In 435/4 the Othorians are recorded as ataktoi (IG v1 277.vi.24). In 422/1 Othoros was assessed for tribute of 1,000 dr. (IG v1 77.v.15). Othoros is not known from any other source.

591. Pharbelos (Pharbelios) Map 51. Unlocated. Type: [A]?: The toponym is Φάρβηλος (IG v1 268.ii.24; Steph. Byz. 658.15). The city-ethnic is Φάρβελιος (IG v1 268.ii.24). In the Athenian tribute lists of 434/3 (IG v1 278.vi.5–6, 15) and 433/2 (IG v1 279.ii.76–77, 86) the Pharbelians are recorded after the heading πόλεις αὐτῆς ταχαύμαναι.

The Pharbelians were members of the Delian League. They belonged to the Thracian district and are recorded from 454/3 (IG v1 259.1.15) to 433/2 (IG v1 279.ii.86) a total of fourteen times, once completely restored, paying 1,000 dr. from 454/3 to 435/4, but only 500 dr. in the two following years (IG v1 278.iii.15, 279.ii.86). They were assessed for
tribute in 422/1 (IG i 77.v.19), 500 dr. The fact that the Pharbelians did not pay tribute after 432 may indicate that they took part in the Revolt of 432 (Thuc. 1.58.2), and also that they lived in the Chalkidik peninsula (ATL i. 560).

Steph. Byz. 658.15 calls Pharbelos a polis Eretreion. Zahnrt (1971) 251 thinks that the Pharbelos mentioned by Stephanos must be a locality in Euboea and different from Pharbelos in the Chalkidik peninsula. However, Knoepfler (1997) 358 argues that Pharbelos was a colony in Chalkidike funded by Eretrians.

592. (Phegontioi)  Map 50. Unlocated. Type: B:?? Only the city-ethnic is known: Φεγέτιος (IG i 263.111.18), Φεγέντιος (IG i 268.111.9) or Φεγόντιος (IG i 267.11.27), all three variants known from the Athenian tribute lists. The singular of the city-ethnic (Φεγόντιον) was restored in SEG 10 53 (c.430) but not adopted in IG i 159. Since the Phegonites disappear from the tribute lists after 432, it is possible that they revolted along with Poteidaia (no. 598), the Bottiai and the Chalkidians in that year (Thuc. 1.58.2), and therefore, that they lived somewhere on the Chalkidik peninsula, but it cannot be determined with any certainty.

The Phegonites were members of the Delian League. They belonged to the Thracian district and are recorded from 451/0 (IG i 262.111.29) to 433/2 (IG i 279.11.63) a total of thirteen times, paying 1,600 dr. from 451/0 (IG i 262.111.29) to 447/6 (IG i 265.1.47) and thereafter 1,000 dr. (IG i 266.11.33). The fact that the Phegonites did not pay tribute after 432 may indicate that they took part in the Revolt of 432 (Thuc. 1.58.2).

593. Piloros  Map 51. Lat. 40.20, long. 23.45. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A: a?? The toponym is Πίλωρος (Hdt. 7.122; IG i 278.v1.22). Apart from Steph. Byz. 523-12, there is no attestation of a city-ethnic. At Hdt. 7.122 Piloros is twice called a polis, first in the urban and then in the political sense.

It was a member of the Delian League, but it is listed only once, in 434/3 (IG i 278.v1.22), under the heading πόλεις Æς οί ιδιώται ένεγραφαν φόρον φέρειν (18–21, where polis is used in the political sense), paying 600 dr. Herodotos locates it in the bay of Singos along with Ass(et)a (no. 564), Singos (no. 605) and Sarte (no. 602). Piloros supplied Xerxes with troops in 480 (Hdt. 7.122.1).

594. Pistasos  Map 51. Unlocated. Type: [A]:?? The toponym is Πίστασος (IG i 278.v1.27). Pistasos was a member of the Delian League, but it is recorded only once: viz. in 434/3 under the heading πόλεις Æς οί ιδιώται ἐνέγραφαν φόρον φέρειν (IG i 278.v1.19–21, 27, where polis is used in the political sense), paying 500 dr. In ATL i. 538 Pistasos is identified with Istaos, listed in the Thracian district in the assessment decree of 422/1 (IG i 77.v.16) and assessed at 50 dr. For a critical view, see Zahnrt (1971) 213.

595. Pleume (Pleumeus)  Map 50. Lat. 40.20, long. 23.10. Size of territory: 1. Type: [A]:?? The toponym is Πλεύμε (IG i 77.v.35). The city-ethnic is Πλευμεκεῖς (IG i 278.v1.17). In the Athenian tribute lists Pleume is recorded in 434/3 under the heading πόλεις αὐται φόρον ταξάµεναι (IG i 282.11–36, 40). Pleume may have been a Bottiaian polis (Flensted-Jensen (1995) 124–25). It is known exclusively from the Athenian tribute lists, where it is recorded twice (supra), paying 1,000 dr. Pleume is also recorded in the assessment decree of 422/1 (IG i 77.v.35).

596. (Polichnitarai)  Unlocated, not in Barr. 51. Type: C:a. No toponym is attested. The city-ethnic is Πολιχνῖται (IG i 260.viii.17).

The Polichnites were members of the Delian League. They are recorded in the first two years of the tribute lists, 454/3 and 453/2 (IG i 279.v.11–12, 260.viii.17). In the first year the Polichnites were in a sympathy with Stolos (no. 614) and Mekyberna (no. 583), paying 2 tal. and 1,880 dr. They are also recorded (as Πολιχνῖται παρὰ Στῶλον) in the assessment decree of 425/4 (IG i 77.v1.137–74).

The site of the Polichnites has been identified tentatively with modern Smixi (Hatzopoulos (1988a) 70–72), where a number of deeds of sale have been found (SEG 37 575–76 (Cam)). The name of the month Demetron is attested in one of them (SEG 37 576.5). Moreover, an eponymous priest is mentioned in 575.2–3 (and possibly in 576.3–4; the name, as restored, is Euphrantides son of Aristotimos, who is mentioned in a deed of sale from Torone, SEG 24 574.2, and who was perhaps a priest of the Chalkidian Federation).

597. Posideion  Map 51. Unlocated, not in Barr. Type: C:?? A Posideion is known from the tribute assessment list of 422/1 (IG i 77.v.32). It was assessed at 1,000 dr. and located in the Thracian phoroi; otherwise its location is unknown. There were two places in the Chalkidik peninsula called Pos(e)idion. One is a promontory (modern Ποσείδηδο) about 4 km from Mende (and in its territory); a sanctuary of Poseidon has been found there (supra 832). The other is Ποσείδηδον mentioned by Hdt. 7.115.2 between Argilos (no. 554) and Akanthos (no. 559), probably the promontory c.20
km north of Akanthos (not in Barr.). However, Zahrnt ((1971) 214) does not believe that this area could have supported a polis that (possibly) paid 1,000 dr. to the Delian League.

598. Poteidaia (Poteidaiaes) Map 50. Lat. 40.10, long. 23.20. Size of territory: 2. Type: Aηα. The toponym is Ποτείδαια, η (Hdt. 8.126.3; Thuc. 1.61.3; IG i² 268.111.14) and later Ποτείδαια (Isoc. 15.108; Ps.-Skylax 66; Diod. 12.46.2). The city-ethnic is Ποτειδαιτής (Hdt. 8.129.2), Ποτειδαίτης (Thuc. 1.56.2; IG i² 272.11.50), Ποτειδαιός (ML 27.9 (the Serpent Column); Diod. 12.46.6) or Ποτειδαιός (IG i² 10109 (C4m)). Poteidaia is called a polis both in the urban sense (Thuc. 1.62.1; Aen. Tact. 31.25; Ps.-Skylax 66) and in the political sense (Thuc. 1.66; Isoc. 15.108; SEG 38 662.4 (Caf)). The collective city-ethnic is used internally (in abbreviated form) on C5–C4 coins (infra), and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i² 272.11.50). The individual and external use of the city-ethnic is attested in a C4m sepulchral inscription from Attika (IG ii² 10109).

At Xen. Hell. 5.2.39 the toponym η Ποτείδαια denotes the territory of Poteidaia. Thuc. 1.64.2 mentions that the territory (ge) of Poteidaia was ravaged by Phormion. Although Poteidaia was one of the most important poleis on the Chalkidic peninsula, its territory cannot have been larger than 0.65 km², since Olynths (no. 588) was situated c.11 km to the north, and Aphytis (no. 563) and Sane (no. 6000 c.14 and 15 km respectively to the south of it. Furthermore, the isthmus of Pallene is 900 m wide (Strabo 7 fr. 25) at its narrowest. Hdt. 7.123.1 locates Poteidaia on Pallene next to Aphytis. Thuc. 1.56.2 and Xen. Hell. 5.2.15 place it on the isthmus of Pallene.

Poteidaia was colonised from Corinth (no. 227) (Thuc. 1.56.2, 66.1), and according to Nikolaos of Damaskos (FrHist 90) fr. 59, the oecist was Euagoras, son of Periandrus. Thus, it was probably founded c.600. Annual magistrates called ἐπιθημιουργοί were still sent from Corinth to Poteidaia in C5s (Thuc. 1.56.2), but there is no evidence that Poteidaia was ruled from Corinth (Graham (1964) 135–37). Poteidaia sent donations to Delphi in C6l (Syll. 15; Alexander (1963) 29–30), where it also had a treasury (Paus. 10.11.5; Alexander (1963) 25–29; Bommaelaer (1991) 140–41).

Poteidaia supplied troops and ships to Xerxes in 480 (Hdt. 7.123.1). Furthermore, it had 300 hoplites at Plataiai (Hdt. 9.28.3; ML 27.9 (the Serpent Column); see Alexander (1963) 34–35; Paus. 5.23.2 Arist. Rh. 1396ε20). Apparently Poteidaia entered into an alliance with the other towns of Pallene against the Persians in 479 (Hdt. 8.128.2).

Poteidaia was a member of the Delian League (Thuc. 1.56.2, 1.66). It was probably a member from the very beginning (it is recorded on the Serpent Column; see e.g. Sealey (1966) 243), but it does not appear in the tribute lists until 446/5 (IG i² 266.111.7). Alexander (1963) 41–42 suggests that Poteidaia supplied a quota of ships and only later a quota of tribute. After 446/5 Poteidaia occurs regularly in the lists until 433/2 (IG i² 279.11.70) a total of eleven times, twice completely restored. Poteidaia belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded sometimes by toponym (IG i² 268.111.14), sometimes by city-ethnic (IG i² 272.11.50), paying a phoros of 6 tal. down to 440/39 (IG i² 272.11.50), but 15 tal. in 433/2 (IG i² 279.11.70). It revolted in 432 along with the Chalkidians and the Bottaians (Thuc. 1.58.2), and consequently it is not recorded in the complete panels of 432/1 and 430/29. However, it appears from Thuc. 4.120.3 that it belonged to the Athenians in 423.

In 432, the Athenians requested that Poteidaia demolish part of its city wall, give hostages and refuse to accept the epidemourgoi from Corinth (supra). Poteidaia sent envoys to Athens and Sparta simultaneously, and then countered the Athenian request by entering into an alliance with the Bottaians and the Chalkidians and rebelling against the Athenians (Thuc. 1.56–58). Poteidaia was besieged by the Athenians from 432 until 430 (Thuc. 1.59–67; 2.58; Pl. Chrmt. 153A–B), when it capitulated (Thuc. 2.70.1–3). The inhabitants left Poteidaia and went to Chalkidike and other places (Thuc. 2.70.4; cf. Diod. 12.46.6). The Athenians settled Poteidaia with 1,000 klerouchs (ML 66: ἐποίκοι εἰς Ποτείδαιαν; Thuc. 2.70.4; Diod. 12.46.7), who in IG i² 62.8, 20 are referred to as οἱ ἐποίκοι οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι οἱ Ποτείδαιων εἰχοντες. In 423 there is evidence of stasis in Poteidaia (Thuc. 4.121.2), but Brasidas’ attempt to conquer the city failed (Thuc. 4.135.1). According to Xen. Hell. 5.2.15, 24, Poteidaia was a member of the Chalkidian Federation in the 380s. In 364/3 Timotheos captured Poteidaia (and Torone (no. 620)) from the Chalkidian Federation (Isoc. 15.108, 113; Din. 1.14, 3.17; Diod. 15.81.6). Some pro-Athenian Poteidaiaans sent envoys to Athens to ask for additional settlers, and in 362/1 Poteidaia became once again a klerouchy (IG i² 114 = Tod 146) settled with a contingent called Ἀθηναῖοι οἱ ἐν Ποτείδαιᾳ κατοικοῦντες (Dem. 7.10). In 356 Philip forced Poteidaia to surrender to the Olynthians (no. 588) (Dem. 6.20, 7.10, 23.107–8; cf. Diod. 16.8.3–5). Philip let the Athenians leave Poteidaia, but exposed the Poteidaiaans to an andrapodismos they were sold off as slaves, and the town and territory given to the Olynthians (Diod. 16.8.5). However, the city was not destroyed by Philip
Poteidaia may have had an oligarchic constitution, at least until 433 (Rhodes (1981) 299).

There is no evidence of civic subdivisions in Poteidaia, apart from Athenian tribes and demes from the time of the first klerouchy (AAA 7 (1974) 190–98; Jones, POAG 266–67).

Being an Athenian klerouchy once again from 361 to 356, Poteidaia is recorded in the Epidaurian list of theoreodakoi of, probably, 360/59 (IG iv.2.1 94.1.12) and functioned as a (dependent) polis as is attested in a proxeny decree dated to the years 359–357 (Hatzopoulos (1988b) 55–61 = SEG 38 662). The inscription was found in Ag. Mamas (between Olynthos and Poteidaia) and Hatzopoulos believes that it comes from Poteidaia rather than Olynthos. If that is so, there is evidence of a boule (l. 7), an ekklesia (l. 8, heavily restored) and a tamias (l. 16), and the community is twice referred to as a polis in the political sense (l. 4, 13).

Thuc. 1.56.2 mentions the city walls of Poteidaia. Alexander (1963) 3 writes that “traces of ancient wall construction, apparently classical, were reported to have been found”, and during recent excavations parts of the C5 walls have been found along with C6 sherds (ArchDelt 40 (1985) Chron. 237–38; 41 (1986) Chron. 147; Sismanides and Karaïskou (1992) 485, 489; Kossoulakou (1997) 457–58). Poteidaia must have been strongly fortified: in 479 it was able to withstand a siege for three months (Hdt. 8.126–28; cf. Aen. Tact. 31.25–27 and Poly. 7.33.1), and from 432 it was besieged by the Athenians for 2½ years (Thuc. 2.70).

Not much of ancient Poteidaia is left; much material has been employed in later construction (Alexander (1963) 1–7; cf. Gomme (1945) 199). Two passages in Thucydides suggest that Poteidaia had two harbours, one to the east and one to the west (Thuc. 1.63, 4.129; cf. Alexander (1963) 19). At some point in antiquity there may have been a canal through the isthmus on which Poteidaia was situated. Strabo says that the isthmus of Pallene is διαφορομενός (7 fr. 25). Hdt. 7.22 mentions the canal on Athos, but he does not mention any canal on Pallene, so it may have been dug later. There was a temple of Poseidon in the proasteion of Poteidaia in 479 (Hdt. 8.129.3; Thuc. 4.129.3). IG iv 673 is a C4 honorific inscription for a Nauplian victor in athletic contests. The name of Poteidaia is restored in line 6, and if the restoration is correct, this is the only known example of games held in Poteidaia.

Poteidaia struck silver coins on the Euboic standard from c.550 (Alexander (1953), (1963) 50), C6 (Gaebler (1953) 103–5; Robinson and Clement (1938) 307; SNG Cap. Macedonia 312–316), or c.500 (Head, HN² 212) until c.356. Denominations: tetradrachms, tetrobols, diobols and tritemorion. (1) c.500–429: types: obrv. Poseidon on horseback; legend: ΠΙ or ΠΠΩ; rev. incuse square. (2) 400–358: types: obrv. head of Athena; rev. Pegasos, or trident; legend: ΠΠΩ or ΠΟΤΕΠ. Others have female head on the obrv., a sitting bull and legend on the rev. Poteidaia struck bronze coins in C4 as well.

599. Prassilos (Prassilios) Unlocated. Type: B? The toponym is Πρασσίλος (IG i² 285.111.10). Steph. Byz. 534.11 has Πρέσιλος (and the city-ethnic Πρασσίλων). The city-ethnic is restored [Πρασσίλος in a C4 inscription (SEG 40 542.28). Prassilos may have been located in Bottike (Flensted-Jensen (1995) 124).

Prassilos was a member of the Delian League, but it is listed only once, in 421/0 (IG i³ 285.111.10), paying 900 dr.

600. Sane (Sanaios) Map 51. Lat. 40.20, long. 23.55. Size of territory: 2 or 3. Type: A±a. The toponym is Σάναιος, Ἶ (Hdt. 7.22). The city-ethnic is Σαναιής (IG i³ 260.viii.19). Hdt. 7.22.3 calls Sane a Hellenic polis (πόλις Ἐλλάς), using polis in the urban sense, whereas Thuc. 4.109.3–5 probably uses polis in the political sense, using polisma about the settlement. The collective city-ethnic is used externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i³ 260.viii.19).

In Č5 Sane was considered a colony from Andros (no. 475) (Thuc. 4.109.3). Plutarch (Mor. 298A), however, says that Sane was settled jointly by the Chalkidians (no. 365) and the Andrians.

Sane was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded from 454/3 (IG i³ 259.11.25, completely restored) to 415/4 (IG i³ 290.111.12) a total of nineteen times, four times completely restored, paying a phoros of 4,000 dr. from 447/6 (IG i³ 265.11.100) to 442/1 (IG i³ 270.111.6). From 435/4 (IG i³ 277.vi.27) to 433/2 (IG i³ 279.11.74) it paid 1 tal., and in 430/29 (IG i³ 281.11.27) just 1,000 dr. It is universally accepted that the Sane record in the tribute lists is Sane on Athos. But an inspection of its position in the tribute lists shows that it may equally well be Sane (no. 601) on Pallene, thus Hansen (2004).
Sane withstood an attack from Brasidas in 424, but its territory was ravaged (Thuc. 4.109.5). The incident indicates that Sane was fortified. Sane is mentioned in the Peace of Nikias (Thuc. 5.18.6). The passage runs as follows: Μηνυβερναιός δὲ καὶ Σαναῖος καὶ Σηγγαῖος οικεῖν τὰς πόλεις τὰς ἐκεῖν, καθάπερ Ὄλυνθοι καὶ Ἀκάνθοι. This may be interpreted to mean that the Mekybernaians (no. 583), the Sanaians and the Singaians (no. 605) are to live in their own poleis, the Mekybernaian and the Singaians independently of Olynthos (no. 588), and the Sanaians independently of Akanthos (no. 559) (Gomme 1956; 672; cf. Hornblower 1996: 478–79). Others want to emend the passage and write Γαλαίους instead of Σαναῖους (West 1937b: 166–73, accepted by e.g. Zahrnt (1971: 220).

Sane may have been incorporated into Ouranopolis, which was founded by Alexarchos c.315 (Zahrnt 1971: 209–10), or perhaps into Akanthos, since it is not mentioned by later sources.

South-west of modern Nea Rhoda (in the territory of Sane?) an Archaic sanctuary has been found. The sanctuary was in use from the Archaic period to C3 (Vokotopoulou and Tsigardia 1992, (1993); Tsigardia 1996).

601. Sane Map 50. Lat. 40.05, long. 23.20. Size of territory: 2. Type: Aa. The toponym is Σάνη, ἦ (Hdt. 7.123.1). The city-ethnic is not attested.

At 7.123.1 Herodotos uses the pronoun αὐτὰ about eight poleis on Pallene, and it is an almost certain inference that the noun to be supplied is πόλεις. He mentions Sane after Mende (no. 584) and locates it on Pallene. Furthermore, he says that it supplied ships and troops to Xerxes in 480.

West (1918) 73 argues that Sane at Hdt. 7.123.1 must be an error and that Sane on Pallene would have been distinguished from Sane (no. 600) on Akte, in, e.g., the Peace of Nikias (see also Gomme (1956) 589). This argument carries no weight; see supra 839. Furthermore, according to Strabo (7 fr. 27) Sane was one of four poleis on Pallene. Pomponius Mela (2.3.35) mentions Sane too. Finally, Geometric and Archaic remains of a considerable settlement have been found on some hills near modern Sani, c.15 km south of Poteidaia (no. 598) (ArchDelt 41 (1986) Chron. 147, 42 (1987) Chron. 367–68; Vokotopoulou (1987) 279). The fact that some Archaic sherds are inscribed in the Corinthian alphabet (SEG 38 667) may indicate Corinthian influence, possibly via nearby Poteidaia, at Sane; these sherds seem to originate from the site of a nocturnal cult of a female chthonic deity (ibid.). It cannot be precluded that the Sane recorded in the Athenian tribute lists is Sane on Pallene, not Sane (no. 600) on Athos.

602. Sarte (Sartaïos) Map 51. Lat. 40.05, long. 24.00. Size of territory: ? Type: Aa. The toponym is Σάρτη (Hdt. 7.122). The city-ethnic is Σάρταιος (IG i³ 281.11.57). At Hdt. 7.122 Sarte is twice called a polis, first in the urban sense; but the information that Sarte was one of the poleis that supplied Xerxes with troops in 480 indicates that polis is used in the political sense as well. In the Athenian tribute lists Sarte is recorded three times under the heading πόλεις (infra), where polis is used in the political sense. The collective city-ethnic is used externally in the tribute lists (e.g. IG i³ 281.11.57).

Hdt. 7.122 locates Sarte on the bay of Singos and says that it supplied troops to Xerxes in 480. Sarte was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded in 434/3 (IG i³ 278.v1.13), 433/2 (IG i³ 279.11.79) and in 432/1 (IG i³ 280.11.71) under the heading πόλεις αὐτῶν φόρον ταξάμεναι, in 430/29 (IG i³ 281.11.57) and in 429/8 (IG i³ 282.11.38) under the heading ταύδε ἐτάξαν οἱ τάκται ἐπὶ Κρ[...]. Εὐγενῆς, the toponym is Σαρταῖος (Sermaios) Not in Barr 50. Unlocated. Type: C2. The toponym is Σέρμης (IG i³ 77.V.20). The city-ethnic is Σέρμειούς (IG i³ 264.11.34) or Σέρμαιος (IG i³ 272.11.48). It is restored as Σέρμαιος in the tribute lists of 443/2 (IG i³ 269.11.33) and 442/1 (IG i³ 270.11.32). The collective city-ethnic is used externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i³ 264.11.34).

The editors of the Athenian tribute lists suggest that the Sermaians were the inhabitants of Therme (Hdt. 7.124), but most scholars disagree (ATL i. 546, contra e.g. Zahrnt (1971) 223–25).

The Sermaians were members of the Delian League. They belonged to the Thracian district and are recorded in the tribute lists from 450/49 (IG i³ 263.14.14) to 432/1 (IG i³ 280.11.57) a total of fourteen times, twice completely restored, paying 500 dr. They were assessed for tribute in 422/1 (IG i³ 77.V.20) 500 dr.

603. Serme (Sermaios) Not in Barr 50. Unlocated. Type: C2? The toponym is Σέρμης (IG i³ 77.V.20). The city-ethnic is Σέρμειούς (IG i³ 264.11.34) or Σέρμαιος (IG i³ 272.11.48). It is restored as Σέρμαιος in the tribute lists of 443/2 (IG i³ 269.11.33) and 442/1 (IG i³ 270.11.32). The collective city-ethnic is used externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i³ 264.11.34).

The editors of the Athenian tribute lists suggest that the Sermaians were the inhabitants of Therme (Hdt. 7.124), but most scholars disagree (ATL i. 546, contra e.g. Zahrnt (1971) 223–25).

The Sermaians were members of the Delian League. They belonged to the Thracian district and are recorded in the tribute lists from 450/49 (IG i³ 263.14.14) to 432/1 (IG i³ 280.11.57) a total of fourteen times, twice completely restored, paying 500 dr. They were assessed for tribute in 422/1 (IG i³ 77.V.20) 500 dr.

604. Sermylia (Sermylieus) Map 51. Lat. 40.15, long. 23.30. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: Aa. The toponym is Σέρμυλη (Hdt. 7.122) or Σέρμυλια (IG i³ 118.1.50; Ps.-Skylax 66). The city-ethnic is Σέρμυλιούς (IG i³ 277.V.26), Σέρμυλιούς (IG i³ 264.11.34) and ΣΕΡΜΥΛΙΑΙΟΝ on Archaic coins (Gaebler (1935) 106–7). Sermylia is called a polis both in the urban sense (Thuc. 1.65.2; Ps.-Skylax 66 (cf. Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 142)) and in the political
sense (Thuc. 5.18.8: Peace of Nikias). At Hdt. 7.122 polis is used in both senses simultaneously (Hansen (2000a) 175–76). Hecat. fr. 151 (apud Steph. Byz. 561.14) mentioned Sermylia, although it is not certain whether he called it a polis (cf. Hansen (1997b)). The collective city-ethnic is used internally on coins of c.500 (Gaebeier (1935) 106–7) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i 270.111.27).

Hdt. 7.122 lists Sermylia between Gale(pso) (no. 571) and Mekyberna (no. 583); Zahrnt (1971) 225 mentions an ancient settlement c.3 km south of modern Ormilia. The name of Sermylia’s territory was Σερµυλιαία (SEG 38 619.6 (c.285)). Sermylia supplied Xerxes with troops and ships in 480 (Hdt. 7.122).

Sermylia was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded from 454/3 (IG i 259.9 v.9) to 434/3 (IG i 278.9 v.9) a total of thirteen times, once completely restored. In 445/4 it is recorded as Σερµυλιαίη (IG i 267.11.23; see West (1918) 12 n.20). In the first years it paid odd sums such as 4,462 dr. in 445/3 (IG i 259.9 v.9), 3,550 dr. in 451/0 (IG i 262.11.28). In 448/7 and 447/6 it paid 3 tal. (IG i 264.4v.34, 265.11.29). From 445/4 it paid 5 tal. (IG i 267.11.25), and from 435/4 4½ tal. (IG i 277.1v.26). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i 71.111.165, completely restored).

In 432 the Peloponnesians under Aristeus killed many Sermylians near their polis, and, since he helped the Chalkidians, they must have been enemies of the Chalkidians (Thuc. 1.65.2). Nevertheless, the Chalkidians must have secured control of Sermylia shortly after, since they do not appear in the complete panels of the tribute lists of 432/1 and 430/29. However, it appears from the Peace of Nikias (Thuc. 5.18.8) that Sermylia was once again in the hands of the Athenians.

It seems reasonable to infer that Sermylia was a member of the Chalkidian Federation in C4 (Zahrnt (1971) map 4), and that it was one of the poleis annihilated by Philip II, since there is no mention of Sermylia after 348. Hatzopoulos (1996d) 121 suggests that it became a kome of Kassandraea. Around 285 some land in the territory of (the former polis) Sermylia was given to Limmaios by Lysimachos (Hatzopoulos (1988b) 37; cf. SEG 38 619).

Sermylia struck silver tetradrachms on the Euboic standard c.500 (Head, HN2 207; cf. Gaebeier (1935) 106–7) or perhaps as early as the third quarter of C6 (Robinson and Clement (1938) 333). Types: obv. naked horseman and dog; legend: ΣΕΡΜΥΛΙΑΙΟΝ or ΣΕΡΜΥΛΙΑΙΩΝ; rev. quadripartite incuse square. A few C4 bronze coins have been found (ibid. 313).

605. Singos (Singaios) Map 51. Lat. 40.15, long. 23.45. Size of territory: . Type: . The toponym is Σίγγος (Hdt. 7.122). The city-ethnic is Σίγγοι (IG i 260.viii18) or Σίγγαιοι (Thuc. 5.18.6). Singos is called a polis at Hdt. 7.122 in the urban and political senses simultaneously (Hansen (2000a) 175–76) and in the political sense at Thuc. 5.18.8 (Peace of Nikias). The collective city-ethnic is used externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i 260.viii18).

Singos supplied Xerxes with troops in 480 (Hdt. 7.122). It was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i 259.v.13) to 433/2 (IG i 279.11.75) a total of sixteen times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of between 1 tal. (IG i 279.11.75) and 4 tal. (IG i 263.4v.11). Singos was assessed for tribute of 10 dr. in 421 (IG i 77.v.22), and possibly in 425/4 too (IG i 71.v.109, completely restored).

In the Peace of Nikias it is stipulated that the inhabitants of Singos live in their own polis (Thuc. 5.18.6), which probably means that Singos was one of the poleis that took part in the synoecism of Olynthos (no. 588) in 432 (Thuc. 1.58.2; see West (1918) 74 and Hornblower (1996) 478–79); the wording of Thuc. 1.58.2 (πόλεις . . . καθαρωντες τας πολεις) suggests that the city was destroyed in connection with the synoecism. Perhaps Singos was one of the towns destroyed by Philip II, since Strabo calls it a πόλεις ἀρχαία κατεσκαµµένη (7 fr. 31). Remains of the urban centre and its harbour have been found near modern Ag. Nikolaos; the urban centre was protected by a wall of the Classical or Hellenistic period (Zahrnt (1971) 227–28).

606. Sinos Map 50. Lat. 40.15, long. 23.45. Size of territory: . Type: [A]j. Only the toponym Σῖνος (IG i 278.vi.24) is attested. In the Athenian tribute lists Sinos is twice recorded under the heading πόλεις ἀσ τι οί ίδιωται ἐνέγραφαν φόρον φέρεων, in 434/3 (IG i 278.vi.18–21, 24) and in 433/2 (IG i 279.11.89–92, 98, restored), where polis is used in the political sense. The name of the territory, Σίναια, is mentioned in Syll.3 332 (306–297), according to which a field in the Sinai was given by Kassandraos to Perdikkas. Sinos may have been situated in Bottike (Flenssted-Jensen (1995) 125).

Sinos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded in the tribute lists for the years 434/3 (IG i 278.vi.24), 433/2 (IG i 279.11.98) and 421/0 (IG i 285.111.9), paying 1,500 dr. in 434/3 and 433/2 and 800 dr. in 421/0. Furthermore, it was assessed in 422/1 (IG i 77.v.38).
607. Skabala (Skablaios) Map 51. 40.20, long. 23.35. Size of territory: ? Type: Bα. The toponym is presumably Σκάβαλα (Theopomp. fr. 151; cf. Knoepfler (1997) 358 with n. 49). The city-ethnic is Σκαβλαίος (IG i² 263.111.16). The collective city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i² 259.v.6–7).

Theopomp. fr. 151 describes Skabala as a χωρίον Ἐρετρίων, which indicates that he took it to be a colony of Eretria (Knoepfler (1997) 358 with n. 49).

The Skablaioi were members of the Delian League. They are recorded from 454/3 (IG i² 259.v.6–7) to 433/2 (IG i² 279.11.71) a total of fourteen times, once completely restored. In the first year (IG i³ 259.v.6–7 (454/3)) they appear in a syntelic group along with Olynthos (no. 588) and Ass(ε)ra (no. 564), paying 2 tal. 4,000 dr. altogether. When the Skablaioi are listed alone, they pay either 3,000 dr. (IG i³ 263.111.16) or 2,000 dr. (IG i³ 266.11.25) or, once, 1,500 dr. (IG i³ 279.11.71). Since they are absent from the full panel of 430/9 (IG i³ 281.11.5–27), many scholars believe that the Skablaioi revolted in 432 (Zahrnt (1971) 231). This, and the fact that they paid along with Olynthos and Ass(ε)ra, led the editors of the Athenian tribute lists to believe that the Skablaioi lived north of Sithonia (ATL i. 549).

608. (Skapsai) Unlocated. Type: Βατ. The city-ethnic is Σκαψαῖος (IG i³ 279.11.49). The abbreviated collective city-ethnic is used internally on C5f coins (infra) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i² 290.111.13).

The Skapsai were members of the Delian League. They belonged to the Thracian district and are recorded in the tribute lists from 452/1 (IG i³ 261.11.6, heavily restored) to 415/4 (IG i³ 290.111.13) a total of fourteen times, once completely restored. However, they are not listed in the complete panel of 430/9 (IG i³ 281.11.5–27), which may indicate that they took part in the Revolt of 432 (Thuc. 1.58.2). If so, they must have joined the Athenians again at some point before 415. The Skapsai paid a phoros of 1,000 dr.

During the excavations at Olynths a Skapsaian bronze coin was found. It dates from C4f. Type: obv. head of Apollo; rev. lion (or panther); legend: ΣΚΑΨΑΙ (Robinson (1952) 407–8, 419; Flensted-Jensen (1997) 122–25).

609. Skione (Skioniaios) Map 51. Lat. 39.55, long. 23.35. Size of territory: 2. Type: Ατα. The toponym is Σκιωνίη, ἦ (Thuc. 4.120.2) or Σκιώνω (IG iv².1 1.b.94.25 (399)). The city-ethnic is Σκιωνίαος (Thuc. 4.120.1; IG i³ 266.11.31). Skione is called a polis both in the urban sense (Thuc. 4.131.1; Ps.-Skylax 66, where it is listed under the heading πόλεις αἰσθε) and in the political sense (Hdt. 8.128.3; Thuc. 4.122.4, 5.18.8: Peace of Nikias). Thuc. 5.2.1 once describes Skione as a chorion in Thrace. The collective city-ethnic is used internally on C5f coins (Head, HN² 210), and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i³ 266.11.31). The individual and external use is attested in Attic sepulchral inscriptions (IG ii³ 10365–66 (C4)) and in literary sources (Hdt. 8.8.1).

Hdt. 7.123, locates Skione between Therambos (no. 616) and Mende (no. 584) on Pallene (cf. Thuc. 4.120.1).

Skione supplied troops and ships to Xerxes in 480 (Hdt. 7.123). Hdt. 8.128.1–3 mentions a strategos from Skione in reference to 479. Skione was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded in the Athenian tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i³ 259.11.9) to 429/8 (IG i³ 282.11.12) a total of fourteen times. In the years 454/3–451/0 Skione and Therambos (no. 616) paid jointly 6 tal. (IG i³ 262.1.3); in the following period Skione paid 6 tal. (IG i³ 266.11.31) until 432/1, when the tribute was lowered to 4 tal. (IG i³ 280.11.52), but in 430/9 (IG i³ 281.11.14) and in 429/8 (IG i³ 282.11.12) it paid 9 tal.

Skione joined Brasidas in 423 (Thuc. 4.120–21; cf. Diod. 12.72.1), just after Athens and Sparta had concluded an armistice for a year (Thuc. 4.117–19). Therefore, on the motion of Kleon, the Athenians decreed that Skione be destroyed and the inhabitants killed (Thuc. 4.122.6). Having captured Mende, the Athenians laid siege to Skione and built a wall round the city (Thuc. 4.130.7–132.1, 133.4, 5.2.2; Ar. Vesp. 210). In the Peace of Nikias Skione is ceded to Athens (Thuc. 5.18.7–8). Shortly after, the Athenians captured Skione and exposed the city to andrōpanodos: the adult males were killed, the women and the children enslaved, and the land given to the Plataians (Thuc. 5.32.1; Isoc. 4.109)—in later sources described as a harsh treatment (Xen. Hell. 2.2.3; Isoc. 4.100). In 405/4 Lysander gave Skione back to its former inhabitants (Plut. Lys. 14.3; cf. Xen. Hell. 2.2.3, 9). Skione is recorded in the Epidauran list of theodorokoi of 360/59 (IG iv².1 94.1.b.25).

Meritt (1923) 450–51 offers a description of the site of Skione. He located the acropolis of Skione on a fortified hill (p. 447) from which C4 remains of a building have been reported (ArchDelt 41 (1986) Chron. 149), and later excavations have revealed remains of, inter alia, a large C5 building, built in isodomic masonry (Sismanides (1991)).

The Skioniaioi believed that, originally, they came from Pellene in the Peloponnese. The first settlers were driven by a storm on their way back from Troy (Thuc. 4.120.1; cf. Polyain. 7.47). Borza (1990) 75 suggests that Achaians settled at Skione. This tradition is undoubtedly an attempt to connect Peloponnesian Pellene with Thracian Pallene, on which
Skione was located. An Archaic coin testifies to a different tradition: on the obverse Protesilaos is celebrated as the eocist of Skione (Kraay (1976) 134 with no. 470). The two traditions are not mutually exclusive: “Protesilaos the ‘Achaian’ (in the broad Homeric sense) is easily reconcilable with the story of a foundation from Achaia (in the narrow geographical sense of Achaia, i.e. northern Peloponnese)” (Hornblower (1996) 377–78). Skione was considered an Achaian colony by later writers: Pomponius Mela rev 4f. Types: lely. (2) Other coins: denominations: tetradrachms, after that expedition (Hornblower (Troy (Hom. utes the foundation of Skione to Protesilaos. However, it was well known that Protesilaos was killed as soon as he arrived at Troy (Hom. II. 2.698–702). Various solutions to this problem have been suggested: Protesilaos participated in the first expedition against Troy (with Herakles) and founded Skione after that expedition (Hornblower (1996) 377 with refs.); or there may have been an alternative tradition according to which Protesilaos did not die when he arrived at Troy, and thus was able to found Skione (Boedeker (1988) 36 n. 22).

Skione struck silver coins on the Euboic standard from C61 to c.450, and on the Phoenician standard before c.424.

1) Tetradrachm (supra): obv. head of Protesilaos with the name written out along the crest-holder of the helmet; rev. 2SKIO in corners of incuse square containing stern of galle,

(2) Other coins: denominations: tetradrachms, tetrobols, triobols and hemiobols. Moreover, it struck bronze coins in C4f. Types: obv. heroic head, or female head; rev. Corinthian helmet; legend: ΣΚΙΟ, ΣΚΙΟΝΑΙΩΝ or ΣΚΙΩ. (Head, HN2 210; Gaebler (1935) 108–9; SNG Cop. Macedonia 318–24, pace Robinson and Clement (1938) 311–12).

610. Skithai (Skithaios) Not in Barr. Unlocated. Type: Α. The toponym is Σκιθαίος (Steph. Byz. 574.17). The city-ethnic is Σκίθαιος (Theopomp. fr. 375), ΣΚΙΘΑΙΟΣ (Rev. 2SKIO in corners of incuse square containing stern of galle,

611. Smila Map 50. Unlocated. Type: Α.? The toponym is Σµίλλα (Hecat. fr. 148; Hdt. 7.123.2) or Σµίλλα (IG I3 278. v1.31). Apart from Steph. Byz. 580.10, there is no attestation of a city-ethnic. Smila is called a polis in the urban sense by Hecat. fr. 148 (Hansen (1997b) 25), and in the urban and political sense combined (Hansen (2000a) 175–76) by Hdt. 7.123.2–3. In an Athenian tribute list Smila is recorded under the heading πόλεις ὡς οἱ ἴδιωται ἐνέγραψαν φόραν ἡφεῖν (IG I3 278. v1.18–21, 31), where polis is used in the political sense. Hdt. 7.123.2–3 locates Smila in Krouss.

Smila supplied Xerxes with troops in 480 (Hdt. 7.123.2). It was a member of the Delian League, but is listed only once, in 434/3 (IG I3 278.11.31), paying 3,000 dr. along with the Tindaians (no. 619), Kithas (no. 579), Gigonos (no. 572) and Haisa (no. 573). [Σµίλλα] is restored in IG I3 71. iv. 84 (425/4).

612. Spartolos (Spartolios) Map 50. Lat. 40.20; long. 23.10. Size of territory: ? Type: Α. The toponym is Σπάρτολος, η (Thuc. 2.79.2). The city-ethnic is Σπάρτολος (IG I3 259. 111. 24). Spartolos is called a polis both in the urban sense (Thuc. 2.79.2) and in the political sense (Thuc. 2.79.2, 5.18.5; Peace of Nikias). The collective city-ethnic is used externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG I3 259.111.24).

Spartolos was a polis in Bottike (Thuc. 2.79.2; Harp. Σ34). The name of its territory was probably also Σπάρτολος (Syll.3 332.15–16 (306–297); cf. Flensved-Jensen (1995) 125).

Spartolos was a member of the Delian League until the beginning of the Peloponnesian War. It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG I3 259.111.24) to 443/4 (IG I3 278. v5) a total of sixteen times, once completely restored, paying 2 tal. each year, except in 434/3 (IG I3 278. v5) and 433/2 (IG I3 279.11.73), when it paid 3 tal. 500 dr. In 432 the Bottaianas revolted against the Athenians (Thuc. 1.57.5), and in 429 they fought and won a battle against the Athenians outside Spartolos (Thuc. 2.79.2–7; Isae. 5.42; Flensved-Jensen (1995) 121–22). Spartolos may have been listed in the assessment decade of 425/4 (IG I3 71. 111. 167: Σπάρτολος). According to the Peace of Nikias, Spartolos was to be autonomos and pay the tribute as fixed by Aristeides (Thuc. 5.18.5).

A C4m deed of sale has been found at the presumed site of Spartolos (Papangelos (1996)). The inscription indicates that Spartolos was a member of the Chalkidian Federation at that time, since Aristoboulos, son of Kallikrates (II. 1–2), was a priest of the Chalkidian Federation, perhaps in 353/2 (Hatzopoulos (1988a) 59, 67, 73–75).

It appears from Thuc. 2.79 that Spartolos was walled. At the presumed site of Spartolos there are remains of a
cemetery containing graves from the Archaic and Classical periods and of a settlement. Furthermore, excavations at Nea Syllata, 3.3 km from ancient Spartolos, show continuous habitation from the Bronze Age, through the Classical, Roman and Byzantine periods (ArchDelt 31 (1976) Chron. 247); also a cemetery has been found at Nea Syllata (AAA 14 (1982) 246–50).

613. Stagiros (Stagirites) Map 51. Lat. 40.35, long. 23.45. Size of territory: ? Type: A. The older toponym is Στάγειρος (Hdt. 7.115.2; Thuc. 4.88.2) or Στάγιαρα (IG iv.2.1 94.1.b.21 (360/59)), and the later one is Στάγειρα, τά (Dion. Hal. Ad Amm. 1.5) or Στάγειρος (Strabo 7 fr. 33 (but note Στάγειρα, fr. 35)). The city-ethnic is Σταγιρίτης (IG i. 271.11.53), and later Σταγιρίτης (Diod. 18.8.3; Dio Chrys. 47.9). Herodotus calls Stagiros a polis in the urban sense (πόλις Ἐλλάς: 7.115.2), and Thucidides in the political sense (5.18.5; Peace of Nikias). The collective city-ethnic is found internally in abbreviated form on C61 coins (infra), and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i.281.11.18). The individual city-ethnic is used externally on a gravestone from Athens (IG i.370 (C55)) and in Syll.2 275 (334–332).

According to early tradition, Stagiros was a colony from Andros (Thuc. 4.88.2, 5.6.1), but Dion. Hal. Ad Amm. 1.5 seems to believe that it was founded from Chalkis (no. 365). Hdt. 7.115.2 mentions Stagiros in connection with Xerxes’ march in 480. Stagiros was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded from 454/3 (IG i.2 259.11.14) to 429/8 (IG i.2 282.11.10) a total of fifteen times, once completely restored, paying 1,000 dr. in all years (IG i.2 263.11.15). In 424 Stagiros revolted and joined Brasidas (Thuc. 4.88.2), and in 422 Kleon made an unsuccessful attack on the city (Thuc. 5.6.1). In the Peace of Nikias Stagiros was declared autonómos and liable to the tribute assessed by Aristides (Thuc. 5.18.5). It was assessed for tribute in 410/9 (Krateros fr. 25 (Krech 1888) = IG i.1 106). If we can trust some late sources (Tzetzes, Chil. 7.441, 11.849; Dio Chrys. 47.9), Stagiros had been a polis (or kome) in Olymphant territory, i.e. a member of the Chalkidic Federation (Zahrnt 1971) 242–43). According to an emended passage in Diod. 16.52.9 and two passages from Vit. Arist. (fr. 655, Rose), Stagiros was destroyed by Philip in 348 (see Hammond and Griffith (1979) 376 and Hatzopoulos (1996a) 191). It is not clear from Plut. Alex. 7.2 and Dio Chrys. 47.9 whether the town was in fact destroyed; what is clear is that the population was expelled and later allowed to move back. Excavations show that the site of Stagiros was fortified in the Hellenistic period (see infra).

Stagiros is recorded in the Epidaurian list of theodorokoi of 360/59 (IG iv.2.1 94.1.b.21). The most famous citizen of Stagiros, Aristotle, was praised by the Delphic Amphiktyony in 334/3 (Syll.2 275).

Excavations were begun in 1990. The city was situated on a promontory consisting of two hills. The earliest settlement was located on the northern hill. When the town expanded in the Classical period, building was begun on the southern hill as well, and both hills were surrounded by a wall, which is very well preserved, especially on the southern side. The wall is built in various types of masonry (Lesbian and polygonal) and has an estimated length of 1.5–2 km, with both square and circular towers. It is about 2 m in width. The building of the wall was begun c.500 (Sismanides (1997) 5; cf. Sismanides (1991); BCH 118 (1994) 762; Sismanides (1996) 279–80; Camp (2000) 44).

On the north-east part of the northern hill there is a 150 m zigzag stretch of a wall built in the late Classical period, presumably after Philip II destroyed the town (Sismanides (1996) 280).

On the northern hill there are remains of a complex from the Byzantine period. Remains of the Archaic wall was found in this complex, along with a C6 lintel with a C6 inscription, which seems to be some kind of tax regulation, imposing a tax of 5 dr. (autopsy).

On the northern hill, where the oldest settlement was located, three Archaic sanctuaries have been found. One, which is situated close to the sea, may have been for Demeter. In connection with this sanctuary, many fragments of female clay protomes have been found; the other sanctuary is a circular structure, 11 m in diameter, which is probably a Thesmophorion (Sismanides (1997) 19). The third one is situated closer to the top of the hill. The divinity worshipped in this temple has not been identified. Theophr. Hist. Pl. 4.16.3 refers to a Mouseion in Stagiros, but it may have been located on the southern hill.

Between the two hills is a depression, where the agora was situated. On the agora a C4 stoa, 6 × 26 m, has been found. It is built in pseudo-isodomic masonry. Only the marble bases of the columns survive. Near the agora is a paved road, 3 m wide. A stretch of 30 m has been located so far. Furthermore, there are remains of commercial buildings, such as shops, store-rooms and a wine vat (Sismanides (1996) 286–87, (1997) 12, 14).

On top of the southern hill are the remains of the triangular acropolis. One of the sides is formed by the Classical wall, and on this side there is also a small gate. Opposite the gate is a cistern. The walls surrounding the acropolis are
preserved, in some places very well, with flights of internal steps, etc. On the north-west corner there is also a watchtower. Remains of water pipes are preserved in situ, and about forty have been found so far (Sismanides (1996) 284).

On both hills remains of dwellings have been found, dating to the Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic periods (Sismanides (1996) 285–86).

Stagiros struck silver staters on the Euboic standard from Col. Types: *obv. lion and boar; rev. incuse square, or obv. wild sow; rev. incuse square; legend: ΣΤΑΙΠ. (Gaebler (1930) 302, (1935) 110–11; *SNG Cop. Macedonia 327; Cahn (1973)).

614. **Stolos** (Stolios) Map 51. Lat. 40.20, long. 23.40. Size of territory: ? Type: Aα. The toponym is Στόλος (IG iv².1 94.1.b.23 (360/59); Steph. Byz. 588.18) or Στολός,ἡ (Thuc. 5.18.5; Strabo 9.2.23; Eust. II. 2.497). The city-ethnic is Στολικός (e.g. IG i¹ 259.vi.11).

Stolos is referred to as a *polis* in the urban sense in three C4 deeds of sale (SEG 38 670.4, 671.7, 672.4; cf. *infra*). It is called *polis* in the political sense at Thuc. 5.18.5 (Peace of Nikias). The city-ethnic is used externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i¹ 259.vi.11).

West (1937a) 166 thinks Stolos must be located in the interior of the Chalkidic peninsula, west of Akanthos (no. 559). Hatzopoulos (1988a) 70–72 tentatively identifies Stolos with modern Kellion, where a number of deeds of sale have been found (SEG 38 670–73 (C4m)). According to Sismanides, however, there was “an unknown, but important ancient town” at Kellion; building debris has been found there (*ArchDelt* 41 (1986) *Chron.* 150).

Stolos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded from 454/3 (IG i¹ 259.vi.11 to 434/3 (IG i¹ 278.vi.13) a total of fourteen times. In the first year Stolos paid in a syntely with the Polichnitans (no. 596) and Mekyberna (no. 583). After that, it paid 4,000 dr. in 450/49 (IG i¹ 263.iv.17), 5,000 dr. in 448/7 (IG i¹ 264.i.1.2) and 447/6 (IG i¹ 265.i.32), and again 4,000 dr. from 445/4 (IG i¹ 267.i.26). In 438/7 and 434/3 Stolos paid 1 tal. (IG i¹ 274.vi.12, 278.vi.3). According to the Peace of Nikias, Stolos was to be *autonomos* and pay the tribute as fixed by Aristides (Thuc. 5.18.5).

Stolos may have been a member of the Chalkidian Federation, at least in C4. Hatzopoulos (1996a) 388–89 argues that Stolos must have been a member of the Chalkidian Federation, since it is evident from a number of C4m deeds of sale that Stolos used the calendar also in use at Olynthos (no. 588). Four month names are known from C4m deeds of sale (Hatzopoulos (1988a) 65–66, 80; Trümpl, *Monat.* 42–43).

Steph. Byz. 588.18–20, without quoting any source, reports that Stolos originally was an Edonian town, which was later taken over by the Chalkidians.

615. **Strepsa** (Strepsaios) Map 50. Lat. 40.30, long. 23.10. Size of territory: ? Type: Bα. The toponym is Στρέφψα,ἡ (Aeschin. 2.27). The city-ethnic is Στρεψαίος (IG i¹ 259.iv.14; Ar. fr. 126, *PCG*). Harp. Στάγρα, quoting Hellan. fr. 61, classifies Strepsa as a *polis* in Thrace (πόλις ἑστι τῆς Ῥώκακης). Hellanikos was obviously Harpokration’s source for the location, but not necessarily for the site-classification. Strepsa’s status as a *polis* is indicated by its membership of the Delian League combined with the evidence that Strepsa was a nucleated settlement. The collective city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i¹ 259.iv.14).

The location of Strepsa has been the subject of considerable scholarly discussion (Hatzopoulos and Loukopoulo (1987) 59; cf. Gomme (1956) 215–18; Edson (1955); Borza (1990) 294–95). Hatzopoulos and Loukopoulo suggest that Strepsa be identified with modern Vasilika (cf. AR (1868–87) 34; Papazoglou (1988) 202–3; cf. Hammond (1972) 190–91). Not far from that, at modern Ag. Paraskevi, a large C6 cemetery containing c.500 graves has been excavated in the period 1981–88. All the female burials faced east, and the male west (as in nearby Thermi). Men were buried with weapons, and women with jewellery. A large amount of vessels have been recovered, both imported and local ware, and virtually all types are represented (Sismanides (1987); *Macedonians* (1994) 170 with photos 177–93). The degree of organisation seems to show that the cemetery was part of an organised community, not just the result of private enterprise. The cemetery was remarkably rich, and it is noteworthy that weapons were found in a period when they were no longer used as grave-offerings in Attika (Kurtz and Boardman (1971) 75). Traces of the settlement to which the cemetery belonged were found nearby (*ArchDelt* 41 (1986) *Chron.* 139). At Souroti in the vicinity two C4 graves have been found (*ArchDelt* 29 (1973–74) *Chron.* 697), and a further eight C6–C41 graves were excavated in 1999 (Souereph and Havela (2001)).

The name of Strepsa’s territory was Στρεψαία (SEG 38 619.17 (C3e)). In 285 King Lysimachus gave to Limnaios τῶν ἄγρων ἐν τῇ Στρεψαίᾳ (ibid.). It appears from the inscription that Limnaios was also given land in Sermyleia and in Olynthia. Those two districts were indisputably quite
close to each other, and Strepsa seems to have been situated in the same area (Hatzopoulos (1988)). A fragmentary C4 deed of sale is from Vasilika, supposedly ancient Strepsa (SEG 37 583).

It is mentioned again in connection with Kallias’ march from Pydna (no. 544) to Poteidaia (no. 598) in 432 (Thuc. 1.61.4, if indeed Pluygers’ emendation of ἐπιστρέφαντες is correct), and once more in 368 when the pretender Pausanias seized Strepsa along with Anthemous (no. 562) and Therme (no. 552) (Aeschin. 2.27).

Strepsa was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded from IG i² 259.iv.14 (IG i² 259.11.68) to 433/2 (IG i² 279.11.68) a total of sixteen times, paying 1 tal. (IG i² 277.vi.9). It is absent from the full panel of 430/9 (IG i² 281.11.5–27), which indicates that it may have participated in the Revolt of 432.

616. Therambos (Therambaioi) Map 51. Lat. 39.55, long. 23.40. Size of territory: 2. Type: Aa. The toponym is Θεράμβος (Hdt. 7.123.1) or Θεράμβης (Ps.-Skalx 66). The city-ethnic is Θεράμβαιος (IG i² 62.6) and perhaps Στραµβαῖος (Krateros fr. 25 (Krech 1888)). Therambos is probably the Στράµβαῖοι of Steph. Byz. 586.11. Furthermore, he mentions a Θράµβος, ἀκροτήριον Μακεδονίας (317.5). Ps.-Skalx 66 lists Therambos as the fourth toponym after the heading πόλεις αἵδε, where polis is used in the urban sense. At 7.123.1 Herodotos uses the pronoun αὐτὰι about Therambos and seven other poleis on Pallene, and it is an almost certain inference that the noun to be supplied is πόλεις. That Therambos was a polis in the political sense too is indicated by its membership of the Delian League and, if correctly restored, by IG i² 62.6: Θεράμβαιοι . . . καὶ α[ἱ] ἀλλαὶ πόλεις, where the city-ethnic is attested in its collective and external sense. Hdt. 7.123.1 locates Therambos on Pallene between Aige (no. 556) and Skione (no. 609).

Therambos supplied Xerxes with troops and ships in 480 (Hdt. 7.123.1). Therambos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i² 259.11.10) to 429/8 (IG i² 282.11.25) a total of seventeen times, twice completely restored, paying 4,000 dr. from 454/3 (IG i² 259.11.14, restored) to 451/0 (IG i² 262.11.29), ½ tal. from 450/49 (IG i² 263.11.23) and 1 tal. from 446/5 (IG i² 266.11.11) to 429/8. Therambos was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i² 71.11.175). In 424/3 Therambos joined Brasidas (Thuc. 4.109.5), but it must have become a member of the League again shortly after, because it was allied with Athens in 421 when it was captured by Dion (Thuc. 5.35.1).

Thuc. 4.109.4 says that Thessalos had a mixed (i.e. barbarian–Hellenic) bilingual population, but about a century later Ps.-Skalx 66 calls it a <polis> Hellenis (Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 151).

619. Tinde (Tindaios) Map 50. Lat. 40.25, long. 23.00. Size of territory: ? Type: A?. The toponym is Τίνδη, known only from Steph. Byz. 624.18. The city-ethnic is Τίνδαιοι (IG i² 278.vi.29). In an Athenian tribute list, the Tindaioi are recorded under the heading πόλεις ἃς οἱ ἰδιώται ἐνέγραψαν φόρον φέρεαν (IG i² 278.vi.18–21, 29, where polis is used in the political sense), attesting to the collective and external use of the city-ethnic. Tinde may have been a Bottiaioi polis (Flensted-Jensen (1995) 123).
Tinde was a member of the Delian League, but it is recorded in the tribute lists only once: viz. in 434/3 (IG i 3 278.vi.29), paying 3,000 dr. together with Kithas (no. 579), Gigonos (no. 572) and Haisa (no. 573). Perhaps Tinde was also listed in the assessment decree of 425/4 (IG i 3 71.iv.83, completely restored).

620. Torone (Toronaioi)  Map 51. Lat. 40.00, long. 23.55. Size of territory: 3. Type: Α/α. The toponym is Τορώνη, ᾦ (Hdt. 7.122; Thuc. 4.129.1). The adjective Τορώναίης occurs in Archil. fr. 89.20, West, which implies that the toponym antedates C7m. The city-ethnic is Τορώναιος (IG i 3 266.11.28; IG II 10454) or ΤΕΡΩΝΑΙΟΝ on C5 coinage (Head, HN 2 207).

Torone is called a polis in the urban sense (Hdt. 7.122; Thuc. 4.110–14; Ps.-Skylax 66), in the territorial sense (Thuc. 4.110.2) and in the political sense (Thuc. 4.110.1, 5.18.8 (Peace of Nikias); Isoc. 15.107–8; Xen. Hell. 5.3.18); cf. politeuterion used of the Toronaians in Thuc. 4.114.1. The poet Archestratos (C4m) described Torone as an asty (fr. 24.1–2, Olson and Sens). The collective city-ethnic is used internally on coins (infra) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i 3 266.11.28). The individual city-ethnic is attested externally in a citizenship decree from Samos (SEG 38 845 (C4l)) on a gravestone from Attika (IG II 10454 (C4)) and in Hdt. 8.127.

Hdt. 7.122 locates Torone before Galepsos (no. 571) on Sithonia. Perhaps the southernmost part of the peninsula was Toronaian territory; Steph. Byz. s.v. ΑΜΠΕΛΟΣ calls Ampelos akra Toronaion. Thuc. 4.113.2 mentions a phourion Lekythos on a promontory close to the city itself. About 3 km south of Torone was the Kophos limen, which belonged to Torone (Meritt 1923) 453–54.

The communis opinio is that Torone was a C8 colony from Chalkis (no. 365) (e.g. Boardman 1980) 229, pace Harrison (1912)). Nevertheless, the only ancient source to call Torone a colony from Chalkis is Diod. 12.68.6, who evidently interpreted Thucydides’ Τορώνη ᾦ Χαλκιδική (4.110.1) as meaning “Torone, a colony from Chalkis”. But the phrase does not necessarily mean that Torone was a colony from Chalkis. Thucydides may refer to Torone’s membership of the Chalkidian Federation, although it is unclear whether the meaning of “Chalkidian” is (a) geographical/territorial ( = “situated in Chalkidike”), (b) ethnic ( = “of the Chalkidian tribe”), or (c) specifically of Chalkis (cf. Hammond 1995) 315 n. 37; Hornblower 1997). In any case, Torone cannot have been a Euboian colony founded ab novo in C8, since excavations have shown that the site of Torone was inhabited several centuries prior to C8. Furthermore, the excavations do not support the assumption that Torone was a colony from Chalkis (see also Papadopoulos 1996).

According to Hdt. 7.122, Torone supplied troops and ships to Xerxes in 480. It was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i 3 259.11.15) to 429/8 (IG i 3 282.11.29) a total of fourteen times, paying in most years 6 tal. (IG i 3 266.11.28), in some years 12 tal. (IG i 3 259.11.15, 260.viii.10, 281.11.17) and in 447/6 possibly two payments adding up to 16 tal. (IG i 3 265.11.71, 101). In 423 an oligarchic faction (Thuc. 4.110.1–2) invited Brasidas to attack Torone, which was held by the Athenians, and he managed to seize it with the help of traitors inside the town (Thuc. 4.110–13; Gehrke, Stasis 199–98). The majority of the Athenians who were in Torone and those of the Toronaians who had not joined Brasidas fled to Lekythos, a fortification on a promontory a short distance from the city itself. The Athenians defended themselves, but were eventually forced to leave (Thuc. 4.114–16).

In 422 Kleon recaptured Torone (Thuc. 5.3.4), whereupon he exposed it to an andrapodismos by enslaving the women and the children; the men were taken captive and sent to Athens, but later ransomed by Olynthos (no. 588) (Thuc. 5.3.4; cf. Xen. Hell. 2.2.3 and Isoc. 12.63).

Torone was a member of the Chalkidian Federation at least until 380 (Xen. Hell. 5.3.18). During the Olynthian War (i.e. in 380) Torone, then a member of the Chalkidian Federation, was attacked and taken by the Spartans (Xen. Hell. 5.3.18). In 364 Torone was taken again, this time by Timotheos (Diod. 15.81.5; Isoc. 15.108; Poly. 3.10.15). And finally, in 349, before attacking Olynthos, Philip captured Torone by treachery (Diod. 15.81.5), but did not destroy the city. In C4l Gyges of Torone was granted citizenship in Samos (IG xi 7.6; see Hatzopoulos 1988b) 47 n. 8).

Thuc. 4.113.2 mentions the agora of Torone. It appears from Thuc. 4.110.1 that there was a Diokoreion C 3 stades (540 m) from the city. Thuc. 4.116.2 mentions a temple of Athena in Lekythos (near the city). Fragments of a Doric temple have been interpreted as the remains of this temple (Cambitoglou and Papadopoulos 1988) 205; Cambitoglou (1990) 191–92; Cambitoglou and Papadopoulos (1991) 159).

Thucydides has several references to the walls of Torone (e.g. 4.110–11). Part of the extant wall dates from the Classical period, and part of it from the Hellenistic period (Ergon 1978) 27 fig. 29). The remains of the early Hellenistic fortifications are extensive (Cambitoglou and Papadopoulos 1988) 183).

Excavations have shown that the site of Torone was inhabited continuously from the late Neolithic period to the
post-Byzantine period (Papadopoulos (1996) 160). Torone probably had two harbours, one by the city itself, and one c. 3 km to the south, the Kophos limen (Thuc. 5.2.2–3; Hornblower (1996) 425–26). Thuc. 5.2.4 mentions the proasteion of Torone, and it is clear from Thuc. 4.11.4.2 that there were houses close to Lekythos. Beneath the Classical city an early Iron Age cemetery has been found. By 184, 134 graves had been excavated, yielding more than 500 vessels. The finds dated from c. 1125 to c. 850 (Cambitoglou and Papadopoulos (1988) 187). A house excavated in 1976 and 1978 seemed not to be of the pastas type known from Olynthus, but resembled “the lay-out of the so-called Herdhaumhäuser prevalent in north-west Greece” (Cambitoglou and Papadopoulos (1988) 186). Excavations on the promontory of Lekythos show that Torone was a relatively important settlement in the early Iron Age (Cambitoglou (1990) 188). Henry (1993) combines Thucydides’ description with the archaeological evidence.

Only one month name is known from Torone: viz. Artemision, found in a deed of sale (Karamanoli-Siganidou (1966); cf. SEG 24 574.2 (C4)).

Torone struck silver coins on the Euboic standard from C6 to C4.80, and on the Phoenician standard from C.480 to C.420. Denominations: tetradrachms, tetrobols, obols and hemiobols. (1) C6–480: types: obv. amphora, or oinochoe; legend: TE or HE; rev. incuse square. (2) 480–424: types: obv. amphora, or oinochoe; rev. forepart of a goat. (3) 424–420: types: obv. satyr and oinochoe; rev. TE and a goat in an incuse square, or TEPΩNAON and a square (Head, HN2 206–7; Gaebler (1935) 114–15; SNG Cap. Macedonia 336–38). Bronze coins were struck in C4 (Hardwick (1998)).

621. Triphoiai Unlocated. Type: [A]? The toponym is Tριφοιαί (IG 4.9.76.146 = Tod 68 (c.422)) or Tρίποιαί (IG 3.76.111.8). Triphoiai is listed under the heading αἵδε πόλεις in a treaty of C.422 (IG 3.76.44.46).

Triphoiai was a Bottaiian polis which was located in the vicinity of Kalindoia, i.e. probably in the northern part of Bottike (Flensted-Jensen (1995) 116–17). The name of the territory was Tριποίατις and it was given to the Makedonians by Alexander (SEG 36 626.6–7 (333)).

Triphoiai was a member of the Delian League, but it is recorded only once in the tribute lists in the Thracian district: viz. in 421/0 (IG 3.76.111.8), paying 800 dr. About the same time the Bottaiians had probably formed a confederation (Flensted-Jensen (1995) 126–28), of which Triphoiai was a member (IG 3.76.47).

622. Zereia (Zeranios) Map 51. Unlocated. Size of territory: ? Type: C? The toponym is Ζερεία (IG 1.7.77.18). It has been suggested (Zahrt (1971) 186 with refs.) that the inhabitants of Zereia were the Ζηράνοι mentioned by Theopomp. fr. 214. Their territory is called Ζηρανία by Ephor. fr. 88. Zereia may have been a member of the Delian League: it was assessed for tribute in 422/1 (IG 1.7.77.18) 500 dr., but is unattested in the tribute lists.

4. Unlocated Poleis

623. Aison (Aisonios) Unlocated. Not in Barr. Type [A]? The toponym is Αἴσων (Αἴσων, IG 1.76.27) or Αἴσων (haíson, IG 3.271.11.48). The city-ethnic is Αἴσωνες (Αἴσωνες, IG 3.268.111.16) or Αἴσωνες (haísonēs, IG 3.279.11.66) or Αἴσωνες (haisónoi, IG 3.277.11.28).

Aison was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district (IG 3.76.111.48) and is recorded from 454/3 (IG 3.259.11.19) to 429/8 (IG 3.282.11.54) a total of seventeen times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 1,500 dr. (IG 3.268.111.16), reduced to 1,000 dr. in 432/1 (IG 3.280.11.62) or perhaps in 433/2 (IG 3.279.11.66, amount completely restored). It is recorded twice by toponym, and otherwise by ethnic (supra). In the tribute list for the year 429/8 the Aisonioi are recorded under the heading ἑίδε τῶν πόλεων αὐτῆς τῆς ἀπαρχῆς ἀπέναν (IG 3.76.282.11.51–52, 54) where polis is used in the political sense.

As the Athenian tribute lists are the only sources we have for Aison, all we know about its location is that it was located somewhere in the Thracian district. A river by the name of Αἴσων situated in southern Makedonia is mentioned by Plutarch at Aem. 16.9. Referring to this source, RE i–ii suppl. 40 and ATL i. 467 followed by Zahrt (1971) 146 suggest a location near the modern river Pelikas (= ancient Aison). However, Edson (1947) 88 argues that, apart from Methone (no. 541), it is highly unlikely that any other Makedonian city was a member of the Delian League. He prefers to identify Aison with Haisa (no. 573), a suggestion rejected by Zahrt (1971). As the evidence stands, Aison’s precise location within the Thracian district remains unknown.

624. Brea (Breaios) Map 50. Lat. 40.15, long. 23.10, but see infra. Size of territory: ? Type: B:a. The toponym is Βρέας, ἳ (ML 49.33), the city-ethnic Βρεαίος (Theopomp. fr. 145 apud Steph. Byz. 185.8–9).

An Athenian decree of 4.445 (ML 49.4), 439/8 (Woodhead (1952) 61), or perhaps 426/5 (Mattingly (1966) 185) lays down the rules for the founding of a new colony (apoikia), Brea, in
Thrace. The name of the oecist was Demokleides. The attestation of the city-ethnic in a fragment of Theopompos (fr. 145) is the only evidence that the decree was carried into effect (Hansen 2001: 320–21).

Some scholars believe that Brea was situated in the Chalkidic peninsula (Woodhead 1952: 62; Asheri 1969), others that it was in Bisaltia (Meritt 1967: 48; Gomme 1945: 373). Following Pazaras and Tzanana (1990), Barr. identifies Brea or Beroia with modern Veria, which has, however, only random C4 finds.

625. Kossaia (Kossaios) Map 51. Unlocated. Type: C? The toponym is Κόσσαια, η (Steph. Byz. 378.11–12). The ethnic is Κοσσαίος (IG i3 71.111.172: Κοσσά|αί|οι; but, given the large number of toponyms in IG i3 71, an equally possible restoration would be Κοσσαία).

The link between our two sources was suggested by ATL i. 506. In Steph. Byz. Kossaia is listed as a Θράκης πολέμιον. In the assessment decree of 425/4 Kossaia—or the Kossaians—is placed in the Thracian district. There is no other source. So all we know is that Kossaia was a settlement somewhere in Thrace which in 425/4 was assessed for tribute by the Athenians. The suggestion to locate Kossaia in Chalkidike (Bradeen 1952: 374–75) was rightly rejected by Zahrnt (1971) 195.

626. Okolon Unlocated, not in Barr. Type: C? The toponym is ᾨκόλον (Steph. Byz. 488.11–12 = Theopomp. fr. 150: Ὄκωλον χωρίον Ἐρετριέων Θεόπωντος Φιλιππικῶν εἰκοστῶ πετάρτω. το ἔθνικον ᾨκόλος). There is no other source, but, on the analogy of Skabala (no. 607), Okolon is usually taken to be an Eretrian colony situated in Thrace (RE xii.2. 2385–86; cf. Knoepfler 1997: 358 with n. 49).
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I. The Region

The region bounded by the lower courses of the rivers Strymon and Nestos consists of two extensively marshy plains, well watered by the river Strymon and by its tributary, the Angites, dominated by imposing richly wooded mountains—Mt. Pangaion to the south-west, Mt. Lekane to the east, Mt. Kerkine and the Rhodope range to the north. A third plain, rich in agricultural lands, extends between Mt. Pangaion and Mt. Symbolon to the south-east. The latter mountain range and Mt. Lekane further north-east together define a narrow coastal strip, whose easternmost part was considerably extended through the centuries by the massive alluvial deposits of the river Nestos.

Various tribes are known to have occupied this part of Thrace: Bisaltians (lower Strymon valley), Odomantes (the plain to the north of the Strymon), Sintoi (middle Strymon valley, to the north of the Bisaltians and the Odomantes), Pieres (the area south of Mt. Pangaion), Edonians (the left bank of the lower Strymon, south of the Angites, and the plain of Philippi), Satriai (the Pangaion range), Dersaioi (further north), Sapaians (lower Nestos course) (Papazoglou (1988) 351–413).

It was most probably the rich mineral resources of the area, the famed gold and silver of Mt. Pangaion, said to have been discovered first by the Phoenicians (Isaac (1986) 4), then systematically mined and exploited by Pierians, Odomantes and Satriai (Hdt. 7.112), which attracted early Greek ventures and settlements in the area.¹ Thus, soon after the foundation of a Parian colony on Thasos in early C7, the fertile coastal zone² across this island from the mouth of the Strymon to that of the Nestos—and beyond, infra 859–60, Stryme—appears to have been studded with various Thasian emporia, settled and supported by means of ferocious fighting against the local inhabitants.³ Early on in C6, these invaluable resources, not least the area’s abundant supplies of timber for shipbuilding and oar making,⁴ must have become widely renowned: following a brief but very profitable venture of the Athenian Peisistratos (Arist. Ath. Pol. 15.2; cf. Isaac (1986) 14), the importance of these resources became known to the Athenians; soon thereafter (c.509: Hammond and Griffith (1979) 68 n. 4), it attracted Histiaios, tyrant of Miletos, who briefly settled Myrkinos of the Edonians, only to be recalled when the Persian king realised the importance of the area (Hdt. 5.11, 23–24); in 497 Histiaios’ venture was repeated by his nephew and successor Aristagoras (Hdt. 7.124, 125; cf. Thuc. 4.102; Diod. 12.68). Mileesian efforts were thwarted, however, both by an intense Thracian counter-offensive and by the extension of Persian occupation over the Thracian coast following the campaigns of Megabazos (513) and Mardonios (492) and the establishment of an important supply base at Eion.⁵ Interestingly, Thasos under Persian rule seems to have retained control of her peraia and of vested interests in regional mineral resources. The annual income of Thasos from mining ventures is said to have amounted to no less than 200 (in better years 300) talents c.493, derived for the greatest part from gold and silver mines on the mainland; those at Skapte Hyle alone, presumably located opposite Thasos, on the southern slopes of Mt. Lekane east of Neapolis (Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1990)), are known to

¹ Both literary sources (discussed by Isaac (1986) 31–34) and archaeological research (cf. most recently Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1990)) attest to the existence of various productive mining areas in the region.
² According to Armenidas (apud Athen. 1.31a), the coastal zone between Antisara and Oisyme was named Biblia (Bibline in Steph. Byz. 168. 10; cf. the Βίβλια δόρυ of Epicharmos in Athen. 1.31a), well known for its wine (cf. Steph. Byz. 168.10: Βιβλία ἄμπελος and Βιβλίος ὀίνος).
³ For literary testimonies and archaeological evidence on the establishment of the Thasian peraia, see Isaac (1986) with refs. A C6 epigram engraved on the base of a funerary monument discovered in Amphipolis (Lazaridis (1976)) testifies to the unrelenting war between Thasian/Parian colonists and local Thracian tribes.
⁴ Thuc. 4.408.1, on Athenian revenues from Amphipolis.
⁵ For the extent and nature of Persian occupation in Thrace, see Isaac (1986) 17–18, with references and bibliography.
have yielded a higher income than the famous gold mines on Thasos itself (Hdt. 6.46; cf. Isaac (1986) 21–22).

Following Xerxes’ defeat, Kimon’s Thracian expedition and the capture of Eion in 476 provided the Athenians with a long-sought-after opportunity to gain a foothold in the lower Strymon valley; they settled at Eion, probably also at Ennea Hodoi, challenging Thasian interests in the area. Thasos, deprived of her fleet and with her fortifications dismantled on Persian orders, had no choice but to join the Delian League (Isaac (1986) 19–21). After 442, the area was included in the Thraceward district, which contributed by far the largest tribute (see tables in Meiggs (1972) 529–30) to the Athenian League. Inevitably, conflicting interests over the *emporia* and mining resources on the *peraia* caused Thasos to revolt as soon as her defensive power and her fleet were restored (Thuc. 1.100–1; Diod. 11.70.1; Polyaen. 2.35, 8.67; Plut. Cim. 14.2). Capturing the city after a two-year siege (465–463), Kimon acquired for the Athenians the Thasian settlements (including probably Berga, which appears in the tribute lists at least from 451) and gold mines on the mainland (probably Skapte Hyle). Concurrently, 10,000 Athenian and allied settlers launched an ambitious project to penetrate the Thracian hinterland and gain control over the mines (probably on Mt. Pangaion and in the lower Strymon valley) worked and controlled by the local Thracian tribes. Having occupied Ennea Hodoi, the newcomers under the Athenian generals Sophanes and Leagros were ambushed and annihilated by the Thracians at Drabeskos near Daton.\(^6\) However, Athens’ aspirations to extend and expand her control over south-western Thrace were not abandoned. Epigraphic evidence (*IG* II 3 1, 46) attests in detail the otherwise undocumented foundation c.445 of a colony at Brea in Bisaltia (location unidentified); the venture, which has been plausibly related (ML 132–33; Meiggs (1972) 159; disputed by Isaac (1986) 36) to the dispatch of 1,000 Athenian settlers by Perikles to Bisaltia (Plut. Per. 11.5), was presumably short-lived.\(^7\) Athenian colonising efforts in the north Aegean were finally crowned by success in 437/6, with the foundation of Amphipolis. Inevitably, the importance of the interests at stake kindled anti-Athenian sentiments among both Greek settlers of various origins and Greek and native neighbours, such as the Edonians of Myrkinos. Thus, a Lakedaimonian expedition under Brasidas in 424 met with unprecedented support; the Athenians were expelled from Amphipolis (Thuc. 4.102–8; cf. Isaac (1986) 40–43). Two years later (422) an expedition under Kleon succeeded in regaining control only of Galepos, but failed to recapture Amphipolis (Thuc. 5.2–3, 6–11), which remained loyal to the Spartan League, despite repeated Athenian campaigns, till it eventually fell under Makedonian rule under Philip II. Athens, however, is believed to have maintained control over the Thasian *peraia* to the end of the Peloponnesian War, even through the troubled years of the second secession of Thasos (411–407) (see Isaac (1986) 67–68).

The collapse of the Athenian Empire provided Thasos with the opportunity to reclaim possession of mainland territories: since Amphipolis—now an established and flourishing independent city—controlled the lower Strymon basin, the Thasians targeted the eastern entrance to the Angites plain and the Pangaion mines: c.360 they founded Krenides (no. 632) and Datos (no. 629), the latter with the guidance and support of Kallistratos, the exiled Athenian orator. The new settlements marked the resurrection of the Thasian *peraia* and immediately provoked the hostility of the Thracians;\(^8\) most importantly, they provided Philip II with a legitimate justification for penetrating the area and for the founding in 356 of Philippi, a Makedonian colony in the Angites plain (Collart (1937)).

Written sources provide information about a total of twenty-five named settlements of the Archaic and Classical periods, thirteen of them attested to have had *polis* status, in the area between the lower and middle courses of the rivers Strymon and Nestos.\(^9\) Despite rather extensive archaeologica research, particularly in recent decades,\(^10\) only ten have been securely identified (Antisara, Berga, Gasoros, Galepos, Neapolis, Neine, Oisyme, Phagres, Philippoi and Sirra); the location of the remaining fourteen (Acontisma,

---

\(^6\) For a detailed discussion of sources and bibliography, see Isaac (1986) 24–30.

\(^7\) The controversy concerning the location of Brea is succinctly summarized by Isaac (1986) 52 (with refs.). Recent finds have now affirmed beyond doubt that Bisaltia, usually located according to Hdt. 7.115 west of the Strymon, extended over this river’s eastern bank as well, as suggested by Strabo 7.36 (cf. Koukouli-Chrysanthaki (2000)). It becomes clear that all Athenian colonising ventures targeted the lower Strymon and the rich hinterland to which it provided access.

\(^8\) On the identity of the Thracians who threatened Krenides, see Isaac (1986) 50 (with ref.), who plausibly suggests the possibility that local tribes—indeed, the ever independent Thracians of Mt. Pangaion whose interests were threatened—should be counted among the most probable candidates.

\(^9\) We have omitted the following toponyms of probable pre-Roman date, which do not belong to urban settlements and remain unidentified (cf. Samsaris (1976) 196–97): Asyla (App. B Civ. 4.106); Biblia, or Bibline chora (Armenidas apud Athen. 131a); Daineros (letter of Alexander to Philippoi, see Philippoi); Himeraios (Thuc. 7.9 (141.4)); Nereidon Choroi (Ps.-Skymnos 6.49–51); Thasian Kephali (Strabo 7 fr. 44).

\(^10\) More or less regularly presented in *ArchDelt. Prakt* and, more recently, *AEWO*; results summarised by Isaac (1986) 1–71 and Papazoglou (1988) 345–413.
Apollonia, Daton, Drabeskos, Eion, Ennea Hodoi, Krenides, Myrkinos, Paroikopolis, (Herodotean) Pistyros, Sapai, Skapte Hyle, Skotoussa and Tristolos) remains, in our opinion, inconclusive, while that of Brea is unknown and strongly disputed. The following Inventory comprises thirteen settlements considered to have been poleis in the Archaic and/or Classical periods; in addition to the poleis, ten second-order settlements are known, to which can be added the remains of fourteen unidentified settlements.¹¹

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis

*Akontisma (Acontisma) Mentioned only in Roman literary and epigraphical sources as a station on the via Egnatia, situated in a narrow defile between Mt. Lekane and the sea, 9 miles east of Neapolis (It. Ant. 321.2, 331.3; Acontisma, It. Burd. 603.8: manusio Hercontroma; Amm. Marc. 26.7.12, 27.4.8, 36.7; cf. Collart (1935) 403 no. 1 for a milestone dated to the reign of Trajan), it is probably identified with a fortress built on a stronghold east of Nea Karvali (Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1972b)). Traces of C6l masonry in the Roman walls and C4 surface pottery were interpreted as indicating a strategically located emporion of Thasos, possibly with the name *Akontisma, controlling the passage to the lower Nestos valley (Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1980b) 320–22; cf. Isaac (1986) 12, 69). Not in Barr. Antisara (Ἀντισάρα) Steph. Byz. 100.17, quoting Herodian; Ath. 31A, quoting Armenidas (C4); cf. Νεάστολης παρα Ἀντισάραν (IG i³ 263,111,13). Citing some unnamed authors, Steph. Byz. 100.17 offers Τισάρη as an alternative toponym. Antisara was an urban centre (a polis according to Herodian (Steph. Byz. 100.17)) located, together with Oisyme, on the coast of the wine-producing Βιβλια χώρα (Armenidas apud Athen. 1.31a), which served Datos as a port (Steph. Byz. 100.17; ἐπίνευοι Δατηνῶν). It is probably to be identified with a fortified C6l settlement on the promontory of Kalamitsa, west of Kavala, with remains of a C6–C4 sanctuary, dedicated to Asklepios since C4e (Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1980b) 314–16; (1990) 500; plan in Lazaridis (1971) fig. 68; cf. Isaac (1986) 10, 65); presumably an emporion of the Thasians, serving as a maritime outlet for Datos. Barr. AC.

Drabeskos (Δραβησκός) Thuc. 1.100.3, 4.102.2, some MSS; cf. Herod. De prosodia cath. 3.153; also Δραβησκος (Thuc. 1.100.3, 4.102.2, some MSS; Strabo 7 fr. 33; Steph. Byz. 238.1) and Δραβησκος (Diod. 12.68.2); a Thracian settlement attributed to the Edonians and situated in the Thracian hinterland (Thuc. 1.100.3; cf. Steph. Byz. 238.1), called a polis only by Strabo (7 fr. 33). Together with Argilos and Daton it was situated not far from the Strymonic Gulf, and was said to have occupied, together with Myrkinos, the western end of the plain of Philippoi, near the river Strymon (App. B Civ. 4.13.105). In 465 it was the site of the catastrophic ambush by the Edonians of 10,000 Athenians and allies under Leagros and Sophanes attempting to establish a colony in Ennea Hodoi (Thuc. 1.100.3, 4.102.3; Diod. 12.68; Paus. 1.29.4; however, according to Hdt. 9.75 and Isoc. 8.86, the massacre happened ἐν Δάρῳ). Drabeskos was identified with the village of Zdravik (present-day Draviskos), 12 km north of Amphipolis, which presumably preserved the altered form of the ancient toponym (Papazoglou (1988) 391–92, contra Samsaris (1976) 141 and 145; cf. BE (1988) no. 854). Remains of a settlement from the Hellenistic period to late Antiquity at Frangala, 1–2 km to the west of Zdravik/Draviskos, were first recorded by Perdrizet ((1910) 14f; cf. Kaphtantzis (1967) nos. 568–74). In Barr. only HR, but Ca also attested.

Ennea Hodoi (Ἐννέα Ὀδοί) Thuc. 1.100.3 (χωρίων); Hdt. 7.114 (χώρως); Harp. Εξύν (τόπος); cf., however, Strabo 7 fr. 35 (Ἀθηναίων κτίσµα ἐν τ/Oψegas-ΧιΞταῶ τόπ/,lΨhas-ΧιΞταω τούτ/Oψegas-ΧιΞταω). However, if the plausible combination of Thuc. 4.102.2 and Diod. 12.68.1–2 is correct (Collart (1937) 60), Ennea Hodoi is the polis of the Edonians not named in Hdt. 5.126 (1497). Presumably identified with Hill 133, c.3 km north of Amphipolis (Lazaridis (1964), (1965a), (1965b); Pritchett (1965) 46, 48; cf. the grave mound at nearby Kastas: Lazaridis (1973); Isaac (1986) 4–5, 24, 28, 37; Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1993) 682–84). Barr. AC.

Gasoros (Γάσωρος) Hatzopoulos (1996) ii. no. 39.20 (AD

¹¹ It is noteworthy that inscriptions of the Roman period have preserved exceptionally full information on many unidentified rural settlements of Philippi, most of them bearing indigenous names and populated by pre-Roman inhabitants (Papazoglou (1988) 41–12, with complete list of the 15 known komai). Their names are either ethnic or derivatives of local epithets of gods, mostly of non-Greek (and non-Latin) origin (e.g. Satriceni, Kalpapouriati, Tazabasti). They may well have been pre-Greek settlements of unknown political status before the foundation of the Roman colony. Indeed, some of the unidentified rural sites attested by archaeological remains are dated to the Hellenistic period and earlier: fortress of Palaiokastro, 1 km east of Angista, with a Makedonian tomb and finds dating from C5 to the Roman period (ArchDelt (1968) Chron. 359–60; ArchDelt (1973) Chron. 455–59); rich tumulus at Nikisiani with six tombs dating to Philip II and Alexander (ArchDelt (1963) Chron. 257; ArchDelt (1964) Chron. 374); inscriptions from a settlement at Kalambaki (Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1968)), one mentioning ὁ δράχος. In view of the modest size of c.3 Philippi, it is very doubtful whether these settlements were part of their territory in pre-Roman times.
158); Γάζωρος in literary sources. A polis according to Steph. Byz. 195.7, listed among the cities of Odomantike and Edonis in Ptol. Geog. 3.12.8. The ethnic Γάζωρος, known from Steph. Byz., is epigraphically attested both individually (Roger (1945) 46, from Toumba (AD 144/5) and collectively (Hatzopoulos (1996) ii. no. 39.15–16 (c.215); cf. Roger (1938) (early third century AD)). Gasoros has been securely located on the hill of Ag. Athanasios, between the villages of Ag. Christophoros and modern Gasoros (Papazoglou (1988) 382–84 with refs.; for the identification of a C5–C4 cemetery west of the hill of Ag. Athanasios, cf. Samartzidou (1982); Tasia (1985)). Gasoros may have acquired polis status either under Philip II (Hatzopoulos (1996) i. 51–75) or at least under the Antigonids (Papazoglou (1988) 373), but all the evidence we have is Hellenistic and too late for inclusion in this Inventory. In Barr. only HR, but C also attested in the cemetery.

Paroikopolis (Παροικόπολις) A polis of the Sintike according to Ptol. 3.12.27 (cf. Hierocl. 639.8, but most importantly Phlegr of Tralleis (FGH 257) fr. 37, nos. 47–53 (first century AD)), it was presumably a Makedonian foundation, reinforced by large numbers of paroikoi, incorporated in the community as citizens with full civic rights (Papazoglou (1988) 372). It is probably to be identified with the remains of a large unnamed urban centre inhabited from C5, which was excavated at Sandanski. On the evidence of finds dating to the Hellenistic period, it was presumably organised as a polis at the time of the Roman conquest at the latest (ibid. 373–75). In Barr. only HR, but C also attested.

Pergamos (Πέργαμος) One of two fortresses (teichsea) of the Pieres in the plain crossed by the army of Xerxes south of Mt. Pangaion (Hdt. 7.112). It has been suggested that Pergamos was a member of the Delian League; but this is based on unconvincing restorations of the toponym (Περγαμοι) (IG i3 71.IV.61–62) and of the ethnic (Περγαμον) (IG i3 71.IV.64)). Pergamos, formerly sought at Eleuthereopolis (Pravi; cf. Samsaris (1976) 161) has tentatively been identified with a fortified settlement (surface Classical and Hellenistic pottery) located on the hill of Koules or Alonaki, near Mostheni (Pikoulas (2001) 64–65 and 176–79). Unlocated in Barr. and without periodisation.

Skapte Hyle (Σκαπτή Υλή) Hdt. 6.46.9; Plut. Cim. 4.3 (τῆς Θράκης χωρίων); Steph. Byz. 573.20 (Σκαπτησύλη πόλεις Θράκης μικρά ἀντίκρυ Θάσου); cf. IG v3 376B.118–19 (φθοίδες χρυσό Σκαπτεσύληκο). The restoration of the name of Skaptesyle after Maroneia and before Lysimacheia in the C3l theorodokoi list from Delphi (BCH 45 (1921) 111.94) seems unwarranted. A most important gold-mining area in the mainland peraia of Thasos, with a yearly yield of 80 talents (Hdt. 6.46); invariably sought on the slopes of Mt. Pangaion (TIR 54), it was more recently located east of Kavala, immediately below Mt. Lekani (Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1990) 493–96). Unlocated in Barr., dated C.

Skotoussa (Σκοτούσσα) Strabo 7 fr. 36; cf. Plin. NH 4.42 and 35; a polis in the Odomantike according to Ptol. 3.12.28. Located by Strabo (7 fr. 36) on the river Strymon, it is listed among the inland cities east of the Strymon by Pliny 4.42—indeed, between Herakleia of Sintike and Sirrai according to the Tábula Peutingeriana. It has been tentatively located north of Lake Tachinos, between Vana-vakostyn and Palaiokastro and, more recently, at Sidirokastron (Papazoglou (1988) 381–82, with refs.). Barr. C.

Trístolos (Τρίστωλος) A city of the Sintike attested in Ptol. 3.12.27 but otherwise unknown. It has been tentatively identified with the remains of an urban centre strategically located at Hijadnica, between the villages of Illindenci and Gorna Gradesnica c.15 km north of Sandanski (Papazoglou (1988) 375–76, with bibliography). Unlocated in Barr. and without periodisation.

2. Unidentified Settlements

The archaeological atlas of the area is further supplemented by frequent discoveries of numerous unidentified sites, mostly of Roman date. However, substantial archaeological remains of pre-Hellenistic date, including inscriptions, have been reported in the following locations.

Alisstrati (Panokklissi) Tombs dating from C4 to the Hellenistic and Roman periods indicate the presence of some still unidentified settlement—a kome? (Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1981) 346). Not in Barr.

Amygdaleonas (Vassilaki) Fortified citadel (irregular masonry), with pottery finds dating up to C4 (Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1986)). Probably identified with the Roman station Fons co on the via Egnatia (Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1983) 322; Samartzidou (1990)). Not in Barr.

Kali Vrysi (dept. of Drama) Remains of a C4l or C3e large unidentified building with regular masonry (Peristeri (1991) with plan). Not in Barr.

Karyani (on the coast) An ancient settlement was identified on Pithari hill, located 1 km to the east of Gaïdourokastro (= Galepsos (no. 631)). Not in Barr.

Mesia (Kavala, north-west slopes of Mt. Symbolon). C6l–C5e cemetery (Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1988)). Not in Barr.

Mesokomi Tombs of late Classical (C4s) and Hellenistic date (Poulios (1987)). Not in Barr.

Nea Karvali (south-west) Unidentified trapezoidal C6 to Roman period fortress located on a hill (Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1990) 502 n. 68; possibly an island in Antiquity) west of Nea Karvali (plan in Lazaridis (1971) fig. 70), formerly identified with Acontisma (Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1967)); Lazaridis (1971)). The fortress, which controls a natural port, was occupied according to surface pottery from C6l, being some unknown Thasian *emporion* (Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1972b), (1990) 503 n. 69, (1980b) 320–22). Not in Barr.

Nea Zichni C.1 km south of the village a cemetery dated from C6 to C3 was excavated, presumably belonging to a settlement located on a neighbouring hill (Samartzidou (1982); cf. Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1983) 323). Not in Barr.

Nikesiane A rich tumulus with six tombs dated to the reigns of Philip II and Alexander III (ArchDelt (1963) Chron. 257, (1964) Chron. 374). This evidence is perhaps not quite enough to justify Barr’s classification of the site as a settlement. Barr. C.


Podochori North of the deserted village, on the flank of Mt. Pangaion, a cult cave (Arkoudotrypa) with rich ceramic finds dating from the early Bronze Age and from C6 to the Roman period (Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1982) 327). In Barr. only RL, but AC also attested.

Statthmos Angistas (Angista station) Remains of an extensive cemetery, with phases from prehistoric to historic (C4s pottery) periods (Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1989)) including a Makedonian tomb (Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1973) 455, (1973–74) 786–87) were discovered on the hills to the west of the important but unknown urban centre identified at Paliakastro west of the village of Angista Station. Not in Barr.

II. The Poleis

627. Apollonia Map 51. Lat. 40.45, long. 24.10. Size of territory: ? Type: A.α. The toponym is Ἀπόλλωνια, ἡ (Dem. 9.26; Strabo 7 fr. 35 (rC4f)). Apollonia is implicitly called a *polis* in the urban sense at Dem. 9.26, where Olynthos, Methone and Apollonia are juxtaposed with thirty-two unnamed Thracean *poleis*, all destroyed by Philip; cf. also Strabo 7 fr. 33 and Pompon. 2.30. *urbs*.

Apollonia was located on the Pierian coast between Galepsos and Oisyme, on the cape enclosing the Strymonic Gulf from the east, opposite Mt. Athos (Strabo 7 fr. 33; Plin. *HN* 4.42). It was an allegedly Ionian colony (Steph. Byz. 106.13, probably referring to Dem. 9.26). Together with Galepsos, it was conquered and destroyed by Philip II (Strabo 7 fr. 33E; Dem. 9.26), presumably following the capture of Krenides in 356 (Hammond and Griffith (1979) 363). This Apollonia has often been confused with Apollonia in Mygdonia (Hirschfeld (1895); cf. Papazoglou (1988) 399–400, see *supra* no. 545).

Apollonia is tentatively identified with the sparse remains on the rocky promontory called Pyrgos Apollonias (ruins of a Byzantine fortress), c.6 km to the east of the Loutra Eleutheron (Papazoglou (1988) 400, following Collart (1937) 88ff).

628. Berga (Bergasios) Map 51. Lat. 40.55, long. 23.30, but see *infra* for a recently established different location. Size of territory: probably 3. Type: B:β. The toponym is Βέργα, ἡ (IG iv.2.1 94.19 (360/59); Ps.-Skymnos 653–54; cf. also Ptol. 3.12.28) or Βέργη (Strabo 7 fr. 36; Steph. Byz. 163,31 and Hieroc. *Synedr.* 640.6; cf. Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (2000) 351, n. 9 for an unpublished C4 inscription from Dion, where the toponym (dat. Βέργη) is mentioned twice) or Βέργιον
(Steph. Byz. 163.18). The city-ethnic is Βεργαίος (IG i3 261.1v.29; Bonias [2000] 231; cf. Alexis fr. 90.1, PCG). Berga is called a polis only in late sources (Ptol. 3.12.28; Steph. Byz. 163.13). In Strabo 7 fr. 36 it is called a kome in Bisaltia. The site-classification as a polis in the Classical period is corroborated (a) by the appearance of the Delian League (infra); (b) by the C5 coins; and (c) by the listing of Antiphanes Bergaios (probably the famous C4 author of Apista) among the theorodokoi to host theoroi from Epidaurus (IG iv².1 94.19). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins (infra) and in an inscription of C5f (Bonias [2000] 231) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (infra). For the individual and external use, see Polyb. 34.6.15.

Recorded between Amphipolis and Tragilos in the Epidaurian theorodokoi list, Berga is located by Strabo (7 fr. 36) in the territory of the Bisaltai, c.200 stadia (some 36 km) upstream from Amphipolis in the Strymon valley. Berga was usually sought in different locations on the west bank of the river Strymon, which was considered to be the easternmost frontier of Bisaltia (for a review of the various identifications, see Koukouli-Chryssanthaki [2000] 353–58). It is now identified beyond reasonable doubt with the remains of an important urban centre by Neos Skopos, close to the eastern bank of the now drained Lake Achinos (ancient Kerkinitis) in the lower Strymon basin (Bonias [2000] 236 n. 28; Koukouli-Chryssanthaki [2000] 359–61, recording imported Ionic and Attic pottery of C6 and C5 date, C5 and C4 Attic sculpture, and various finds indicative of strong Thasian and Attic influence). On the remnants of the defence circuit—now destroyed—see Samsaris (1976) 133. The use of the Parian–Thasian alphabet in the new C5f inscription from Neos Skopos (Bonias [2000]) strongly supports the view that Berga was established as a dependent colony and, probably, emporion of Thasos providing access to commercial routes and Thracian resources through the Strymon and the Angites valleys. In 463, following the suppression of its secession from the Delian League, Thasos must have lost control of Berga along with the rest of its mainland possessions.

Consequently, the Bergaians became members of the Delian League. Berga belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 451 (IG i3 261.1v.29) to 429/8 (IG i3 282.11.32) a total of seven times. There is a gap of twelve years between 447/6 and 435/4, and Berga is absent from the full panel of 443/2 (IG i3 269.11.27–11.33). The gap may be connected with the Athenian venture to settle 1,000 colonists in Bisaltia (Plut. Per. 11.5; cf. Hammond and Griffith [1979] 117). Berga paid 2,880 dr. in 452/1 (IG i3 261.iv.29), 3,240 dr. in 447/6 (IG i3 265.1.93) and 3,120 dr. from 435/4 on (IG i3 277.vi.30).

In the new inscription, the obscure term βoλη is unconvincingly interpreted as a reference to a council (Bonias [2000] 231 line 3). Berga is recorded in the Epidaurian list of theorodokoi of 359 (IG iv².1 94.1.b.19). The name of the theorodokos was Antiphanes, who may be identical with the author whose patris was Berge according to Ps.-Skymnos (653–54) (Isaac [1986] 59).


629. Datos (Datenos) Map 51. Lat. 40.55, long. 24.20, in Barr. recorded as Fons Ca (...). Size of territory: probably 3. Type: A?β. The toponym is Δάτος (IG iv².1 94.32), η (Ephor. fr. 37), or once δ (Theopomp. fr. 43), also Δάτος, τό (Ps.-Sklay 67; Steph. Byz. 221.3). The city-ethnic is exclusively attested in late literary sources in the collective and external form (Harp. Δ7; Strabo 7 fr. 36). Datos is called a polis Hellenis by Ps.-Sklay 67 and in Harp. Δ7 quoting Ephoros, where we cannot be sure that the term polis stems from Ephoros (cf. fr. 37).

Δάτων/Δάτων appears to have been the name both of the settlement itself and of the surrounding region (Ephor. fr. 37; Suda Δ92). Datos was proverbially rich in fertile lands, timber and gold mines (Harp. Δ7; Suda Δ92). It was inhabited by Edonians (Hdt. 9.75), and situated near the Strymonian Gulf (Strabo 7 fr. 33; cf. fr. 36). The region has been identified with a more or less vast area including the left (east) bank of the lower Strymon below Mt. Pangaios, bordering on ancient Lake Prasias and extending across the Strymon–Angites confluence further eastward into the territory of the Edonians, probably into the marshlands of the plain of Philippos (Collart [1937] 133–37; cf. Hammond and Griffith [1979] 72, 188; Vatin [1984] 265–68; Borza [1989] 63–65). Antisara, situated on the Gulf of Kavala, west of Neapolis, served as its outlet to the sea (Steph. Byz. 100.17: ἐπίνειον Δατηνῶν). Herodotos (9.75) locates in the region of Datos the massacre by the Edonians of the Athenian settlers under Leagros and Sophanes in 465.
Part of the Datos region probably became the territory of the homonymous urban centre, an *apoikia* founded c.360 by the Thasians (Diod. 16.3.7 (r360/59); cf. Eust. *ad Dion. Perieg.* 517 = *GGM* II 315.40–44) under the exiled Athenian Kallistratos (Ps.-Skylax 67; Isoc. 8.24; Zenobios 4.34, where τίνι άντίπεραν γίνει οίκησαν shows that Θασίων is an obvious emendation of *Μία Θραϊκών*). In 360/50 Datos appointed a *thedorodos* to host the *theoroi* of Epidaurus (*IG* i3.1.94.32).

By founding the colony at Datos, Kallistratos and the Thasians created a bridgehead aimed at controlling the whole of the Datos region, which is identified with the “Thasian continent” of the coinage minted in 360. Recently it was tentatively proposed to identify Datos with the fortified settlement on top of Vassiliki hill, near the village of Amygdaleonas, at the entrance of the pass leading from the plain of Philippoi over Mt. Symbolon to Neapolis (Samartzidou (1990)).

Shortly afterwards Datos was conquered by Philip of Macedon and renamed Philippoi (Harp 27, quoting Ephor. fr. 37; Philoch. fr. 37). Epigraphic evidence indicates that Datos and its territory (or at least part of it) were absorbed into the territory of Philippoi: *Δάτου χώρα* is mentioned in Alexander’s settlement concerning the territory of Philippoi (*SEG* 34 664.15; Hatzopoulos (1996) ii. no. 6), and the hypothesis is further corroborated by the plausible identification of Timandros, the Epidaurian *thedorodos* in Datos (*IG* iv2.1.94.32) with Timandros the father of five citizens of Philippoi honoured with *proxenia* in a Delphic decree of C4S (Syll.3 267A.3; cf. Collart (1937) 177–78). Thus, Datos was incorporated into Philippoi, and it is this reform that lies behind the information in several sources that Datos was renamed Philippoi. A complete equation of Datos with Krenides-Philippoi, as indicated at App. *B Civ.* 4.13.105 (rC4) and accepted by Avramea in *TIR* 23–24, is plausibly refused by Hammond (Hammond and Griffith (1979) 187–88, cf. 235). According to Vatin ((1984) 267–68), Krenides was the name of a locality populated by Thracians on the border of the region called Datos.

### 630. Eion

Map 51. Lat. 40.45, long. 23.50. Size of territory: probably 3. Type: A: ? The toponym is Ἡιὼν, Ἡ (Hdt. 7.25.2; Thuc. 4.102.3; *SEG* 27 249 (*Cse*); *IG* i3 265.1.105). The only attestation of a city-ethnic is at Steph. *Byz.* 298.22. Eion is called a *polis* in the urban sense by Herodotos (7.131.1), who also mentions the *asty* and its defence circuit (*teichos*, 7.107.2), whereas Thucydidcs calls it a maritime *emporion* of the Athenians (4.102.3). On the combined evidence of literary and numismatic sources, Hansen argues that Eion was not simply a fortified *emporion* (Isaac (1986) 60–63; cf. Papazoglou (1988) 388) but indeed a (dependent) *polis* in the political sense (Hansen (2000) 197–98), at least until the foundation of Amphipolis.

Eion is said to be the maritime outlet (*limen*) of Amphipolis (schol. Thuc. 1.98.1). Literary sources identify Eion as Ἡ ἐπί Στρυμόνι (Hdt. 7.25.2; Thuc. 1.98.1) and Ἡ πρὸς Ἀμφιπόλεις (Dem. 23.199), as opposed to Ἡιὼν ἐπί Θρᾴκης, the homonymous colony of Mende in the Chalkidike (Thuc. 4.7; see no. 570). Colonising ventures in the area of Eion by the Parians (no doubt involving the Parian colonists of Thasos) are inferred from a C6 epigram from Amphipolis (Lazaridis (1976); cf. *BE* (1978) no. 297; *SEG* 27 249 (525–490)) combined with extensive C7–C6 archaeological remains in the area. Eion is recorded as a strongly fortified supply base of the Persian army in *C5e* (Hdt. 7.25.2), heroically defended by its governor Boges against the Athenians in 476/5 (Hdt. 7.107). After a protracted siege by the Athenians under Kimon, Eion was conquered and exposed to *andropodismos* (Thuc. 1.98.1). Its capture raised unprecedented enthusiasm in Athens (Plut. *Cim.* 7–8; cf. Perdrizet (1910) 9–11), which reveals the strategic importance attached to the conquest. Eion became an *emporion* of the Athenians and was used as a base for their penetration and colonising efforts in the Strymon valley (Drabeskos: Thuc. 4.105; cf. schol. Aeschin. 2.31), which culminated in the foundation of Amphipolis in 437/6 (Thuc. 4.102). It became a strongly fortified naval base (Thuc. 4.107.2), and in 447/6 Abdera is recorded in the Athenian tribute lists paying 1 talent to Eion (*IG* i3 265.1.105). In the Peloponnesian War it controlled the entrance of the river, especially during the siege of Amphipolis in 424 and 422 (Thuc. 4.106–8, 5.6). It was probably incorporated into the territory of Amphipolis (cf. Theopomp. fr. 51). After the fall of Amphipolis in 424, Brasidas’ attack on Eion failed (Thuc. 4.107.1–2), and Eion served as a base for Kleon’s campaign in 422 (Thuc. 5.6). The Athenians in Eion were, however, forced into exile after Aigos potamoi (schol. in Aeschin. 2.31). At an unspecified date, Eion was razed to the ground by the Athenians, and its Amphipolitan inhabitants were expelled (Theopomp. fr. 51; cf. Jacoby *ad loc.* 364, where the event is connected with the operations of Chares against Philip II in 357), following which Eion does not appear in any source, either historical or geographical.

According to Thuc. 4.102.3, Eion was situated on the estuary of the river Strymon, 25 stadia (c.30 stadia according to Diod. 12.73.3) downstream from Amphipolis. It was usually
sought at the mouth (most probably on the left bank) of the Strymon (Collart (1937) 73ff). The acropolis of Eion was recently identified on the Prophitis Elias hill, with surface finds dating from C7 to C5f (Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1980a) 423) and C6 cemetery strata (Koukouli-Chryssanthaki and Samartzidou (1984) 276; cf. Pritchett (1965) 40 and Papazoglou (1988) 389. For remains of the pre-colonial period, see Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1993) 684–85). A fragmentary boundary stone of “Classical date” from the ruins of the Byzantine castle of Marmarion is tentatively restored as indicating the presence of a sanctuary of Artemis in the area (Papangelos (1990); cf. BE (1991) no. 414).

A number of C5f silver and electrum coins discovered in the area have been attributed to Eion. (1) Electrum: denominations: hekte and fractions. Type: obv. goose with or without lizard; rev. incuse square. (2) Silver: denominations: drachm and fractions down to hemiobol. Type: obv. one or two geese usually with lizard, often letters in field; rev. incuse square (Head, HN² 197; SNG Cop. Macedonia 173–81).

**631. Galepsos (Galepsios)** Map 51. Lat. 40.45, long. 24.00 (to be distinguished from Galepsos in Sithonia (no. 571); size of territory: probably 3. Type: [A]:a. The toponym is Γαληψος, ἡ (Thuc. 4.107.3; schol. Thuc. 5.6.1; Ps.-Skylax 67), said to derive from Galepsos, son of Thasos and Telephe (Marsyas the Younger (FGIH 136) fr. 5). The city-ethnic is Γαλήψος (IG 1³ 259.14.15). In Ps.-Skylax 67 Galepsos is the third of four toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις Ἑλληνίδες αἵδε (Marsyas the Younger (FGIH 136) fr. 5). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins (infra) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (infra). For the individual use and external use, see an undated Athenian funerary inscription (SEG 32 297; cf. no. 571).

Galepsos was a colony (apoikia) of Thasos (Thuc. 4.107.3, 5.6.1; Heraclid. Pont. fr. 125, Wehrli; Diod. 12.68.4). Qualified as a πόλις Ἑλληνικής and one of the emporia of the Thasians by Ps.-Skylax 67, it is generally considered as one of the mainland emporia of Thasos (Avram (1995) 193: “Urspriinglich bloss ein Emporion der Thasier”) or rather a dependent polis and an emporion in the mainland peraia of Thasos (Hansen (1997) 88, (2000) 199).

Galepsos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG 1³ 259.14.15) to 415/14 (IG 1³ 290.111.21, heavily restored) a total of fourteen times, paying first c.1½ tal. (IG 1³ 259.14.15) reduced to 3,000 dr. in 443/2 (IG 1³ 269.111.3) and further reduced to 1,000 dr. in 433/2 (IG 1³ 279.11.35). After the fall of Amphipolis in 424, Galepsos was won over by Brasidas with the assistance of the Makedonian king Perdikkas (Thuc. 4.107.3), but was recaptured by Kleon two years later (Thuc. 5.6.1). It was conquered and destroyed by Philip II (Strabo 7 fr. 35), presumably soon before or after his capture of Krenides in 356 ( Hammond and Griffith (1979) 363; however, it was probably refounded by the Makedonians, as inferred by the mention of Galepsos in Livy (44.45.14–15 (rC2f)), drawing on Polybios.

Galepsos is generally identified with the ruins at Gaidourokastro, a C5e fortified citadel, strategically located south of the village of Karyani (7–8 km south-west of Orfano), which dominates both the Strymonic Gulf and the Pierian coast (Collart (1937) 78–80, following Perdrizet (1894) 440; detailed description of the site in Bakalakis and Mylonas (1938); plan of the citadel in Lazaridis (1971) fig. 64). The earliest finds are dated to C7l and C6e (Romipoulo (1960)), indicating its foundation as a Thasian colony as early as C7l, possibly on the site of a pre-existing Thracian settlement. A C6–C4 cemetery, including both inhumation and cremation burials, was excavated on a low hill, south-west of the citadel, some 200 m from the coast (Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1972c) 526–27). The existence of a sanctuary of Zeus, worshipped with the epithets herkeis, patrois and ktesios, is assumed from the discovery of two C5l–C4e boundary stones with characteristic Parian/Thasian lettering (Collart (1937) 79, n. 4, with refs.). Moreover, the urban centre at Gaidourokaston may be related to the neighbouring coastal settlement identified 1 km to the east, on the Pithari hill, which is probably linked to the C6 tombs excavated in the vicinity, and with an unlocated sanctuary of Demeter with a hekatompedos temple, mentioned on four inscribed boundary stones found at the foot of the hill (unpublished; cf. Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1982) 325–26; BE (1994) no. 433).

Galepsos struck bronze coins, probably in C4e, but so far only three pieces are known (Bon and Bon (1936); BCH (1930); cf. Robert (1940) 90, n.1). Obv. head of Dionysos; rev. protome of ram; legend: ΓΑΛΗΨΙΩΝ (Bon (1936) 172–74; Robert (1940) 90 n. 1; Liampi (1991) 30 with n. 63). These coins are sometimes erroneously attributed to Galepsos on Sithonia (Blanchet, RN (1937) 325; Demetriadi (1974)).

**632. Krenides (Krenites)** Map 51. Lat. 41.00, long. 24.15. Size of territory: ? Type: Bα. The toponym is Κρηνίδες, αἱ (IG 1² 127.45; Tod 157, 356; Diod. 16.3.7). The city-ethnic is
κρηνίτης (Artam. fr. 15, GGM 1 476). Krenides is called a polis in late sources only (Diod. 16.8.6 (1361)), but polis status in C4 is strongly indicated by its mint (infra). The legend on the coins shows that the polis was a Thasian dependency (infra). In C1 it had dwindled to a κατοικία μικρά (Strabo 7 fr. 41).

Krenides is said to have drawn its name from springs rising near the foot of its acropolis (App. B Civ. 4.105; Strabo 7 fr. 34; cf. Collart (1937) 399f). It was colonised by the Thasians c.360/59 (Diod. 16.3.7). That the exiled Athenian Kallistratos was involved in the colonisation is argued by some historians (Hammond and Griffith (1979) 188–88, 235; Vatin (1984) 267–68), but has no foundation in the sources (see supra).

Krenides was located near Mt. Pangaion, possessing numerous gold mines, where the city of Philippoi was eventually established (Strab. 7 fr. 34; Artem. fr. 15; Diod. 16.3.7). Threatened by Thracian attacks, it requested aid from Philip II, who occupied and fortified it (356), introducing new Makedonian settlers and renaming it Philippoi (Artam. fr. 15; Diod. 16.3.7, 8.6; Steph. Byz. 383.9–10; App. B Civ. 4.105; see infra 865).

Krenides struck coins of gold and bronze c.360–356. Type: obv. head of Herakles; rev. tripod (gold), or club and bow (bronze); legend: ΘΑΣΙΟΝ ΗΠΕΙΡΟ. The types are identical with those of Philippoi, which shows that they were struck by the precursor of Philippoi, i.e. Krenides (Head, HN² 217; Le Rider (1956) 16–19; Kraay (1976) no. 509; SNG Cop. Macedonia 219).

634. Neapolis (Neopolites) Map 51. Lat. 40.55, long. 24.25. Size of territory: probably 2. Type: Αα. The toponym is Νέα πόλις (IG iv² 263.111.13–14; Ps.-Skyrax 67; IG iv² 1 94.27 (360/59)) or Νέα Πόλις (IG iv 101.44; Ps.-Skymnos 659), often accompanied by geographical specifications: εν Θράκη (IG iv² 259.vi.9–10) or παρά Αντισάραν (IG iv² 263.111.13) to distinguish it from homonymous cities. The city-ethnic is Νεαπολίτης (IG iv 101.2) or Νεαπολίτης (E.Delphes 111.4 414.13 (C3)) and is often geographically specified: Νεαπολίτης παρ’ Αντισάραν (IG iv² 278.v.14–15) or Νεαπολίτης οἱ ἀπὸ Θράκης (IG iv¹ 101.32 and 48). The second part of the compound toponym testifies to the polis status of Neapolis. In Ps.-Skyrax 67 Neapolis is one of the toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις Ελληνιδεῖς αἰδε, where polis is used in the urban sense; and in the so-called Charter of the Second Athenian Naval League Neapolis appears under the heading πόλεις αἰδε σύμμαχοι (IG iv 43.78 and B.34). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins (infra) and externally in the Athenian decrees and tribute lists (supra). The individual and external use is attested in a Thasian inscription of C3 (IG xxi.8 263.12–13).

Neapolis was situated at the northernmost limit of the Strymonic Gulf, near the coast of the Datoeni (Strabo 7 fr. 32 and 36) not far from Daton itself (Ps.-Skyrax 67). It is the last city attested by Ps.-Skyrax 67 west of the river Nestos; in the list of the Epidaurian theorodokoi it is recorded before Abdera and after Mende (IG iv² 1.1 94.27), in the Delphic list.
of *theorodokoi* after Philippi and Oisyme but before \[\Sigma^1\]árrm (BCH 45 (1921) 111.82). According to Cassius Dio (47.35.3) it was located on the coast opposite Thasos, separated from the plain of Philippi by Mt. Symbolon. The port of Neapolis is mentioned in an Athenian decree of 409 (IG¹³ 101.28; Lazaridis (1969) 20 and 23). The proposed identification with Kavala (Heuzey and Daumet (1876) 18–20; cf. Collart (1937) 105–6) was archaeologically confirmed by the discovery of segments of polygonal fortification walls of a Classical citadel on the Pharos peninsula (plan in Lazaridis (1971) fig. 69).

The disputed origin of Neapolis from either Thasos or Athens or Eretria (Collart (1937) 112–24) was settled by Pouilloux ((1954) 158ff), who emphasised the decisive argument provided by the archaeological material: Thasian–Parian lettering in C6 graffiti and standard Thasian types of early Neapolis coinage (Kraay (1976) 150–51). It is notable that in 411–409, at the request of the Neopolitans, Athens erased the expression reference to Neapolis being a colony of Thasos from the first of two hortific decrees (IG¹³ 101.7, 8 /rasurae/; cf. 68–69).

Neapolis was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and was entered on the Athenian tribute lists first by toponym (IG¹ 259.v1.9–10) but from 443/2 by city-ethnic (IG¹ 269.11.28). It is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG¹ 259.v1.9–10) to 429/8 (IG¹ 282.11.19–20) a total of fourteen times, once completely restored, and paid in all years 1,000 dr. (IG¹ 265.1.20).

A further proof of its continued independence of Thasian control is inferred from the fact that it had control over customs dues collected in its own harbour (IG¹ 101.27–30; Isaac (1986) 67). Thus the fact that some Neopolitans possessed property in Thasos, which was confiscated by the oligarchic government of that island in 411 (IG¹ 11.8 263.5–7, 12–13), reflects most probably the survival of a situation dating from before 463, when Neapolis, with the rest of the Thasian *peraia*, was detached from the territory of Thasos.

Following the defection of Thasos from the Athenian League in 411, Neapolis remained loyal to Athens, causing Neopolitan oligarchs to take refuge in Thasos, while the property of Neopolitan democrats in Thasos was confiscat-ed (IG¹ 11.8 263; cf. the admission into the citizen body of Thasos of presumed Neopolitan refugees born of Thasian mothers (IG¹ 11.8 264 (c.408–404); cf. Wilhelm (1911–32) ii (1914) no.14; Collart (1937) 129–30). Unsuccessfully besieged by the Thasians, the Neopolitans were praised by the Athenians for their loyalty and for participating in the siege of Thasos by Thrasyboulos (IG¹ 101 (410/9)).

A problematic inscription from Paros (IG¹ 109 (C5l–C4e)), usually considered as a treaty between Thasian oligarchs and Paros with the participation of Neopolitan refugees (*of Νεοπολίται εἰς Ἐν Θάσου*), has been interpreted as a peace treaty between Thasians and Neopolitans organised by Paros (Pouilloux (1954) 178–92; cf. IG¹ 11.8 264, from Thasos and the fragmentary treaty of reconciliation between Thasos and Neapolis in 390 recently discovered in Delphi: Moretti (1987) with refs.).

Having preserved its independence from Thasos in the aftermath of the Peloponnesian War, Neapolis became a member of the Second Athenian Naval League in 375/4 (IG¹ 11² 43B.34). This independent status seems to have been preserved even after the expansion of the *peraia* of Thasos in the plain of Daton in 360/59, obliging Thasos to seek an alternative outlet to the sea for the production of her new possessions: it may account for the record of Antisara as a port of the Datoii in Steph. Byz. (100.17). In the spring of 355 Neapolis sent ambassadors to Athens to negotiate the conclusion of an alliance with Athens, presumably against Philip II of Makedon (IG¹ 128). The termination of the Neopolitan coinage around the same period indicates the final annexation of Neapolis to the Makedonian kingdom. C3 epigraphic testimony from Delphi (F.Delphes vv. 111.4 414.13) and the fact that Neapolis hosted *theoroi* of Delphi in C3l (BCH 45 (1921) 111.82) indicate that its civic status remained unchanged after the foundation of Philippi; cf. Papazoglou (1988) 403.

The poliad deity of Neapolis was Athena Parthenos, as confirmed by epigraphic and figurative testimonies (Bakalakis (1936a) 33 nos. 1 and 2). The relief crowning a C4m Athenian decree in favour of the Neopolitans represents Athena and a *polos*-wearing goddess, identified by the legend *ΙΑΠΟΘΕΝΟΣ* (IG¹ 128; Lawton (1995) no. 28), and Parthenos is presumed to be represented in the relief crowning the C5l decree as well (IG¹ 101; Lawton (1995) no. 7). Her sanctuary, attested in IG¹ 101.45, 57 and 63 (cf. Tod 84), was identified on decisive epigraphic evidence with the archaeological remains of a monumental C6 temple (Ionic capitals and fragments of entablature) discovered inside the citadel, on the Pharos peninsula in Kavala, presumed to have replaced an earlier wooden construction. The earliest pottery finds in the sanctuary were dated to c.650–625 (Lazaridis (1961–62) 235–6), while a rich Archaic deposit yielded Thasian, Corinthian and East Greek ware (625–600) and C6m Attic black-figure (Lazaridis (1961–62)); for probable pre-colonial pottery, cf. Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1993) 686–87). Moreover, a cult of Artemis with the epithet *Opitais* is epigraphically attested (Lazaridis (1941–42)). Some
further information concerning religious institutions in Neapolis is preserved in a C4 (?) inscription mentioning a neokoros of the Parthenos and the existence of a kreasphylakion (= archives; Collart (1937) 108–9).

Neapolis struck silver coins from c.530 to the Makedonian conquest in C4m, and bronze in C4s. (1) Silver on the Babylonian standard, c.530–C5l: denominations: stater, third, ninth. Type: obv. Gorgoneion; rev. incuse square. (2) Silver on the Phoencian standard, C5l–C4m: denominations: drachm, triobol, diobol. Type: obv. Gorgoneion; rev. head of Parthenos; legend: NEIOI or NEIOPOLEITENΩν. (3) Bronze, C4e onwards: obv. Gorgoneion; rev. head of Parthenos, or Parthenos standing; legend: ΝΕΑΠΟΛ or ΝΕΑΠΟΛΙΤΗΩν (Head, ΝΕΑΠΟΛΙΤΩΗ 1966; Bakalakis (1987) 318–19; Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1980b) 317–18; Koukouli-Chryssanthaki and Papanikolaou (1990)).

635. Oisyme (Oisymaia) Map 51. Lat. 40.50, long. 24.20. Size of territory: probably 3. Type: A: a. The toponym is Οἰσυμή, ή (Thuc. 4.107.3; Ant. fr. 25, Sauppe), Οἰσύμη in the Delphic list of theorodokoi (BCH 45 (1921) 111.81), identified in Steph. Byz. 487.8 with Homeric Αἰσύμη (Hom. II. 8.304). Oisyme is said to have been renamed Ἡμαθία after Makedonian Emathia (Ps.-Skymnos 456–58; Steph. Byz. 487.8), presumably following its occupation by Philip II. The city-ethnic is Οἰσύμαιος (C4 stamped amphora handles (Bakalakis (1938) 101–2; cf. Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1969)). Both the toponym and the ethnic are epigraphically attested in C3 (SGDI 2600; BCH 45 (1921) 111.81; cf. Robert (1940) 89 n. 4). Oisyme is called a polis by Harpokration (Ο12), quoting Ephoros (fr. 36): πόλις ἐστὶ τῆς Θρ/Οψegas-ΧιΞταάκης καθαφασιν ἄλλοι τε καὶ Ἐφορος ἐν δ'. Here Ephoros is probably quoted for the site-classification, since Harp. quotes Antiphon for the toponym. Polis is probably used in the urban sense (see Ant. fr. 23, Sauppe). In Ps.-Skylax 67, Oisyme is the last of four toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις Εὐλαριάδες αἰδε, where polis is used in the urban sense; cf. Ps.-Skymnos 656–57. For polis used in the political sense, see Diod. 12.68.4 (rC5s). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on stamped handles (supera) and on coins (infra). The individual and external use is attested in a C3m Delphic proxeny decree (SGDI II 2600).

Oisyme was a colony (apokitia) of Thasos (Thuc. 4.107.3; Diod. 12.68.4 (rA244)). Qualified as a πόλις Ἐλληνίς and one of the emporia of the Thasians by Ps.-Skylax 67, it is classified as both a dependent polis and an emporion in the mainland peraia of Thasos (Hansen (1997) 88, (2000) 199).

Situated in Thrace (Ephor. fr. 36), Oisyme is indeed the only city of the Thasian peraia mentioned in Homer (Il. 8.304). Listed in the C3l Delphic list of theorodokoi between Philippoi and Neapolis (BCH 45 (1921) 111.81), it is located by Armenidas (apud Athen. 1.31a), together with Antisara, in the βιβλία χάρα renowned for the excellent quality of its wine, and by Ptolemys on the coast of Edois (Ptol. 3.12.7).

Oisyme joined Brasidas after his capture of Amphipolis in 424, following the example of Myrkinos and Galepsos (Thuc. 4.107.3). Thereafter and during C4 her fortune seems to have followed that of the neighbouring communities: Phagres, Galepsos and Apollonia.


The acropolis wall was built over a pre-colonial stratum on the hill-top (plans in Lazaridis (1971) figs. 66–67; Giouri and Koukouli (1987) 366) and shows two distinct phases (irregular polygonal and rectangular ashlar local granite masonry, respectively); in C5f, a second wall extended the walled area to the north. The settled area spread to the south-east flank of the hill, towards the natural harbour. The cemetery of Oisyme, excavated in the sea-coast sand-dunes south of the citadel, testifies to the existence of the settlement from 650 to 625 and indicates close cultural relations with Thasos and its mainland colonies (Giouri and Koukouli (1987) 365, with refs.). Remains of a monumental rectangular C5e temple excavated at the top of the acropolis hill (plans in Giouri and Koukouli (1987) plans 2–3; Koukouli-Chryssanthaki and Papanikolaou (1990) 488) were found to succeed an older temple which was destroyed in C5e. A pre-colonial stratum was identified under the Archaic temple (Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1987), (1988)). Finds in the destruction layer and in a nearby deposit include roof tiles, decorated terracotta antefixes, C7s–C5e pottery, various types of terracotta female figurines, and fragments of large-size C6l clay kore-type statues, mostly relating to materials from Thasos. Imported ware include C7 and C6 Corinthian, Attic, Cycladic and East Greek productions. The excavators attributed the sanctuary—mainly on the basis of the figurine types and of bronze shield dedications—to Athena Polias, referring to the sanctuary of the...
same goddess on the acropolis of Thasos, which also suf-
furred destruction in C5e and was similarly reconstructed on
a larger scale. The construction of the C5 temple in Oisyme
is considered to be contemporary with the restoration and
extension of the defence walls, as in the case of Thasos. Its
destruction layer abounds in C2 pottery (C4–C2 are re-
presented only sparsely in surface finds).

Rare C4 bronze coins of Oisyme have been related to a
short period of civic autonomy (Picard (1993); cf. (1994)
467). Type: obv. head of helmeted Athena; rev. kneeling
archer Herakles; legend: ΟΙΣΥΜΑΙΩΝ (Head, HN² 892).

Size of territory: probably 3. Type: [A]:α. The toponym is
Φάγρης, -ης (Hecat. fr. 156; Hdt. 7.112.2; Ps.-Skylax 67).
The city-ethnic is Φαγρήσιος (SEG 38 656 (C4)). In Ps.-
Skylax 67, Phagres is the second of four toponyms listed
after the heading πόλεις Ἐλληνιδῶν αἴδε, where polis is
used in the urban sense. In Hdt. 7.112.2 it is described,
together with Pergamon, as a teichos of the Pieres (Hdt.
7.112), whereas Thuc. 2.99.3 calls Phagres a chorion. That
Phagres was a polis in the political sense is indicated by its
mint (infra) and by the recording of its city-ethnic in a
Delphic catalogue of communities which seem to have been
either poleis or islands with more than one polis (F.Delphes
111.1 497.4 (C4l–C3ε)). The collective use of the city-ethnic is
attested internally in abbreviated form on coins (infra) and
externally in the Delphic catalogue (supra). The individual
and external use is attested on a C4 funerary stele from
Eleutheropolis (SEG 38 656).

Phagres was one of the πόλεις Ἐλληνιδῶν in Thrace, list-
ed between Amphipolis and Galepsos by Ps.-Skylax 67 and
further described as a Thasian emporion. From the time of
Philip II and Alexander III it was part of Makedonia (Strabo
7 fr. 33). Phagres is said to have been settled by Pieres
expelled from the Makedonian Pieria under Perdikkas I east
of the mouth of the river Strymon, at the westernmost end
of the Pierian coast (Thuc. 2.99.3). It must have been strong-
lly fortified, as indicated by its classification as a teichos in
Hdt. 7.112.2. At an unknown date in C6(?), Phagres was pre-
sumably colonised by the Thasians and incorporated in
their mainland peria. Together with Galepsos and
Appollonia, Phagres may have been one of the poleis occupied
and destroyed by Philip II after his capture of Amphipolis
(Strabo 7 fr. 35; cf. Dem. 9.26).

The urban centre was tentatively located on a hill
(Kanoni) rich in ancient remains east of the village of
Orphanion, c.8 km to the east of the mouth of the Strymon
(Leake (1835) iii. 176ff), followed by Perdrizet (1894) 440 and
Collart (1937) 76ff; cf. BE (1990) no. 491). Recent excavations
on the site revealed abundant C6–C5e good-quality Attic
and Thasian pottery, which was collected from a group of
circular pits and was interpreted as remains from a destruc-
tion suffered by the city in C5f (Nikolaïdou-Patera (1989)
490). Archaeological remains, including a Hellenistic build-
ing and a cemetery of Hellenistic date (C3l–C2ε) located to
the north-west of the hill, indicate the survival of the settle-
ment probably down to the Roman period (Nikolaïdou-
identification was confirmed by the discovery of one bronze
coin of C4f. Type: obv. laureate head of Apollo; rev. lion pro-
tome; legend: ΦΑΙΡ (Liampi (1991)).

637. Philippoi (Philippeus) Map 51. Lat. 41.00, long.
24.15. Size of territory: probably 2 or 3. Type: Β:α. The
toponym is Φιλιπποῦ, οἱ (Arist. M. auc. 833.28; Artem. fr.
15, GGM 1 576.7 (rC4m); BCH 45 (1921) 111.80 (C3l)). The
city-ethnic is Φιλιππεῶς (IG iv 617.21 (C4l)) or (once in
Polybios) Φιλιππηγός (fr. 85), or (internally and in plural)
Φιλιπποῦ (coins, infra; Hatzopoulos (1996) ii. no. 36.13, Kos:
τὸν πόλιν τὴν Φιλίππων, 243; cf. Hatzopoulos (1993) 322
with n. 22). Philippoi is not called a polis in any Classical
source, but its status as a polis is strongly indicated by its
C4m coinage combined with numerous attestations of polis
status in the Hellenistic period (Rigby (1996) no. 27.7, 9.13,
15 (243/2); Hatzopoulos (1996) ii. no. 37.2 (C2); Artem. fr.
15, GGM 1 576.7; cf. Hammond and Griffith (1979) 358–61). The
collective form of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins (infra) and in inscriptions (IG iv 617.21 (C4l); IG ii²
1956.149 (C4l)). For the individual and external form, see IG
vi 2433, Thebes (C3–C2).

Founded and fortified by Philip II (Artem. fr. 15), who inter-
vened to protect Krenides in 356 when it was threatened by
the Thracians of Kersebleptes in 356, Philippoi is recorded as hav-
ing replaced Krenides (Strabo 7 fr. 41 and 43; Diod. 16.3.7, 8.6; Artem. fr. 15 (all rC4f) or Daton (Ephor. fr. 37; Philoch. fr. 44;
cf. App. B C iv. 4.13.105; Krenides = Daton = Philippoi). The
identification of Timandros (the theorodokos of the Epidaurian
theoroi at Daton in 360/59 (IG iv 1.94.32)) with the father of five Philippeis appointed proxeni of Delphi in a
C4l decree (Syll.³ 267A; cf. Collart (1937) 177–78) confirms the
permanence of the pre-Makedonian population (of Thasian
origin) in Philip's new foundation.

Philippoi is listed between Amphipolis and Oisyme in the
catalogue of Delphic theorodokoi (BCH 21 (1945) 111.80). It is
located near Mt. Pangaion, rich in gold and silver mines, on
the site of Krenides (Strabo 7 fr. 34; cf. fr. 41); it is also said to lie near Mt. Symbolon, which extends between Neapolis and Philippoi, i.e. in the plain between the mountains (Dio Cass. 47.35.4). According to App. B Civ. 4.105, the city of Philippoi covered—at least in Roman times—the entire width of a steep hill. The original boundaries of Philippoi remain unknown.

A boundary settlement concerning Philippoi dictated by Alexander III (recently, Hatzopoulos (1996) ii. no. 6 = Ager (1996) no. 5) and dated to 335 or 330 attests not only to ambassadors of Philip II submitting requests to the Makedonian king (ii.11, as restored in Ager), but also to the king’s intervention in matters of boundary disputes: viz. exploitation and allocation of uncultivated lands and dues thereon (1.4–6); delimitation and re-establishment of the integrity of the territory (1.8) initially donated to the city by its founder Philip II (1.8–13), which had apparently been trespassed upon (8 and 12), presumably by the Thracians; a special provision (exclusion?) concerning part (more than 2,000 plethra) of the territory of Daton (1.13–15); the measurement and addition of new territory (11.1–2); the confirmation of territorial rights of Philippoi as opposed to those of the Thracians (11.2–5), followed by a summary topographic delimitation, presumably the new borders of the territory of Philippoi mentioning hills (11.7), attributing to Philippoi the land around the territory of Sirra (11.8) and including Daineros, as established by Philip II (11.8–10), allocating the marshes to Philippoi as far as “the bridge” (11.12–13), and provisionally forbidding sales of forest land on Mt. Dyson (11.10). The document indicates that the boundaries of Philippoi following Alexander’s arbitration (and confirming Philip’s initial settlement—as indeed in the Roman period (Papazoglou 1982) 99–102)—included only part of the territory to the west and north-west (possibly east of Mt. Menoikon), allowing the Thracians of the Strymon valley to remain in possession of at least part of their lands.

Attested sales transactions from Philippoi include the sale of sacred lands in C45 (temene), and a unique testimony regarding civic taxation is inferred from the mention of a c.2 per cent ἐπώνιον imposed on land transactions. The documents also record several deities worshipped in C45 Philippoi, one each for Ares, Poseidon and the Heroes, two for Philip—presumably Philip II, being the object of heroic cult as the krites of the city (Hatzopoulos (1996) ii. no. 83; cf. Ducrey (1988), (1990)).

The constitution of pre-Roman Philippoi presents all the characteristics of a Hellenistic polis. It is inferred from, especially, the decree of asylia for Kos (Hatzopoulos (1996) ii. no. 36, Kos (243) = Rigsby (1996) no. 27), that the original constitution remained unchanged during C4 and most of C3. The documents confirm the particular political status of Philippoi, formally founded as a—theoretically—Independent polis, an ally of the Makedonians, yet institutionally organised on the Platonic model current at that time (Hatzopoulos (1996) i. 158–60, 186–88). Furthermore, evidence from unpublished hierokerykeia sales deeds supports the view that the calendar used in pre-Roman Philippoi was not the Makedonian, but “an original calendar with names of months formed on the names of the Twelve Gods, just as in Cassadreia”, another Makedonian foundation with closely related institutions of Platonic inspiration according to Hatzopoulos (Hatzopoulos (1993) 322–23; cf. (1996) i. 158–60). Philippoi, as the oldest Makedonian foundation, must have served as a model for subsequent foundations.

The political status and institutions of the pre-Roman city were recently reconstructed from Hellenistic epigraphic material (Hatzopoulos (1993); cf. Hatzopoulos (1996) i. passim).


638. Pistyros

Map 51. Lat. 41.00, long. 24.35 in Barr. but see infra for an alternative location. Size of territory: probably 3. Type: Aca. The toponym is Πίστυρος (Hdt. 7.109.2). Pistyros is not mentioned in any other source, unless it is identified with Βιστίρος, πόλις Θράκης ὡς Πίστυρος τὸ ἐμπόριον (Steph. Byz. 171.6). Thus, the polis Bistiros is explicitly distinguished from the empöron Pistoiros, mentioned again at Steph. Byz. 524.11: Πίστυρος, ἐμπόριον Θράκης, undoubtedly to be identified with the toponym Πίστυρος and the collective ethnic Πιστυρινοί epigraphically attested in a recently published C4 inscription from Vetur in Bulgaria (SEG 43 486 = BCH 123 (1999) 246–56).

At Hdt. 7.109.2 Pistyros is called a polis twice, first in the territorial sense, denoting the town with its hinterland, next in (probably) the urban sense, perhaps with the territorial sense as a connotation. It is described as one of the coastal ἡπειρώτιδες πόλεις of Thasos, qualified as Ἑλληνική and παραβαλλασσαία, situated near a salt lake west of the Nestos estuary, on the route traversed by Xerxes’ army through southern Thrace in 480 (Hdt. 7.109–10).
Pistyros has tentatively been identified with the remains of a Col fortified settlement east of Pontolivado, located near the Vassova salt lake. Archaeological reports (Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1972a) 529, (1973) 451; (1980b) 322–25; cf. Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1990)) record fortification walls with regular masonry of the “Thasian” type, Thasian stamped amphoras and roof tiles stamped ΘΑΣΙΩΝ, indications of active metal working (silver), traces of buildings dating to C2 and an important coin hoard, containing coins of Neapolis and Thasos dated c.520–510 (Oikonomidou (1990)). It is possible that the homonymous C5–C4 emporion excavated in the upper Hebrus valley, near Vetrin in Bulgaria (Velkov and Domaradzka (1994) = SEG 43 486) duplicated—or replaced—the coastal settlement, following the successful penetration of the Thasians deep into the Thracian hinterland (Loukopoulos (1999) 368).

639. Sirra (Sirraios) Map 51: Lat. 41.05; long. 23.35. Size of territory: probably 3. Type: C:β. The toponym is Σίρρα, η (Theopomp. fr. 125) or Σέρρα (Hierocl. Synedkl. 639.10) or Sirai (Livy 45.4.2). The city-ethnic is Σειραῖος (Papakonstantinou-Diamantourou (1971) 140 no. 223 (C3); IG xi.18 206.8 (first century AD)) or Σιρραίος (CIG 2007 (first century AD)). The only source in which Sirra is called a polis is Steph. Byz. 572.16: Σίρρα, πόλις Θράκης, quoting Book 20 of Theopompos' Philippika (fr. 125); but it is unknown whether Steph. Byz. found the site-classification in Theopompos' work or just the toponym.

First mentioned in Theopompos, Sirra is located in the territory of the Odomantes according to Livy 45.4.2. Its polis status and civic institutions are epigraphically attested only for the Roman period (Papazoglou (1988) 379–81). According to Hatzopoulos, it was one of several native communities expanded with immigrants under Philip II and extended to comprise a vast territory with its komai (Hatzopoulos (1996) i. 70). For the participation of Sirra in the local Pentapolis—probably also in the earlier local sympoliteia—see supra 857/859, Gasoros, and Berga (no. 628).

The territory of Sirra (Σειραῖη γῆ) is mentioned in the settlement of Alexander III concerning Philippoi (Hatzopoulos (1996) ii. no. 6,18 (330)). It was, together with the otherwise unknown Daineros, the northern limit of the territory granted to the city of Philippoi by Philip II.

Sirra survives with its name virtually unchanged from Antiquity through the Middle Ages to the present day (Seres). On the precise location of ancient Sirra on the Koulas hill dominating the modern city from the north, and the sparse ancient remains, see Bakalakis (1957) and Samsaris (1976) 128, with references. Some commentators (How and Wells (1928) ii. 274) have improbably identified Σίρρα with Σίρης τῆς Παλαιᾶς in Hdt. 8.115.3; cf. Steph. Byz. 572.9.
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I. The Region

East of the lower Nestos and its delta, along the Aegean coast, extend vast alluvial expanses. They are barred to the north by the formidable heights of the Rhodope Mts. and bordered to the east by Mts. Ismaros and Zonaia. This fertile plain is richly watered and often flooded by the Nestos (Strabo 7 fr. 44; cf. Theophr. Hist. pl. 1.3.5) and by numerous lesser rivers. They drain the overlying southern flanks of the Rhodopes, and are—from west to east—(a) Koudetos (Ps.-Skylax 67), (b) Trauos, (c) Kompatsos/Kompsantos (Hdt. 7.109; cf. also Ael. NA 15.25), (d) Kossinites, which flows into Lake Bistonis, and (e) Lissos (Hdt. 7.108, 109). Now, as in the past, vast tracts, particularly near the coast, are covered by extensive marshes, some of them forming lakes. The most important are, to the west, Lake Bistonis, by Dikaia (Hdt. 7.109; Strabo 7 fr. 47) and to the east, Lake Ismaris, between Stryme and Maroneia (Hdt. 7.109; Strabo 7 fr. 44). Thus, most of the otherwise fertile and arable expanses were plagued by a notoriously noxious climate, as is evidenced by records in the works of Hippocrates (see infra, s.v. Abdera). A second coastal plain stretches east of the Rhodopes and the Zonaia Mts. It receives the abundant waters of the Hebros river and its tributaries and forms the maritime exit of this river’s valley. The Hebros river provides easy access to the uppermost reaches of the Thracian plain and hinterland, and is indeed the unique waterway leading north from the Aegean coast through the outstretched beachy plain named Doriskos.

By contrast with the lands west of the Nestos, there are no precious mineral resources in the area between the Nestos and the Hebros. Moreover, the narrow gorges of the Nestos and the few passages afforded through the Rhodopes made regular communications with the Thracian hinterland virtually impossible. Furthermore, the warlike Thracian tribes created an impenetrable barrier along the northern limit of the coastal plain and endangered east–west land communications across narrow passes crossing the Nestos river and overriding the Zonaia Mts.² The tribes were—from west to east—the Sapaioi/Saioi/Sinties (Strabo 12.3.19), the Bistones, the Kikones, the Korpiloi and the Apsinthians, Paitoi (Hdt. 7.110). Yet, the area attracted early on the interest of Greek colonists, both from the adjacent northern Aegean islands, Thasos and Samothrake and from East Greek cities. A detailed, yet partially confusing description of the geography and settlement pattern of the area in early C5 is provided by Herodotos in connection with Xerxes’ campaign through southern Thrace in 480 (Hdt. 7.58–59, 108–9).

By C6s, despite long and ferocious Thracian reaction, the coastal plain west of Mts. Ismaros and Zonaia had been divided between three Greek colonies: Abdera, Dikaia and Maroneia, and at least one emporion of the Thasians: Stryme; while Samothrake claimed a series of mainland beachheads on the opposing coastline, east of Cape Serreion and the Zonaia Mts: viz. Zone, Mesambria, Drys and Sale. Moreover, Aiolians from Alopekonnesos, reinforced by colonists from Mytilene and Kyme, founded Ainos at the Hebros estuary, with a territory extending east of the river along the gulf of Melas and protected by a number of unnamed forts (Ps.-Skylax 67).

As with the most of Thrace, this part of the Aegean coast was occupied by Megabazos in the aftermath of Dareios’ Skythian expedition (Hdt. 4.143–44, 5.1–26; cf. Balcer (1972); Castritius (1972); Hammond (1980)). He established a fortified supply base at Doriskos (Hdt. 7.25, 59), securing control of both the east–west and north–south throughfares as well as of the crossing of the Hebros. Following the departure of Persian forces, the area was drawn into the Athenian sphere of interest, and the cities became members of the Delian

¹ For a succinct presentation of geomorphology, mountain passes and natural resources of the area, see Casson (1926) 9–12, 21–24, 24–25, 30–31, 32, 52–79, 90–91, who overestimates, in our opinion, the importance of land routes (correctly assessed by Isaac (1986) 73–74, 140–46).

² The famous passes of the Sapaioi and the Korpiloi mentioned in literary sources are of Roman date. Cf. Collart (1929) and, more recently, Loukopoulou (1987) and (1997), with refs.
League, as evidenced by the contributions recorded in the Athenian tribute lists.

In the course of C5s the cities of the area developed close relationships with the Odryssian kingdom, furthering both their own and the Athenian financial and political interests, a role renewed in C4 in connection with the Second Athenian League, until Macedonian rule extended over the entire Thrace under Philip II.

The impressive wealth of the major poleis in the area—Abdera, Dikaia, Maroneia and Ainos—should probably be attributed more to their key position in politics and finance rather than to the agricultural value of their territory, although they did have a rich production, and export, of grain and fish and of the famous wine from the vineyards of Mt. Ismaros (Casson 1926: 90–92). Their early success is attested in literary sources as well as in the quality, early date and wide distribution of their coins, in particular those of Abdera, Dikaia and Ainos. They must have had direct or indirect access to the valuable mineral resources of the region, which enabled them to develop a delicate network of advantageous political and commercial relationships, and to exploit their intermediary position between the Greek world of the Aegean and the Thracian hinterland (Loukopoulou (2002)).

Written sources pertaining to the region between the rivers Nestos and Hebrus provide us with information about a total of nineteen named settlements of the Archaic and Classical periods, of which twelve are attested as poleis, whereas seven are non-polis settlements or poleis about which we do not have sufficient evidence to establish their status. In addition to the nineteen settlements attested in the written sources are remains of eight unidentified settlements. Despite rather extensive archaeological research, especially in recent decades, only five of the poleis have been securely identified: viz. Abdera, Ainos, Kypselia, Maroneia and Zone. In our opinion, the location of the other seven remains inconclusive. The inventory below comprises twelve settlements considered to have been poleis of type A, B or C in Classical Antiquity. The remaining fifteen settlements are as follows in the next two sections

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements

Charakoma (Χαράκωμα) Unidentified settlement (probably teichos or emporion?) in the peraia of Samothrace (Strabo 7 fr. 47 (48): Σαμοθράκων πόλεις); in C3 it hosted the teiri of the Delphic Apollo C3 (Plassart (1921) 18, 111,72; cf. Isaac (1986) 133, with refs. and bibliography; TIR 22). Barr. H, but, although the earliest explicit attestation is of C3, the settlement seems to have existed already in C4.

Doriskos (Δορίσκος) Hdt. 7.59.1, 108.1, 121.2 (τείχος βασιλίδων); Ps.-Skylax 67 (τείχος); Aeschlin. 3.82 (τεῖχος); cf. Dem. 18.70, 19.156; Harp. Δ75 (χωρίον της Θράκης). Fortified stronghold located in the homonymous vast plain (and beach) extending west of the Hebrus delta and east of the peraia of Samothrace actually located on the river bank and probably controlling an important crossing point (Isaac (1986) 137–40). The only source to call it a polis is Steph. Byz. 236.5. A C3/C2 proxeny decree discovered on the hill Saraya, usually identified with Doriskos, has been attributed, without conclusive evidence, to this city (Bakalakis (1961) 18–19). Barr. AC.

Ismaros (Ἰσμάρος) Hom. Od. 9.197. According to lexigraphic sources (Harp. M7; Hsch. I44), Ismaros was the older name of Maroneia. In the Odyssey (9.40–41) it is called a polis. According to Strabo 7 fr. 43 it was—-with Xanthia and Maroneia—one of three poleis of the Kikones, situated near Maroneia and the sea-ward outlet of Lake Ismaris (for the lake, located between Maroneia and Stryme, cf. Hdt. 7.109). Ismaros was tentatively identified (Bakalakis (1958) 97) with the prehistoric acropolis of Ergani (Turkish Asar Tepe) or, more probably, though with no decisive evidence, with the fortified acropolis of Ag. Georgios, east of Maroneia, with finds dating to the prehistoric and early Iron Age (Isaac (1986) 112; Bakirtzis and Triantaphyllos (1988) 56). Unlocated and without periodisation in Barr.

Mende (Μένδη) Paus. 5.27.12; cf. 5.10.8. Pausanias quotes an elegiac couplet, perhaps of the Archaic or Classical period, commemorating the Mendain's conquest of Sipte.
Mende is described as a Greek settlement of Ionian colonists near Ainos, at some distance inland from the sea. On its disputed location and its presumable status—one of the forts (τείχες) of the Ainians?—see Isaac (1986) 158. The couplet's reference to an ethnic—Μενδαῖοι—may indicate that Mende was a polis, but the evidence is too slim to allow inclusion in the Inventory. Not in Barr. AC.

Sipte (Σίπτης) Paus. 5.27.12 (τείχος καὶ πόλις). A Thracian fortified settlement, presumably in the hinterland of Ainos. Pausanias quotes an elegiac couplet of, perhaps, the Archaic or Classical period, commemorating a victory over Sipte by the Mendaians (supra). Sipte may have been a polis, but the evidence is too slim to allow inclusion in the Inventory. Not in Barr.

Xantheia (Ξάνθεια) Strabo 7 fr. 43 (πόλις). In Barr. recorded as a Classical settlement near Lake Vistonis. However, the reference given does not support the suggested location.


II. The Poleis

640. Abdera (Abderites) Map 51. Lat. 40.55, long. 25.00. Size of territory: 5. Type: Α:α. The toponym is Ἄβδηρα, τά (Anakreon fr. 505, Page; Hdt. 8.120; Thuc. 2.97.1; IG iv2 1990.1 94.1b.28) or, once, Ἄβδηρος (Ephor. fr. 154) or, once, Ἄβδηρα, ἦ (Diod. 31.8.8). The city-ethnic is Ἀβδηρίτης (Hecat. fr. 158; Hdt. 7.120; F.Delphes 111 i 149.2 (C4l–C3e)) or Ἀβδηρίτης (IG i3 263,111.21). Abdera is called a polis both in the political sense (Anacr. fr. 100 = AG 7.226; Aen. Tact. 15.10) and in the urban sense (Hdt. 7.109.3; Thuc. 2.97.1; Aen. Tact. 15.9; Ps.-Skylax 67). At Thuc. 2.97.1 the territorial sense is a connotation. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins (infra) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 263,111.21) and in literary sources (Hdt. 7.120). The individual and external sense is used in reference to ἄμμοκριτος Ἀβδηρίτης (Arist. Cael. 303a4) or Πρωταγόρας Ἀβδηρίτης (Pl. Resp. 660c) and a C5 Attic sepulchral monument (IG i3 1018).

Abdera was a coastal city situated on the left (eastern) bank of the Nestos estuary (Hdt. 7.126), across the strait from Thasos, in a heavily marshy area often flooded by the river (Strabo 7 fr. 44; Casson (1926) 9–10; Lazaridis (1971b) 2ff). Originally, the area belonged to the neighbouring Thracian tribe of the Sintoi, known also as Saioi or Sapaioi (Strabo 12.3.20). Despite the moorlands and the noxious climate (Mart. 10.25; cf. Cic. Att. 7.7.4; Lucian, Hist. conjur. 2; and numerous passages in the Hippocratic literature),
Abdera came to own fertile agricultural land (Pind. fr. 52b.25) and fishing banks rich in cuttle fish and mullets (Archestratos frs. 43, 56, Olson and Sens) The city occupied one of the very few natural harbours east of the Nestos and had access to an important though probably rarely practicable land route linking the Aegean coast to the Thracian hinterland and to the Istros, probably through the modern Nymphaia pass (Thuc. 2.97.1–3; cf. Samsaris (1980) 58, 79).

The territory of Abdera was called *Αβδηρίτες* (Theophr. Hist. pl. 3.1.5) or *Αβδηριτῶν χώρα* (Aen. Tact. 15.8). During the Classical period it presumably extended from Lake Bistonis to the Nestos and from the Aegean coast to the northern end of the plain and the southern foot of Mt. Rhodope, roughly along the modern Xanthe–Toxotes motorway (Lazaridis (1971b) 2 nos. 5–9; Samsaris (1980) 62–63; Skarlatidou (1984a) 150; Isaac (1986) 73); it was crossed by the course of the river *Kossinites*, which flowed into Lake Bistonis (Ael. NA 15. 25; identified with the river of Xanthi; Pantos (1975–76), (1983)). The territory of Abdera appears to have included at least one second named but unlocated urban centre, *Bergepolis* (Pantos (1975–76) 3, 10, (1983) 166, no. 8; see infras.v.).

The population of Abdera, the largest city in the northern Aegean coast, has been variously calculated as from 70,000 to 60,000 to 100,000 (Lazaridis (1971b) 33–34. 167–70; Samsaris (1980) 167; Skarlatidou (1984a) 154–55); on epigraphic evidence from Teos (Herrmann (1981)), supported by the size of tribute paid by Teos and Abdera respectively, the latter's population was presumably 2.5 larger than that of her metropolis (Graham (1991), (1992) 59).

Strabo's testimony at 3.4.3 concerning a homonymous Phoenician foundation in southern Spain led modern historians to suggest a Phoenician origin both for the toponym and for the initial foundation of Abdera (Isaac (1986) 76–77). However, literary tradition records a first unsuccessful colonizing venture by Klazomenians under the leadership of Timesios (Hdt. 1.168; Plut. Mor. 812A; Ael. VH 12.9) c.650 (Solin. Coll. 10.10; Euseb. Chron. 95b, Helm). That another early, yet equally unsuccessful, attempt was undertaken by the Thasians has been argued by Isaac (1986) 79–80 on the basis of Archilochos' accounts of ferocious fights against Thracian Saioi (= Sinties = Sapaidaios). For a critical view, see Graham (1992) 48.

Abdera was eventually refounded in 544 by Teians fleeing from Persian rule (Hdt. 1.168–69; Strabo 14.1.30; Ps.-Skymnos 670–71; cf. Isaac (1986) 81–85, with an interesting analysis of the poems of Anakreon, who participated in the foundation of the colony). Pindar's second *Paian* (Radt (1958); cf. Isaac (1986) 85–86) records the colonists' successful struggles to establish and extend their territory until C6s, probably even C5m (Graham (1992) 62–64); according to Strabo, some of the Teian refugees were eventually repatriated (Strabo 14.1.30; cf. Veligianni-Terzi (1997) 692–93).

The history of Abdera in the late Archaic and Classical periods has been largely reconstructed on the basis of the numerous and plentiful series of its important coinage by May (1966). However, recent numismatic research by Katerina Chryssanthaki (dis. Paris IV, 2000; forthcoming) has brought forth evidence which leads to a drastic revision of May’s dates, and consequently of his historical reconstruction. In anticipation of Chryssanthaki’s substantial revision of May’s seriation and dating, the following account is based mainly on the testimony of literary, epigraphic and material sources other than the important numismatic evidence.

Abdera rapidly grew into a major financial power. Its silver coinage, presumably initiated as early as c.540–35 (May (1966) 49–58; Kraay (1976) 35; cf. however Chryssanthaki, forthcoming) and widely exported and distributed in the East, indicates direct access to rich silver-bearing Thracian regions (Mt. Symbolon, west of the Nestos or the Thracian hinterland?). Her growing rivalry with Thasos became manifest during the period of Persian occupation. Following Dareios’ Skythian expedition, the Thasians were denounced by their neighbours for planning rebellion, and were ordered by Dareios to demolish their fortifications and bring their ships to Abdera (Hdt. 6.46.1), while the latter city was rewarded with the Persian king’s trust and friendship (Hdt. 8.12.20).

Under unknown circumstances and at an unspecified date Abdera joined the Delian League. Numismatic evidence during the period following the evacuation of the Persians appears to indicate a further increase of the city’s opulence, especially following the sedition and fall of Thasos in 463/2. Abdera belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i¹ 259.v.5) to 429/8 (IG i¹ 282.11.30) a total of thirteen times, once completely restored, paying an exceptionally high *phoros* of mostly 15 tal. (IG i¹ 261.v.17) reduced to 10 tal. from 432/1 on (IG i¹ 280.11.46). In 425/4 and 422/1 it was presumably assessed for tribute together with Dikaia (IG i¹ 71.111.153–4 and IG i¹ 77.iv.29–30, city-ethnics completely restored), see infras.v.

Abdera’s opportunistic policies revived after the rise of the Odrysian power: with the Abderitan Nymphodoros as intermediary, she was the first to establish relations with the
Odrysian royalty (Hdt. 8.29.1, 5). The purpose was evidently to secure and develop her exploitation of Thracian resources, even under burdensome financial obligations. On the justifiably disputed tribute imposed on Abdera and other Greek cities of the northern Aegean by the Odrysians, see Veligianni (1995a) and Loukopoulou (2002). The same Nymphodoros extended his services by negotiating in 431 in favour of the Athenians the valuable alliance of the Odrysian king Sitalkes, not least the ephemeral rapprochement of Perdikkas, king of Macedonia (Staatsverträge 165). The reduction of Abdera’s tribute to the League by some 33 per cent in 432/1 may have been a reward in recognition of Nymphodoros’ mediation (Isaac (1986) 102; for a different interpretation, see ATL iii. 310–11). There is no satisfactory explanation of the marked reversal of this situation in 425, when Abdera (with Dikaia) was assessed for the enormous sum of 75 tal. (IG i² 71.111.153–54). Dissatisfaction and unrest among Athen’s allies in the northern Aegean resulted in Abdera’s defection from the League, probably following the second secession of Thasos in 411 (Isaac (1986) 105). Abdera was brought back into the League by Thrasyboulos in 407 (Diod. 13.72.2; Xen. Hell. 1.4.9; cf. May (1966) 181–83).

In 376/5 Abdera fell victim to a massive invasion of Triballians, allegedly assisted—if not invited—by Maronitans; despite untrustworthy support by neighbouring Thracians, the city suffered enormous losses and was saved from complete devastation only thanks to the intervention of an Athenian squadron under Chabrias (Aen. Tact. 15.8–10; Diod. 15.36.1–4). An Athenian garrison was established, and Abdera became a member of the Second Athenian Naval League (IG i² 43.B.3 = Tod 123; Diod. 15.36.3–4; cf. schol. Ael. Arist. 172.7, 173.17). Still suffering from the disastrous effects of her crushing defeat, the city was occupied by Philip II (Polyaen. Strat. 4.2.22; for diverging opinions on the date, see Isaac (1986) 106). In 346/5 Athens granted asylum to pro-Athenian refugees from Abdera (IG i² 218).

Abdera seems to have persistently maintained close relations of affiliation with its metropolis, Teos, down to the Roman period. Characteristically, colony and mother city shared the same religious festivals (Herrmann (1981); Graham (1991)); Abderitan coins (and amphora stamps; cf. Lazaridis (1954) 169) show that a griffin was the city emblem of both poleis, while occasional decrees promulgated in Teos are expressly proclaimed valid also for Abdera (Herrmann (1981) from Teos (C5f)); one contains public imprecations and seems to be a kind of citizen oath applying equally to Teians and Abderitans (SEG 31 985). Also two decrees of Abdera were found in Teos (Herrmann (1971), (1981)).

In C5 the constitution was presumably democratic, as is indicated by the provision that confiscation of property, imprisonment and capital punishment could only be imposed by a court manned with a minimum of 500 citizens (SEG 31 985.A.13–22; Lewis (1982)). Predictably, some at least of the institutions of Abdera reproduced those of its metropolis; most importantly, as in Teos, the board of executive magistrates in Abdera were the timouchoi (Bousquet (1940–41) 100–107; C3m, from Delphi). As in Teos, the citizen body of Abdera appears to have been subdivided in smaller entities; the only one attested in Abdera may be a subdivision of a phyle, perhaps a genos (see ‘Ερµῶναξ Διονυσᾶδος Εὐρυσθείνηδης in a C4l dedication (Kallintzi and Veligianni (1996); SEG 46 841). The eponymous official was presumably the priest of Apollo, at least after C4m (Lazaridis (1971b) 27, 140; Thrace (1994) 61). The names engraved on Abderitan coins (ἐπὶ τοῦ δεῖνος Δηµόκριτος Εὐρυσθείνηδης) are usually interpreted as those of annual(?) mint officials. One C5s moneyer, Δηµόκριτος, is often identified with the pre-Socratic philosopher of Abdera (Isaac (1986) 103). Other institutions, including the boule and demos of Abdera (Herrmann (1981)) and magistracies, are only expressly attested in epigraphic sources of Hellenistic and Roman date.

An Abderitan ambassador is said to have been sent to the king of Sparta, Agis, son of Archidamos, in the latter part of C4 (Plut. Mor. 215 E). Abderitans are awarded proxenia by Athens (IG i² 77 (378/7); SEG 35 71 (332/1)) and Kolophon (AJP 56 (1935) 363 l. 142 (C4l)). In 370/69, a golden crown is recorded as offered by the Abderitans to the goddess of Athens (IG i² 142.119 (370/69)). In 359 the city had a theoderokos to host theoroi from Epidaurus (IG iv2. 9.41b.28). Our knowledge of Abderitan legislation is limited to a C5 Abderitan law forbidding the burial of persons who had dispersed the family fortune, recorded in connection with Demokritos (Ath. 4.168b), and a C4 regulation concerning the marketing of cattle (Feyel (1942–43) 180, no. 2).

Pindar’s second Paian evokes the organisation of the army (with emphasis on cavalry units) in the first days of the establishment of the colony (Pind. fr. 52b.104; cf. Isaac (1986) 85–86). Some indications of the importance of its size can be obtained in relation to the battles fought in 376 against the invading Triballians (Lazaridis (1971b) 33–34 nos. 168–70).

The polis deity of Abdera was probably Dionysos, frequently mentioned by Anakreon (Isaac (1986) 82–85). Also important was the cult of Apollo, evoked with the eponym
Derainos or Derenos in Pindar’s second Paian (Pind. fr. 52b.5) and regularly portrayed on C4 coinage (Isaac 1986: 84 n. 65, 106–7). Also attested in epigraphic and literary sources is the celebration of Thesmophoria, Anthesteria, Herakleia and the festival of Zeus (Herrmann 1981), the cult of Athena Epipyrgitis, probably imported from the metropolis Teos (Lazaridis 1971b: 27 no. 138; Skarlatidou 1984a: 158), that of Aphrodite and Hekate (Pind. fr. 52b.5; 78; cf. Isaac 1986: 107–8), and a grove dedicated to the Nymphs near the city wall (Lazaridis 1971b: 41 no. 206); for the discovery of a C4–C3e sanctuary presumably of Demeter or Kore, see Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1982) 3, (1983) 7; Skarlatidou (1984a) 159; Koukouli-Chryssanthaki (1987b) 180–82, (1988) 143–45, (1989) 222–23, (1992) 165–66). Further attested are the heroic cult of Abderos, celebrated with athletic contests, excluding horse and chariot events (Philost. 2.25: presumably to be identified with the hero Mesopolites Epenor (Kallintzi and Veligianni 1996: 62), and that of Timesios the Klazomenian (Philostr. 2.6.3: presumably to be identified with the hero Mesopolites Epenor (Kallintzi and Veligianni 1996: 62), and that of Timesios the Klazomenian kritos of the first colony at Abdera (Hdt. 1.168); in C4s, Parmenion is said to have built a temple for Jason (Strabo 11.14.12).

Abdera has been identified beyond any doubt with the archaeological site near Cape Bouloustra (with visible remains of the modest Byzantine town Polystylon on its south–west end), some 7 km south-west of the homonymous (formerly Bouloustra) modern village (Reinach 1881: Regel 1887; Kazarow 1918)). Despite dramatic geomorphological mutations of the lowlands from the alluvial activity and the westward movement of the Nestos estuary (cf. Strabo 7 fr. 43), recent excavations have uncovered parts of the Archaic and Classical polis, located further north of Cape Bouloustra, presumably on a promontory linked to the mainland by a narrow strip with natural bays to the east and west: identified are parts of two early phases (C7s–C5: Kokouli-Chryssanthaki 1987b: 177–83) of fortification walls protecting the city’s portuary installations (a neosoikos), remains of an important public building (Koukouli-Chryssanthaki 1991: 200–1), traces of C6–C4 houses and the C7s–C6f (Klazomenian) cemetery (Koukouli-Chryssanthaki 1997)). A vast Late Classical–Classical tumuli necropolis extended to the north and north-west (Romipoulou 1964: 377; Lazaridis 1965: 460–61; Triantaphyllos 1973–74: 809–10; Koukouli-Chryssanthaki 1982) 9–16; Triantaphyllos (1975) 297–98). Two gates are known from literary tradition: the Thracian (Hip. 3.3.17) and the Prourides (Callimach. 4.90). Due undoubtedly to the changing geomorphology, the site was abandoned in C4m (Koukouli-Chryssanthaki 1987a: 412), and the city was relocated further south, where systematic excavations since the early 1950s have revealed segments of the C4 fortifications with a gate, and several insulae of Hellenistic and Roman dwellings. The walls enclosed an area of 112 ha, and the city was apparently grid-planned from its foundation (Hoepfner and Schwandner 1994: 180–87). Only undated traces of the theatre (TGR ii. 115) were identified (Lazaridis 1971b: 38 no. 193; Lazaridis 1966: 359–61; Triantaphyllos (1984: 32–33), but it is attested in a C2 inscription (Avezou and Picard 1913: 122–24, 128–29; BCH 37 (1913) 122–37 (C2)) and mentioned by Lucian in a C4l–C3e context (Hist. conscr. 1). The palaistra (Hippocr. 6.8.30: palaistrophe-lax) remains unidentified.

Abdera struck high-quality coins from C6s and throughout the entire Classical period. Its mint was one of the most important and enjoyed a wide circulation. Seriation and dating of this coinage, established by May’s exhaustive study (1966), has now been drastically revised following important evidence mainly from coin hoards discovered in various parts of the East (Price and Waggoner 1975; Mattingly 1977)). Since the results of recent research are still unpublished (cf. supra 873), it is preferable to refrain from reproducing May’s conclusions and limit the presentation to a summary description of the coin types. Abdera struck silver coins on variable weight standards, of mostly large denominations: octadrachm, tetradrachm, didrachm, monobol, and through-casting of the coinages and its distribution (cf. supra 873). Only undated traces of the theatre (TGR ii. 115) were identified (Lazaridis 1971b: 38 no. 193; Lazaridis 1966: 359–61; Triantaphyllos (1984: 32–33), but it is attested in a C2 inscription (Avezou and Picard 1913: 122–24, 128–29; BCH 37 (1913) 122–37 (C2)) and mentioned by Lucian in a C4l–C3e context (Hist. conscr. 1). The palaistra (Hippocr. 6.8.30: palaistrophe-lax) remains unidentified.

Abdera struck high-quality coins from C6s and throughout the entire Classical period. Its mint was one of the most important and enjoyed a wide circulation. Seriation and dating of this coinage, established by May’s exhaustive study (1966), has now been drastically revised following important evidence mainly from coin hoards discovered in various parts of the East (Price and Waggoner 1975; Mattingly 1977)). Since the results of recent research are still unpublished (cf. supra 873), it is preferable to refrain from reproducing May’s conclusions and limit the presentation to a summary description of the coin types. Abdera struck silver coins on variable weight standards, of mostly large denominations: octadrachm, tetradrachm, didrachm, monobol, and divisions. Type: obv. griffin to left (Abdera’s city emblem, as opposed to that of Teos: griffin facing right), often accompanied by various symbols (May 1966: 86); rev. incuse square and later various representations (portraits or full-length representations of deities—in particular Dionysos—and symbols thereof, animals or birds, objects, fruits). Legend: full or abbreviated name of annual magistrate in the nominative or in the genitive case after ΕΠΙ; also, at times, the city-ethnic ΑΒΔΗ or ΑΒΑΗΠΙΤΕΩΝ. In addition to the silver coins there were limited bronze emissions from C3l, presumably for local use, and in C4m a limited emission of gold coins (SNG Cop. Thrace 308–73).

641. Αίνιος (Ainos)  Map 51. Lat. 40.45, long. 26.05. Size of territory: probably 4 or 5. Type Αίνιος, Αίνιος (Hom. II. 4.520: Ainos/Ainos; Hdt. 4.90.2; Ant. 5.20; Thuc. 4.28.4; Ps.-Skylax; IG iv2: 94.1b.30 (359)). The city-ethnic is Αίνιος (IG iv2 260.vi1.15; F.Delphes III. 1 497.6 (C4l–C3e); Thuc. 7.57.5) or Αίνιοι (Hipponax fr. 72.7, West). Ainos is called a polis both in the urban sense (Hdt. 4.90.2, 7.58.3; Ephor. fr. 39; Ps.-Skylax 67) and in the political sense (Ant. 5.78). The town is called polisima at Ephor. fr. 39. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins.
Aiolian colony (Hdt. endary king Rhesos was king of the Ainians. Ainos was an well-protected harbour (Ps.-Skylax ably a peninsula and is known to have possessed a well-protected harbour (Ps.-Skylax 741), probably a river harbour on Lake Stenoris = Galla Golu (Plin. HN 4.43: portus Stenoris). For sketch plans of the Hebros delta, cf. May (Archestratos frs. 7, 23, Olson and Sens; cf. May (1950) 6).

The extent of the territory of Ainos is unknown; attested however is the existence of dependent forts (teiche) on the Thracian littoral south of Ainos and north of the mouth of the river Melas (Ps.-Skylax 67).

Ainos is already known in the Iliad (4,519–20); and according to Hipponax (fr. 741, Diehl (540–537)) the legendary king Rhesos was king of the Ainians. Ainos was an Aiolid colony (Hdt. 7,58.3), first established, presumably in C7s or C6f (Isaac 1986 147–48) by Alopekonnesians, subsequently reinforced by Mytilenaians and Kymaians (Ephor. fr. 39; Ps.-Skymnos 697; Strabo 7 fr. 51) on land (Apsinthios) owned by the Thracian Apsinthisi, later known as Korpiloi (Strabo 7 fr. 57; cf. fr. 51a).

Undoubtedly occupied by the Persians in C6f, it recovered its independence under unknown circumstances after 480 and joined the Delian League as a tribute-paying member (Thuc. 5,57.5; cf. May (1950) 14). It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i² 259.1.23) to 436/5 (IG i² 276.vi.29) a total of fourteen times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 12 tal. (IG i² 260.vi.15) reduced to 10 tal. after 445 (IG i² 267.xxii.2) and finally 4 tal. in 435 (IG i² 276.vi.29). In 425 Ainos was presumably assessed at 20 tal. (IG i² 71.xxii.159, ethnic completely restored). The reasons for the tribute fluctuations as well as for the absence of Ainos from the full panels of 435/4 (IG i² 277), 432/1 (IG i² 280) and 429 (IG i² 282) remain obscure (Meiggs 1972 249; Isaac 1986 151–52). The army of Ainos included peltasts before the end of C5 (cf. Thuc. 4.28.4 (1425)), and Ainian forces are recorded as having participated in the expedition of Sicily (Thuc. 7,57.5).

In 375, with Athens once more the undisputed mistress of the Aegean, Ainos became a member of the Second Athenian Naval League (IG i² 43.B.7; cf. May (1950) 187). Yet, numismatic evidence has been interpreted as indicating a decline of prosperity since early C4, undoubtedly aggravated since 365 under the pressure of Odrysian expansion over south-eastern Thrace and the Thracian Chersonesos (May (1950) 174–94). The adverse situation was temporarily averted when Kotys I (383/2–359) was murdered by two Ainian citizens, Python and Herakleides, who were handsomely rewarded by the Athenians (Dem. 23.119; Arist. Pol. 131b22). However, the improved relations between Athens and the successors of Kotys could not forestall Philip II's successful advance in Thrace. Renewed aggression by the Odrysians and burdensome contributions imposed by the Athenians could be exploited by a pro-Makedonian faction, active in Ainos at least since 344/3. As a result, Ainos went over to the Makedonian king c.342 or shortly thereafter and accepted a Makedonian garrison (Dem. 58.37–38; cf. May (1950) 195–203; Gehrke, Stasis 16; Isaac (1986) 154–55).

In 359 Ainos had a theoreodokes to host theoreoi from Epidaurus (IG iv² 194.1b.30). The two Ainians who killed the Odrysian king Kotys in 359 were awarded Athenian citizenship and proxenia (Dem. 23.119; Arist. Pol. 131b); Timaphenides of Ainos was granted proxenia in Athens before 355/2 (IG i² 152). In 303/2 another Ainian, Alkaios, son of Heraikos, was granted Athenian citizenship, proxenia and a golden crown in Athens (IG i² 495); furthermore, he was honoured with the proxenia, ateleia and asylia in Epidaurus (IG iv² 158).

The poliad deity of Ainos was most probably Hermes Perpheraios, whose wooden statue, a work of Epeios, was washed up at the neighbouring coast, where a sanctuary was presumably built in his honour (Callim. Ia. 7 fr. 197, Pfeiffer; cf. May (1950) 272–73 for C5 coin representations). Pan and the Nymphs depicted on a C4 relief were presumably worshipped in a cave at the foot of the acropolis (Casson (1926) 257–58). Also presumed from epigraphic, numismatic and literary evidence are the cults of Dionysos, the legendary king Rhesos and Asklepios (Isaac (1986) with refs.).

The town of Ainos is securely identified with Byzantine and modern Ainos (Turkish Enes) on the left bank of the Hebros river; it is now, following extensive geomorphological changes and the formation of a sand-bar blocking the river’s mouth, situated 2.5 km upstream from the modern coastline, surrounded by marshes and lagoons (Hasluck...
(1908–9) 249–51; Casson (1926) 256–57; May (1950) 1–2. The ancient site is hidden under the modern town, and archaeological remains are sporadic.

The coinage of Ainos, of great artistic excellence, was initiated shortly after the departure of the Persians. Ainos struck coins in gold, silver and bronze. (1) Silver, c.478–341: denominations: tetradrachm, drachm, tetronym, diobol; type: obv. head of Hermes, in C4 often facing; rev. goat with various symbols. Legend: AI or AINI or AINION. Sometimes name of magistrate. (2) Bronze, C5s: type: obv. head of Hermes; rev. caduceus. Legend: AINI or AINION.

642. Bergepolis (Bergepolites) Map 51. Lat. 41.05, long. 25.00. Size of territory: ? Type: C3. Both the toponym, Βεργέπολις, Ἡ, and the city-ethnic Βεργεπολίτης are exclusively attested at Steph. Byz. 163.13: Βεργέπολις Ἀβδηριτῶν, τὸ ἑθικὸν Βεργεπολίτης. If this entry can be trusted, Bergepolis was an urban centre dependent on Abdera. The second part of the composite toponym suggests that it was a polis viz., a dependent polis lying in the territory of Abdera.

Otherwise unknown, Bergepolis has been tentatively located—on no conclusive evidence—at the ancient site identified between Koutson and Vafeïka (TIR 21 with refs.; Triantaphylllos (1973–74) 810–13, and, more recently, Skarlatidou (1990) 616). The excavation report mentions sparse ceramic finds from the Archaic to the Roman period, as well as coins of Abdera of the Classical period. If one accepts the identification of Bergepolis with this site, the presumption is that Bergepolis’ status as a polis goes back at least to the Classical period.

643. Dikaia Map 51. Lat. 41.00, long. 25.10. Size of territory: 2 or 3. Type: A:A. The toponym is Δίκαια, Ἡ (Hdt. 7.109.1; Ps.-Skylax 67; IG i3 263.11.19: Δίκαια παρὰ Αβδέρα) or Δικαιόπολις, Ἡ (Harp. 64, quoting Lysias fr. 115, Sauppe; cf. Suda Δ1967). Apart from Steph. Byz. 230.15 there is no attestation of a city-ethnic. Dikaia is listed as a polis in the urban sense alongside Abdera and Maroneia at Hdt. 7.109.1 and Ps.-Skylax 67. Polis status in the political sense is confirmed by her coinage (infra) and membership of the Delian League (infra).

According to Herodotos (7.109.1) Dikaia was situated on the Thracian coast between Abdera and Maroneia, near Lake Bistonis and west of the river Koudetos (Ps.-Skylax 67, to be identified with Herodotos’ river Kompasatos, according to ATL i. 517). According to Strabo 7 frr. 43 and 46, it lay in a bay near the sea-ward side of the lake, which served her as a port. It was situated in the vicinity of the legendary palace of Diomedes, king of the Bitones, and off the sea-ward canal of Lake Bistonis allegedly cut by Herakles.

Usually sought south or south-east of Porto Lagos (ATL i. 517; cf. Bakalakis (1958) 89–90), Dikaia has been located—yet without any conclusive archaeological or epigraphic evidence (Isaac (1986) 109)—on a low hill named Katsamakia, a few kilometers north of Cape Phanari (Bakalakis (1958) 89; Lazaridis (1971b) 45 no. 223). At this site were found traces of part of a C4 fortification wall and sparse remains of Hellenistic houses (Bakalakis (1958) 68; Triantaphylllos (1972) 535). Some C6–C5 sepulchral tumuli found west of Katsamakia have been attributed to the city’s cemetery (Triantaphylllos (1972) 535, (1973); for a tentative demarcation of the territory of Dikaia, see Lazaridis (1971b) 46 no. 225).

On the uncertain evidence of sparse archaeological remains and the modest amount of tribute, the population of Dikaia was estimated as a maximum of 1,000 inhabitants (Samsaris (1980) 168; cf. Lazaridis (1971b) 51 no. 243).

Dikaia was probably founded in C6, but, in the absence of literary testimonia, the origin and foundation date remain obscure (Isaac (1986) 109–10). The bull’s head on Dikaia’s coins in 492 has been taken to indicate a Samian origin or, more probably, financial relations with Samos (May (1965)). Dikaia was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG iii 259.14.28) to 432/1 (IG i2 280.11.60) a total of thirteen times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of 5,000 dr. from 454/3 to 447/6 (IG i3 265.11.44), reduced to 2,000 dr. in 448/5 (IG i3 266.11.8) but raised again to 3,000 dr. (IG i2 280.11.60) perhaps in 435/4 (IG i3 277.11.19, amount restored). In 425/4 and 422/1 it was presumably assessed for tribute together with Abdera (IG i3 71.11.153–4 and IG i3 77.11.29–30). In 425/4 the two members were assessed at the enormous sum of 75 tal.

From C6s to the end of Persian occupation in the area, c.476, Dikaia minted two series of silver coins of excellent workmanship. (1) Series I was struck C6–C60 on the Thraco-Makedonian standard of Thasos. Denominations: tetradrachm, stater and subdivisions. Type: obv. head of Herakles; rev. incuse square. (2) Series II was struck 480–476 on the Thraco-Makedonian standard of Maroneia, probably in accordance with the city’s changing political and financial dependencies (May (1965)). Denominations: didrachm, drachm and subdivisions. Type: obv. head of...
644. Drys (Dryites) Map 51. Lat. 40.05, long. 25.40. Size of territory: probably 2 or 3. Category: B? The toponym is Δρῦς, Ἰδ. (Hecat. fr. 160; Ps.-Skylax 67; Dem. 23.132; IG I2 77.5.29–30: Δρῦς παρὰ Σέρρειον. The city-ethnic is Δρῦτης (F.DelphesIII.1.497.5 (C4l–C3e)). According to Ps.-Skylax 67, Drys and Zone were emporia lying on the coast opposite Samothrace. Drys is classified as a polis only in late sources (Polyaen. Strat. 2.22.3 (1375); Harp. Δ282; Suda Δ1551; Steph. Byz. 240.3). Harpokration is quoting Theopompos (fr. 161) and Stephanos Hekataios (fr. 160), but in neither case is it possible to ascertain that the site-classification as a polis stems from the author quoted. In the Athenian assessment decree of 422/1 Drys is listed as a member of the Delian League and assessed at 1 tal. (IG I2 77.5.29–30). In a Delphic inscription of C4l or C3e, the ethnic Δρῦτης is listed alongside other ethnicities which are indisputably city-ethnicities (F. DelphesIII.1.479.5). The presumption is that Drytes is a city-ethnic too. Thus, Drys appears to have been a polis from C5s to, perhaps, C3e (Robert (1940) 81–87).

Apart from its membership of the Delian League, the only information we have about the history of Drys is that it was a fortified town which in 375 was besieged by the Athenians under Chabrias (Polyaen. Strat. 2.22.3), and that in c.360 it was the home of the Athenian strategos Iphikrates (Dem. 23.132). Drys is believed to have been absorbed by Traianoupolis under the empire (Isaac (1986) 129).

Drys is tentatively but unconvincingly identified by some scholars with Mesambria (Perdrizet (1909) 35) or with Orthagoria (ATL i. 519) and in turn located south–west of Dikella (Kazarow (1918) 52–55; ATL i. 518–19; Bakalakis (1961) 15–16 et al.), at Shabla Dere = infra Zone (Meyer (1976); cf. however Robert (1940) 86–87 and, more recently, Isaac (1986) 129–30 and Mottas (1989) 89, 103).

645. Kypselα Map 51. Lat. 40.55, long. 26.25. Size of territory: ? Type: Bβ. The toponym is Κύψελα, τά (Damofoxenos fr. 1.5, PCG; Steph. Byz. 400.7; Apart from Steph. Byz. 400.8–9 there is no attestation of a city-ethnic. Kypselα is classified as a polis only in late sources (Polyaen. Strat. 4.16: Κύψελα Θράττων πόλις; Strabo 7 fr. 10; Steph. Byz. 400.7; Ptol. 3.11.7). The polis status of Kypselα in C4l–C3e is known exclusively from its short-lived bronze coinage. Type: obv. head of Hermes; rev. beehive-type vase. Legend: ΚΥΨΕ. Stylistic and iconographic parallels and chronology (c.415–387) seem to suggest a former dependency on Ainos and a short period of self-government followed by Odrysian rule at least since c.390–380 (Schöntzer-Gees (1993); SNG Cop. Thrace 532).

Kypselα was located near the (left) bank of the Hebros, some 120 stades upstream from the river’s mouth (Strabo 7 fr. 47), 25 miles east of Traianoupolis on the Via Egnatia (It. Burd. 602.5; 29 miles according to the It. Ant. 332.2); it is identified with modern Ipsala (Turkey).

646. Maroneia (Maronites) Map 51. Lat. 40.50, long. 25.30. Size of territory: probably 5. Type: Aa. The toponym is Μαρωνεία, η (Hdt. 7.109.1; Archestratos fr. 56, Olson and Sens; IG IV2 94.1b.29, Epidauros (359); SEG 43 486.21, Bulgaria (C4m)). The toponym evidently recalls Maron, son of Euanthes, Apollo’s priest at Homeric Iasmaras (Hom. Od. 9.197; C5f coins (infra)); the probable linguistic connection between Maroneia and Iasmaras is underlined by Isaac (1986) 113 n. 224. The city-ethnic is Μαρωνεύς (IG I2 260.vi.19; Xen. Ant. 7.3.16; SEG 43 486.27–8, Bulgaria) or Μαρωνεύς (IG I2 263.iii.22; Maroneus (IG I2 269.iii.6). Maroneia is called a polis in the urban sense by Hekataios (fr. 159), Herodotos (7.109.1) and Ps.-Skylax (67). The political sense is attested in IG II2 43.78 and 87 where Maroneia, under the heading πολέμος, is listed as one of the members of the Second Athenian Naval League. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins (infra) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG I2 260.vi.19) and in literary sources (Dem. 50.20–23). For the individual and external use, see the funerary inscriptions IG II2 9286–93 from Athens and Xen. An. 7.3.16.

The city’s territory extended according to Lazaridis ((1972) 4 and plan 21) from the slopes of Mt. Iasmaros in the east to the course of the river Philiouri (probably identified with the ancient Lissos) and the banks of Lake Ismaris in the west and to the river Kourou and the northern slopes of Mt. Iasmaros to the north, but Pantos claims that it must at times have been far more extended, including Stryme to the west (Pantos (1983) 168 para. 14). The C5s population of Maroneia, a vast and prosperous city, is estimated at c.12,000 (Lazaridis (1972) 14.44–45, with refs.), or at 15,000–20,000 (Samsaritis (1980) 167–68).

Maroneia was situated on a coastal plateau east of Stryme and Lake Iasmar = lake of Mitrikon (Hdt. 7.109.1; Strabo 7
fr. 44) and west of Orthagoria (Strabo 7 fr. 48; Plin. HN 4.42: between Dikaia and Cape Serreon), on the fertile vine-growing slopes of Mt. Ismaros (Suida I645, M222; Eust. Od. 1.133.9; cf. Hom. Od. 9.196–211; Archiloch. fr. 2; Plin. HN 14.53–54).

The exclusive testimony of Ps.-Skymnos (675–78) referring to Maroneia as a colony of Chios is usually accepted (Isaac 1986) 114). Its foundationos date is before C7m, when Maronitans clashed with Thasians over the possession of Stryme (Archiloch. fr. 2, quoted by Philoch. fr. 43). The city fell undoubtedly under Persian rule following the occupation of Thrace by Megabazos. With the Persian rule terminated under unspecified circumstances (Isaac 1986) 115–16 with bibliography) Maroneia predictably entered the Delian League. It belonged to the Thracian district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i3 259.14.5) to 415/14 (IG i3 290.111.19) a total of twenty times. It paid a phoros of 1 tal. 3,000 dr. down to 443/2 (IG i3 269.111.6) or perhaps 441/0 (IG i3 271.11.44). From 436/5 it paid 10 tal. (IG i3 276.v.29), reduced to 3,000 dr. in 430/29 (IG i3 281.11.8). In 425/4 it was presumably assessed at the enormous sum of 21 tal. (IG i3 71.111.156, city-ethnic restored). Moreover, numismatic evidence suggests close financial and political relations with the Odrysian kingdom. On the justifiably disputed tribute imposed on Abdera and other Greek cities of the northern Aegean by the Odrysians, see Veligianni (1995a) with refs. and Loukopoulos (2003).

In C4, Maroneia became a member of the Second Athenian Naval League (IG II2 43.87). Moreover, its relations with the Odrysians were further strengthened in C4f, as was the antagonism with other powerful Greek cities of the north Aegean who had financial interests in the Thracian hinterland. C4.40 a Maronitan served as a councillor at the court of Seuthes II (Xen. An. 7.3.16). In 376/5 Maroneia is believed to have supported, if not invited, the Triballian invasion which resulted in the catastrophic defeat of Abdera (Diod. 15.36.3–4; cf. schol. Ael. Arist. 172.7, 173.17). She had apparently also succeeded in driving Thasos away from Stryme, and the dispute was solved only with Athenian intervention (Dem. 12.17, 17.23, 50.20–23, 51.17). A recently published inscription from Vetren in Bulgaria discloses the privileged position of Maroneia in the Thracian commerce under Kotys I and his successors (SEG 43 486; Velkov and Domaradzka (1994); cf. Loukopoulos (1999), (2002), (2003)); it was brought to an end by Philip II’s conquest of southern Thrace and the dissolution once and for all of the Odrysian power (Dem. 23.183; Polyzen. Strat. 4. 2. 22). Maroneia’s triremes and army, which included mercenaries and “neighbouring barbarians” are mentioned in relation to her dispute with Thasos over Stryme in 361 (Dem. 50.14–15, 20–23).

We have no information about the constitution of Maroneia. Maronian ambassadors are recorded in 361/0 (Dem. 50.20–23). In 359 Maroneia had a theorodokos to host theoroi from Epidaurus (IG iv1 94.1b. 29). In C4 Karthaia bestowed proxenia on a citizen of Maroneia (IG xi1 5 242.b.2). I.Priene 10 (C4) is a decree by Priene (no. 861) bestowing various judicial privileges on citizens of Maroneia. A citizen of Maroneia was Olympic victor in 476 (Olympionikai 213).

The poliad deity of Maroneia was most probably Dionysos, whose portrait appears on coins; his sanctuary (Dionysion) was the place of publication of official documents (SEG 35 823,43–4 (C2)). With Dionysos’ cult was apparently associated that of the city’s eponymous hero Maron (cf. the legend ΜΑΡΩΝΟΣ on C5f coins (infra)), as indicated by their joint cult, along with that of Zeus and Rome, in the Roman period (Triantaphyllos 1983) 425). The cult of Apollo is presumed on legendary evidence (Hom. Od. 9.187–215).

The town of Maroneia is securely located in the well-protected bay of Ag. Charalambos, which also served as the city harbour. A vast 10.5 km-long fortification wall protected the entire area from the port, west of the bay (reinforced to the east by an artificial mole; cf. Sarla-Pentazou and Pentazos 1984) 47 figs. 2–3, 5–6), to the acropolis, identified on the hill of Ag. Athanasios (height 678 m). Archaeological research has not yet identified traces of the Archaic–Classical city. The isodomic city wall was reinforced with numerous semicircular and rectangular towers. Also identified are a C4 sanctuary, presumably of Dionysos, and the sanctuary of the Egyptian deities (Tsimbidis-Pentazos 1971) 104, (1973) 84–86 fig. 1; Pentazos (1982) 29–30; Sarla-Pentazou and Pentazos (1984) 48 fig. 10; Lazaridis (1972) 40.140; Pentazos (1986); Ergon (1973) 59–61, (1986–87) 44–45, (1987) 20–22; Triantaphyllos (1983) 431–32).

In C6 El Maroneia struck a limited series of silver coins on the Thrako-Makedonian standard. Denominations: stater, tetrobol, diobol and obol. Type: obv. horse protome; rev. incuse square. In the Classical period silver coins were struck first on the Phoenician standard, later on the Persian standard, sometimes on the Attic standard. Denominations from C3e on: didrachm, drachm, triobol, diobol, trilobol. Types: obv. forepart of horse, or prancing horse, or head of Dionysos; rev. first, incuse square; later, vine or grapes in square. Legend: c.500 on obv. MA or MAPΩ or
MAPΩΝΙΩΣ, later on rev. MA or MAPΩ but mostly MAPΩΝΙΩΝ or later MAPΩΝΙΩΝ and often a magistrate's name. The same types appear on bronze coins and on two series of gold coins struck in C4f (Head, HN5 48–50; Schönert-Geiss (1987) 46–47; SNG Cap. Thrace 592–633). The dating, seriation and distribution of the important coinage of Maroneia, as well as the systematic study of its impact on political and financial developments in Thrace and on the Odrysian coinage, have been based on the mints of Abdera and Ainos (May (1965); West (1929) 55–147; Schönert-Geiss (1979), (1985), (1987); Peter (1997) passim). As a consequence of the revision of Abdera's monetary history (no. 640), historical conclusions are now open to reconsideration.

647. Mesambria: Map 51. lat. 40.50, long. 25.40, but see infra. Size of territory: probably 2. Type: A2. The toponym, Μεσαµβρία, η, is attested exclusively by Herodotos (7.108.2, quoted at Steph. Byz. 446.19–21: Μεσηµβρία). Herodotos describes Mesambria as the westernmost teichos of the peraia of Samothrake and, at the same time, as a polis both in the urban sense and in the territorial sense, viz. as bordering on the polis of Stryme and the river Lissos. It was situated in the Briantike, formerly called Gallaike, a part of the region formerly owned by the Kikones. Herodotos' description indicates that Mesambria was a dependent polis belonging to Samothrake.

Mesambria was tentatively but unconvincingly identified by some scholars with Drys (Perdrizet (1909) 35; cf. Seure (1900) 152 n. 1), by others with Orthagoria (Meyer (1976) 3, (1978) 97–98) or with Zone (Thrace (1994) 80). For an early discussion of proposed unjustified identifications, simplifying the admittedly confused settlement pattern transmitted by literary sources for this area, see Robert (1940) and, more recently, Isaac (1986) 128–33. Mesambria has persistently been identified with the site systematically excavated near the stream Shabla Dere (Kazarow (1918) 33; Amandry (1940–41); Walter (1942) 189–90); Bakalakis (1961) 15; Lazaridis (1971c) 39; supported by the excavator of the site, A. Vavritsas, and followed by Barr). But this identification has now been abandoned in favour of Zone (Tsatsopoulou (1995) 671–73; cf. TIR 37; Isaac (1986) 131; disputed by Soustal (1991) 354–55; see infra 881). Mesambria should be sought 3 km further west, at the mouth of the stream Yali Dere (Meyer (1976) 3; (1978) 97–98; Mottas (1989) 89).

648. Orthagoria (Orthagoreus) Map 51. Unlocated. Type: Ba. The toponym is Ὄρθαγορεια, ἡ (Strabo 7 fr. 47), according to Pliny (HN 4.42) the former name of Maroneia. The city-ethnic Ὅρθαγορειός is attested on C4m coins (infra), indicating that it was a self-governing polis at the time.

Orthagoria has been unconvincingly identified with various locations on the Aegean coast, usually east of Maroneia (Robert (1940) 87–90; Lazaridis (1972) 40.158, 46.164; Pantos (1985) 171.27 and, more recently, Isaac (1986) 123, with refs.).


649. Sale Map 51. lat. 40.50, long. 25.55. Size of territory: probably 3. Category: A? The toponym is Σάλη, ἡ (Hdt. 7.59.2; IG i3 77.5.31 (422/1)). The city-ethnic remains unattested. According to Herodotos, Sale and Zone were Samothrakean poleis (in the urban sense), situated on the coast of the Doriskos plain, in the region formerly owned by the Kikones. Like other cities of the peraia of Samothrake it appears in 422/1 as a member of the Delian League, assessed at 3,000 dr. (IG i3 77.5.31).

Sale was situated 15 miles west of Traianopolis on the Via Egnatia (B. Burd. 602.9; mutatio Salei) and is tentatively, but not beyond reasonable doubt, located at or near modern Alexandroupolis (Isaac (1986) 131) or further west, at Makri (Mottas (1989) 88, 95).

650. Stryme Map 51. lat. 40.55, long. 25.20. Size of territory: probably 3. Type: Aα. The toponym is Στρύμη, ἡ (Hdt. 7.108–9; Dem. 50.32; SEG 39 666.27, Λδ 202). Apart from Steph. Byz. 587.17 there is no attestation of a city-ethnic. At Hdt. 7.108.2 Stryme is called a Thasian polis bordering on Mesambria: ... Μεσαµβρία, ἡ ἡκτείναι δὲ ταύτης Θασίων πόλεως Στρύμη ... Thus, polis is used in the territorial and political senses combined. For its urban centre, see infra. Some lexicographers seem to agree in calling Stryme an emporion (Harp. Σ49, perhaps derived from Philoch. fr. 43 or from Dem. 50.20; cf. Suda Σ1231).

Stryme was situated in the Briantike, a region formerly called Gallaike and belonging to the Thracian Kikones (Hdt. 7.108–9). Stryme was an island off the Thracian coast colonised by Thasos (Harp. Σ49, quoting Heraclid. Pont. fr. 125, Wehrli) and the C3 historian Philostephanos of Kyrene (FHG Π 28–34, omitting this fragment)). Demosthenes stresses its lack of a safe harbour at least for naval units (Dem. 50.22: ἀλέξενον χωρίον). Describing the march of Xerxes' army through the Aegean Thrace, Herodotos...
(7.108–9) presents a confusing account of Stryme’s location: west of Mesambrie, the westernmost settlement in the peraia of Samothrake, and separated from it by the river Lissos, but also east of Lake Ismaris, which lay between Maroneia and Stryme. These incoherent pieces of information do not allow any secure identification. It is usually assumed that Stryme was a Thasian coastal outpost bordering on the territory of Maroneia (Lazaridis 1971a), and therefore, ever since its foundation in, probably, C7, a constant bone of contention between these two cities. Vaguely attested is a first contention in C7 (Philoch. fr. 43, citing Archilochos, fr. 291, West); a direct conflict in 361/60 was solved by Athenian intervention in support of the Thasians (Dem. 12.17, 50.20–22) recording the Athenian arbitration (cf. Isaac 1986: 70–71). Stryme was presumably destroyed c. 350 by the Maronitans, possibly supported by Philip II (Bakalakis 1967: 145).

Stryme is inconclusively identified with the ancient fortified settlement excavated on a peninsula north-east of Cape Molyvoti (plan in Lazaridis 1972: fig. 71) with remains dating from C6l to C4f (Bakalakis 1967); disputed by Isaac (1986) 12, 71–72). The present configuration of the peninsula allows the hypothesis that, as recorded by Philostephanos (supra), it was indeed an island during at least part of Antiquity (Kranioti 1990: 629; for a tentative demarcation of the extent of Stryme’s territory, see Lazaridis 1972b: 4.19). Archaeological remains include parts of C5–C4m fortification walls and cross-walls built in irregular masonry with brick superstructure, subterranean tunnels, cisterns and wells in the southern edge of Cape Molyvoti, which were interpreted as having constituted a major aqueduct, on the analogy of the Eupalinean aqueduct in Samos but on a much smaller scale. Furthermore, there are traces of a small port located south of the city, and a group of five grave monuments with three inhumations and two cremations dated to 450–425 bordering a roughly paved road, to the north-east of the cross-wall. Imported pottery in the entire excavated area consists exclusively of Attic C5–C4 ware. The urban centre extended south and east of the citadel, while the cemetery spread over the west flank of the cape, outside the wall. On the evidence of a few excavated C5l–C4m private houses, it is believed to have conformed to the Hippodameian urban system (Bakalakis 1967); Kranioti (1984a). A cemetery with tumuli containing C5 cist graves and sarcophagi was excavated 4 km north of the walled settlement (Bakalakis 1967: 3–18; on the recent discovery c.4 km north to north-east of Molyvoti of four C5s sepulchral tumuli, see Triantaphylllos (1992) 655–59).

651. Zone (Zonaios) Map 51. Lat. 40.50, long. 25.45. Size of territory: probably 2. Type: A:α. The toponym is Ζωναί (Hecat. fr. 161; Hdt. 7.59.2; Ps.-Skylax 67; IG i3 77.5.27–28: Ζώνη παρὰ Σέρρειον). The city-ethnic is Zonaios (F.Delphes III.1 497.5; cf. Robert (1940) 81–90). Zone is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 7.59.2, whereas Ps.-Skylax 68 lists Drys and Zone as two coastal emporia situated opposite Samothrake. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins (infra) and externally in a Delphic list of C4l−C3e. The individual and external use is attested in a C3 honorific decree from Samothrake.

Zone is listed among members of the Delian League in the assessment decree of 422/1, and was assessed at 2 tal. (IG i3 77.5.27–28), an indication that it was the richest if not the largest of the cities of the peraia of Samothrake.

Zone was situated on the beach front, between Sale and Serreion (Hdt. 7.59.2), in the vicinity of Drys (Ps.-Skylax 67), also located near Serreion. It has been sought at Cape Makri (identified with Serreion), right below the Zonaia Mts. (presumably Choban Dag), and was tentatively identified with a site near the modern village of Makri (ATI i Proc. 1958; Bakalakis 1961: 15; Lazaridis 1971c: 39; for an early discussion of proposed unjustified identifications simplifying the admittedly confused settlement pattern transmitted by literary sources for this area, see Robert (1940) and, more recently, Isaac (1986) 128–33). However, numerous, otherwise rare coins of Zone have turned up during the systematic excavation of the urban centre near the mouth of the stream Shabla Dere, formerly identified with Mesambria. These finds strongly support the now prevailing view that the site is ancient Zone (BE 1976) 464, (1978) 312, (1979) 282, (1980) 319, (1981) 326; TIR 61; Thrace (1994) 80; J. Tsatsopoulou (1995) 671–73; Galani-Krikou (1996), contra Soustal (1991) 354–55; according to Triantaphylllos (Thrace (1994) 80) Mesambria may have been some older name of Zone). This identification was reinforced by the discovery of an Archaic sanctuary of Apollo (see infra), the poliad deity of Zone, as evidenced by this city’s C4 coinage.

The excavated urban centre near Shabla Dere, dating from C6 to the Hellenistic period, is organised in accordance with the Hippodamian system, with cross-intersecting paved roads, various types of house and an elaborate sewage system. It is protected by two contiguous fortification walls (ashlar and pseudo-isodomic poros masonry, the western wall in Lesbian masonry) measuring 1370 and 960 m respectively and enclosing an area of 50 ha), reinforced with rectangular towers extending from the seaboard to the top of a 108.5 m-high acropolis; the southern sea-wall is
presumed to have disappeared in the sea (J. Tsatsopoulou 1987: 472), as did the presumed port installations (Vavritsas 1988: 80). The south-west part of the enclosed area, measuring 50.50 × 46.50 m, was densely built and additionally fortified with an internal wall. Ceramic pipes probably belonging to the city aqueduct were discovered near a mountain spring c.1,500 m to the north-west (Vavritsas 1973: 122). Extensive C5–C3 cemeteries were identified west of the urban centre (P. Tsatsopoulou 1997). A decree discovered in the excavations remains unpublished (BE 1976: 464; cf. Robert 1940: 82–90).

The evidence of the coins indicates that the poliad deity of Zone was Apollo (Galani-Krikou 1996, 1997). His sanctuary, with a C6 temple, probably in antis or prostyle, has been identified on the hill-top near the eastern fortification wall. Inside the temenos were found parts of the cult statue of c.600, as well as rich votive offerings, including numerous sherds with graffitti (J. Tsatsopoulou 1988: 491–92; 1989; Thrace 1994: 83). Epigraphically attested is the cult of Demeter in a small C4 sanctuary by the south-eastern end of the western fortification wall, with numerous offerings of silver and gilded votive plaques representing Demeter, Kore and Cybele (Vavritsas 1973: 77–81, 1984) 27–29. Moreover, the rich oak forest covering the Zonaia Mts. in the vicinity of Cape Serreion and lying in the territory of Zone, has been associated with the activity of Orpheus (Apoll. Rhod. Argon. 23–31; Nic. Ther. 458–464; cf. Pompon. Mela 2.28; cf. Robert 1940: 82–90).

Zone struck bronze coins in C4–C3. Type: obv. head of Apollo; rev. lyre or laurel wreath, more rarely running deer. Legend: ZΩΝΑΙΩΝ or ZΩΝΑΙ or ΖΩΝ or ΖΩ (Galani-Krikou 1996).
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I. The Region

The reaction of most students of Classical Antiquity to the subject of this chapter might well be: were there any poleis in inland Thrace? Most of the sites marked on Barr. Maps 22, 51 and 52 are coastal,¹ and most of the inland ones seem to be of Roman date. There are some strange exceptions in the central (Thracian) plain of modern Bulgaria, but these are not the locations of known settlements, however designated. We may assume that the cemeteries were connected with communities nearby, but there is no hint on the maps of what these agglomerations may have been.² The foundations of Philip II of Makedonia, at Philippopolis and Kabyle in particular, usually get a mention in political histories of Greece, and Diodorus speaks of some of these as having acted as ἀξιόλογοι πόλεις (16.71.2), implying that they were garrison towns rather than civilian centres. Demosthenes' derogatory remarks about hell-holes like Drongylion and Masteira (Dem. 16.71.2) hardly inspire confidence. It would be easy to dismiss the whole region on the basis of such reports as a mess of mud huts, a wasteland peopled by boorish rascals, whether native or incomers.

Demosthenes' derogatory remarks and the terms they use show us what they thought of the places they were writing about. But Demosthenes' business was belittling Philip II, and one of the ways to achieve this effect was to belittle his achievements, by denigrating his conquests.³ If there was something worth capturing in inland Thrace, we can be confident that Demosthenes refrained from mentioning it. The feeble scraps of citations that constitute, for our benefit, Theopompos' Philippikai Ἱστορίαι, wherein a series of Thracian sites was sketched, are sufficient for little more than highly speculative judgements about what the historian actually said, and why.⁴ Both Demosthenes and Theopompos were widely cited in the late lexicographical works, but fossils with such a dubious pedigree do not make a good starting point for our enquiry. It would be better to leave them aside until other approaches have been explored.

Herodotos and Thucydidēs provide valuable references to communities in inland Thrace, but their accounts do not address our topic directly, not least because subjects that are named explicitly refer to the highest order of political groupings responsible for decision making with respect to outside powers, be they Persian kings or representatives of Greek states. The Odrysians, a “tribal” dynasty that came to dominate the east Balkan region from the Haemus range to the Aegean and Black Seas, are the most prominent agents in Thucydidēs' narrative, while Herodotos' text reflects the manifest change that came about in the post-Persian War period. During Dareios’ and Xerxes’ invasions, various “tribal” groupings either succumbed to, or opposed, the Persian armies. But in the post-war years, Odrysian leadership is taken for granted (Hdt. 7.137; cf. Thuc. 2.67).³ But neither historian was especially concerned with institutional development or state formation in the region. At the very least, there are a number of Thracian communities listed by Hekataios in the European section of his Periodos Ges, but not mentioned by Herodotos or Thucydidēs.⁶

¹ See L. Loukopoulou, in this volume 854–84, 900–23.
² Reviewing Barr, Alcock et al. (2001) 460 with n. 17 have drawn attention to the fact that archaeological evidence has often been included only in areas outside the principal zone of Greek and Roman settlement.
⁵ Archibald (1998) 79–90, 93–125.
⁶ Steph. Byz. s.v. Darsioi = Hecat. fr. 175 (appearing not the same as Derraioi, called Dersaioi by Hdt.), Datyleptoi (Hecat. fr. 177), Desiloi (fr. 176), Disorai (fr. 178), Entribai (fr. 179), Xanthiioi (fr. 180, ethnic only); Lipaxos (fr. 149), and Kabassos (fr. 169, poleis). This list includes sites in Thrace only, and excludes such entities as can be confidently located in the Chalkidic peninsula or along the Aegean coastline. Other references collected by lexicographers and grammarians are dealt with below.
1. Epigraphic Documents

One of the most important new sources of information about inland communities is epigraphy. There are a small but growing number of inscriptions from Thrace that are connected with hitherto unknown historical entities. All, or at least some, of these may be classifiable as poleis, and perhaps even as Greek poleis. Three documents are particularly important in this context.

(1) The first is a decree of C₄s–C₃e tabled by the politai of an unknown community found at the sanctuary near Batkun, in the foothills of the Rhodope mountains, southwest of Pazardjik: IGBulg. 111.111.⁷ Dumont and Kazarow thought that the polis issuing the decree must have been somewhere near Pazardjik, the main market town at the western end of the Thracian plain, speculating that it could have been among Philip II’s foundations. Mihailov (1986) preferred Philippopolis as the location of the polis, arguing that the sons of Seuthes III were honoured around this time in (other) major administrative centres.⁸ But this is an inference based on evidence from the Valley of the Roses, the epicentre of Seuthes’ power at this time.

The recipients of the monument or statue(s) voted by our unknown polis were an unnamed man and his brothers. It is quite possible that the sons of Seuthes III were the intended recipients.⁹ But so far there are no public inscriptions from Philippopolis dating from C₄s.

(2) The Southopolis inscription records an oath sworn by Berenike and her four sons by the Odrysian prince Seuthes (III): Hebryzelmis, Teres, Satokos and Sadalas. The inscription is dated to C₃e by V. Velkov, D. Draganov and K.-L. Elvers.¹⁰ It is stated in the document that it was to be set up in the Phosphorion at Kabyle, and in the agora at the same site, by the altar of Apollo; as well as in two places at Southopolis—in the sanctuary of the Great Gods and on the agora, in the sanctuary of Dionysos, by the altar (29–34). The Batkun inscription was to be erected by the altar in the sanctuary of Apollo (ll.15–17). This resembles the phrasing in the Southopolis inscription with reference to the sanctuary of Apollo at Kabyle. But there is nothing to connect the subjects of the latter with those of the former text. If the Batkun inscription really did belong to Alexander III’s reign (unfortunately, this can no longer be verified), then what we may be seeing in this rather isolated stone is confirmation of Odrysian elite patronage in the western part of the Thracian plain before the military conflict between Lysimachos and Seuthes, a protracted confrontation that created a different kind of status quo between native and Makedonian holders, and restricted Odrysian control in the south and west.¹¹ The excavations at Vetren, north-west of Pazardjik, have demonstrated strong Odrysian princely connections, both in the range of native regal coins, and in the prosopography revealed by inscriptions and graffiti, during C₃l and throughout C₄.¹² The most powerful Odrysian princes in this period—Amadokos I, Kotys I and Amadokos II—appear to have been connected with this site, no matter how the Pistoias inscription is to be interpreted.¹³ The radical changes that took place there after c.300 presuppose a marked change of political status at Vetren, which coincides, directly or indirectly, with the consolidation of Lysimachos’ power.¹⁴ Lysimachos reasserted Makedonian control along the Aegean coast and some way into the interior during a series of campaigns after 323, when he nominally acquired the title of governor of Thrace with the approval of his fellow generals,¹⁵ though it is still hard to define how Lysimachos and Seuthes eventually compromised in territorial terms. Coin hoards suggest that Seuthes maintained his power north of the river Hebros (Maritsa). There is no doubt that this power base included the Valley of the Roses, but the dense distribution of hoards containing coins of Seuthes III extends south of the Sredna Gora range into the area around Stara Zagora (the city of Augusta Traiana in Imperial times), and as far west as the river Stryama, which bisects the Thracian plain due north of Plovdiv.¹⁶ Kabyle, which was garrisoned by Philip II, can have been in Makedonian hands for only a few decades at most. The absence of any clear evidence of a Makedonian political

---

⁷ Archibald (1999) 427–38 with n. 26; Domaradzka (1993) 55 no. 1. Georgi Mihailov provides a detailed history of the stone, which is now lost. Albert Dumont, one of the great early collectors of inscriptions in the Balkan region, dated this text no later than the reign of Alexander the Great. This was accepted by G. Kazarov, the doyen of Bulgarian archaeology in the first part of the twentieth century, while Mihailov (1986) himself adopted a slightly more cautious approach, suggesting a date of C₃d/C₃e.

⁸ G. Mihailov, IGBulg. 111.1 (1961) 117, referring the reader to ibid. 111.2, pp.146–49, nos. 1731–42 (Southopolis inscription and the “Epimenes” inscription from the same site).

⁹ There are other potential candidates: a Rhoubouas, son of Seuthes (II) and brother of Kotys, was granted honours by the Athenians in June 330 (IG 112 349 = Tod 193; Schwenk (1986) 223 no. 45). Note also the Argive proxenos, L—, son of Seuthes, the Thracian, who was also thevrodokos at the sanctuary of Zeus at Nemea and of Hera at Argos: SEG 42 661 (editio princeps) with further bibliography.

¹⁰ SEG 42 661 (editio princeps) with further bibliography.
The two epigraphic texts already referred to (from Batkun and Southopolis) demonstrate a style of decision making that owes much to contemporary civic practice in Greek poleis. Although the preamble of the Batkun inscription is missing, there must have been an opening formula that would have qualified the laconic reference to the decision of the politai in lines 11–12. Honorific decrees are among the commonest stone inscriptions in almost all Greek communities (e.g., Odessos: IG Bulg. 1 35–43).17 The presence of this stone in a shrine that always remained a native sacred space, notwithstanding the later associations with Asklepios (IG Bulg. 111.1 1114–1296), is a strong indication that the political networks honoured there were local ones, unconnected with the Macedonian power.

The third document that deserves consideration here is the Pistiros inscription. This princely decree, evidently issued by order of an unknown Odrysian monarch, perhaps Amadokos II, is undoubtedly the most important single text from the pre-Hellenistic period to have been discovered in the east Balkan peninsula. The letter-forms, the comparatively undeveloped style of expression, and internal evidence (which includes what appears to be a citation of Kotys I) (383–359)), all point to a date prior to the capture of Odrysian Thrace by Philip II of Macedon between 340 and 339.18 The granite block, reused at the Roman mansio of Lissae/Bona Mansio, on the principal road between Constantinople and Serdica, also known as the via diagonalis, is 1.64 m high, 0.27–0.21 m deep, and required six men’s strength to lift. It is unlikely that the stone has moved far from its original location. No substantive evidence of pre-Roman activity has been identified at the mansio, and the likeliest candidate is the river port at Adjiyska Vodenitsa near Vetren, approximately 2 km south-west of the mansio, which became a regularly planned settlement during C5 and was abandoned some time in C2, and where excavations were begun in 1988.

The text is crucial to our understanding of relationships between rulers and local communities, whether indigenous, immigrant or mixed. The original editors of the text, Velizar Velkov and Lydia Domaradzka, took into account the range of epigraphic material from Bulgaria, including Georgi Mihailov’s magisterial survey, Inscriptiones Graecae in Bulgaria repertae (1958–70), as well as information made available by Mieczysław Domaradzki. The text of the decree consists of guarantees bestowed upon the emporitai of one or more settlements (ll. 8–10, 12–13). The property (?) of the Pistirenoi is then referred to (ll. 16–17, certainly ll. 18–20), and tolls are waived between Pistiros and Maroneia, as well as, it appears, to or from other emporia (ll. 21–25). Much of the second half of the text cites what seems to be an earlier ruling by Kotys I, which also guaranteed the rights of habesas corpus and of property to people of Maroneia. These were (or are) equally applicable to citizens of Apollonia and Thasos resident at Pistiros (ll. 27–38). The text refers to different communities in the following way: Πιστιρενοϊ (l. 16), Μαρωνιται (ll. 28–29). Απολληνιται (l. 32), Θασιου (l. 33) Θρακιες (ll. 8–9). In addition, emporitai are referred to six times (ll. 5, 8, 11, 13, 18, 25); emporia twice (ll. 23–24, 25), and there is a further reference to τα έμπορια Βελανα Πρασε, v (ll. 24–25), a phrase that suggests that at least two named emporia were being indicated.19

An identification of the site near Vetren, north-west of Pazardijik, with Pistiros is still a persuasive one.20 But it is not without difficulties, as the excavator himself was not slow to acknowledge. The excavated site shows many of the characteristics that might be expected of a port facility (a fortified nucleus, paved roads, well-built masonry structures suitable for storage, extensive evidence of commercial items, including weights and measures, and large numbers of coins); but it is rather low-lying, situated on a shallow terrace above the flood plain of the largest river in the east Balkan land mass. Whether or not the Pistiros of the inscription has been identified on the ground, the community referred to must belong to the Thrace interior. The decree was issued on behalf of a local ruler whose influence might impinge on those of coastal poleis, but whose authority can never have included juridical powers of the kind enunciated here if Pistiros were either an autonomous polis or a dependent

---


18 Velkov and Domaradzka (1994), (1996); SEG 43.486; Chankowski and Domaradzka (1999); the other contributors to the Dossier: nouvelles perspectives pour l’étude de l’inscription de Pistiros in BCH 123 (1999) 259–371 all accepted a date prior to c.340. Salvati (1999) 259 (summer 359); Bravo and Chankowski (1999) 308–9 (soon after 356); Boinakov (1999) 351 (contents composed in reigns of Kotys I 384/3–360/59), and Amadokos II 359–351); Picard (1999) 340 (“vers le milieu du IVe siècle”); Loukopoulos (1999) 361 (360–359), issued by one of the successors of Kotys I). Cf. Archibald (2001). The main proponents of a Hellenistic date for the inscription have been Tacheva (2002) and Tsetskhladze (2000), Tacheva’s arguments are based on evidence unconnected with the stone itself. Tsetskhladze is not committed to any date, but was drawing on discussions of the text with A. Avram and Y. Vinogradov.


20 I have discussed these terms briefly in Archibald (2001). See also my further remarks in Archibald et al. (2002).
community of Thasos, as was Herodotos’ Pistyros (7.109.2). In institutional terms, the arrangements are in many respects comparable to those at Naukratis (a parallel that seems all the more compelling with the discovery of a second stele, at Thonis, near the mouth of the Canopic branch of the Nile, identical to that from Naukratis, and issued on behalf of Nectanebo in 380).21 The Pistyros text refers to three coastal poleis: Thasos and Maroneia on the Aegean, and Apollonia (whether Pontika or the Chalkidian city of that name).22 All other communities referred to in the inscription either belong to emporia, or to unnamed Thracian entities (8–9; 38: ὀλίγητορεῖς), which may or may not include the shadowy ἐπαυλισταί (12).23 The plural form of emporia is hardly accidental. The existence of other emporia, coastal or inland, is documented in contemporary literary sources (Dem. 23.110: revenues collected by Keresbleptes from the Chersonese amounted to 30 talents in peacetime, while those collected annually from emporia were as much as 200 talents; cf. Arr. Anab. 1.1.6: merchants confronting Alexander III),24 and can be inferred from the circulation of coined money within the east Balkan land mass.25 Margarita Tacheva has argued that trade between Aegean poleis and the continental interior of Thrace was very limited prior to Macedonian expansion into the region. But the volume of exchanges was far greater, in the pre-Macedonian period, than her analysis suggests, and some categories of data diminished rather than increased after 340.26

There are three principal reasons in favour of Adjiyska Vodenitsa, near Vetren, as the original location of the stone. First, it is the largest archaeological site within a radius of 10–20 km from the findsport whose dating coincides with the period of the inscription, and whose physical remains and portable finds identify it clearly as a centre of exchange. Second, five other Greek inscriptions have been found at the site, three of them in situ, while two were reported by nineteenth-century antiquarians.27 Third, the pattern of coin hoard distributions in the Thracian plain points to the area of Vetren as one of the most significant concentrations of C5 and C4 coins in the region as a whole.28 This was one of the reasons why the site was investigated in the first place. Other sites with similar concentrations of coin hoards may indicate further emporia. Domaradzki has suggested two further sites of putative emporia, on the basis of commercial-type finds: at Arzos, near Kalugerovo, on the right bank of the river Sazliyka near its junction with the river Hebro, where lead seals of the pre-Roman period have been found; and Kocherinovo, in the upper Strymon valley.29 His interpretation of pre-Macedonian finds at Nebet tepe, in Plovdiv, and on the acropolis of Začić vrhu, Kabyle, is of temporary markets at native sanctuary sites.

A comparison of the three inscriptions leads to a number of observations. The Seuthopolis and Pistyros decrees are royal edicts. The one was intended to bring order to some irregularities in the relations between Seuthes III’s relatives and a powerful local leader, Spartokos (referring pari passu to a range of civic institutions and amenities). The other regulates inter- and intra-community relations at Pistyros, as well as dictating the scope of commercial privileges. In both cases, the decisions have ramifications that go well beyond the remit of any one individual community. The special conditions to which both decrees apply required special authority (even if we are unable to infer all the relevant implications). So neither text is directly comparable to the day-to-day decision making of a polis. The particular importance of the circumstances in either case may explain why they were committed to stone. Yet they were intended to be civic documents, as the instructions at Seuthopolis make clear. The oath of Berenike was to be made available to the people of Seuthopolis and Kabyle. The Pistyros decree affected a large number of communities, including, but by no means confined to, Maronitans, Thasians and Apollonians living in Pistyros.

Seuthopolis was consciously and deliberately intended by its presumed founder, Seuthes III, to be seen alongside the new cities of Philip II, Alexander III and their successors. It was meant to be a polis, but there is no reason to think that this was anything other than a native settlement, even if there were some Greeks living there.30 It was created by and for natives, using the most up-to-date designs in town planning (albeit adapted to a modest scale) and innovative local techniques, such as baked brick,31 as well as better-known construction materials. Local, east Balkan features—notably low decorated hearth altars—were incorporated
into domestic units that might otherwise look familiar in coastal *poleis*.

The Batkun inscription, on the other hand, has closer similarities with the kind of text that we might expect to find emanating from a Greek *polis*. Nevertheless, the location and style of the monument suggest the adoption of contemporary forms by a native community, rather than the presence of immigrant Greeks. The sanctuary is too far from Philippopolis to have been the natural choice for an honorific monument dedicated by its citizens. Moreover, if the stone is to be dated to the final third of C4, perhaps even very early in this period, it suggests some very rapid developments in the citizen body there. Even if the origins of the decree were Philippopolitans, it makes little political sense to have a body of new citizens honouring native leaders, in a native sanctuary (and, by implication, uncon-nected with the new regime?), at a time when Philip’s city leaders, in a native sanctuary (and, by implication, uncon-nectsed with the new regime!), at a time when Philip’s city

cities. Civic decrees from Makedonia do sometimes adopt δεδόχθαι οτί ἡ πόλη ἡ πόλις, but in the singular, not the plural form. So the formula at Batkun has no clear antecedent.

In the case of the Pisto-rios and Seuthopolis decrees, we have examples of royal decisions couched in the style of a *polis*.34 We can envisage how the chancery styles of royal dynasties, which were closely involved in Aegaean affairs from the time of the Persian Wars onwards, acquired some of the formal characteristics of documents produced by the more officious Aegaean *poleis*. But at Batkun we may have evidence of a non-Greek community operating with a considerable degree of autonomy and adopting the bureaucratic procedures of a Greek *polis*.

Pistiros is clearly an exceptional case, but its status could have some bearing on how we view the Batkun decree. The original editors of the inscription were content to characterise Pistiros as an *emporion*.35 Thereafter opinion divided sharply. Hansen, in his study of Archaic and Classical *emporion*, concluded that Pistiros appeared to be the only example of an *emporion* that was definitely not a *polis*.36 He has since changed his mind, and in the revised version of the 1997a article he argues that Pistiros was both a *polis* and an *emporion*, that the citizens of Pistiros are the Pisto-iren (l. 16), whereas the Greek *emporitai* include citizens of marble, Apollonia and Thasos living or staying in Pistiros as foreign- ers (Hansen (2004)).

Most commentators have accepted that the site at Adjyska Vodenitsa corresponds, wholly or partly, with Pistiros. The question of status has been explored most explicitly by Bravo.37 In his view, the Pistiros of the inscription is not an *emporion* but a *polis*, in the juridico-political sense of the term, while the *emporitai* referred to are subject to an Odrysian ruler. Pistiros cannot, on this reckoning, be connected with the site at Adjyska Vodenitsa, nor, indeed, with any site so deep into the heart of the continent.38 Pistiros must therefore refer to the coastal community referred to by Hdt. 7.109.2. The two references in Stephanos to a *polis* and an *emporion* of this name are therefore seen to apply to the latter. The site near Vetren would then be one of the *emporia* to which the text refers. A. S. Chankowski, co-author of the same article, adopts similar conclusions. The principal objection to their thesis is the fact that the inscription shows an Odrysian ruler manifestly dictating terms to the people of Pistiros. No contemporary source attributes to an Odrysian ruler such decisive power over coastal (Greek) communities. Nor does any contemporary source locate a major *emporion* on the Aegean coast, in the vicinity of Thasos. Neither of these two authors addresses the issue of whether the evidence of a coastal Pistiros squares with the evidence of complex traffic across Rhodope, with which the stipulations of the decree are specifically concerned. If Pistiros were on the Aegean coast, it is hard to see why an

---

32 Bravo and Chankowski (1999) 296–99 argue that the Batkun stele cannot have originated in the sanctuary, because it refers to Apollo, whose cult is not attested there. They believe that either the stele was displayed at Vetren, an Odrysian dynastic seat, then reused at Batkun, or the Batkun stone was copied from a text displayed elsewhere. The latter argument explains nothing; the former presupposes that a civic community somewhere else honoured the ruler in his own seat. These are, of course, possibilities, but no evidence has been furnished in support of either. The authors do not discuss the curious motion formula of the decree. It should be noted that the evidence so far produced by investigations at the sanctuary does not extend back into the period in question (cf. Tsontchev (1941)).

33 Nawotka (1999) 37–68, for the formulas of Miletos (no. 854) and Milesian Pontic colonies, which are comparatively standardised, and thus very different indeed; there are some parallels with the smaller civic centres of east Makedonia, but these do normally give the name of the issuing city in the formula: Hatzopoulos (1996) no. 41.20 (Amphipolis), 53.12 (Morylllos), 55.17 (Pydna), 58.9 (Pella), 60.16 (Beroia).

34 Rhodes, DGS 18–29, 550–57.


37 Bravo and Chankowski (1999).

38 “La ville de Vetren était-elle une *polis* au sens politique du mot? La question semblera sans doute absurde. Aux yeux de tous ceux qui se sont intéressés à cet établissement, il va de soi qu’il n’était une *polis*” (Bravo and Chankowski (1999) 281).
Odrysian ruler would place most emphasis on the routes between Pistiros and Maroneia, and less on those between Pistiros and the “other enporia” (ll. 22–25), if the latter involved the most difficult overland routes. Indeed, the very vague way in which the “other enporia” are referred to in the inscription leaves no clear motive for the presence of the stone (originally) at Vetren. The relationship between the data on the stele and its situating would be opaque. Locating the epigraphic Pistiros on the Aegean coast does not fit the ancient literary evidence either, whether in near contemporary periploi or in the historical fragments reported in later transmissions, such as those of Stephanos of Byzantium. In order to interpret documents such as these inscriptions, we need to construct a clearer view of the evolution of poleis, or cognate forms, in inland Thrace.

2. Lexicographic Sources—Stephanos of Byzantium

The most informative source of information about communities of the Thracian interior is the treatise Ethnika by Stephanos of Byzantium. (Stephanos’ focus of interest lies in the names of various settlements, although he reproduces a limited amount of information concerning the status of his named locations, as well as references to communities not connected with specified centres.) “Thrace” is nowhere explained, of course, because Stephanos did not see it as his remit to analyse the contents of his list. Thrace thus extends from the Haimos mountains to the Chalkidic peninsula and the coastal regions of the Aegean as far as Therme, a geographical definition that corresponds neither to the political division of the region nor to the defined coastal limits. Indeed, the very vague way in which the “other enporia” are referred to in the inscription leaves no clear motive for the presence of the stone (originally) at Vetren. The relationship between the data on the stele and its situating would be opaque. Locating the epigraphic Pistiros on the Aegean coast does not fit the ancient literary evidence either, whether in near contemporary periploi or in the historical fragments reported in later transmissions, such as those of Stephanos of Byzantium. In order to interpret documents such as these inscriptions, we need to construct a clearer view of the evolution of poleis, or cognate forms, in inland Thrace.

The range of names represented in Stephanos’ treatise is a separate problem. In simple numerical terms, the largest number come from locations on or near the coast of the northern Aegean, with the Chalkidic peninsula and the coastlines west and east of it being particularly well represented, with far fewer names that can be associated with the Euxine coast. Even fewer can be identified as “continental”. It is difficult to judge whether the imbalance between the coastal and the continental interior reflects a genuine phenomenon—that is, a general preponderance of maritime poleis over inland ones—or whether the self-selecting principle is at work: viz. an over-reliance on periploi and similar treatises whose focus was inevitably coastal. Maps in Antiquity, with a few notable exceptions, were mainly coastal itineraries. Whereas knowledge of coastal geography played a vital role in maritime activity, and the need to map coastlines provided an important impetus to the creation of detailed descriptions for the benefit of sea captains, there was no analogous incentive to map inland areas, except for internal fiscal or administrative purposes. Access to ports and docking facilities, for non-local people, was far more straightforward than access to inland areas. Strabo’s Geography is just as prone to this imbalance between coastal and inland areas, as were earlier historians and geographers. Pliny’s knowledge of inland Thrace betrays a similar weakness. The majority of Stephanos’ Thracian poleis are not attributed to any writer. Of those that are attributed, Hekataios, Herodotos, Thucydides and Theopompos are most frequently cited, with Strabo, Polybios and Lykophron mentioned occasionally. Hekataios’ Periegesis, which became a model for later writers, shows a preponderance of coastal names. Some of these are rather obscure or oth-

39 See most recently Flensted-Jensen (2000).
wise unattested. These more obscure place-names may have been ephemeral. But most of the sites Hekataios referred to became more, not less, important as population centres.\footnote{Hansen (1997b).} Leaving aside sites along the Aegean seaboard, which have been studied elsewhere, we are left with a small core of native-sounding names, notably Boryza (FGrHist 1 fr. 166), Lipaxos (fr. 149), Kreston (fr. 153), Iton (fr. 168) and Kabassos (fr. 169). (Note that the only one which is explicitly called a polis by Hekataios is Boryza (fr. 166), and here we learn that it is a polis inhabited by Persians, i.e. not by Greeks or Thracians. In the other four cases the site-classification of polis has no authority other than Stephanos and cannot with any certainty be traced back to Hekataios (Hansen (1997b) 17–18).) Stephanos quotes Hekataios about Boryza, to indicate that this was a polis of Persian origin before Cape Thynias. More surprisingly perhaps, Kabassos was a polis beyond the Haimos mountains, connected, in Hekataios’ narrative, with the prodigal attitude of Thracians in those parts towards marriage. As Hansen has pointed out, Hekataios applied the term polis to a significant number of non-Hellenic communities.\footnote{Ibid. 18–20, 26–27.} Since he used the term polis in the political and geographical senses with respect to Hellenic poleis, it is interesting to speculate what he may have understood as the institutional framework of the non-Hellenic settlements at a time when commercial relations between the Aegean and other parts of the Mediterranean were still comparatively rudimentary, and contacts of any kind irregular. Hekataios’ fragments of the Periegesis ges give an impression of spectacular insights that have been blurred by the peculiar way in which his words have been transmitted. (The range of place-names is so erratic that we can see only small glimpses of what must, to him, have been a landscape full of poleis, from Eliburge (fr. 38), a polis of Tartessos, or Nurax in Keltike (fr. 56), to Chorasmie of the Parthians (fr. 293) and Kaspapryros, a polis of Gandara (fr. 295).) What is striking about this vision of Hekataios is that he used the same terms for communities that were culturally dissimilar. He perceived a complementarity in the sites of different regions, a complementarity that we find hard to understand, not least because most of our written evidence postdates the Persian War and the consequent tendency of Greek authors to distinguish Hellas from its neighbours.

Alongside Hekataios’ sites in Thrace, we have a longer list of names from Stephanos, derived from a variety of sources, referring to non-coastal poleis about which very little is known. We could even include here the putative native foundations of Byzantium, Mesembria Pontika, Polytymia and Selymbria. Although the source is late (Nicolaus of Damascus), etymology presupposes some native connection that goes back to the founding days of these poleis.\footnote{Nawotka (1994); Porozhanov (2002).} Some of these are sites known in Hellenistic or Roman times as urban centres, but we lack sufficient data at present to be able to specify which communities had an earlier history as poleis. But these were not among the nuclei that became significant civic centres in Imperial times. Some names look like poleis names derived from community or geographical ones.

### Possible inland poleis referred to by Stephanos

Agessos (Ἀγεσσός); Alybas (Ἀλύβας); Apsynthos (Ἀψυνθός); Arne (Ἀρνη τῆς Ἐρασιών); Benna (Βέννα); Beres (Βέρης); Bibastos (Βίβαστος); Bizye (Βιζής cf. RE iii.1. 552; SEG 40 565); Boiotia (Βοιωτία); Daphnousion (Δαφνούσιον); cf. Daphnousion: SEG 43 880–883, 884; Daunius Teichos (Δαύνιον τείχος); Doriskos (Δορίσκος); Epimaston (not a proper name?); Gigonos (Γίγωνος); Goes (Γοείς); Karos Kepoi (Καρός κήποι); Kattouza (Κάττουζα); Kobrys (Κόβρυς; cf. Ps.-Skylax 67: επορίον); Kossaia (Κοσσαία); Lykone (Λυκώνη); Lykozeia (Λυκοζεία); Mlkosos (Μίλκοσος); Naissos (Νάϊσσος); Nastos (Νάστος); Nestos (Νέστος); Nikaia (Νίκαια); Nipsa (Νίψα); cf. Niparion; SEG 44 1302; Nysa (Νύσα); Passa (Πάσσα); Perne (Πέρνη); Phlegra (Φλέγρα); Phorunna (Φόρυννα); Pisye/Pitye (Πίσυ, Πίτυν); Pirna (Πιρνα); Sikra (Σίκρα; cf. SEG 45 791: Σικραίουs); Spartakos (Σπάρτακος); Strambai (Σπάρμβαι); Therne (Θερνή); Thistoros (Θεστώρος); Tomeus (Τομεύς); Tylis (Τύλης).

Although Stephanos rarely gives much additional information about his sources, occasionally we are rewarded. His references to Kabyle and Pistiros draw on the work of Anaximenes of Lampskos, probably his Philippic Histories (Jacoby, FGrHist 72). Harpokration’s reference to Masteira contains a telling comment: viz. that he could not identify any trace of a Drongylion or a Masteira (the places Demosthenes bandied about) in Anaximenes’ Philippika, whereas there was mention of a Basteira, or Pisteira, or Epimaston (FGrHist 72 fr. 10). Could these belong to a digression on the names of Pistoias?\footnote{Bošnakov (1999).} There is no evidence
that a Beroe/Beroia was another of Philip's foundations, on the site of Augusta Traiana (Stara Zagora), and traditions about Binaí are deeply confused. 48

3. Defining Thracian Poleis

The appearance of the term poleis in a frankly non-Greek environment can be interpreted in at least three different ways. Either the communities so designated were constituted from without (as a result of colonisation, conquest or some other form of territorial acquisition by a Greek authority); or the term applies to native institutions, interpreted or equated with the Greek word poleis. Third, it is at least theoretically possible that poleis appeared in non-Greek areas in emulation of Greek institutions. Each of these interpretations is closely associated with a particular vision of community development in and around the Aegean, or, more broadly, the Mediterranean, in the first millennium BC. Despite the paucity of written data for inland Thrace, there is evidence of poleis, however interpreted, from at least 500 onwards, though we know little of how they were organised internally. In a seminal paper Georgi Mihailov (1986) explored the evolution of towns in the Balkan region in Antiquity. Inevitably, much of his discussion ranged over material from the Imperial period. But he began his essay, consciously and deliberately, in the period prior to the Makedonian expansion into Thrace, exploring some of the principal ideas about internal socio-political development that had characterised Bulgarian scholarship in the 1960s and 1970s. It was clear from the ancient literature that cities did exist, but it was hard to find appropriate evidence. As an epigraphist, Mihailov was more conscious of the need to investigate institutions as well as typologies of place. In the 1980s, the subject of urbanisation began to attract more attention (Balabanov (1986)).

The study of political institutions in neighbouring Makedonia was beginning to produce interesting results that also had implications for their cognates in Thrace (Hatzopoulos (1984)). Much of this research was concerned with political institutions in the post-Makedonian and Roman Imperial eras. But, in tracing these back to their beginnings, Miltiades Hatzopoulos discovered how much had escaped the gaze of historians, who were still inclined to think mainly in terms of rulers and conquered, rather than of communities and their institutions. His *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings* (1996) was a substantial monograph which attempted to sketch the relationships between individual communities and their representatives, on the one hand, and the machinery of government, on the other (Hatzopoulos (1997)). Far from being late attempts by rulers to impose order on their subjects, Makedonian civic institutions are emerging as a series of interconnected levels of government, beginning with the village and its connections with the nearest town. No such study is as yet possible for Thrace, but I believe that the organisation of cities and territories in this region would benefit from a similar approach (Archibald (2000)).

II. The Poleis

652. Alexandropolis Unlocated. Not in Barr. Type: B/B.

The toponym is Αλεξανδρόπολις (Plut. Alex. 9.1); for Αλεξάνδρεια at Steph. Byz., see infra. The poleis status can be inferred from the toponym, but see infra.

The principal, perhaps, only source for this poleis is Plut. Alex. 9.1: Alexander, left in charge of affairs and of minting in Makedonia during Philip’s absence on campaign against Byzantion (no. 674) in 341, suppressed an uprising of the Maidoi, captured their poleis, ejected its inhabitants, and settled a mixed community in their place, calling this new foundation Alexandropolis. The incident is usually connected with the same campaign that led to a confrontation between Antipater and Parmenio on the Makedonian side, with the “Tetrachoritai” on the other (P.Ryl. 1.19 = Theopomp. fr. 217; cf. Archibald (1998)).

The other possible source is Steph. Byz. 70.8: Αλεξάνδρεια πόλεις δικτυωκαίδεκα with 71.8–9: τρίτη Θράκης προς τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ, “the one he founded before the big Alexandria, being seventeen years of age”.

Since Stephanos lists all eighteen cities founded by Alexander under the heading Αλεξάνδρειαι, the presumption is that the third one, that in Thrace, is identical with Plutarch’s Alexandropolis and that its name was in fact Alexandropolis, as reported by Plutarch. However, the story that Alexander founded a poleis at the age of 16 or 17 may be just another anecdote about Alexander, of which there are so many in late sources (cf. Fraser (1996) 26 and 29–30).

653. Apros Map 52. Lat. 41.00, long. 27.05. Size of territory: ? Type: C: ︖ The toponym is Ἄπρος, Ἄπρος (SEG 37 618; C4f); Steph. Byz. 107.5); the later Roman colony was called Ἀπροι in the plural (Ptol. 3.11.7; Plin. *HN* 4.47). Steph. Byz.
Deep trenches in the Roman city have revealed evidence of Artemis Phosphoros and Herakles (Velkov (1983)), have shown that the earliest occupation layer in this area dates from the same period, on the basis of imported amphora stamps of C45 (Domaradzki (1991)) 59; Getov (1995) 99–101. Deep trenches in the Roman city have revealed evidence of earlier deposits. None of this material has yet been published, although brief reports have appeared in the annual bulletin of excavations of the Institute of Archaeology, Sofia (Archaeologicheski Otkrytiya i Razkopki = AOR). Between 1986 and 1990, Getov excavated the road leading into the city from the western gate. Domaradzki revealed a road surface paved with river stones and fired clay sherds at the level of the early Macedonian gateway, and a similar road surface made of pebbles close to tower no. 2. Stone foundations belonging to various structures of the late Iron Age (second half of the first millennium bc) were discovered near the same tower and below the floor of the Roman horreum. The foundations of an oval(?) hut were found near the western gate, together with stone footings and clay floors belonging to residential units whose design cannot as yet be determined.

The most important evidence dating to the first 100 years after Philip II’s foundation comes from burials in tumuli outside the city (Getov (1991)). These suggest that local elite families continued to dominate civic affairs; the names of moneyers and such information as can be gleaned from epigraphic and written sources tend to confirm this impression (Draganov (1993); cf. Dimitrov in Dimitrov and Penchev (1998)). In Antiquity, the river-bend of the Tonzos (modern Tundja), now occupied by a tributary of the Tonzos, the Azmak, lay some 3 or 4 km nearer Kabyle, and thus washed around its south-eastern periphery. The excavators assume that docking facilities would have existed close by. The nucleus of the ancient settlement was the acropolis of Zaiči vrh, where an Iron Age cult centre was located, associated in Hellenistic times with Artemis Phosphoros and Herakles (Velkov (1983) 237–38). Traces of occupation in the early Iron Age have been discovered on the lower hill to the south-east, called Hisarlik (Archibald (1998) 45 with further refs.).

Excavations along the lower slopes of Zaiči vrh, where the C4 western gateway and contemporary parts of the adjacent circuit wall were discovered (Domaradzki (1991)), have shown that the earliest occupation layer in this area dates from the same period, on the basis of imported amphora stamps of C45 (Domaradzki (1991)).

The most important evidence dating to the first 100 years after Philip II’s foundation comes from burials in tumuli outside the city (Getov (1991)). These suggest that local elite families continued to dominate civic affairs; the names of moneyers and such information as can be gleaned from epigraphic and written sources tend to confirm this impression (Draganov (1993); cf. Dimitrov in Dimitrov and Penchev (1984) concerning Seuthopolis; Archibald (1998) 311, 315–16). On the basis of numismatic, archaeological and epigraphic data, scholars have postulated a formative phase of the city while a Macedonian garrison was resident, c.340–280, followed by a period dominated by one or more local rulers, from c.280, with a marked diminution of activity from C2 onwards, precipitated perhaps by the aggressive campaigns of Philip V.

The spatial characteristics of the city in pre-Imperial times are uncertain. The agora and sanctuary (Phosphoron) of Artemis, mentioned in the Seuthopolis inscription, have not yet been located. The acropolis shrine was put out of use by a tower, associated by Velkov with the introduction of the Macedonian garrison, but activities at the shrine resumed, perhaps later in C3. Unpublished evidence from Hisarlik of extensive trading contacts in C5–C4 suggests that there may have been a permanent settlement there before the advent of Philip II; but how this changed in response to the Macedonian garrison, and the creation of a fortified enclosure, is still unknown. Kabyle minted coins on behalf of two local leaders, Spartokos and Skostokos, and later for the Celtic chieftain Cavarus. An autonomous bronze coinage began some time in the second quarter of C3, showing the city’s patron goddess, Artemis Phosphoros, and the legend KAB (Draganov (1983)).
(1993), (1998)). In C3 coins of Kabyle circulated in an area extending westwards along the upper Tundja valley north of Nova Zagora, and southwards some 40 km downstream (Draganov 1998 map 1). The issues of Spartokos and Skostokos suggest that whatever power they had was of limited scope and duration, and that they acted as lieutenants, or officials, rather than rulers (Draganov (1984, 1985); Archibald (1998) 311–12).

655. Philippopolis (Philippopolites) Map 22. Lat. 42.10, long. 24.45. Size of territory: ? Type: B:γ. The toponym is Φιλιππούπολις, η (Steph. Byz. 666.9; Plin. HN 4.41; Dexippus ((FGrHist 100) fr. 27.1). The city-ethnic is Φιλιπποπολίτες (Steph. Byz. 666.10, perhaps just a conjecture). Philippopolis is called a polis in late sources only (Steph. Byz.; Dexippus) but probably by Theopompos too, since the late tradition about the nickname Πονηρόπολις seems to be a direct quotation of his work (Plut. Mor. 520B; Plin. HN 4.41; Suda Δ1423 = Theopomp. fr. 110, see infra).

Philippopolis (Plovdiv) is usually considered to have been one of the cities founded by Philip II when he was consolidating his power in Thrace after the defeat of Kerceleptes, the last independent ruler of the region (Diod. 16.71.2). Diodorus does not name any of the cities, but Pliny says “oppidum sub Rhodope Poneropolis aneta, mox a conditore Philippopolis, nunc a situ Trimontium dicta” (HN 4.11.41), without specifying which king was being referred to. But Dexippus specifies that Philip is the son of Amyntas, which rules out Philip V (whom Domaradzki (1993) 36 preferred, judging by the absence of any clear military architecture before the late Hellenistic period). The epithet “Poneropolis” derives from Theopompos (fr. 110, see supra), and is consistent with the sort of moralistic, disparaging phrases the historian used liberally of Philip II (e.g. fr. 162; cf. Flower (1994) 119–30). Pliny takes the disparaging name too literally, assuming it to have been an earlier epithet of Philippopolis.

The historical origins of Philippopolis lie in the sanctuary that occupied part or all of the summit of Nebet tepe, which, together with Djambaz tepe and Taksim tepe, constituted “Trimontium” under the Roman Empire. The earliest traces of cult activity date to the early Bronze Age (Tsonchev (1938); Peykov (1990), (1994), (1995)). Some controversy has attached to the Iron Age remains that succeeded these (see Domaradzki (1998) 22–29; Popov (2000) 125–26). But recent excavations have shown that the cult centre here was far larger and more ambitious in C4l and C3e than had previously been thought (Koleva (1997); Koleva et al. (2000) 103–8). These discoveries have dispelled any doubts that may have existed about the religious nature of activities on the summit. Six locations have been investigated in detail on the summit of Nebet tepe, and one below it, on the eastern side of the ancient city. A concentric circular stone foundation (St. Matanov trench) marks a substantial structure belonging to the late Bronze or beginning of the Iron Age (i.e. in absolute dates, end of second and early first millennium). Cult deposits in the area of the temple continued until C6 or C5.

Approximately 300 m away, on the same terrace, three strata were identified belonging to the period between C5 and C3. In the latest stratum was the foundation of a rectangular structure, oriented north–south, whose hard-beaten floor contained a decorated hearth altar and a trapezoidal platform, the former resembling well-known types from Southopolis, Vetren and elsewhere in Thrace (Koleva et al. (2000) 104 fig. 1 for plan; fig. 3, hearth altar). Elsewhere rock carvings bring this sanctuary into line with upland cult sites in the Sakar and Strandja mountains and at Kabyle (Začić vrhu). Twenty-six pits associated with cult activity and three hearth altars were discovered on Kamchya Street, at the north-eastern foot of Nebet tepe. This area seems to be linked with activities on the summit not just in terms of chronology (C6 onwards) and function, but also in the design of specific structures. Some of the pits were superseded by a roofed construction, resembling the form of a building that succeeded the circular “temple” on the summit.

There is now growing agreement among scholars that D. Tsonchev was right to postulate a fortified enclosure on the summit of Nebet tepe before the Makedonian conquest (Tsonchev (1938); Botusharova (1963); Domaradzki (1998) 28; Koleva et al. (2000) 110–11; Popov (2000) 129). Traces of a wall made of river stones have been dated before C6 (Domaradzki (1998) 28, with discussion). The earliest section of masonry in the city’s fortifications has been dated to between C3 and C2, and may be connected with the campaigns of Philip V rather than Philip II (Botusharova (1965)).

The nucleus of Iron Age activity at Plovdiv expanded from the summit of Nebet tepe to its surrounding plain. This expansion was already in progress in C6–C5. A little further from Nebet tepe, to the south-east, a cultural deposit of C4–C3 (4 m below the modern street) has revealed domestic structures and abundant movable finds (ceramics, including imported fine wares, numerous loom weights and coins of Maroneia, Philip II and Alexander III). In the vicinity are burial mounds and flat cremation burials dating


The main source for PISTIROS is the recently found C4 inscription (BCH, discussed supra 887–90). It is a renewal of the privileges bestowed by the late Kotys on a community of Greeks in PISTIROS. As a group the Greeks are called ἐμπορίται, a rare word presumably used synonymously with ἐμποροὶ, but not quite: ἐμποροὶ are traders who travel from place to place. The ἐμπορίται seem to be the inhabitants of the emporion, only some of whom were ἐμποροὶ (ll. 10–11). PISTIROS is not explicitly called an ἐμπόριον, but from the term ἐμπορίται and the reference to other emporia in the neighbourhood (ll. 22–24) it seems safe to infer that the place was an emporion, an inference supported by Stephanos’ note: Πίστιρος, ἐμπόριον Θράκης (524.11).

In constitutional terms, PISTIROS appears to be a polis, not just an urban centre, but it also enjoyed some degree of autonomy, which was asserted, as well as constrained, by the unnamed ruler in relation to other named and unnamed groups. It is worth noting that the terminology of the decree might be distinguishing between οἱ Πιστιρενοὶ (l. 16) and “Apolloiians and Thasians who are in PISTIROS” (ll. 32–33; Maronitans, l. 28, also understood?). But the reference to PISTIROS comes from the main body of the decree, while the latter distinction is contained in the citation attributed to Kotys (I).

To understand the status of PISTIROS, one must start with the toponym Πίστιρος (ll. 12, 22–24, 33) and the ethnic Πιστιρήνωι (l. 16). PISTIROS is a rare name, and it seems reasonable to assume that there must have been some connection between the polis PISTIROS on the coast and the homonymous inland emporion, and that the PISTIRENIAI living in the emporion were citizens of the polis, just as others among the inhabitants were citizens of Apollonia, Maroneia and Thasos (Hansen (2004); Velkov and Domaradzka (1994) 7; Loukopoulou (1999) 368 assumes a transfer of the settlement, i.e. a metoikēsis. It is nowhere stated that the citizens of Apollonia, Maroneia and Thasos were among the emporitai = the PISTIRENIAI. The MARONITAI, APOLLOI, and THASAI may well have been emporoi, i.e. travelling merchants or merchants living for a shorter or longer period in PISTIROS without becoming citizens of the community.

One possible scenario is as follows (Hansen (2004)). The emporion of PISTIROS was an inland trading station, originally founded by merchants coming from the polis of PISTIROS, a dependency of Thasos situated on the Thracean coast (Hdt. 7.109.2). The core of the settlers (τῶν ὀικητῶν in l. 38) were from the outset citizens of the polis PISTIROS (cf. Πιστιρήνωι at l. 16), but some of the other inhabitants were citizens of Maroneia, Apollonia and Thasos (ll. 27–33), and in C4 they may have formed the most important element of the population. It is apparent from the inscription that it was only one out of a number of emporia in inland Thrace involved principally in trade with Maroneia (ll. 21–24). The emporion was surrounded by native Thracians (τῶν Θραϊκῶν in ll. 8–9). The mixture of four different ethnics suggests that PISTIROS was not an ordinary polis in its own right. But we cannot exclude the possibility that PISTIROS was a kind of dependent polis whose citizens are described as Πιστιρηνοὶ, and that the Μαρωνίται, the Θάσιοι and the Ἀπολλονιηται lived in PISTIROS as metics.

At present the origins of the emporion are uncertain. The site at Adjiyska Vodenitsa was occupied some time in C5 (Bouzek (2002a) discusses the evidence prior to C5). Excavations have yet to reveal the character of the earliest settlement. During C5s, the area was (re)organised in a formal manner, based on a street system integrated with the fortification walls and the eastern gateway, through which
the main east–west road (Domaradzki (1993), (1995), (1996), (2002)). This east–west road has at least three major surfaces, which mirror the key events that affected life on the site in its three phases. The initial plan consisted of an ambitious double-faced masonry wall enclosing a grid plan of streets, paved with ashlar slabs, similar to the wall itself and the main drain. Some time in C4f, perhaps in the 370s, the eastern gateway was modified substantially, with the reconstruction of the exterior tower. This reconstruction heralds a phase of spectacular internal development, both architectural and commercial. Multi-roomed structures, on stone footings, roofed with imported and locally made tiles, can certainly be traced back to this period. The largest number of bulk imports, including storage amphorae from Chios, Thasos and elsewhere in the Aegean, together with Attic fig- and other Aegean civic coins. Other items of territory: Σευθόπολις (SEG 42 661.31 (C3e)). The polis status of Seuthopolis can be deduced from its toponym.
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domestic and commercial. Multi-roomed structures, on stone footings, roofed with imported and locally made tiles, can certainly be traced back to this period. The largest number of bulk imports, including storage amphorae from Chios, Thasos and elsewhere in the Aegean, together with Attic fig- and black-glazed pottery, belong to this period. C.300, the eastern gateway perished in a fierce blaze and was never rebuilt in the same form. The successor gateway was far more modest and lacked many of the specific defensive features of its predecessor. The road was relaid with cobbles made of river stones, not dressed slabs (Domaradzki (1995), (1995), (1996), (2002)). There followed a lengthy period of redevelopment, involving the reuse of older materials. Some areas seem to have changed their function (Domaradzki (1999); Archibald et al. (2002)). The interpretation of this phase is still in progress.

One of the most remarkable aspects of the finds at Vetren is the large number of coins discovered during the excavations. The total number currently stands at c.1,800 items. A pot hoard of 552 Makedonian coins, datable to the 28os, was found by the Czech team in a building adjacent to the east–west road. The coins range from rare regal issues of Amadokos I, Kotys I, Amadokos II and other Thracian rulers, to imitation Thasian denominations, silver from Parion, the Chersonese, Mesembria and Apollonia on the Black Sea, as well as other Aegean civic coins. Other items of commercial significance include weights and measures, and graffiti. Domestic items include loom weights, spindle whorls, gaming tokens, metallic pins, needles, ornaments and other equipment, together with tools for domestic and industrial (metallurgical) use.

The name of the city indicates that it was either founded or refounded in C4f by Seuthes III, a Thracian prince who in the years c.325–315 asserted his independence of Makedonia (Bengtson (1962) 19–20). Seuthopolis is usually taken to be the residence of Seuthes III (Archibald (1998) 313). The city of Seuthes III was unknown until its chance discovery and excavation in advance of the construction of the Georgi Dimitrov Dam in the upper course of the river Tundja. The only known reference to Seuthopolis in written sources is in the inscription found in a room of the “palace” during its excavation. The publication formula (ll. 27–34) prescribes that one copy of the text be deposited in Seuthopolis (l. 31) in the sanctuary of the Great Gods, and a second copy in the hieron of Dionysos, in the agora (IGBulg. ill.2 (1964) 146–49 no. 1731; Velkov (1991a) 7–11; SEG 42 661 (ed. pr.), 46 877*, 48 995).

The plan of the excavated city (8 km west of modern Kazanluk) covered a mere 5 ha and was situated on a ridge above the river Chiflikchiyska, a tributary of the Tonzos (Tundja), which protected the city on its eastern flank. From the other three sides it was enclosed by a circuit wall of brick on a foundation of two stone courses, the lowest of which forms a slight bench extending away from the outer face. Squarish towers protected the corners of a pentangular area, divided into insulae by a cruciform pattern of streets, north–south and east–west, with narrower cross-streets. The insulae were divided into residential property units, comprising house designs of pastas and prostatas types. One room usually contained a decorated hearth altar. The northwestern corner of the city plan was separated from the city by an additional fortification wall, also with towers at each corner, and entered through a gateway without special elaboration. The inscription refers to the agora, a sanctuary of Dionysos and a shrine of the Samothrakian gods. The latter shrine was identified with the complex of rooms in the “acropolis” area. The agora was situated north of the east–west road, but remains in the area were not sufficiently well preserved to allow any clear identification of the sanctuary of Dionysos.

The circulation of Seuthes III’s coins in a relatively homogeneous area suggests the possible scope of his political power. This area included the Valley of the Roses, the Thracian plain between the valley of the river Tundja on the east, including Kabyle, and the river Sazliyka in the west, east of Plovdiv, extending down the Hebros valley towards Haskovo and Svilengrad (Domaradzki (1987) 7 and map 2 = Archibald (1998) 312 fig. 13.1).
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THRAICIAN CHERSONESOS

LOUISA LOUKOPOULOU

I. The Region

North of the Hellespont—the only waterway linking the Aegean Sea to the Propontis and thence to the Black Sea—lay the relatively low peninsula (maximum altitude 300 m) called the Thracian or Hellespontine Chersonesos, or simply Chersonesos; Θρακία Χερρόνησος (Ps.-Skylax 67; cf. Ps.-Skymnos 698; Strabo 7 fr. 52); Χερρόνησος ἐν Ἱλίῳ (Hdt. 7.33); Ἑλλησπόντια Χερρόνησος (Steph. Byz. 80.13); Χερρόνησος (Hdt. 6.36.2; Xen. Hell. 1.5.17).¹ The corresponding ethnic is Χερσονησίτης (Hdt. 4.137.1), or Χερσονησίτης (Dem. fr. 7.25). The region is only indirectly known in the Iliad (2.836), where Sestos (no. 672) is mentioned together with Abydos (no. 765), its counterpart on the Asiatic shore of the Straits. It covers c.900 km² of mostly fertile agricultural land (Xen. Hell. 3.2.10), but above all, it was of major strategic importance. The Hellespont narrows to a width of 1.2 km just west of Sestos (between Dardanos and Kynos Sema), and provides a good crossing point and even the possibility of bridging from coast to coast. The peninsula is linked to the Thracian mainland by a narrow isthmus (minimum width 3 km). It was exposed to continuous marauding from neighbouring inland tribes, but could relatively easily be fortified and defended. The isthmus and the Long Wall—constructed from sea to sea as early as C6th (Hdt. 6.36.2; cf. Plin. HN 4.43, cf. 48) and repeatedly restored thereafter—constituted the inland border of the Chersonesos, at least in the Archaic and Classical periods (Ps.-Skylax 67; Ps.-Skymnos 698–712). However, Hegesippos (Dem. 7.39–41) claims that the frontier of the Chersonesos lay far beyond Agora—thus well beyond the isthmus wall on which Kardia (no. 665), Agora (no. 661) and Paktye (no. 671) were situated—and that its border was marked by the altar of Zeus Horios, between Pteleon and Leuke Akte, where Philip II planned to dig a canal.

¹ For a discussion of the dual use of the name Chersonesos (geographical as well as political) and the city-ethnic derived from the toponym, see Hansen (1997a) 21–22 and infra s.v. Chersonesos/Agora (no. 666).

According to the literary tradition (Ps.-Skymnos 698–710; cf. Strabo 7 fr. 50), the Chersonesos was first colonised by Aiolians, who came mainly from Lesbos. They founded Sestos (no. 672) and Madytos (no. 669) on the Hellespontine coast, and Alopekonesos (no. 659) at the southernmost end of the Gulf of Melas. The first colonists were followed by Milesians (no. 854), who founded Limnai (no. 668) (cf. Strabo 14.1.6), in collaboration with Klausmenians (no. 847), who founded Kardia (no. 665) (Strabo 7 fr. 50). At the southernmost end of the peninsula, opposite Sigeion (no. 791), on the site of Elaious (no. 663), archaeological remains of the same period (C7) testify to a presumably Aiolian or Athenian settlement (Loukopoulou 1989) 35 n. 2 and 68 n. 6; cf. Isaac (1986) 192–93.

Before the end of C7, the strategic and financial importance of the Straits attracted the Athenians, who secured control over Sigeion, a Mytilenean colony on the Asiatic coast of the south entrance of the Hellespont. Athenian interests in the area were further pursued around the middle of C6 under Peisistratos. They were presumably triggered by a call of the native Chersonesian Dolonkoi, who were threatened by the neighbouring Apsinthians (Hdt. 6.34ff.; cf. Hecat. fr. 163). Under the leadership of Miltiades the Elder, several Athenian colonies were founded or refounded: viz. Krithote (no. 667), Paktye (no. 671), Elaious (no. 663) (Ps.-Skymnos 709ff; Ephor. fr. 40), Agora (no. 661) (Hdt. 7.58; cf. the polis Chersonesos in Hecat. fr. 163) and Kardia (no. 665) (according to Ps.-Skymnos 699–702). Next, Miltiades constructed the 36 stadia-long fortification wall across the isthmus of the peninsula (Hdt. 6.36.2). It was repeatedly rebuilt, first in C5 (Plut. Per. 19.1), then in C4e (Xen. Hell. 3.2.9–10), and again in later centuries (Procop. Aed. 4.12f). On the presumed location and traces of the wall, see Kahrstedt (1954) 11–14. Miltiades also sought to strengthen the defences of the Chersonesos against incursions by the Apsinthians by securing fortified outposts (see infra 903 (Teichos Aratou)). Miltiades became tyrannos of the Dolonkoi; he appears to have ruled the entire peninsula and was posthumously honoured as the oikistes of the Chersonesian state (Hdt. 6.38.1,
103.4; cf. Paus. 6.19.6 for a dedication set up in Olympia in the name of the Chersonesitans).²

The political situation remained unchanged under his successors: Stesagoras, who inherited the oecist’s powers (ἀρχή, Hdt. 6.38.1), and Miltiades the Younger (στρατηγοῦστος καὶ τυραννεύοντος τῶν Ἡρακλείστων, Hdt. 4.337.1). It is usually believed, however, that the old political entities, the πόλεις συχναί (Hdt. 6.33.1), represented by δυναστεύοντες (Hdt. 6.39.2; cf. Kahrstedt (1954) 8) survived alongside a central administrative centre with a prytaneion (Hdt. 6.38.2) presumably established in Agora (no. 661). The political identity of the Chersonesitan state is supported by the identification of a series of silver coins struck on the Euboic standard and dated c.515–493: obv. lion; rev. incuse square containing head of Athena, some with the legend XEP (Head, HN² 257; Seltman (1924) 141–42).

In the aftermath of the suppression of the Ionian Revolt, following the flight of Miltiades, the Chersonesos—except for Kardia (no. 665)—was occupied by the Phoenician fleet in 493 (Hdt. 6.33.1). The region joined the Delian League after its final liberation by Kimon, probably c.466 (Plut. Cim. 9.3–6, 14.1; Polyb. 1.34.2; on the date, see Isaac (1986) 176–77). Athenian presence and control were further strengthened by Perikles, who restored the defence works on the north-eastern border of the Chersonesos and on the adjacent Propontic coast (see Bisanthe (no. 663)).

The survival or breakdown of the political entity established on the Chersonesos in C6 remains a matter of major controversy. In the Athenian tribute lists the enormous sum of 18 tal. was paid in the first period by the Cherronesitai (IG i³ 259.11.28, 260.x.6, etc.), whereas the Alopekonesians were independently assessed (IG i³ 263.v.14). But the sum was drastically reduced after 447/6 to a total of less than 3 tal., divided among a number of independently contributing Chersonesitan cities: Limnaioi (no. 668), Madytioi (no. 669), Elaiousioi (no. 663), Sestioi (no. 672), Alopekonesioi (no. 669) and Cherronesitai (no. 661) or Χέρωνεσιταί ἀπ’ Ἀγορᾶς, listed from 443/2 in the Hellespontine district (IG i³ 269.11.14–21). The evidence has been variously interpreted as indicating either (a) the temporary survival of the Chersonesitan state or religious entity, or (b) an initial synteleia of otherwise independent city members, or (c) a switch from contributing ships to paying tribute by the group of individual Chersonesitan cities that are first listed in the second period, or (d) as a consequence of the settlement of Athenian colonists.³ As for the few cities that are never recorded in the tribute lists (Krithote (no. 667), Pakte (no. 671), Kardia (no. 665)), it is inferred that they held on to the old Chersonesitan state, that they received the largest numbers of Athenian colonists and are presumably included in the Cherronesitai/Chersonesitai ap’ Agoras of the tribute lists (Kahrstedt (1954) 18).

During the last decades of C5, the Pontic grain trade became of vital importance to the Athenian economy (Xen. Hell. 1.1.35–36; Isaac (1986) 180–81; Garnsey (1988) 132–33) and, consequently, the Hellespont became one of the centres at the end phase of the Ionic War (Thuc. 8.62.3, 99.2–107.1; Xen. Hell. 1.3.8–10, 1.5.17, 2.1.17–32). For the Chersonesos, a troubled period followed, marked by the ever growing pressure of the Odrysians, who now either directly or through vassal Thracian dynasts occupied vast tracts of the bordering inland region. Presumably they also controlled parts of the adjacent Propontic coast (see Bisanthe (no. 673)). Tensions were increased by the presence of famous exiled adventurers, such as the Athenian Alkibiades and the Spartan Klearchos. They held some forts and strongholds on the north-eastern border of the Chersonesos and on the adjacent Propontic coast, and they established themselves as mercenary leaders, providing protection against the Thracians (cf. Kahrstedt (1954) 22–24 and Isaac (1986) 180–85, with refs.). In 398 Chersonesitan envoys requested Sparta’s help against Thracian incursions, and Derkylidas undertook to restore the isthmus wall, now said to protect eleven or twelve poleis on the Chersonesos (Xen. Hell. 3.2.8–10; Diod. 14.38.6).

Entering the Peloponnesian League after the defeat of Athens, the Chersonesos appears to have hosted harmosts and persons who had received land from the Lakedaimonians (Xen. Hell. 4.8.5; cf. An. 7.2.15). In 378/7, a new political situation can be inferred from the list of members of the Second Athenian Naval League, where Elaious (no. 663) is the only city of the Chersonesos to be recorded (IG ii² 43B.27); the rest of the Chersonesos was presumably occupied by the Persians and subject to the satrap Ariobarzanes. Athenian interests in the region were, however, reconfirmed in 365, when Ariobarzanes ceded Sestos (no. 672) and Krithote (no. 667) to Timotheos (Isoc. 15.108, 112); they must have entered the Athenian alliance in order to ward off continuous Thracian pressure (Xen. Ages. 26: ² For detailed bibliography and arguments, based mainly on relevant epigraphic and numismatic evidence, cf. Kahrstedt (1954) 14–18 and Isaac (1986) 178–80.

—
The list of settlements excludes sanctuaries, altars, herae and other minor localities recorded in Classical or in late sources, such as Argoi (App. Syr. 63); tomb/monument of Hekuba (Strabo 13.1.28); Εκάβης τάφος; Diod. 13.40.6; Εκάβης μνημείον, alternatively named Κούρος σήμα (Thuc. 8.104.5; Strabo 13.1.28; Plin. HN 4.49)); Έλλην τάφος (Hdt. 7.58.2); Λευκή δέκατη (Hdt. 7.25.2); Πρωτεσιλάειον (Strabo 7 fr. 52.13.1.31; cf. Hdt. 7.73; Thuc. 8.102.3; Att. An. 11.1.5; Plin. HN 4.49). On a city named Αἴδηλεον attributed to the Thracian Chersonesos by Steph. Byz. 53.1, see Flensted-Jensen (1995) 117; according to Plin. HN 4.49, Aiōlon was the name of the extreme tip of the Chersonesos peninsula (extrema Cherronesi frons).

4. Usually interpreted as the political community of Athenian colonists; cf. a decree of “the Athenians in Chersonesos” (IG ii² 275 (336/5)).

5. This number is higher than the 11 or 12 suggested by Xenophon at Hell. 3.2.8–10 and the 12 listed in Ps.-Skylax, i.e. 11 toponyms after the heading πόλεις ... αἵδε plus Agora called polis individually. Note, however, that Aigos potamoi was not a polis in the period described by Xenophon and that Deris is outside the Thracian Chersonese proper.
1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis

Arrhianoi (Ἀρρηναῖοι or Ἀρρηναύ) Locality on the Hellespontine coast of the Chersonesos (Thuc. 8.104.2: ἑπὶ Ἔλλησποντον τεῖχος Ἀράτου), otherwise unattested. Not in Barr.

Drabos (Δράβος) Strabo 7 fr. 51 (52). Locality on the north coast of the Chersonese west of Kardia (no. 665), sometimes identified with Araplos (no. 660) (Kahrstedt 1954 n. 47). Barr. C.

Idakos (Ἰδακός) Locality on the Hellespontine coast of the Chersonesos (Thuc. 8.104.2), otherwise unattested. Not in Barr.

Kobrys (Κόβρυς) Listed as a πόλις Θεράκης by Steph. Byz. 400.10, quoting Theopomp. fr. 84, but in such a way that we cannot be sure whether Theopomp is his authority for the toponym only or for the site-classification as well (Hansen and Nielsen 2000: 141). According to Ps.-Skylax 67, it was one of two emporia (with Kypasis, infra), both dependencies of Kardia (no. 665), located on the Gulf of Melas, south of the estuary of the river Melas (Hansen 1997b 88–89). Kobrys has tentatively but unconvincingly been identified with Krobyle by ATL i. 480 followed by Kahrstedt (1954) 20 n. 47. Barr. C.

Koila (Κοίλα) According to Ptol. Geogr. 3.12.4, a settlement on the Hellespontine coast of the Chersonese, between Elaius (no. 663) and Sestos (no. 672). According to Plin. HN 4, a harbour on the Gulf of Melas (4.49) not far from Alopeknavnes (no. 659) (4.74). In Barr. identified with a site between Madytos (no. 669) and Sestos with remains of the Classical period. Barr. C.

Kypasis (Κύπασις) Listed as a πόλις περί Ἐλλησποντοντος by Steph. Byz. 395.12, quoting Hecat. fr. 162, but in such a way that we cannot be sure whether Hekataios is his authority for the toponym only or for the site-classification as well (Hansen 1997a: 18). According to Ps.-Skylax 67, it was one of two emporia (with Kobrys, supra), both dependencies of Kardia (no. 665), located on the Gulf of Melas, south of the estuary of the river Melas (Oberhummer 1925; Kahrstedt 1954 20 n. 47; Isaac 1986 187; Hansen 1997b 88–89). In Barr. Kypasis is located north of the river Melas. Barr. C.

Pteleon (Πτέλεων) Locality in the vicinity of Leuke Akte and the altar of Zeus Horios (Dem. 7.39–40); presumably situated near Baklar Burnu (ATL i. 564 n. 5; Kirsten 1959 1484, 2465; Isaac 1986 197) and tentatively equated with Kypasis (Kahrstedt 1954 nn. 46–47; see supra, Kypasis). Not in Barr.


“Tower of Hero” (Ἡροῦ πύργος) A coastal locality, presumably west of Sestos (no. 672) (Strabo 13.1.22). Not in Barr.

II. The Poleis

658. Aigos potamoi (Aigos po(-)) Map. 51. Lat. 27.20, long. 26.35. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: Ca. The toponym is Ἄγιος ποταμός, oí (Xen. Hell. 2.1.24; Marm. Par. A57 (r468/7)), named after the nearby river: Ἄγιος ποταμός (Ps.-Skylax 67; IG v.1 239.5 (C4e)). The collective and internal use of the city-ethnic is attested in abbreviated form on some C4s coins: ΑΙΓΟΣ ΠΟ (infra).

Aigos potamoi was situated on the Hellespontine coast of the Chersonese, not far from Sestos (no. 672), and presumably near the river Aigos potamos (Xen. Hell. 2.1.20–29; cf. schol. Ael. Arist. 164.17). Hauvette-Besnault (1880) 517–18 found no remains along the river. The actual distance between Sestos and the river Aigos potamoi is c.105 stadia; but the distance between Sestos and Aigos potamoi was 15 stadia according to Xen. Hell. 2.1.25 and 280 according to Strabo 7 fr. 55. Both must be wrong, but Xenophon’s account of the situation leading up to the battle in 405 shows beyond doubt that Sestos must have been within walking distance of Aigos potamoi; see also πλησιόν Σηστοῦ at schol. Ael. Arist. 1.167. It seems, pace Barr., that Aigos potamoi must be located somewhere south of the river.

It is apparent from Xen. Hell. 2.1.25 and 28 that Aigos potamoi was not a polis in 405, but the silver coins of, probably, C5, and the bronze coins issued in C4s (infra) indicate that Aigos potamoi probably had had polis status at some point in C5, and probably acquired polis status again some time c.350: it is not among the poleis on the Chersonese listed at Ps.-Skylax 67, a chapter that includes Datos (no. 629) and thus must be dated to C4m or a little later. Aigos potamoi is called a deserted polichne by Strabo (7 fr. 55) and a polis by Steph. Byz.
Aigos potamoi struck coins in C5–C4. (1) “Small silver coins with obv. head of a goat; rev. incuse reverse of the Chersonesian pattern” (Head, HN² 258, referring to BM). According to Head, these coins are certainly earlier than 405.

(2) Bronze: obv. Demeter; rev. goat; legend: ΑΙΓΟΣ ΠΟ. Date: c.300 (Head, HN² 258; Kahrstedt (1954) 35, 38; Isaac (1986) 196; SNG Cop. Thrace 850–54); before Alexander: BMC; C4: Grose/McClean; MacDonald/Hunterian).

659. Alopekonnesos (Alopekonnesos) Map 51. Lat. 40.20, long. 26.15. Size of territory: 2 or 3. Type: [A]:α. The toponym is Λωπεκόννησος, ἦ (Dem. 23.166; Ps.-Skylax 67). The city-ethnic is Λωπεκοκόννησος (IG ii³ 1443.97 (344/3)) or, once, Λωπεκοκόννησος (IG i³ 282.1.21). Alopekonnesos is not explicitly called a polis in any Archaic or Classical source, but in Ps.-Skylax 67, where polis is used in the urban sense, Λωπεκοκόννησος is the fourth of eleven toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις μεταξύ αἰθέων. The political sense is attested in IG i³ 282.1.15 and 21, where the Alopekonnessians are listed under the heading αἰθέω πόλεως. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form on C4 coins (infra) and externally in literature (Ephor. fr. 39) and in inscriptions (IG i³ 277.v.8). The individual use is attested both externally (IG xii.8.95 (C2), Imbros; IG xii.8.190.10–11 (C1), Samothrace; cf. Robert (1948) 37 (C1)) and internally in funerary inscriptions of Roman date, discovered at neighbouring sites in the Chersonesos, also with variant forms such as Λωπεκοκόννησος (cf. Robert (1948) 37–39).

Alopekonnesos was situated between Limnai (no. 668) and Elaious (no. 663) (Ps.-Skymnos 705–7), at the southern end of the Gulf of Melas, directly north of Cape Mazousia and Elaious (Strabo 7 fr. 51). In Ps.-Skylax 67 it is listed between the unlocated settlements of Paion (no. 670) and Araplos (no. 660). It lay on a headland running out towards Imbros, a place swarming with robbers and pirates in C4m (Dem. 23.166–68). The presumed location of Alopekonnesos on the promontory of Küçük Kemikli, at the north end of Suvla Bay, following Strabo’s description, is archaeologically and epigraphically confirmed (Hauvunte-Besnault (1880) 518–20; Picard and Reinach (1912) 277; Hutton (1914–16); cf. Robert (1948) 37–39; Isaac (1986) 189–91).

Alopekonnesos was founded by Aioliens, and the Alopekonnessians were the first to colonise Ainos (no. 641) (Ephor. fr. 39; cf. Strabo 7 fr. 52). The foundation of Alopekonnesos is presumed to antedate the C6 Athenian colonisation of the Chersonesos. It was probably integrated into the Chersonesian state set up by Miltiades, but after the flight of Miltiades and the Persian occupation, it regained its independence and became a member of the Athenian League. Thus, it is the first city of the Chersonesos to appear independently as a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 452/1 (IG i³ 261.111.29, mostly restored) to 429/8 (IG i³ 282.1.21 and 111.55, almost entirely restored) a total of fifteen times, three times completely restored, paying 3,240 dr. in 450/49 (IG i³ 263.v.14), 1,000 dr. from 442/1 onwards (IG i³ 270.11.14), a reduction usually attributed to the establishment of Athenian klerouchs; cf. Kahrstedt (1954) 16; Isaac (1986) 179–80, 190, and later, from 435/4, 2,000 dr. (IG i³ 277.v.8). In 429/8 Alopekonnesos is listed (with Sestos (no. 672)) among poleis of the Hellespontine district that καταδηλωσι τὸν φόρον (present a voucher for tribute) (IG i³ 282.1.15–16 and 21), presumably contributing to the maintenance of the hellespontophylakes and serving as bases for the fleet patrolling the Hellespontine waters (ATL i. 449–50; cf. Thuc. 2.24.1). During the lengthy conflict between Athens and the Odrysians for control of the Chersonesos in the second-quarter of C4, Alopekonnesos, which had become a pirates’ nest, was besieged by the Athenians in 360/59 (Dem. 23.166–68), and seems to have become part of the Atheno-Thracian condominium, ratified by the short-lived treaty of 357 (IG ii³ 126; cf. Kahrstedt (1954) 27; contested by Veligiani (1995) 161–68). Ten years later Alopekonnesos joined the demos of Chersonesos (no. 661) and of Mydya (no. 669) in awarding Athens a golden crown (IG ii² 1443.95–97 (347/6)).

Alopekonnesos struck bronze coins from c.400 to c.200: obv. usually Dionysos, or head of maenad, rarely Apollo or Athena; rev. fox, or kantharos, or bunch of grapes; on later coins, ear of wheat. Legend: ΑΛΩΠΕΚΟΝ or ΑΛΩΠΕΚΟΝ (Head, HN² 258; SNG Cop. Thrace 856–61; Yarkin (1978)).

660. Araplos Map 51. Unlocated. Type: [A]:α/α. The only reference to the site is in Ps.-Skylax 67, where Αραπλος is one of eleven toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις μεταξύ αἰθέων and located between Alopekonnesos (no. 659) and Eaious (no. 663) on the north coast of the Chersonesos. Tentatively identified with Drabos (Kahrstedt (1954) 31 and n. 47). But Drabos (Strabo 7 fr. 51) is east of Alopekonnesos, while Ps.-Skylax locates Araplos south-west of that town (Isaac (1986) 188). Thus, the two sites should be distinguished as they are in Barr.

The toponym is either Χερσονήσος (Hecat. fr. 163) or, usually, Ἀγορά (Hdt. 7.58.2; Ps.-Skylax 67; Dem. 7.39 with schol. (no. 43, Dilts); Steph. Byz. 20.9). The city-ethnic is Χερσονήσιοι (Hecat. fr. 163) or Χερσονησίται (IG i³ 259.11.28, 268.11.7). In literary sources, it is in most cases impossible to distinguish whether Χερσονησίτης is a city-ethnic designating the polis of Agora (no unquestionable example) or a regional ethnic designating all the inhabitants of the peninsula (cf. e.g. Hdt. 6.39). Οἱ Χερσονησίται ... ἀπὸ πατέων τῶν πολιών. Agora is called a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 67 and in the territorial sense by Hdt. 7.58.2 (see Hansen (1996) 37). The political sense is implicitly attested in the Athenian tribute lists, where the Chersonesitai ap' Agoras are once recorded under the head-ly attested in the Athenian tribute lists, where the

If Chersonesos/Agora was indeed the centre of Miltiades' Chersonesian state, we should assume that it housed the pyrtaneion mentioned by Hdt. 6.38.2. It is generally believed that the entry Χερσονησίται in the Athenian tribute lists refers to the polis Chersonesos/Agora, presumably representing the remains of the old Chersonesian state. The Chersonesitai belonged to the Hellespontine district and are recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i³ 259.11.28) to 418/17 (IG i³ 287.11.27) a total of seventeen times, twice completely restored. They are first recorded as Χερσονησίται (IG i³ 268.11.7) but from, probably, 441/0 (IG i³ 271.1.34–35) mostly as Χερσονησίται ἀπ' Ἀγορᾶς (IG i³ 277.v.9–10). Chersonesos was regularly assessed at 18 tal. from 454/3 to 452/1 (IG i³ 261.11.31), but 13 tal, 4,840 dr. in 450/49 (IG i³ 263.v.12). Their contribution appears drastically reduced to 1 tal. (IG i³ 270.11.13), perhaps after 447/6 (IG i³ 265.1.91, amount not preserved) following the establishment of 1,000 Athenian colonists under Perikles (ATL i. 565–64; Kahrstedt (1954) 15). Chersonesos was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.111.73–74).

Apart from the coins struck in C6–C5 when Chersonesos/Agora was the capital of Miltiades' state (supra 901), the Chersonesitai struck coins (silver and bronze) from c.350 onwards (Kraay (1976) 158; SNG Cop. Suppl. 99). (1) Half-sigloi in silver: obv. bounding lion with head reverted; rev. a variety of types in quadripartite incuse square (olive leaf, dolphin, lizard, etc.). (2) Small denominations in bronze: obv. lion's head, or head of Athena; rev. barley-corn; legend: XEP or XEPO (Head, HN² 257; SNG. Cop. Thrace 824–49, Suppl. 99). These coins are often taken to be federal (Head, HN² 258; Kahrstedt (1954) 40; see supra 902), but they are apparently contemporary with the silver half-sigloi and with the C4s coins of Elaious (no. 663), Krithote (no. 667) and Madytos (no. 669), and are better interpreted as a polis coinage struck by Agora/Chersonesos (M. H. Hansen per litt.)

662. Deris (Deraíos?) Map 51. Lat. 40.40, long. 26.50. Size of territory? Type: Bœ. The only reference to the site is in Ps.-Skylax 67, where Δερίς is listed as an emporion situated between the river Melas and Kobrys; cf. ATL i. 480, where a location between Ainos (no. 641) and the river Melas is proposed; see also Kahrstedt (1954) 20–21 with nn. 47–48; Isaac (1986) 187. Δερίς is tentatively equated with Δερίη, ethnic: Δερίας, recorded in Stepp. Byz. 224.1–2 as a polis and a member of the Delian League (πόλις Ἀθηναίων συμμαχική). Following Meineke and Krech, the editors of IG i³ believe that Stephanos’ source is Krateros’ συναγωγή
ψηφισμάτων, and at IG i. 100 fr. 26 they print the reconstructed city-ethnic Δεραιοί. For settlements which were both a polis and an emporion, see Hansen (1997b).

663. Elaious (Elaiousios) Map 51. Lat. 40.05, long. 26.15. Size of territory: 2 or 3. Type: [A]:α. The toponym is Ἔλαιους, ὁ (Hdt. 7.22; Thuc. 8.102.2) or, later, Ἐλαίους (Diod. 13.49.5; Strabo 7 fr. 51; Paus. 1.34.2). The city-ethnic is Ἐλαιούσιος (IG ii² 228.9 (341/0)). Elaious is not explicitly called a polis in any Archaic or Classical source, but in Ps.-Skylax 67, where polis is used in the urban sense, Ἐλαιούς is the sixth of eleven toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις ... αἴδε. The political sense is attested in IG ii² 43.78 and B27, where the Elaiousians under the heading πόλεις are listed as members of the Second Athenian Naval League. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on C4 coins (infra) and externally in both literary sources (Hdt. 9.120.4; Thuc. 8.107.2) and inscriptions (IG i. 285.11.81–82 (421/0); IG ii² 228 = Tod 174 (340)). The individual and external form is found in a C4 honorary decree passed by the klerouchs in Samos (no. 865) (SEG1 349 (C4), Samos; IG xii.6 253.12 (c.350)).

A city of the Thracian Chersonesos, Elaious is listed between Araplos (no. 660) and Madytos (no. 669) by Ps.-Skylax 67, between Alokekonnesos (no. 659) and Sestos (no. 672) by Ps.-Skymnos 707–8. According to Strabo (7 fr. 51 and 55), its precise location was on a bay directly east of Cape Mazousia at the southernmost tip of the Chersonesos, at a distance of 40 stadia from the city of Sigeion (no. 791). Strabo gives the distance from Kardia (no. 665) as just over 400 stadia, and from Sestos as 170 stadia. Thanks to archaeological and epigraphic finds, Elaious has been securely identified with the modern village of Eski Hisarlik at the eastern end of Morto Bay.

The archaeological evidence points to the presence of Greek colonists in Σήλ (Isaac 1986) 193). In 6th Elaious was colonised by Athenians under Φορβέων (Ps.-Skymnos 707–8), in ATL i. 289 n. 75 emended to Φρύνων (Loukopoulos 1989) 68). According to Bengtson (1939) 19–20, it is a legend fabricated to serve Athenian propaganda, but Elaious was undoubtedly Athenian hands in Σήλ (Hdt. 6.140.1). Elaious was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 447/6 (IG i. 265.1.100) to 421/0 (IG i. 285.11.81–82) a total of fourteen times, four times completely restored, paying a phoros of 3,000 dr. in all years (IG i. 265.1.100). In 430/29 and 429/8 the Elaiousians are listed among cities of the Hellespontine district who paid part of their tribute in the form of misthos (IG i. 281.111.47, 282B.19), presumably contributing to the maintenance of the hellespontophylakes (ATL i. 449–50; cf. Thuc. 2.24.1). Elaious was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i. 71.111.78–79).

It is the only city of the Chersonesos to have joined the Second Athenian Naval League (IG i. 43.B.27). It remained loyal to Athens even under pressure from Kotys and despite the siege by Charidemos in 360 (Dem. 23.158); cf. the golden crown awarded in 347/6 to the Athenians by the Elaiousian demos (IG ii² 144.93–95); its loyalty was recognised and compensated by the Athenians: in 341 the privileges of the “Chersonesitans” were extended to the Elaiousians, who obtained equal property rights with the Athenian klerouchs settled in the Chersonesos, probably in 353 under Chares and in 343 under Diopeithes. On this occasion, the ambassadors of Elaious are presumed to have been awarded Athenian citizenship, since they were invited to dine (ἐπὶ δείπνυν not ξείνα) in the prytmpanieon (IG ii² 228 = Osborne (1981) D15). In C4 a citizen of Elaious was granted proxenia by Chios (PEP Chios 50.10).

Elaious is known to have possessed a safe harbour at the southern entrance of the Hellespont (Hdt. 6.140.1; Thuc. 8.101) and at the eastern end of Morto Bay (Picard and Reinach (1912) 314–15; cf. Isaac (1986) 192–93). The sieges of Elaious in 411 (Thuc. 8.103.1) and in 360 (Dem. 23.158) indicate that the town was fortified in the Classical period. The tomb and sanctuary of Protesilaos were situated in the immediate vicinity of the city (Hdt. 7.33, 9.116; Thuc. 8.102; Arr. An. 1.11.5; Plin. HN 4.11.49; cf. Strabo 7 fr. 51 (52): Προτεσίλαος). The Protesilaion was tentatively identified with a prehistoric mound on the western shore of the bay (Casson (1926) 217–18). Excavations of the cemetery of Elaious have confirmed both the first foundation of the city in Σήλ as an Athenian (or Aiolian) colony and the unambiguous Athenian predominance after 550 (Pottier (1915); CRAI (1915) 268ff, (1916) 40ff, (1921) 130ff; cf. BCH 44 (1920) 41; Waiblinger (1978)).

Elaious struck bronze coins from 350 to 281: οβων, head of Athena, or of Artemis; rev. wreath, or owl, or bee; legend: ΕΛΑΪ, ΕΛΑΙΟΥΣΙΩΝ (Head, HN² 259–60; SNG Cop. Thrace 889–98).

664. Ide Map 51. Unlocated. Type: [A]:α? The only reference to the site is in Ps.-Skylax 67, where Ηδη is the second of eleven toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις ... αἴδε and, alongside Paion (no. 670), located between Kardia (no. 665) and Alokekonnesos (no. 659) on the north coast of the Chersonesos (Kahrstedt (1954) 20 n. 47; Isaac (1986) 188).
lists is usually explained by assuming that, together with (Hdt. occupation by the Phoenician fleet in the Ionian Revolt Chersonesos/Agora (Hdt. Holding a key location for the Chersonesos (Dem. on the adjacent coast south of the estuary of the river Melas, Kardians were defeated by the Bisaltians in a battle fought 358 cf. Strabo 25). Kardia was situated at the southern end of the Gulf of Kardia's absence from the Athenian tribute (Dem. 7, 36). Kardia was situated at the southern end of the Gulf of Xερσονησίται (Kahrstedt (67)). An anecdote told by (Müller in 1954). The position near the river Aigos potamos has led to the river Aigos potamos and Krithote (no. 665). Kardia is said to have a gymnasion in C4 (Plut. Eum. 1). Kardia struck bronze coins, probably from 350 to 309, when the city seems to have been incorporated into Lysimacheia: obv. head of Demeter wearing corn wreath, or lion, or lion's head; rev. lion, or corn-grain in linear square. Legend: ΚΑΡΔΙΑ or ΚΑΡΔΙΑΝΟΣ or ΚΑΡΔΙΑΝΩΝ (Head, HN2 259; SNG. Cop. Thrace 862–71; cf. Kahrstedt (1954) 38–40). 666. Kressa Map 51. Lat. 40.20, long. 26.35. Size of territory: 2 or 3. Type: Α. The only unquestionable reference to the site is in Ps.-Skylax 67, where Κρήσας is the ninth of eleven toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις . . . αἰδε. and is located between the river Aigos potamos and Krithote (no. 667) on the south coast of the Chersonesos. Presumably to be identified with Cissa listed in Plin. HN 3.48: Chersonesos a Propontide habuit Tristasin, Crithoten, Cissam fluminii Aeges adpositam. The position near the river Aigos potamos has led to the further identification of Κρήσας/Cissa with the settlement of Άλγος ποταμοί (no. 658) (Müller in GGM 1 56; Kahrstedt (1954) 20 n. 47), which, however, must have been situated south of the river and close to Sestos (supra 903). 667. Krithote (Krithousios) Map 51. Lat. 40.25, long. 26.40. Size of territory: 2 or 3. Type: Α. The toponym is
Kριθώτη (Hellen. fr. 27; Isoc. 15.112) or Kριθωτῆ (Ps.-Skylax 67; Strabo 7 fr. 55). The city-ethnic is Kριθώνιος on Ç4s coins (infra). Isoc. 15.107–8 calls Krithote a polis in both the political and the urban senses. In Ps.-Skylax 67, where polis is used in the urban sense, Kριθώτη is the tenth of eleven toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις . . . αἰδε. The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is attested on Ç4s coins (infra).

Krithote is listed among the cities of the Hellespontine coast south of Paktye (no. 671) and north of Kressa (no. 666) (Ps.-Skylax 67) or north of Madytos (Ps.-Skymnos 711) or north of Kallipolis (Strabo 7 fr. 55) or between Tiritasis and Cissa (Plin. HN 4.48). According to Steph. Byz. 384.18–19, it was situated at a distance of 80 stadia from Kardia (no. 665). Krithote must be located somewhere near modern Gelibolu (Isaac (1986) 191), and probably to the north (Kahrstedt (1954) 10–11) rather than to the south (Barr.).

Krithote was founded by the Athenians under Miltiades (Ephor. fr. 40; Ps.-Skymnos 712; see Obst (1932)). Never listed independently as a member of the Delian League, Krithote was presumably included among the Chersonesiatae in the tribute lists. Occupied by Ariobarzanes in Ç4e, it was recovered by the Athenians under Timotheos (Isoc. 15.108, 112). Later besieged by the Thracians under Charidemos (Dem. 23.158), it remained, with Elaious (no. 663), an Athenian possession. The mention of a siege shows that Krithote was fortified.


668. Limnai (Limnaioi) Map 51. Lat. 40.10, long. 26.20. Size of territory: probably 2. Type: [A]:â. The toponym is Λίμναι, al (Hecat. fr. 164; Anaximenes (FGHist 72) fr. 26; Ps.-Skymnos 705). The city-ethnic is Λιμναιος (IG i3 71.111.107). In the Athenian tribute list of 429/8 the Limnaioi are recorded under the heading πόλεις αἰδε (IG i3 282B.11–13). Limnai is listed as a πόλις ἐν Ἑλλησπόντι ἀπ’ Σηστόν by Steph. Byz. 417.11, quoting Hecat. fr. 164, but in such a way that we cannot be sure whether Hekataios is his authority for the toponym only or for the site-classification as well (Hansen (1997a) 18). However, its status as a polis is confirmed both by its membership of the Delian League (infra) and by its status as a colony of Miletos (no. 854). The city-ethnic is unattested in literary sources, but the collective and external use is recorded in the Athenian tribute lists (infra).

In Ps.-Skymnos 705, Limnai is located west of Lysimecheia and east of Alopekonnos (no. 659). In Strabo 7 fr. 51, it is located west of Kardia (no. 665) and Drabos and east of Alopekonnos. Isaac (1986) 189 states: “in the tribute lists it appears between Elaious and Alopekonnos”. But the only attestation of this sequence is in IG i3 272.11.30–34, where all ethnics are completely restored. Nevertheless, following Isaac, Barr. locates Limnai south of Alopekonnos.

Limnai was colonised by Milesians (Anaximenes (FGHist 72) fr. 26; Ps.-Skymnos 705). It was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 447/6 (IG i3 265.1.97) to (IG i3 282.1.13) a total of thirteen times, five times completely restored, paying a phoros of 2,000 dr. in 447/6 (IG i3 265.1.97), reduced to 500 dr. in or before 442/1 (IG i3 270.11.11) and raised to 1,000 dr. in the years 433/2–429/8 (IG i3 279.11.25). In 430/9 (IG i3 281.11.67, restored) and 429/8 (IG i3 282B.1.13) the Limnaioi are recorded (together with the Ἐκρούσαε άπ’ Τριστάσις as having paid their tribute to the archontes; presumably they had to contribute to the maintenance of magistrates established in these two cities, following the special measures instituted by the Athenians in the Hellespontine district; cf. Thuc. 2.24.1. Limnai, not mentioned by Ps.-Skylax, is believed to have vanished by Ç4.

669. Madytos (Madytios) Map 51. Lat. 40.10, long. 26.20. Size of territory: 3. Type: A:â. The toponym is Μάδυτος, η (Hecat. fr. 165; Hdt. 9.120.4; Ps.-Skymnos 709). The city-ethnic is Μαδύτοσ (IG i3 114.11.34 (464)). It is called a polis in the urban sense by Hdt. 9.120.4. In Ps.-Skylax 67, Μάδυτος is the seventh of eleven toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις . . . αἰδε, where polis is used in the urban sense. The political sense is attested in the Athenian tribute lists, where Madytos appears under the heading ἀνδε (πόλεις) (IG i3 281.11.51). The Ç4s mint is further evidence for polis status in the political sense (infra). The collective form of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins (infra) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 271.11.34). The individual and external use is attested only in one late inscription (IGRR I 822).

Madytos is listed between Elaious (no. 663) and Sestos (no. 672) (Ps.-Skylax 67; cf. Ps.-Skymnos 709–10), to the east of Cape Kynos Sema and the site of Hekuba’s tomb, and west of Cape Sestias (Strabo 7 fr. 55); together with Sestos it lay at the narrowest part of the Hellespont (Ps.-Skymnos 709–10). The Kynos Sema or tomb of Hekuba (Strabo 7 fr. 55) presumably belonged to its territory, as indicated by the representation of a seated dog on the reverse of Madytos’ coins.
The toponym survived through the centuries in the modern village of Maítö (now Ecebat), where several antiquities—including inscriptions—were discovered, confirming the identification (Hauvette-Besnault (1880) 506–10; Picard and Reinach (1912) 306–12; IGRR 1 822; cf. Robert (1948) 38–39; BE (1972) 279; Isaac (1986) 194).

Madytos was colonised by Lesbians (Ps.-Skymnos 709–10), presumably in C7 (Isaac (1986) 161), and in any case before the arrival of the Athenian colonists under Miltiades the Elder (supra 900). Some Madytians are listed in the Athenian casualty list of c.465 (IG i3 1144,34–38), indicating that the city was a member of the Delian League. Madytos belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 445/4 (IG i3 267.v.3, completely restored) to 421/0 (IG i3 285,11.79) a total of twelve times, six times completely restored, paying 500 dr. (IG i3 270,11.12), attested until 440/39 (IG i3 272,11.32), later raised to 2,000 dr., attest- ed from 435/4 (IG i3 277.v.5). In 430/29 Madytos is listed among those cities in the Hellespontine district whose trib- ute (phoros) of 1,920 dr. took the form of pay (mismatch), presumably a contribution to the maintenance of the hellespontophylakes (IG i3 281,11.42–43 and 51; cf. Thuc. 2.24.1). Xen. Hell. 1.1.3 indicates that it possessed a good harbour, which served as a base for the Athenian fleet in 411 (cf. Casson (1926) 212ff). In 346/5 Madytos joined other cities of the Chersonesos in awarding Athens a golden crown (IG ii² 1443,98).

Madytos struck bronze coins in C4s. Types: obv. rushing bull and fish, or female head; rev. dog seated, or lyre; legend: ΜΑΔΙΔΥ (Head, HN² 260: from 350; BMC: before Alexander; SNG Cop. Thrace 923–26: 350 and later).

670. Paion Map 51. Unlocated. Type: [A]. The only reference to the site is in Ps.-Skylax 67, where Παϊόν is the third of eleven toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις . . . αἰδε and, alongside Iđe (no. 664), is located between Kardia (no. 665) and Alopekonnesos (no. 659) on the north coast of the Chersonesos (Kahrstedt (1954) 20 n. 47; Isaac (1986) 188).

671. Paktye Map 51. Lat. 40.30, long. 26.45. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: [A]:α. The toponym is Πακτύη (Hellan. fr. 127; Hdt. 6.36.2). The city-ethnic remains untested. The only source in which Paktye is described as a polis is the late Hellenistic Ps.-Skymnos 711, but in Ps.-Skylax 67 Πακτύη is the last of eleven toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις . . . αἰδε, where polis is used in the urban sense. According to Ps.-Skymnos 711–12, Paktye was founded by the Athenians under Miltiades, i.e. in C6. Kahrstedt (1954) 20 n. 47 and Isaac (1986) 196–97 suggest that Paktye in C5–C4 was a second-order settlement and a dependency of the polis of Chersonesos/Agora (no. 661), a view which seems to be con- tradicted by the only source we have (Ps.-Skylax). It should be noted, however, that Paktye is never included in the Athenian tribute lists and is not known to have minted coins.

Paktye was situated on the Propontic coast of the isthmus of the Chersonesos (Strabo 7 fr. 52 and 54), near the site of Helle’s tomb (Hellan. fr. 127), at the eastern end of the forti- fication wall constructed by Miltiades across the isthmus (Hdt. 6.36.8; Strabo 7 fr. 54; Plin. HN 4.48). It lay east of Krithôte (no. 667) and west of Leuke Akte and the Hieron Oros (Ps.-Skylax 67; Ps.-Skymnos 711–12; Strabo 7 fr. 56), at a distance of 40 stadia from Kardia (no. 665), which occupied the western end of the isthmus (Ps.-Skylax 67). Alkibiades is said to have sought refuge in Paktye in 408 (Diod. 13.74.2; Nep. Alc. 7.4). Its exact location remains uncertain (cf. Kahrstedt (1954) 13–14; Isaac (1986) 197).

672. Sestos (Sestios) Map 51. Lat. 40.15, long. 26.25. Size of territory: 3 or 4. Type: A:α. The toponym is Σηστός, Ἱ (Hdt. 7.78; Thuc. 1.89.2; IG ii² 274,3 (C4m)) or 6 (Xen. Hell. 4.8.5; Ephor. fr. 155); cf. Hom. Il. 2.836. The city-ethnic is Σηστιός (MDAI (1957) 165–69 2 = IG xii.6 43.3 (C45)). Sestos is called a polis both in the urban sense (Hdt. 7.33; Thuc. 8.62.3; Isoc. 15.107–8) and in the political sense (Isoc. 15.107–8). Furthermore, after the heading αἴδε πολεῖς, the Sestians are recorded in the Athenian tribute lists as members of the Delian League (IG i3 282,B1.20), and Sestos is recorded in Ps.-Skylax’s list of cities on the Chersonesos (67). The collective form of the city-ethnic is attested internally on Hellenistic coins (ΣΕΣΤΙ, SNG Cop. Thrace 945), and externally in literary (Dem. 23.160) and epigraphical sources (IG i3 267,iv.33). For the individual and external use, see MDAI (1957) 165–69 2 = IG xii.6 43.3, Samos (C45); IG ii² 10262–64, Athens (C4).

Sestos lay at the narrowest part of the Hellespont, oppo- site Abydos (no. 765), east of Cape Sestias where the bridge constructed by Xerxes touched the coast of Europe (Hdt. 7.33–34; Thuc. 8.62.3; Xen. Hell. 4.8.5; Ps.-Skylax 67; Polyb. 16.29.3–14; Strabo 2.5.22, 7 fr. 51, 55, 13.1.22; Ps.-Skymnos 709–10). It is probably to be located near Yalova, in the little bay of Ak-Bachi, on the dominating hill of the Teke of Ak-Bachi (Isaac (1986) 195, mentioning only a mediaeval castle and monastery).

Sestos was colonised by Lesbians (Ps.-Skymnos 709–10; Eustath. in Dionys. Per. 513 = GGM 11.314,43, quoting the lost part of Strabo 7), presumably in C7 (Isaac (1986) 161),
and in any case before the arrival of Athenian colonists in C6 (supra 900). Sestos was conquered by the Persians alongside all the other cities that were part of Miltiades’ Chersonesian state (Hdt. 6.33, 39), and governed by Artayktes (Hdt. 7.33, 78, 9.116–22). The city was besieged and captured by the Athenians in 479/8 (Hdt. 9.114–19; Thuc. 1.89.2; Diod. 11.37.4–5). Sestos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 446/5 (IG i3 266.v.24) to 421/0 (IG i3 285.11.74) a total of thirteen times, five times completely restored, paying a phoros of 500 dr. (IG i3 270.11.71) until 435/4, when it was raised to 1,000 dr. (IG i3 277.v.7). In 429/8 Sestos is listed (with Alopekonnesos (no. 659)) among poleis which κατὰ δὲλτα τὸμ φόρων (present a voucher for tribute), presumably contributing to the maintenance of the hellespontophylakes and serving as bases for the fleet patrolling the Hellespontine waters (IG i3 282.B.i.20; cf. Thuc. 2.24.1; Bradeen and McGregor (1973) 3–23). Thanks to its strategic location for seafaring and the excellence of its harbour, Sestos served as a main base and strong point (phorourion) for the Athenian fleet in 411 (Thuc. 8.66.2, ἄρηνον; cf. 102.1, 104.1, 107.1; Xen. Hell. 2.1.25, 4.8.5; Pol. 16.29; Strabo 13.1.22; Procop. Aed. 4.10, 5.1.8). After the battle at Aigos potamoi in 405, it was occupied by Lysandros (Diod. 13.106.8), who expelled the Sestians and gave the city and its territory to his officers; the Lakedaimonians, however, soon decreed that the Sestians should be restored to their country (Plut. Lys. 14.3). Liberated from the Lakedaimonians by Konon in 393 (Xen. Hell. 4.8.3, 5, 6), the city fell under the rule of Ariobarzanes who, assisted by Agesilaos and Timotheos, averted its occupation by Kotys in 365 (Xen. Ages. 2.26; Isoc. 15.108, 112) and presumably gave it to Timotheos together with Krithote (no. 667) (Nep. Tim. 11.3). Sestos was eventually occupied by Kotys with support from Abydos (360). In 353 the city was seized and exposed to andrapodismos by the Athenian general Chares: the adult population was killed, the rest enslaved (Diod. 16.34.3), and new colonists (klerouchs) were settled by Chares in 353/2 (Diod. 16.34.4; IG ii2 1613.297). An Athenian(? ) archon in Sestos is mentioned in an Athenian decree of the same period (IG ii2 274; cf. the archontes in Chersonesos in IG ii2 275 (before 336/5)). In 355/4, the year before the andrapodismos, a citizen of Sestos was granted proxenia by Athens (IG ii2 133).

Information about political institutions and public architecture is amply attested in inscriptions of Hellenistic and Roman date, especially in the famous honorary decree for the gymnasiarchos Menas (I.Sestos 1 (C2)).

Hdt. 9.115 describes Sestos as the strongest fortress (teichos) of the region, and according to Theopomp. fr. 390 it was small but strongly fortified and was connected with its harbour by long walls, 2 pletra (61 m) apart (cf. Xen. Hell. 4.8.5; Ages. 2.26). The C4m Athenian rhetor Peitholaos called Sestos “the Baker’s board of the Peiraes” (Arist. Rh. 141i14–15), undoubtedly referring to its importance for the Athenian import of grain from the Pontic region.

Sestos did not begin to strike coins until c.300 (Head, HN 260–61; cf. Kahrstedt (1954) 39).
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PROPONTIC THRACE

LOUISA LOUKOPOULOU, ADAM EAITAR

I. The Region

The European coast of the Propontis was settled by Megarians (no. 225) and Samians (no. 864). By 480 four colonies are recorded: viz. from east to west, Megarian Byzantion (no. 674) and Selymbria (no. 679), and Samian Perinthos (no. 678) and Bisanthe (no. 673), along with two probably smaller and presumably dependent settlements, Tyrodiza (no. 681) and Heraion [Teichos] (no. 676) (Loukopoulou 1989: 51–57).

The settlement pattern appears enriched after the middle of C5. In the Athenian tribute lists are recorded not only the Greek colonies of this area, with the addition of Tyrodiza, but also new independent members: viz. Neapolis “from Athens” or “by Chersonesos” (no. 677) (evidently an Athenian colony), Daminon Teichos (no. 675) and Serrion Teichos (no. 680). The absence of Bisanthe and Heraion Teichos from the tribute lists is usually believed to indicate a probable extension in C5m of Thracian rule over the northwestern part of the coastal zone (Hdt. 7.137; Thuc. 2.67). In fact, Bisanthe first appears in the assessment decrees of 425/4 (restored) and 422/1, and then again in 410/9 (restored). With the rest of the western Propontis it probably came under Athenian control after the victory at Kyzikos. Other sites—viz. Ornoi, Ganios and Neon Teichos, probably situated in the westernmost part of the Propontic zone—are first attested in connection with Alkibiades’ activity in the area soon after 410.

In the following century, Ps.-Skylax 67 lists a total of six “Thracian teiche” between the Chersonesos and Perinthos. From west to east they are Leuke Akte, Teirstasis (usually identified with Herodotos’ Tyrodiza), Herakleia, Ganios, Ganiai and Neon Teichos. A seventh—Daminon Teichos—is recorded between Perinthos and Selymbria.

Furthermore, a number of settlements—some of them of unspecified origin and status—are attested as places conquered by Philip II. They are Apros, Ergiske, Ganios, Ganiai, Hieron Oros, Myrtenon/Myrgiske and Serrion Teichos (Theopomp. fr. 160; Dem. 18.27; Aeschin. 2.90, 3.82). Two of them, Apros and Ergiske, together with Beos and Sauthaba, are now epigraphically attested on silver vessels from the treasure discovered in Rogozen in north-west Bulgaria (SEG 37 618 (C4f)). All of these should be more or less safely located in the hinterland of the Thracian Chersonesos and the Propontic coast. Indeed, the vast area extending east of Ainos (no. 641) to the Gulf of Bisanthe, occupied in C6–C5 by the Apsinthians (Hdt. 6.39ff, 9.119.1) and dominated by the imposing heights of the Hieron Oros (= modern Tekir Dagi), seems regularly to have shunned permanent Greek control before the Macedonian conquest, despite its importance for land communications between the Propontic coast and the Gulf of Melas. As in other parts of Thrace, the territories of the Greek colonies did not extend far inland; no Greek foundations are recorded in the hinterland of south-east Thrace, despite the explicit mention of a land route linking the western Pontic coast with the Propontis (Hdt. 4.90.2). According to literary and epigraphic sources of Roman date, the rich plain of the river Ergines, dominated by Mt. Strandza and as far as Cape Thynias—thus in the immediate hinterland of Perinthos and Byzantion—was the land of the Thracian ethnös of the Astai (Strabo 7.6.1–2; Steph. Byz. 137.12, quoting Artemidoros; Livy 38.40.7; Ps.-Skymnos 729; cf. Sayar (1998) 412, no. 294). In the latter part of C5 and until the conquest of Thrace by Philip II, the same area appears to have been under Odrysian rule, either directly or indirectly through suzerainty over local dynasts or chieftains; at times this rule extended as far south as the north-western part of the Propontic seaboard (Xen. An. 7.5.8).

Particularly notable in this area is the exceptionally frequent use of the technical term teichos as a standard component of toponyms and often also of the ethnics derived from the toponyms. Such names denote fortified places and indicate the imperative need for protection of the agricultural chorå of the colonies from incursions by native or
neighbouring (sometimes even remote) barbarian tribes (Loukopoulou (1989) 185–90). Indeed, the rise of the Odrysian power in the latter part of C5 intensified the precarious situation of the Greek settlements and the need for external support from the leading Greek powers with vested interests in the area, in particular the desire to control the only maritime access to the Black Sea through the Hellespont and the Bosporos.

The historical and political map of the area is doomed to obscurity owing to the scarcity of literary sources, the lack of systematic archaeological investigation in the Propontic region and, in recent years, the dramatic development and uncontrolled urbanisation of the coastal zone. In all, a total of twenty-two ancient toponyms are known to denote settlements of the Propontic coast and the adjacent Thracian hinterland, not including the altar of Zeus Horios, the “advanced” boundary (horos) of the Thracian Chersonesos, between Pteleon and Leuke Akte (Dem. 160). The toponym is epigraphically attested on C4f silver vessels in the treasure of Rogozen, Bulgaria (SEG 37 618). Not in Barr.

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis

Apros (Ἀπρός) According to Steph. Byz. 107.5, a polis in Thrace, conquered by the Macedonian army in C4m (Theopomp. fr. 160). The toponym is epigraphically attested on C4f silver vessels in the treasure of Rogozen, north-west Bulgaria (SEG 37 618). Situated at a distance of 22–26 miles west of Rhaistodos on the eastern extension of the Via Egnatia (Plin. HN 4.11.48; It. Ant. 175, 332, 333, 334; It. Burd. 601: civitas Apris 24 [miles]), it is tentatively identified with a site of Roman date located near the village of Germeyan (Polychronidou-Loukopoulou (1990)). Barr. RL, but C also attested (supra).

Beos or Beon (Βέος or Βέον) Epigraphically attested on C4f silver vessels in the treasure of Rogozen, Bulgaria (SEG 37 618: ἐγάρι Βέος), it was tentatively identified with the Roman mutatio Bedizo, halfway between Rhaistodos and Apros (It. Burd. 601; Polychronidou-Loukopoulou (1990)); cf., however, the mutatio Beodizum situated according to the same source halfway between Tzurullon (= modern Corlu) and Perinthos (no. 678) (It. Burd. 570.2), tentatively located in the area of the village of Türkmenli, near the remains of an ancient bridge (Sayar (1998) 67). Barr. (s.v. “Beodizo’) L, but C also attested.

Ergiske (Ἐργίσκη) Called chorion at Dem. 7.37, 18.27; Aeschin. 3.82; and Harp. s.v. Epigraphically attested on C4f silver vessels in the treasure of Rogozen, Bulgaria (SEG 37 618). Not in Barr.

Ganai (Γαναί) In Ps.-Skylax 67, Ganai and Ganiai are listed as the fourth and fifth of six Thracian teiche. MS Ganai is sometimes interpreted as a corruption of Πάνως (see infra); but this emendation is unlikely when Ps.-Skylax’s text is compared with Aeschin. 3.82, where a list of chorai in Thracian Propontis ends with Γάνος καὶ Γανίδα. Some commentators have rejected the toponym Γανίδα as a sarcastic duplication of Ganos (Richardson (1889) 102), but its existence is ensured by a number of lexicographers, principally Harp. I’, quoting the C2 geographer Artemidoros; see also Phot. Γ’30 and Suda I’59. Either Γαναῖ and Γαναῖς are variant toponyms or Γαναῖ in Ps.-Skylax should be emended to Παναῖς. Not in Barr.

Ganos (Γάνος) According to Aeschin. 3.82 a chorion; in Xen. An. 7.5.8 listed as a teichos and together with Bisanthe (no. 673) and Neon Teichos; in Ps.-Skylax 67 listed under the heading τείχη τάδε. In Barr. identified with Serrion Teichos (no. 680) and dated C.

Hera Kleia (Ἡράκλεια) In Ps.-Skylax 67 listed as the third toponym after the heading τείχη τάδε (after Teiristasis/ Tyrodiza and before Ganaios), and usually identified with Heraklitza/Erikli (Isaac (1986) 202). In Barr. identified with Neapolis (no. 677) and dated C.

Krobyle (Κροβύλη) An unlocated settlement, together with Tiristasis (infra 914) exposed to andrapodismos by the Athenian general Diopeithes in 341 (Dem. 12.3; cf. Dem. 8 hypoth. 2–3); tentatively but unconvincingly identified with Kobrys by ATL i. 480 followed by Kahrstedt (1954) 20 n. 47. For Kobrys, one of the emporia of Kardia (no. 665) in the Gulf of Melas, see supra 903. For an equally unlikely equation with Neapolis ap’ Athenon (no. 677), see ATL i. 525. Not in Barr.

Myrtenon (Μυρτυνῶν) Together with Serrion Teichos (no. 680) and Ergiske, one of the ἐπίκαιρα χωρία held by

### Myrtiske
See Myrtenos (*supra*).

#### Neon Teichos (*Νέον τείχος*)
A fortified town (Xen. *An*. 7.5.8: *teichos*, *Nep*. *Alc*. 7.4: *castellum*), one of the strongholds of Alkibiades, listed with Bisanthe (no. 673) and Ganos as offered by Seuthes to Xenophon; situated on the Propontic coast between Ganos and Perinthos (no. 678) (*Ps.-Skylax* 67 lists it under the heading *τείχον τάδε*); identified with *‘Didymon Teichos in *ATL* i. 481–82*, but cf. Robert (1948) 56 n. 1; Kahrstedt (1954) 21–24; Isaac (1986) 212). *Barr. C.*

#### Ornii (*Ορνι*;

#### Panion, Panaioi
Proposed emended form of *Ganaiai* (*Γαναιαί*) in *Ps.-Skylax* 67, allegedly the “Greek name of Bisanthe” (no. 673), equated with Byzantine Panion/modern Panados/Baniado; now Barbaros (*Ps.-Skylax* 67; cf. Isaac (1986) 213 and Sayar (1992) 188–89 with bibliography and references; cf. more recently Sayar (1998) 62). *Barr. C.*

#### Sauthaba (*Σαυθάβα*)
Epigraphically attested on C4f silver vessels in the treasure of Rogozen, Bulgaria (*SEG* 37 618); possibly identical with *Sawada* (*Σαώδα*) listed in Hierocl. *Synked*. 47.4b. Not in *Barr.*

#### T(e)iristasis (*Τειρίστασις*)
One of the Thracian *teiches* on the coast of the Propontis, between Leuke Akte and Heracleia (*Ps.-Skylax* 67). Together with Krobyle exposed to *andrapodismos* by the Athenian general Diopeithes in 341 (Dem. 12.3; cf. Dem. 8 *hypoth*. 2–3). Identified with mediaeval *Peristasis* = modern Peristeri = present-day Sharkeui (schol. Dem. 12.3; cf. *ATL* i. 558 with references; Isaac (1986) 203–4). Tentatively identified with Tyrodiza (no. 681) in *Barr.*, see 922. *Barr. C.*

#### II. The Poleis

### 673. Bisanthe (Bisanthenos)
Map 52. Lat. 41.00, long. 27.30. Size of territory: 2. Type: *B*. The toponym is *Βισανθηνός* (Hdt. 7.137.3; Xen. *An*. 7.2.38; *IG* 137.14–15). The city-ethnic is *Βισανθηνός* (*C3f* coins: Head, *HN* 266; Schöner-Gess (1975) 1–11). The only explicit reference to Bisanthe as a *polis* is in Steph. *Byz*. 171.3; *oppidum* in Plin. *HN* 4.11.43. But *polis* status in the Classical period can be inferred from the attestation of Bisanthe in the Athenian assessment decree of 422/1 (*infra*), combined with the Hellenistic evidence (*C3f* coins, attestation in the *C3l Delphic theorodokoi* list (*BCH* 45 (1921) 111.96); cf. Robert (1948) 54–55). The internal and collective form of the city-ethnic appears on Hellenistic coins (*supra*). The external and individual use is attested in Hellenistic inscriptions (*IG* xii.9 1126 (*C?*), from Chalkis; *F.Delphes* 111.4 133 1.18, 11.27–28 (208)).

Bisanthe was situated on the Thracian coast of the Propontis and, on the evidence of *Ptol. Geog.* 3.11.4, it is usually identified with mediaeval Rhaestodos = modern Tekirdag. However, Sayar (1992) 187–89 and (1998) 62–63 has recently defended the alternative equation of Bisanthe with Paniai in *Ps.-Skylax* 67, a conjecture of MS *Γαναιαί* = Byzantine *Panion* and modern Panados/Baniado/Barbaros (*ATL* i. 475–76; cf. Isaac (1986) 213). The identification with Tekirdag seems preferable.

Bisanthe was a colony founded by the Samians (no. 864) (*Steph. Byz*. 171.3: *ἄπωκος Σαμίων*; *Pompon*. 2.2.4: *Bisanthe Samiorum*). It may initially have belonged to the extended territory of Perinthos (no. 678) as a dependent *polis*, like Tyrodiza (no. 681), whose fate it must have shared during C6l and C5e. However, it is usually believed to have fallen under Odrysian rule in 430, when a Peloponnesian
embassy on its way to meet the Persian king was treacherously arrested by Sitalkes and Nymphodoros in Bisanthe and extradited to the Athenians (Hdt. 7.137.2–3; cf. Thuc. 2.67).

Bisanthe is indisputably listed as a member of the Delian League in the assessment decree of 422/1 (IG 13.77.10.10) and as belonging to the Hellespontine district, and the toponym is restored in the assessment decrees of 425/4 (IG 13.71.111.20) and 410/9 (IG 13.100.111.9). It is recorded alongside Paktye, Ornoi and Neon Teichos as one of the strongholds (teiche) held soon after 410 by Alkibiades, who appears to have closely collaborated with the Thracian kings Medokos and Seuthes (Plut. Alc. 30.10 (1408), 36.3–5; Lys. 10.4; Diod. 13.105.3–4; Nep. Alc. 7.4; cf. Lys. 14.26). A few years later (400–399), Bisanthe—the fairest of Seuthes’ possessions on the coast—was repeatedly offered to Xenophon by the Thracian dynast Seuthes II (Xen. An. 7.2.38; cf. 5.8).

For the sparse remains—including Cel Adarcahnic sculpture, a Cē inscription, an undated weight bearing the inscription Βουτανης[θηνῶν] μνᾶ seen in the archaeological collection of Rhaedestos—brought to light in neighbouring locations, cf. ATL i. 475; Kahrstedt (1954) 21ff; Loukopoulos (1989) 150, 161–63; more recently, Sayar (1992) 187–89, with bibliography.

674. Byzantium (Byzantios) Map 52. Lat. 41.00, long. 28.55. Size of territory: 5. Type: Α. The toponym is Ὑβζάντιον, τό (Thuc. 8.80.3; Xen. Hell. 1.1.3.14; Xen. An. 7.1.7; IG 13.1162.49 (Csm)). The city-ethnic is Ὑβζάντιος (SEG 32.412.7–8 (Cē); IG VI1 2418.9 (Csm); Xen. Hell. 1.3.19; Dem. 15.33). Byzantium is called a polis both in the urban sense (Hdt. 4.87.2; Xen. Hell. 1.3.17–19; An. 7.1.17–19; Dem. 18.87; Aristeas fr. 39.8, Olson and Sens) and in the political sense (Hdt. 5.103.2; Xen. An. 7.1.27; Dem. 8.15; IByz. 4.3 (C4) = IVO 45 and 9.3 (C4)). Polites and astos are used synonymously at Arist. Oec. 1346b27–29. The collective use of the city-ethnic (abbreviated as BY) is found internally on C5l–C4 coins (infra) and externally in inscriptions (IG 13.1144.118 (C5f); IG II² 43.83 (378/7)) and in literature (Xen. Hell. 1.3.16; Isoc. 14.28; Dem. 15.3; Arist. Pol. 1303b3). The individual and external use of the ethnic is attested in inscriptions (SEG 32.412, Olympia (C5f); SEG 18.180, Delphi (C48); IG II² 8434–35, Athens (C4)) and in literature (Hdt. 4.158.1; Dem. 20.61).

The city of Byzantium occupied the head of the promontory between the Golden Horn, the Bosporos and the Propontis. Its favourable geographical position from both a military and an economic point of view is frequently noted in our sources and contrasted with the less favourable position of Kalchedon (no. 743) (Hdt. 4.144.2; Polyb. 4.38.1; Strabo 7.6.2; Dio Cass. 75.10.1). Except from the west, the city was protected by the sea and, to the south-east, by a precipitous shoreline. A particular conjunction of currents and winds forced all ships coming from the Black Sea to sail close to the fortifications of Byzantium, which meant that the city could control all navigation from the north through the Bosporos (Polyb. 4.44.3–11). For the same reason, large shoals of spawning mackerel and tuna migrated from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean Sea near the west shore of the Bosporos and provided the Byzantians with great quantities of easily obtainable food (Aristarchos fr. 38; Arist. Pol. 1291b23).

The territory of Byzantium comprised the eastern part of the Thracian peninsula between the Black Sea to the north, the Bosporos to the east and the Propontis to the south. It covered an area of some 1,500 km². The western frontier stretched overland from a point west of the Derkos (Delkos) Sea in the north to the river Athyras (Kara Su), and then along it to the Athyras (Büyükçekmece) Sea in the south (Strabo 7 fr. 56; Plin. HN 4.46; Pompon. 2.24). It encompassed to the north a locality called Phileas or Philia situated on a promontory of the same name stretching into the Black Sea (Ps.-Skymnos 722–23). To the north, Byzantium bordered on the domain of Thracian dynasts (Polyb. 4.45.1). To the south Byzantium bordered on Selymbria (no. 679) (Dem. 15.26). On the other hand, the possession of the sanctuary of Zeus Ourios on the east side of the Bosporos opposite the entrance to the Black Sea was a bone of contention between Byzantium and Kalchedon (Diod. 20.111.3 (1302); Polyb. 4.50.3).

According to some sources, Byzantium was a colony of Megara (no. 225) (Ps.-Skymnos 717; Philostr. VS 24). Vell. Pat. 2.7.7, however, lists Byzantium along with Kyzikos (no. 747) as foundations of Miletos (no. 854). Late authors of local history as a rule point to Megara as the founder of Byzantium, but they also mention Sparta (no. 345), Argos (no. 347), Corinth (no. 227), Mykenai (no. 353), Karystos (no. 373), Boiotia and Athens (no. 361) (Dion. Byzant. Anapl. Bosp., passim; Lydus, Mag. 3.70; Hsch. Patria 3–5; Const. Porphyry. De them. 11 p. 46, Bonn). Probably, the majority of colonists came from Megara, while some contingents were supplied by their immediate neighbours, especially Argos, Corinth and Boiotia. Such a scenario is confirmed by Aristotle’s report of a stasis between the original colonists and a later contingent of different stock, resulting in the expulsion of the newcomers (Pol. 1303b25, 32–33). The
incident is probably to be dated to the Archaic period (Gehrke, *Stasis* 34). The Megarian majority came to dominate Byzantium, as attested by its Doric dialect, its cults, its onomastics and its institutions (division of the civic body into *hekastotyseis* and a *hieromnemnon* as the eponymous official).

According to a well-known anecdote (Hdt. 4.144.2), Byzantium was founded seventeen years after Kalchedon. As the foundation year Euseb. *Chron.* versus Arm. records Olymp. 30.1 = 660/59 (Schoene II 86), and the Hieronymus adaptation Olymp. 30.2 = 659/8 (94b, Helm) or, in another manuscript, Olymp. 30.3 = 658/7 (Schoene II 87). The year of the foundation of Kalchedon as indicated by the Hieronymus adaptation is Olymp. 23.4 = 685/4 (93b, Helm). The difference between the sources amounts to only nine years, and we may assume that the foundation of Byzantium took place around 660. From the foundation onwards the Byzantians were involved in constant warfare with neighbouring Thracian tribes (Polyb. 4.45.1; Diod. 14.12.2 (1493)).

Byzantium joined the Ionian Revolt in 499–494 and, after its suppression by Persia, the Byzantians and the Kalchedonians fled to the Pontic region and settled down in Mesambria (no. 687) (Hdt. 6.33.2), reinforcing the original contingent of colonists from Megara and Kalchedon (*infra* 935).

Byzantium was a member of the Delian League, and was probably among the original members (ATL iii. 206). In the early years of the Delian League Byzantium supplied ships rather than paying tribute. Thus, an Athenian casualty list of c.465 records names of Byzantians killed in a naval battle near Sigeion (IG i² 1144.118–28). Byzantium belonged to the Hellespontine district (IG i² 269.11.26) and is registered in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i² 259.11.7) to 428/7 (IG i² 283.39, completely but plausibly restored) a total of fourteen times, three times completely restored, paying a *phoros* of 15 tal. in 450/49 (IG i³ 263.v.16), surpassed only by the 30 tal. paid by Aigina (no. 358). The tribute was raised to 15 tal., 4,300 dr. in 443/2 (IG i³ 269.11.26) and to 18 tal. 1,800 dr. in 433/2 (IG i³ 279.11.32). In 430/29 Byzantium paid a *phoros* of 21 tal. and 3,420 dr. (IG i³ 281.11.18) in addition to 855 dr. for special measures taken by Athens in the Hellespontine and Bosporos regions (IG i³ 281.11.49). Byzantium was possibly assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.11.175, completely restored). Byzantium revolted in 441/0, supporting Samos (no. 864) in her conflict with Athens (Thuc. 1.115.5), but was recovered in spring or early summer 439 after the subjugation of Samos (Thuc. 1.117.3). Byzantium defected from the League once again in 411 after the Sicilian disaster (Thuc. 8.80.3; cf. Diod. 13.34.2). A Spartan garrison under a harmost was placed in the city (Xen. *Hell.* 3.13.15), but it was expelled in 408 when the city was betrayed to the Athenians under Alkibiades (Xen. *Hell.* 3.20–22; cf. Losada (1972) 22). Thereafter Byzantium remained loyal to Athens until after the battle of Aigos potamoi (Xen. *Hell.* 2.2.1).

In C4e Byzantium formed an alliance together with Kyzikos (no. 747), Ephesos (no. 844), Samos (no. 864), Iasos (no. 891), Knidos (no. 903), Rhodos (no. 1000) and possibly Lampsakos (no. 748), Thebes (no. 221), Kroton (no. 56) and Zakynthos (no. 141). This alliance is known only through a series of silver coins weighing c.11 g (tridrachm of Rhodian standard or didrachm of Aiginetan standard), and all with the same *obv.* type: infant Herakles strangling snakes and the legend ΣΥΝ(µαξιδια); on the *rev.* each of the allied cities placed its emblem, i.e. in the case of Byzantium a bull above a dolphin. The purpose of the alliance was to oppose Sparta (no. 345), and it was formed either in 394 after the battle of Knidos or in 387/6 after the King’s Peace (Karwiese (1980); Schönert-Geiss (1970) 31–35).

Alongside Chios (no. 840), Rhodos (no. 1000) and Mytilene (no. 798), Byzantium was a founding member of the Second Athenian Naval League. A separate treaty between Athens and Byzantium was concluded in the autumn of 378 (IG i² 41 = *Staatsverträge* 256), and Byzantium is listed among the allies in the so-called Charter of the League (IG i² 43.83 = *Staatsverträge* 257). At the instigation of Epameinondas, Byzantium may briefly have left the League in 364 (Diod. 15.79.1; Isoc. 5.53; but see Buckler (1980) 170–72; Hornblower (1982) 200). If so, it rejoined the League (*Staatsverträge* 305) until—in collusion with Mausolos (Dem. 15.3; Hornblower (1982) 209)—Byzantium, Chios, Rhodos and Kos (no. 497) revolted against Athens in 357 and started the so-called Social War (Dem. 15.3; Diod. 16.7.3–4). When peace was concluded in 355, Athens had to accept Byzantium’scession from the League (Isoc. 8.16, 15.63–64; Diod. 16.22.2; *Staatsverträge* 333).

In 352/1 or later, a treaty was concluded between Byzantium and Philip of Makedon (Dem. 9.34, 11.3, 18.87 and 93; *Staatsverträge* 318), but when in 340 Philip attacked and besieged Byzantium a new treaty with Athens was concluded (Dem. 18.87–89).

Byzantine envoys are attested in 378/7 in connection with the treaty with Athens (IG i² 41) and in 355 in connection with Byzantium’s financial contribution to Thebes (no. 221) during the Third Sacred War (IG vii 2418.12). Demostenes served as envoy to Byzantium in 341 (Dem. 18.244; Aeschin. 3.256). From the Classical period, only one grant of proxeny
is attested: viz. to the Spartan harmost Klearchos in 409/8 (Xen. Hell. 1.1.35). Citizens of Byzantion received proxeny from Athens (Dem. 20.60–63 (after 389); IG II² 76 (before 378/7); IG II² 235 (340/39)), from the Thebes (IG VIII 2408 (364/5)); from Kos (no. 497) (ICos ED 40.5 (C4)) and from Olbia (no. 690) (IGDOP 18 (340–330)).

The original constitution of Byzantion is unknown. In the time of Dareios’ campaign to Skythia the city was ruled by a tyrant (Hdt. 4.138.1). It is often assumed that Byzantion became a democracy when it joined the Delian League (Gehrke, Stasis 35) but we have no information. In the period 411–408 Sparta had a harmost and a garrison in the city (Xen. Hell. 1.3.15, 20–22). In 408 an Athenian garrison took over but left the city after the defeat at Aigos Potamoi in 405 (Xen. Hell. 2.2.1). After their victory, the Spartans introduced an oligarchic constitution supervised by a Spartan harmost (Xen. An. 6.2.13, 7.2.5–12) perhaps heading a dekarchy (Gehrke, Stasis 36). Stasis between factions of citizens is attested for the following period (Xen. An. 7.1.39; Diod. 14.12.2–3). In 390/89, with the help of the leaders of the democratic faction (Dem. 20.60), the Athenians under Thrasyloupos were admitted to the city and had the constitution replaced by a democracy (Xen. Hell. 4.8.270), which seems to have remained in force for the rest of the Classical period (Theopomp. fr. 62; Arist. Pol. 1291b23; in 354/3 or slightly later, Byzantion intervened in Kalchedon (no. 743) and introduced a democratic constitution there (Dem. 15.26).

Under the democracy, citizenship was confined to those whose parents were both citizens. During a financial crisis, however, it was decreed that citizenship could be bought for 30 minas (Arist. Oec. 13.46b26–29). The civic body was organised into hekatostyes. The oldest attestation is in an honorary decree for Eudamos of Seleukeia of c.175–170 (IByz. 1.60–61). But the presence of hekatostyes in other Megarian colonies in the Black Sea area (Kalchedon (no. 743), Herakleia (no. 715) and Chersonesos (no. 695)) and in the mother city itself indicates that the institution goes back to the foundation of Byzantion (Jones, POAG 284–85). The number of hekatostyes is unknown. At Arist. Oec. 13.46b15 there is a stray reference to other civic subdivisions, viz. thiasoi and patrai, which, however, may have been private associations. Free non-citizens living in Byzantion are called metoikoi and were barred from owning landed property (Arist. Oec. 13.47a1–3). In 390/89 there were a large number of Athenians living in the city (Xen. Hell. 4.8.27).

The eponymous official of Byzantion, as of its mother city Megara before the Hellenistic period, was the hieromonmon (epichoric form always with the long Doric a) (IByz. 2.1 (C2m); cf. Polyb. 4.52.4). The legends ΕΠΙ ΚΑΛΕΩ and ΕΠΙ ΝΕ on coins of C4m probably refer to hieromnmones (Schönert-Geiss (1970) 131–32 nos. 954–78). The only known public enactment of the Classical period is an honorary decree (psephisma) for the Athenians passed by the Byzantians in 341/0 and read out to the Athenian Assembly (Dem. 18.89). The document inserted in Demosthenes’ text 90–91, however, is a spurious composition of, probably, C2 (Wankel (1976) 497–98).

The patron deity of Byzantion may have been Apollo, as in the mother city Megara and in other Megarian colonies (Hanell (1934) 164–70). In Hellenistic and later inscriptions, public enactments were set up in his sanctuary (IByz. 1.48–49, 63–64), and Apollo’s head occurs on coins of C4 (Schönert-Geiss (1970) nos. 951–953). Games may be deduced from an Archaic inscription mentioning a stadion-runner (IByz. 42.3). In later times there was a festival called Bosporia devoted to Artemis Phosphoros—identified with the Thracian Bendis—during which a torch-race was held (IByz. p. 40).

Very little is known from contemporary sources about the cult places of Byzantion in the Archaic and Classical periods. Hdt. 4.87.2 mentions an altar of Artemis Orthosia (a typically Megarian epithet), a temple of Dionysos and a hieron at the entrance to the Black Sea (apparently not to be identified with the well-known hieron of Zeus Ourios on the east side of Bosporos but rather with its counterpart on the west side, called Sarapieion by Polyb. 4.39.6). Two cult places are mentioned in a Classical context by Dion. Byzant. Anapl. Bosp. 6.6–10, Güngerich: the temple of Hera which is said to have been destroyed by the Persians and the temple of Plouton demolished by Philip of Makedon. Furthermore, the temple of Poseidon on the promontory is described as being old (5.1–2). For a list of cult places, some of which may have originated in the Classical period, see Miller (1899) 1146–47.

Byzantion possessed a treasury in Olympia (Paus. 6.19.9; Ath. 480A), and a Cše dedication of Python of Byzantion at Olympia may commemorate a victory in the Olympic Games (SEG 32 412).

Names of the months are attested in late sources only (IByz. 2.30, 31, 33), but they resemble those of the other Megarian colonies: Kalchedon (no. 743), Herakleia Pontike (no. 715), Kallatis (no. 686) and Chersonesos (no. 695), and a Megarian origin for the calendar can be presumed (Hanell (1934) 190–204; Trümper, Monat. 147–55).

The citadel of Byzantion is called akra at Xen. An. 7.1.19 and akropolis at 7.1.20. It was situated on the north-eastern
tip of the promontory between the Golden Horn and the Propontis. It is completely covered by the Topkapi Saray of the Turkish sultans, and there are no physical remains.

Byzantium had a defence circuit which, according to later local tradition, had been erected in connection with the foundation of the colony (Hsch. *Patria* 12). The walls were renowned for their strength (Paus. 4.31.5), and the description at Dio Cass. 75.10.3–6, 14.5–6 is at least to some extent valid for the Classical period. The walls with numerous interval towers and gates (Xen. *An*. 7.1.12, 15–17, 36; *Hell*. 1.3.20) were particularly strong on the landward side to the west; the sections towards the sea were considerably lower and protected against breakers by a mole (Xen. *An*. 7.1.17). During the siege in 340 part of the fortifications were strengthened with tombstones and was thereafter called τυµβασύνη (Hsch. *Patria* 27). The original fortifications of Byzantium were destroyed by Septimius Severus (Dio Cass. 75.14.4–5); no traces of them have been found. Byzantium was besieged in 478/7 by the Greeks (Thuc. 1.94.2), in 409/8 by the Athenians (Xen. *Hell*. 1.3.14–20), in 357/6 by the Athenians (Diod. 16.21.3) and in 340 by Philip of Macedon (Dem. 8.14, 18.71, 93; Diod. 16.76.4, 77.2–3; Plut. *Phoc. 14.4–7*). The city also possessed within its walls a vast uninhabited area called Thrakion (Xen. *Hell*. 1.3.20; *An*. 7.1.24), most likely intended as a place where the rural population could have been accommodated during a war.

There are no remains of public architecture of the Archaic and Classical periods, and the written sources are silent apart from a reference to a gymnasium at Arist. *Oec*. 1346b19. The context indicates that it was situated within the city walls. The existence of the stadius may be deduced from an Archaic inscription mentioning a stadius-runner (Byz. 42).

Byzantium’s important commercial activities were centred on an agora, a limen and an emporion (Theopomp. fr. 62; Arist. *Oec*. 1346b18–19; Xen. *An*. 7.1.19). Byzantium controlled all navigation through the Bosphorus (supra); it sometimes seized ships belonging to other poleis (Arist. *Oec*. 1346b30–31; Dem. 50.6), and during the Peloponnesian War the Athenians (or the Delian League) exacted dues from grain ships passing through the Bosphorus (IG I2 61.34–40 (426/5); cf. Rubel (2001)).

That the Byzantians struck coins of iron in C55 is suggested in old Attic comedies (At. *Nub*. 248 with schol.; Plato *Com*. fr. 103, *PCG*; Poll. 9.78; Hsch. s.v. σιδάρεος; cf. *LSAG* p. 366). Not a single specimen has survived. The minting of silver coins started c.411. From 411 until c.387/6, drachms and hemidrachms were struck on the Persian standard, and from c.387/86 until c.340/39 tetradrachms, drachms and hemidrachms were struck on the Rhodian standard. The obv. type is invariably a bull above a dolphin, legend: BY in Archaic script with a Corinthian B; rev. types: incuse square punch, or trident (on drachms of Rhodian standard). In the same period Byzantium also struck some small denominations in silver with the same types—probably trihemibols and hemibols on the Persian standard—and six series of bronze coins with various types. Some have obv. head of Athena, or Demeter, or Apollo. One issue has the rev. legend ΕΠΙ ΚΑΛΕΩ or ΕΠΙ ΝΕ, presumably denoting the eponymous magistrate (supra). The animal of the bovidae family frequently occurring on the coins of Byzantium and designated here as a bull is sometimes identified as a cow and connected with the myth of Io (Schönert (1966)). For the alliance coinage, inscribed ΣΥΝ, see supra (Schönert-Geiss (1970); SNG Cop. Thrace 475–85).

675. Daminon Teichos (Daminoteichites) Map 52. Lat. 41.05, long. 28.05. Size of territory: 1. Type: Ba? The toponym is Δαµνιον τείχος (P.-Skylax 67) or Δαµνιον τείχος (Steph. Byz. 222.2) or *Δάµνιον τείχος* (reconstructed from the city-ethnic). The city-ethnic is Δαµνιοτειχίτης (IG I2 271.1–27) or Δαµνιοτειχίτης (IG I2 272.1–38). The only explicit reference to Daminon Teichos as a polis is in Steph. Byz. 222.2. It is here considered a polis—undoubtedly a fortified teichos—on the evidence of its being a member of the Athenian League (Hellespontine district).

In P.-Skylax 67, Daminon Teichos is listed between Perinthos (no. 678) and Selymbria (no. 679). It has been tentatively identified with Baunae, a mutatio situated 12 miles east of Perinthos-Herakleia (It. *Burd*. 572), and hypothetically located at Eski Ereğli = modern Gümüşyaka (ATL i. 480; cf. Isaac (1986) 208 n. 294; Sayar (1998) 64).

Daminon Teichos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG I2 259.ll.11–12) to 418/17 (IG I2 287.11.20) a total of seventeen times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of 1,000 dr. down to 433/2 (IG I2 279.1.l04), raised to 2 tal., 4,000 dr. in 430/29 (IG I2 281.11.21), and still 2 tal. in 421/0 (IG I2 285.11.84).

676. Heraion, Heraion Teichos (Heraites) Map 52. Lat. 41.00, long. 27.40 (in Barr. 27.45). Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: Αα. The toponym Ἡραιων, τά (Hdt. 4.90.2; Steph. Byz. 303.13) is plausibly identified with Ἡραιων τείχος (Dem. 3.4; F.Delphes III.3 207.3 (C3m)). The city-ethnic is Ἡραιώτης (IGBulg. i. 43.4, Odessos (C3a) or Ἡραιώτης (ibid. 26) or Ἡραιέτης (Sayar (1992) 190 (C2l–C2e)). Heraion is called a polis in the urban sense by Hdt. 4.90.2 and in the confused
entry of Steph. Byz. 303.13–15, who seems to record a polis and a teichos bearing the same name. The collective and internal use of the city-ethnic is attested in a Cal–Cte dedication to Hermes Agoraios from the area of Rhaidestos/Tekir Dag (Sayar (1992) 190–95). The individual and external use is found in a C3m decree from Delphi (no. 177) awarding proxi-
nia to two of its citizens (F.Delphes 111.3 207.3) and in a C1 honorary decree from Odessos (no. 689) (IGBulg. i² 43).

It seems quite arbitrary with ATL i. 482 to identify Heraion Teichos with Neon Teichos (no. 824) and Didymon Teichos (no. 741); see also Isaac (1986) 203 and Sayar (1992) 191–92. Heraion was situated on the northern coast of the Propontis, near Perinthos (no. 678), at one end of the road to the sources of the river Tearos and thence to Apollonia Pontike (no. 682)—a total of four days’ march (Hdt. 4.90.2). It is probably to be identified with the Roman mutatio Aerea (It. Buri.
601.6) located at a distance of 16 miles from Herakleia (Perinthos) and 12 miles from Registo (= Rhaidestos); cf. Hiero in the Tab. Peut.; Anon. Rav. 4.6: Ereon. The data recorded in the Roman Itineraria fit an ancient settlement with remains of Classical, Hellenistic and Roman date—including a C4 inscription—situated east of the mouth of the stream Chitemblik, in the bay of Karaevili, 2.24 km west of Perinthos (Loukopoulou (1989) 100–2; Sayar (1992) 192 and (1998) 62). In Barr. Heraion Teichos is identified with the prehistoric/Classical settlement near the tumulus of Aytpe, c.12 km north-west of Perinthos.

According to Harp. H15 and Etym. Magn. 436.39–40, Heraion Teichos was a colony of Samos (no. 864). Alternatively, it has been suggested (Loukopoulou (1989) 56, 100–2) that Heraion was a secondary colony, i.e. a sanctuary of the Samian Hera founded by the Samian colonists of Perinthos (no. 678) in the chora of the latter city; but, for fear of barbarian incursions, it later developed into a self-gov-
erning and strongly fortified settlement. Heraion Teichos is not attested in the Athenian tribute lists, but in C4m it is mentioned as an important stronghold under Keraseleptes’ rule, successfully besieged by Philip II in 352 (Dem. 3.4).

677. Neapolis (Neoplaton) Map 52. Lat. 40.40, long. 27.10. Size of territory: 1. Type: Βα. The toponym is Νεάπολις (IG i² 270.11.25), specifically qualified as Ἀθηνικὸς (IG i² 272.1.29), presumably also as παρὰ Χερσόνησος (IG i² 71.111.105–6). The city-ethnic is Νεοπολίτας (IG i² 71.111.105–6).

Neapolis was a member of the Delian League, and the tribute lists and assessment decree (Hellespontine district) constitute the only sources for this community. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 442/1 (IG i² 270.11.25) to 430/29 (IG i² 281.111.36) a total of six times, three times completely but at least once plausibly restored, paying 300 dr. in all years (IG i² 272.1.29).

A location in the vicinity of the Thracian Chersonesos has been inferred from the qualifying epithet παρὰ Χερσόνησος, and the epithet Ἀθηνικὸς indicates that it was an Athenian foundation. For its possible connection with the Athenian klerouchy settled c.450 in Tyrodiça (no. 681), see Kahrstedt (1954) 22 and Isaac (1986) 204. Neapolis was further equated, without positive evidence, with Herakleia, one of the Thracian teiche listed by Ps.-Skylax (67; cf. Ptol. Geog. 3.11.7) on the Propontic shore, between Paktye and Perinthos (no. 678) and located at modern Heraklitsa (Erikli; cf. ATL i. 475 and 525).

678. Perinthos (Perinthos) Map 52. Lat. 41.00, long. 28.00. Size of territory 5. Type: Α. The toponym is Περίνθους, (Hdt. 5.2.2; Arist. Gen. an. 773°27), after Perinthos of Epidaurus, the associate of Orestes (Steph. Byz. 517.18) or one of Herakles’ lovers (schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.12.07b, Wendel). In the third or fourth century AD, Perinthos’ name was changed to Herakleia, after Herakles, its mythical κτίστη (Amm. Marc. 22.8.6; see Sayar (1998) 171, EZt; Leschhorn (1984) 270). The city-ethnic is Περίνθους (Xen. Hell. 1.1.21; SEG 12 391, Samos (C6f)). Perinthos is called a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 67; see also Hdt. 6.33.1: αἰὴδέ (sc. πόλεις) and Diod. 16.74–76 (1340). The political sense is attested in IG ii² 43.78 and 84, where Perinthos under the heading πόλεις is listed as one of the members of the Second Athenian Naval League. Perinthos is called asty at Xen. Hell. 1.1.21. The term politai for Perinthians is used in Arist. Oec. 1351* (rC4f). The collective use of the city-ethnic in its full form is attested internally on C4m bronze coins (infra) and externally in the ATL and on the stele listing the members of the Second Naval League (infra). The individual ethnic is used externally in a C4–C3 comedy by Lyneus (fr. 1.2, PCG) and in a Delphic inscription (F.Delphes 111.3 207.3 (252/1)).

The name of Herakleia survives in modern Marmara Ereğlisı, the town now occupying the site of ancient Perinthos-Herakleia (Sayar (1998) 59–62). Situated at a distance of 630 stadia west of Byzantium according to Artemidoros (600 according to Demetrios of Skepsis in Strabo 7 fr. 56), it was situated west of Selymbria (no. 679) (Ps.-Skymnos 714–15) between Neon Teichos and Damimon Teichos (no. 675) (Ps.-Skylax 67). For the identification of Perinthos with Marmara Ereğlisı, see Robert (1974a) and, more recently, Sayar (1998).
The territory of Perinthos was rigidly demarcated to the east by the rival presence of the Megarian colonies of Selymbria (no. 679) and Byzantion (no. 674) (Loukopoulou 1989: 53–61); a plausible natural frontier line has been sought in the region of Kinaliköprü (Sayar 1998: 64). From C5m, an independent settlement—Daminon Teichos (no. 675)—is recorded between Perinthos and Selymbria. Moreover, at least during the period of Persian occupation in C5e, but probably also from the start, the territory of Perinthos was significantly extended westwards, since it appears to have included not only Tyrodiza (no. 681) (Hdt. 7.25 (r480)) but presumably also Heraion [Teichos] (no. 676) and Bisanthe (no. 673); see Hdt. 6.33.1 where Perinthos, Selymbria and Byzantion are the only poleis listed along the northern Propontic shore, and Perinthos is associated with τὰ τείχεα τὰ ἐπὶ Θερήκης (Kahrstedt 1954: 9–10). Subsequently, however, when Perinthos was a member of the Delian League, its territory must have been restricted to the immediate hinterland and have bordered on that of Heraion Teichos (Kahrstedt 1954: 21; Sayar 1998: 62–64). To the north, the springs of the river Degirmen are believed to have constituted a plausible border (Sayar 1998: 63).

Perinthos was a colony of Samos (no. 864) (Ps.-Skymnos 714–15; Strabo 7 fr. 56; Plut. Mor. 303E) and was founded in 602 (Hieron. Chron. 98b, Helm) on the northern—Thracian—coast of the Propontis (Hdt. 5.1.1–2, 6.33.1; Ps.-Skylax 67). The names of three of the old Ionic phylai are attested in an undated list of names, probably of ephesiai (SGDI 5723; cf. Jones, POAG 286). During its early years (c.570–560), Samian Perinthos faced deadly attacks both from invading Paionian hordes (Hdt. 5.1; Strabo 7 fr. 41) and from its rival Megarian neighbours, who attempted to monopolise the Propontic coast but were repulsed with the assistance of forces from the mother city (Plut. Mor. 303E–304A; cf. Loukopoulou 1989: 54–56). Following Dareios’ Skythian expedition, Perinthos was subdued by the Persians under Megabazos (Hdt. 5.1–2); after the Ionian Revolt, it fell under Persian rule (Hdt. 6.33.1). Following the expulsion of the Persians from Thrace, Perinthos became a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 452/1 (IG i² 261.v.3) to 418/17 (IG i² 287.11.22) a total of twelve times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 10 tal. (IG i² 269.11.25), perhaps less in 418/17. In 411 it probably joined the revolt of Byzantion (no. 674), only to be forced back into the League by Alkibiades in 410 (Xen. Hell. 1.1.21). Perinthian cavalry forces seem to be indicated by Xen. An. 7.2.8. Perinthos joined the Second Athenian Naval League in 377 (IG ii² 43.84); it fell temporarily under the rule of Ariobarzanes, and suffered variously under the pressure of the expansionist ambitions of Kotys, the Odrysian king (Dem. 23.142; cf. Arist. Oec. 1351a; cf. Isaac 1986: 207). The inability of Athens to provide effective protection against the renewed Thracian oppression under Kotys’ successor Kerseleptes and the general Charidemos (Dem. 23.165, 168), in 352/1 drove Perinthos, together with Byzantion and Amadokos, to conclude an alliance with Philip II (Staatsverträge 318; schol. Aeschin. 2:81; cf. Sayar 1998: 72 with nn. 145–46). After the defeat of Kerseleptes, Perinthos and Byzantion are believed to have established a sympoliteia (Polyb. 18.2.3–5; cf. Loukopoulou 1989: 147–48; Sayar 1998: 72 with n. 147). A few years later (340), when the two cities refused to support the Macedonian king’s anti-Athenian operations in the Chersonesos area, first Perinthos and subsequently Selymbria and Byzantion were unsuccessfully besieged by the Macedonian army (Theopomp. frr. 217, 292; Philoch. fr. 162 (cf. fr. 54); Ephor. T 10; Diod. 16.74–76; for a complete list of testimonia, cf. Sayar 1998: 51–79). Perinthos joined Byzantion in voting unprecedented honours for Athens in gratitude for her decisive support on this occasion (Dem. 18.89–91). The alliance with Philip was eventually renewed after the defeat of Athens at Chaironeia, and in 337 Perinthos joined the Macedonian king’s Hellenic League together with the rest of the Greek cities in Thrace (Sayar 1998: 73).

Perinthos occupied a headland 1,200 m long and 50 m high, linked to the Thracian mainland by an isthmus c.200 m = 1 stadion wide (Diod. 16.76; cf. Plin. *HN* 4.47) and projecting eastwards to form a well-protected harbour (cf. πόλις καὶ λιμήν in Ps.-Skylax 67). Its naturally fortified position was enhanced by strong defensive walls with towers (Diod. 16.74) capable of withstanding a prolonged siege ( Xen. *An.* 7.2.10; Diod. 16.74ff, following Ephor. (1340/39). The area enclosed by the walls measured c.75 ha. According to Hdt. 5.1.2, there was a προάστειον, a term that probably signifies the area immediately outside the city wall, east of the neck of the peninsula. The urban centre (called an asty in Xen. *Hell.* 1.1.21), with closely packed, exceptionally tall houses, overtopping one another along the hill slope and separated by narrow alley-ways, had the appearance of a theatre (Diod. 16.76.2). Moreover, the privileged location of Perinthos at the intersection of important land and sea routes accounts for its importance as a market (Xen. *An.* 7.4.2, 6.24).

Archaeological investigation in Marmara Ereglisi has identified the location of two ancient harbours, to the north-east and west of the isthmus of the peninsula, with traces of ancient breakwaters; the western harbour is now completely silted up by alluvial deposits from the Baglar stream (Oberhummer (1938) 803–4; Sayar (1998) 59). Visible remains of the fortification system, dated as early as C5, have also been identified, protecting the acropolis (located on the higher, western part of the peninsula), as well as the lower city, mainly from the north and west (Sayar (1998) 60, with refs.). The cavea of the theatre (diameter 140 m) can be seen on the southern slope of the acropolis, and there are traces of the stadion (240 m long, undated) on the west slope of the acropolis (ibid. with refs.). The cemetery extended over 3–5 km to the north and west of the city walls (Sayar (1998) 60–61, with refs.).

In C4m, Perinthos struck coins of silver and bronze on the Persian standard. Silver issues included didrachms, with refs. 460, 450. The toponym is allegedly derived from Σῆλυς and βρία, the Thracian word for polis (Strabo 7.6.1). The city-ethnic is Σηλυμβριανός (Pl. *Prt.* 316D) or Σελυβριανός (IG 11813.408) or Σηλυβριανός (Arist. *Oec.* 1348b33) or Σαλυμβριανός (IG 12 10261a (C4m)). Selymbria is called a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 67; see also Hdt. 6.33.1: αἰδε (sc. πόλεις). The political sense is attested in Dem. 15.26; Arist. *Oec.* 134835 and IG 11 43,78 and B29, where Selymbria under the heading πόλεις is listed as one of the members of the Second Athenian Naval League. The politeia of the Selymbrians is mentioned in the treaty with the Athenians of 408 (IG 11810–11). Epigraphic evidence indicates that Selymbria had become a kome of Byzantion or of Perinthos in the Roman period (Robert (1946))—its absence from the list of Delphic theorodokoi in C31 being a probable terminus ante quem, Selymbria may have lost its autonomy at the time of the formation of the sympoliteia between Byzantion (no. 674) and Perinthos (no. 678), tentatively dated to the period of Philip II's unsuccessful efforts in 340 to bring the area under Macedonian control. The collective use of the city-ethnic (abbreviated as ΣΑΛΥ) is attested internally on C5 coins (infra) and externally in the treaty with Athens (IG 118.30) and in Pl. *Prt.* 316D. The individual ethnic is used externally in the C5l settlement with Athens (IG 118.42) and in a C5m epigram commemorating Pythagoras, son of Dionysios, a Selymbrian proxenos of Athens (IG 1154). Patris is found in IG 1154 (C5m).

Selymbria is mentioned at Hdt. 6.33.1 as a polis east of Perinthos and the Thracian teiche, and west of Byzantion, and in Ps.-Skylax 67 it is recorded as a polis and a limen situated 500 stadia from the mouth of the Black Sea. Selymbria is identified with modern Silivri, which preserves a variant toponym. For sparse antiquities collected locally mostly during the nineteenth century, see Seure (1912) and Loukopoulou (1989) 27–38 with refs. Literary sources attest the existence of fortifications from C5l (Diod. 13.66.4, 14.12.7; Plut. *Alc.* 30.2) to C4m (Dem. 18.77, for which see infra).

According to Ps.-Skynnos 715–16, Selymbria was founded by Megara (no. 225) “before Byzantion”, some time in the second quarter of C7 (Isaac (1986) 210; Loukopoulou (1989) 51–53). The exact limits of its territory remain unidentified; it bordered the territory of Daminon Teichos (no. 675) to the west, that of Byzantion (no. 674) to the east—with two rivers, Athyras and Bathynias, mentioned in the border area (Strabo 7 fr. 56; cf. Plin. *HN* 4.47). Selymbria was conquered by the Persians after the Ionian Revolt (Hdt. 6.33.1). Following the expulsion of the Persians from Thrace,
Selymbria became a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i² 259.111.16) to 418/17 (IG i³ 287.11.17) a total of sixteen times, twice completely but convincingly restored, paying a phoros of 9 tal. in 454/3 (IG i² 259.11.16), 6 tal. from 450/49 (IG i³ 263.11.4.7) to 447/6 (IG i³ 265.15.17), 5 tal. from 443/2 (IG i² 269.11.9) to 439/8 (IG i³ 273.11.23), 900 dr. from 435/4 (IG i³ 277.7.12) to 432/1 (IG i³ 280.11.33) and 9 tal. again in 430/29 (IG i³ 281.111.19). The reduction to 900 drachmas was presumably connected with the growing pressure of the Odrysians (ATL iii. 310–12). Selymbria joined the revolt of Perinthos (no. 678) by 410, and members of the pro-Athenian faction were exiled (Staatsverträge 207.12 = IG i³ 118; cf. Gehrke, Stasis 145–46); the city refused to admit Alkibiades, but paid him money (Xen. Hell. 1.1.21). Selymbria was recaptured by Alkibiades in 408; the city was torn by stasis, and its fortifications betrayed to Alkibiades by the pro-Athenian faction; it was forced to pay indemnity, to accept an Athenian garrison (Plut. Alc. 30.2–5; Xen. Hell. 1.3.10; Diod. 13.66.4; Gehrke, Stasis 145–46), and probably also to give hostages. The ensuing settlement in 408 (IG i³ 118; ML 87) mentions guarantees (ll. 1–31) of Selymbrian autonomy, restoration of hostages and political refugees (Staatsverträge 207.12), cancellation of Athenian and allied claims to property lost in Selymbria except for real property (presumably indicating the existence of Athenian and allied landownership in Selymbria). The settlement was ratified in 407 by the Athenian ekklesia on the motion of Alkibiades (ll. 31–47). A member of the Second Athenian Naval League since 377 (IG i³ 438.B.29), Selymbria joined the revolt of Byzantium in 357 (Dem. 15.26). According to the decree quoted at Dem. 18.77, Selymbria was besieged by Philip in 340. The decree is spurious, but the information it contains may be correct, and, like Perinthos and Byzantium, Selymbria must have been besieged by Philip II in 340.

The civic institutions of Selymbria are unattested, except for the probable mention of aismimatai in a C 4 inscription (SGDI 3068: [ai]σιμμίμαται [α]ι); cf. Hanell (1934) 149) but are believed to have reproduced the pattern better known for other colonies of Megarian origin (Hanell 1934) 132ff; cf. Loukopoulou (1989) 142–47. Arist. Occ. 1348a mentions a law forbidding the export of corn in times of shortage.

Apollo (Pythios), probably to be restored in line 28 of the agreement between Athens and Selymbria of 407, seems to have been the protective deity of Selymbria, with public documents being published in his sanctuary (IG i³ 118.26–28; cf. Hanell (1934) 166; Loukopoulou (1989) 104–5 with reference to BCH 36 (1912) 558, pace ML 87).

Selymbria issued two series of silver coins: (a) from 492/0 to 473/0 and (b) from 425/0 to 411/0, presumably on the Thraco-Makedonian standard and apparently for local use. Denominations: octobols down to hemiobols: obv. cock; rev. incuse square (a) or ear of corn (b). Legend: ΣΑ or ΣΑ.ΙΥ (Head, HN² 271; Schönert-Geiss (1975) 35–49; SNG Cop. Thrace 789–90).

680. Ser(re)ion Teichos (Ser(re)iotiteichites) Map 52. Lat. 40.45, long. 27.00. Size of territory: 1. Type: Ca? The toponym is Σέρριον (Steph. Byz. 642.18) or Σέρριον τείχος (Aeschin. 3.82; Dem. 7.37) or Σέρριον τείχος (Dem. 9.15; Harp. Σι). The city-ethnic is Σερριοτείχησις (IG i³ 283.11.19). Ser(re)ion Teichos is not called a polis in any source, but polis status is indicated by its membership of the Delian League. The collective and external use of the city-ethnic is attested in the tribute lists (infra) and is restored in the assessment decree of 425/4 (IG i³ 71.111.104).

The identification of Ser(re)ion Teichos with Ganos (ATL i. 545; Kahrstedt (1954) 21 followed by Barr.) is unconvincing (Isaac (1986) 211) and contradicted by the explicit distinction between the two sites in Aeschin. 3.82 followed by Harp. Π3 and Σ4; see Ganos, supra 913. Propontic Ser(re)ion Teichos is clearly to be distinguished from Serrion on the Aegean coast of Thrace (supra 872).

Ser(re)ion Teichos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded in the tribute lists of 428/7 (IG i³ 283.11.19), 421/0 (IG i³ 285.11.87) and 418/17 (IG i³ 287.11.18), contributing unknown sums. It was one of the fortresses conquered by Philip II in 346 (Aeschin. 3.82; Dem. 7.37, 9.15).

681. Tyrodiza (Tyroditon) Map 52. Lat. 40.35, long. 27.05. Size of territory: 5. Type: B?: The toponym is Τυροδίζα, Τυροδίζα (Hdt. 7.25.2; IG i³ 71.111.108) or, once, Τυροδίζαι (IG i³ 261.4.30) or, once, Τυροδίζα (Hellan. fr. 62). The city-ethnic is Τυροδίζησις (Krateros (FGrHist 342) fr. 3 = IG i³ 100). The only source to call Tyroditon a polis is Steph. Byz. 642.18. According to Herodotos, it belonged to the Perinthians (no. 678) (Hdt. 7.25: εἰς Τυροδίζην τὴν Περινθιάνων), implying that it was a possession of Perinthos (ATL i. 558); It could, however, mean “a colony or foundation of the Perinthians” (see e.g. Thuc. 2.30.1, 4.49.1). It is here considered to be a polis, at least in C55, on the evidence of the Athenian tribute lists, where it is recorded among paying members of the League. Only the collective and external use of the city-ethnic is attested (supra).

Tyroditon is usually identified with Teiristasia, one of the Thracian teicere recorded by Ps.-Skylax 67 on the north-west
shore of the Propontis, between the isthmus of the Chersonesos and Perinthos (cf. Dem. 12.3; schol. Dem. 12.1.1), which is plausibly identified with mediaeval Peristasis = modern Peristeri = present-day Sharkeui (ATL i. 558; but see Isaac (1986) 203–4). According to Steph. Byz. 642.18, Tyrodiza was situated “after” (i.e. east of) Serrion.

Tyrodiza is recorded as one of the supply bases of Xerxes’ army in 480 (Hdt. 7.25). Tyrodiza was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded by toponym in the tribute lists of 452/1 (IG i² 261.1v.30), 446/5 (IG i² 266.1.22) and 445/4 (IG i² 267.1.30), paying 1,000 dr. the first year, a sum reduced to 500 dr. in 446/5 and 445/4 (IG i² 266.1.22; 267.1.30), presumably following the establishment of Athenian klerouchs shortly before 450 (cf. IG i² 417.9: ἐν Τυροδίζ [αὐτοῖς] (448/7)). For a possible relation with the Athenian klerouchy settled c.450 in Neapolis (no. 677), see ATL iii. 205; Kahrstedt (1954) 22 and Isaac (1986) 204. Tyrodiza appears again in the assessment decree of 425/4 (IG i² 71.111.108; cf. Krateros fr. 3 (IG i³ 100)). If the identification with Teiristasis is correct, Tyrodiza and its neighbour Krobyle were exposed to andrapodismos by the Athenian general Diopeithes in 341 (Dem. 12.3; cf. Dem. 8 hypoth. 2–3), see supra 913.
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THE BLACK SEA AREA

ALEXANDRU AVRAM, JOHN HIND, Gocha Tsetskhladze

I. The Region

The ancient name for the Black Sea, Πόντος Εὔξεινος (Hdt. 1.72.3), often transliterated as “Euxine Pontos”, has all the hallmarks of a hybrid name, part Greek, part Iranian. The Greeks themselves took it to be Hellenic in both parts, “the hospitable (εὔξεινος) sea (πόντος)” (Hdt. 4.95.1), but they also recognised an earlier form, which they took to mean its opposite, “inhospitable” (ἅξεινος, Eur. IT 253; Ps.-Skymnos 735–37, Diller; Strabo 7.3.6). In the twentieth century, since the studies of Vasmer (1923) and Boisacq (1924), it has become generally accepted that axenos was itself a borrowing into Greek from an Iranian root αχξαίνα meaning “dark”. This gives a consistent naming principle for the Black Sea in a number of different languages, including Russian Черное море and Turkish Karadeniz (see further discussion by Moorhouse, Allen, Yelnitskij and Georgiev, summarised in Danoff (1962) 950–54).

The region was regarded as a unitary one by many Greeks of the homeland and Aegean area, who referred to it by such expressions as Ελληνες οἱ τὸν Εὔξεινον καὶ Πόντον οἰκέοντες (Hdt. 4.8.1), αἱ τῶν Ελληνών καὶ Πόντων οἰκέων Ελληνες (cf. the rubric [πόλες] ἐκ τοῦ Εὐξείνου in IG1 371.11.266). However, within the Euxine certain cities were especially close geographically and by reason of a common barbarian hinterland, while others were linked by regular sea routes along coastlines, or across from shore to shore (Arnaud (1992)). Strabo 2.5.22 divided the sea into “left-hand” and “right-hand” regions, i.e. those of Thrace to the left, and those of Bithynia, Paphlagonia and Kappadokia to the right, on entering from the Bosporos. We may divide the whole of its circuit into four sub-regions, already treated separately by Strabo: (1) the coasts of Thrace and Getike (Strabo 7.6.1); (2) of Skythia, Taurike and Sindike (Strabo 7.3.14–4.8, 11.2.1–11); (3) of the Caucasus and Kolchian lowlands (Strabo 11.2.12–19); and (4) of the Mariyandnoi, Paphlagones and Kappadokes (Strabo 12.3.2–17). The Inventory of poleis is presented in these four regions, while the introduction treats the Black Sea area as a whole.

So much for the regions and shores of the Euxine; it should be noted that the Pontos could also be regarded as virtually two seas (διθάλαττος πόντος, Strabo 2.5.22), with a narrow waist between the central part of the Turkish coast and the southern tip of the Crimean Peninsula, creating the conditions for a convenient and much-used cross-sea route (Maximova (1956) 145–68; Gajdukević (1969)).

The planting of Greek poleis around the shores of the Black Sea is largely a tale of two mother cities, Miletos (no. 854) and Megara (no. 225). A very few other (east Greek) states took subsidiary roles, and an occasional party of settlers (e.g. Boiotians) from elsewhere joined the founding, main group of colonists. These minor participants tended to be forgotten after a short time except in local tradition; even Megara’s colonising activity, well attested as it was in Classical and Hellenistic times, could be obscured as time went on by Miletos’ greater fame as a coloniser and by her higher profile as a city in Roman times (Robert (1937) 247–48). There was the expectation that a Greek colony in the Propontis and Pontos areas would be Milesian (Strabo 14.1.6). There were also, by the first century AD, much-inflated estimates of Milesian colony numbers, seventy-five according to Seneca (Helv. 7.2), or the ninety reported by Plin. HN 5.112. Lists have not been preserved for us, but they would have included sub-colonies of Sinope (no. 729) and many places labelled poleis by the geographers in a region generally thought of as a “Milesian lake”. This increasing tendency to assume that a colony here was Milesian is probably also responsible for some of the more glaring individual errors (see Strabo 12.3.4 on Herakleia (no. 715); Pompon. 2.22 on Kallatis (no. 686)).

Another feature of the historiographical tradition is the tendency to move away from giving foundation dates of colonies in the form of chronology relative to another Greek or Near Eastern event, or a king (Hdt. 4.144 on Kalchedon (no. 743)/Byzantion (no. 674); Ps.-Skymnos 730ff, on a string of Pontic colonies), and towards the practice of using Olympiads and their four-yearly cycle. Eventually, in the Christian writers of the later Roman Empire, the era of
Abraham was added as well. The dates in Eusebius and Jerome have an aura of exactness about them that is misleading (Chron. 95b), being based on a chain of previous pagan traditions that was very late in finding its final tabular form. For colonies within the Pontos three dates have gained common acceptance: Istros in 657, Olbia in 647, Sinope in 631. But these should be regarded as dates arrived at by being put belatedly into tabular form, and not as a canon, sanctified by the Christian Fathers (Hind (1999a)). A fourth date, found in the Armenian version of Eusebius, relating to Trapezous (757, Ann. Abr. 1260) is to be discounted as a mistake, referring to the city of Kyzikos (no. 747) in the Proponentis (Hind (1988) 213–14; Huxley (1990) 199; Ivantchik (1998) 314–18). Setting aside the exaggerated numbers of Milesian colonies and the (misleading) seeming exactitude of the few colonial dates provided by the chronographers, we may now turn to the distribution, character and development of the poleis in the Pontic region.

The Pontos amazed the Greeks by its vast emptiness; according to Hdt. 4.85, it impressed even the Persian Great King Dareios. It was particularly marked by a lack of islands, except for very small offshore islets. Huge stretches of varied coastline surrounded it. Hills and harbourless coast at first in Salmydessian Thrace; bays and headlands beyond; then marshy delta, treeless steppe, the high mountains of Taurike, the Caucasus and Eastern Anatolia, the Kolchian lowlands and marshy Phasian shoreline. Pouring into the Pontos are the great rivers then called Istros, Tyras, Hypanis, to invade both Asia and Europe south of the Danube (Hdt. 9.2.16, or, as he disbelieves, 300). These included the many small peoples listed by Ps.-Skylax (82–89) on the coast east of Sinope (no. 729) and Amisos (no. 712). These, and Herakleia (no. 715), were under the direct, or indirect, control of the great Asian power, Persia, after c.545 through its satraps at Daskyleion and in Kappadokia, and through the kings of Paphlagonia. The southern Thracians formed a sort of satrapy in Europe (Skudata) from c.512 to 478, while the Kolchoi were tribute-payers on Persia’s northern fringe. Most curious in their way of life seemed to be these Phasian–Kolchoi, delta-dwellers with timber towns, and the nomad, wagon-dwelling Skythians (Hippoc. Aer.), who knew how to frustrate the greatest invasions with their strategy of retreat into the steppe. If Greeks wished for an ally against the Persian colossus, they thought of their own cultural antithesis—nomads with only royal burials to defend and the mobility to invade both Asia and Europe south of the Danube (Hdt. 4.46, 122–27, 6.84).

There were in Archaic and Classical times some thirty poleis with full credentials around the shores of the Euxine Pontos, and a further twenty or so which were dependent communities or doubtfully Greek, some being mentioned in dubious contexts or in plain error (Hind (1994) 481–86; Tsitskhladze (1994a), (1998b); see also the relevant entries in the Inventory below). Three primary colonies were planted along the southern shore: Sinope (I c.700–690; II c.630–600) by Milesians, Amisos by Phokaian and/or Milesians (c.560–550), and Herakleia by Megarians and Boiotians (c.550). (Herakleia was, according to Xen. An. 6.4.2, the first Greek polis one met having passed the Bosporos and turned east.) The Greek cities here were well spaced out, and there is little or no friction recorded between them. To the east of Sinope were three of her own daughter colonies, dependent and tribute-paying by C3: Kotyora (no. 722), Kerasous (no. 719) and Trapezous (no. 734). Between Herakleia and Sinope

The coastal Pontic Mountains. Copper in the west and north-west Pontic region and some gold in the streams of Kolchis show up in the archaeological record (but only from C3) and in the Argonaut myth (Tsitskhladze (1995)). Since many native peoples were treated as commodities, it was probably the slave trade (Paphlagonians, Thracians, Getai, Kolchoi and Skythians) that was most consistently lucrative—organised at cities like Sinope (no. 729), Apollonia (no. 682), Istros (no. 685) and Olbia (no. 690).

The variety of the peoples around the Pontos arose from that of the lands—Mariандыnoi, Kappadokians, Tauroi, Caucasian tribes with languages more numerous even than Milesian colonies (seventy according to Strabo 11.2.16, or, as he disbelieves, 300). These included the many small peoples listed by Ps.-Skylax (82–89) on the coast east of Sinope (no. 729) and Amisos (no. 712). These, and Herakleia (no. 715), were under the direct, or indirect, control of the great Asian power, Persia, after c.545 through its satraps at Daskyleion and in Kappadokia, and through the kings of Paphlagonia. The southern Thracians formed a sort of satrapy in Europe (Skudata) from c.512 to 478, while the Kolchoi were tribute-payers on Persia’s northern fringe. Most curious in their way of life seemed to be these Phasian–Kolchoi, delta-dwellers with timber towns, and the nomad, wagon-dwelling Skythians (Hippoc. Aer.), who knew how to frustrate the greatest invasions with their strategy of retreat into the steppe. If Greeks wished for an ally against the Persian colossus, they thought of their own cultural antithesis—nomads with only royal burials to defend and the mobility to invade both Asia and Europe south of the Danube (Hdt. 4.46, 122–27, 6.84).

There were in Archaic and Classical times some thirty poleis with full credentials around the shores of the Euxine Pontos, and a further twenty or so which were dependent communities or doubtfully Greek, some being mentioned in dubious contexts or in plain error (Hind (1994) 481–86; Tsitskhladze (1994a), (1998b); see also the relevant entries in the Inventory below). Three primary colonies were planted along the southern shore: Sinope (I c.700–690; II c.630–600) by Milesians, Amisos by Phokaian and/or Milesians (c.560–550), and Herakleia by Megarians and Boiotians (c.550). (Herakleia was, according to Xen. An. 6.4.2, the first Greek polis one met having passed the Bosporos and turned east.) The Greek cities here were well spaced out, and there is little or no friction recorded between them. To the east of Sinope were three of her own daughter colonies, dependent and tribute-paying by C3: Kotyora (no. 722), Kerasous (no. 719) and Trapezous (no. 734). Between Herakleia and Sinope
were four small settlements, described as *poleis* or *katoikiai*—Tieion (no. 733), Kromna (no. 723), Sesamos (no. 728) and Kytoros (no. 724)—which achieved some strength in union (*koinonia*) under the name Amastris on the site of Sesamos only c.300–290.

On the western shore, south of the Danube, the Milesians founded three early *apoikiai*: Istros (no. 685), c.650–625; Apollonia (no. 682) by c.600 or earlier, with some Rhodians? or Phokaian; and Odessos (no. 689) c.590–575. Megarians founded two, but, as these were sub-colonies of Byzantion (no. 674) and Heracleia (no. 715), they came much later—Mesambria (no. 687) c.513/12–494 and Kallatis (no. 686) in C61 at the earliest: its date is set by some in C61, but, perhaps more likely is c.400–375 (Hind (1998); Saprykin (1998); Ivantchik (1998) 321–22).

Further north, on the fringes of Skythian lands, the Milesians had a near monopoly in colonial activity, apart from Heracleia's large colony at Chersonesos (no. 695), c.425–375. Olbia (no. 690) was in place on the Berezan peninsula by c.625–600, and transferred to the mainland site at Parutino some 40 km further inside the estuary within a generation or so, where it became an early *poleis* and *emporion*. Karkinits (no. 698) in west Crimea was settled by C61, to be taken over by Chersonesos (no. 695) c.350. The Tyritai at Ophioussa and Nikonion also existed by C61; they were combined in C4 at Tiras (no. 694, at the site of Akkerman/Belgorod).

The *poleis* east of the Tauric part of the Chersonesos were also mainly Milesian: Theodosia (no. 707) and Pantikapaion (no. 705) on the Kerch Peninsula (the western side of the Bosporos), both left undated by literary sources but placed by archaeological finds c.600–575 (Tssetskhladze (1997b) 39–69). The eastern side of the Bosporos, the Sindiand islands and delta of the river Kuban seem to have attracted some of the earliest *poleis*, not merely Milesian Kepoi (no. 699), c.580–560, but Hermonassa (no. 697), probably an *apoikia* from Aiolian Mytilene (no. 798), also c.580–560. Phanagoria (no. 706) came later, founded by men from Ionian Teos (no. 868)—these last in flight from the Persians (c.545–540). The western side of the Kimmerian Bosporos may have been subject to threatening Skythian movements, including raids and tribute exactation. In time, however, Pantikapaion (no. 705) became the chief market for the Skythians and eventually the capital of an expanding Bosporan state under Archaianaktid dynasts (480–437) and “archons” of mixed Thracian and Greek origin, the Spartokidai (437–109) (Hind (1994) 486–501). Of the small towns here, Nymphaion (no. 704) and, more doubtfully, Myrmekeion (no. 703) qualified as *poleis*, while numerous other lesser *polichnia, komai* and *phouria*, developed in the two geographical halves, European and Asiatic (Tssetskhladze (1997b) 70–81). Under Satyros I (433/2–389/8) and Leukon I (389/8–349/8), the Spartokidai expanded to include not just these cities, but some settled Skythians in the eastern part of the Kerch Peninsula and also the Sindoi and numerous Maiotian tribes who inhabited the river system of the river Antikeites (Kuban) and the east side of Lake Maiotis.

In the furthest reaches east of the Euxine were some small towns on the North Caucasus coast, Bata/Patous and Torikos. These can be seen to have been relatively late and mixed in character, and are attested as *poleis* only by Ps.-Skylax (*infra*). In the Kolchian lowlands (Tssetskhladze (1998a)) the Phasianois seem to have developed towns of their own, partly through contact with Media and Persia, and partly under the stimulus of trade with Milesians, perhaps mostly Sinopean merchants. These were Phasis (no. 711), Dioskouris (no. 709), Gyenos (no. 710) on the coast, and Aia and Sourion up the river Phasis; however, the sites of the first two towns, barbarian or Hellenic, have yet to be found. Whether any of these was a Greek *poleis* proper in the Classical period is a much debated question, but not one of them is ever attested in the literary record as a community doing anything diplomatic or political; nor has a citizen of any of them ever turned up in an inscription as a visitor or resident of any city of the Black Sea or elsewhere (see Phasis (no. 711) and Dioskouris (no. 709)). These, perhaps small, and certainly elusive, settlements were possibly *katoikiai* of miscellaneous Greeks, and one an *emporion* of the Phasianois, servicing merchants. We may well think of them as dependent on Sinope (no. 729) for access by sea from the west and on the Phasian Kolkhoi for the trade with the hinterland. A string of such sites lay between Sinope and Phasis, at Batumi, Tsikhidzirzi and Pichvnari, where a considerable Greek presence has been revealed in a C5–C4 cemetery (Tssetskhladze (1999) 43–50, 74–81).

The Pontos offered great resources, but was fraught with what seemed initially an inhospitable climate—stormy seas and biting winters. There were tough opponents in the small local Thracian tribes, and stronger and stranger ones still in the steppeland Skythians and Sarmatians. It was dire necessity at home that drove Greeks out to found these *apoikiai* beyond the Hellespont and Bosporos. There was loss of land at home to near neighbours, to Lydians inland from Miletos (no. 854), to Corinthians and Athenians around Megara (no. 225). But there were also plague, famine, *stasis* and the exile
of losers in it. Raids by the Kimmerians into western Asia Minor had some temporary effect, but they probably also brought in their wake new information about the far northeast. It was probably also the policy of the Milesian tyrants Thrasyboulos (c.600) and Thoas and Damasenor (c.580–560) to promote the sending out of apokiai, just as Gyges, king of Lydia, seems to have done from his position of attempted overlordship (see on Abydos, Strabo 13.1.22). Gradually the Black Sea came to seem more inviting—with colonies settled in the softer target areas: Sinope (no. 729), Herakleia (no. 715), Olbia (no. 690) and Kepoi (no. 699) among the Sindoi. Its coasts were now known and negotiable, its currents familiar and followed, its smaller, poorly organised and ill-equipped peoples able to be defeated by immigrant hoplites. Every city founded—Apollonia (no. 682), Istrōs (no. 685), Pantikapaion (no. 705), Kallatis (no. 686), Chersonesos (no. 695)—made the Pontos more sailor- and settler-friendly.

Initially, and for generations, the poleis were in the ascendant; some, like Herakleia (no. 715), subdued their neighbours (Mariandynoi); perhaps Chersonesos (no. 695) repeated this pattern later among the Tauroi. The Milesians drove out from Sinope the weakened Leukosyroi, after a period of occupation by the Kimmerians. Sinope (no. 729) conquered land from the natives to the east for her colonists. Milesians were believed to have expelled some Skythians in founding Pantikapaion (no. 705). But this dominance did not stay unchallenged beyond C5e. Major powers evolved in Thrace (the Odrysai) and in Skythia (Royal Skythians ranging from the Danube to the Don), and they held the individual Greek poleis (Istrōs (no. 685), Olbia (no. 690)) as valued channels of trade within their sphere of control. Even the Paphlagonian and Kappadokian vassals of Persia occasionally pressed on their coastal poleis, Sinope and Amisos (no. 712). On the Kimmerian Bosporos, the Spartokid state was able to withstand the Skythians and Sarmatians throughout C5 and C4 by creating a “proto-Hellenistic” state out of several cities, and incorporating the extensive lands of the Sindoi and Maiotai. In the second half of C5, perhaps c.439/6–411/405, Athens extended her thalassocracy into the Euxine Sea, using as her chief footholds the cities of Sinope (no. 729) and, less certainly, Nymphaion (no. 704), while drawing Apollonia (no. 682) and Herakleia (no. 715) into her arche.

In constitutional and religious matters the colonists predictably seem to have held to practices prevalent in their mother cities: Milesian and Megarian magistracies, councils, assemblies, calendars and cults, the latter sometimes taking on a native element from a deity deemed to be the equivalent of the Greek (Bilabel 1920; Hanell 1934; Ehrhardt 1988; Saprykin 1997). Internal troubles followed, with some delay, the pattern of those noticed in Megara (no. 225) or Ionia: increased inequalities of wealth, formation of new aristocracies out of the first colonial families, relative overpopulation, tyrannis, and stasis between the aristoi and the demos. The major poleis of the Pontic region in the Classical period were relatively few: Sinope (no. 729), Herakleia (no. 715), Apollonia (no. 682), Mesambria (no. 687), Istrōs (no. 685), Olbia (no. 690), Chersonesos (no. 695), Pantikapaion (no. 705) and Phanagoria (no. 706). They all struck coinage by the late fifth century (in the case of Chersonesos by the early fourth). Another city, Hermionassa (no. 697), had some early importance, but declined, or was incorporated in Bosporos, too early to issue coinage. Most had cross-Pontic economic links, now traced by proxeny decrees and burial stelai of foreigners in the cities’ cemeteries. Several had a considerable export trade in wine, olive oil, salted fish and their pottery containers, the bulk-carrying amphoras. Warfare broke out between some—Sinope (no. 729) with Sestos (no. 672), and Herakleia (no. 715) with Bosporos (no. 705) in the early fourth century. Nearly all had agoras, temples and temene and a variety of public buildings. These have been found especially in the cities on the territories of present-day Bulgaria, Romania, Ukraine and Russia, where excavation, in some areas going back a century, has provided fullest evidence. Nearly all of them had territories, inland and around them, and lesser communities within them—dependent poleis, polichnia, katoikiai, choria, phouriai. A few had an emporion quarter, or had so developed as ports of trade that they could loosely be termed emporia in recognition of their general character.

Three ancient sources for the period and region may be looked at in some detail, for all purport to provide toponyms, or parts of names, for the Pontic poleis. Of these the first is Hekataios of Miletos (c.500), who has left some 175 references to poleis, mainly through the medium of the Ethnika of Stephanos of Byzantium (Hansen 1997a 17). Among these are twelve located in the Euxine Pontos. They include three certain Greek poleis—Hermionassa (no. 697) (fr. 208), Karkinītis (no. 698) (fr. 184) and Phanagoria (no. 706) (fr. 212)—but also one temple (hieron); Apatouron (fr. 211), near Phanagoria (no. 706) (see also Kepoi (no. 699)). His remaining poleis are said to be barbarian, or are left unspecified: Patrasys (fr. 214: πόλις Πωτίκη (= Patraieus)); Krossa (fr. 213: πόλις πρὸς τῷ Πόντῳ...
The second source is the section of the Athenian tribute assessment decree of the year 425/24 headed [πόλεις] ἐκ τῷ Εὐχεσίῳ (Α.Τ.Ι. Α.9.11.126ff = ΙΓ 71.11.126ff). This portion of the inscription is said to have space for up to forty poleis, although the boldest restorations have sought to provide about fifteen (Α.Τ.Ι. i. pp. 527–39; Meijs (1972) 328–29). Most acceptable are Herakleia (no. 715) and Apollonia (no. 682) in the nearest south-western corner of the Pontos; then in declining order of conviction, Кερας (iv.169); Νικ[ονία] (iv.167); Τύρ(πας) (iv.163); Κά[λλατρς] or Κα[ρκνίτις] (iv.165); Τα[ξιμπάκη] (iv.164); ‘Ο[λβία] or ‘Ο[ργάμε] (iv.162); Κύμ[ερχικών] (iv.166); Πατ[ραέως] or Πατ[ρασός] (iv.168); Νή[φωσι?] (iv.143); Δα[νάκε] (iv.170); Κάρ[πα] (iv.129); Τ[?] (iv.160); Μ[?] (iv.161). No widespread Pontic thalassocracy of Athens should be deduced from individual initials, though Sinope (no. 729) was drawn well into Athens’ net (on Plutarch’s authority: Περ. 20), and the intervention at Herakleia (no. 715) is accepted (on the authority of Θυκ. 4.75.2). A fragment of a casualty list is now once more interpreted to read “at Sinope”, reinforcing the account of Plutarch (IG i 3 1180; Clairmont (1979) 123–26); the longer reach of Athens is illustrated by the case of Glykon, the ancestor of Demosthenes, said to have held Nymphaion (no. 704) on the Bosporos in Athens’ interest (Aeschin. 3.171). The story is reinforced by Kraters Harpokration (ΦΓρHist 342) fr. 8, who says that “Nymphaion paid one talent” (Meijs (1972) 329 n. 5).

The third and last apparent provider of Pontic poleis is Ps.-Skylax; dating to c.340–330 this text produces a prolific list of poleis, many of them said to be Hellenides, presumably in the topographic, urban, sense (Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996)). Of the forty or so places around the Black Sea, described as Greek poleis, nineteen are cities well known from other sources relating to the Archaic and Classical periods. But there are many omissions and misdescriptions as well. The omissions are concentrated particularly in the west and north-west. Istron (no. 685) and Olbia (no. 690) do not appear, nor do Tomis (no. 693) or Dionysopolis (no. 684). Kromna (no. 723) and Kotyora (no. 722) on the southern shore are missing, as is Hermonassa (no. 697) on the Kimmerian Bosporos. Chersonesos (no. 695) figures as emporion (68), not polis. Sometimes poleis are left without the adjective Hellenis (Dioskouris (81), Limne (83)); one toponym, Aia (81), is described as “a great barbarian city 180 stades up the river Phasis” (possibly Kutaissi). But another twenty or so poleis Hellenides listed by Ps.-Skylax are completely unattested in other sources. These appear mainly on the eastern (72–74, 81–83) and southern shores (86, 89–90) of the Euxine, where not only small settlements are elevated, but even rivers and promontories are transmuted, into cities (e.g. the river Lykastos (89: poleis Ἑλληνις), Cape Karambis (90: poleis Ἑλληνις), Cape Jasonia (88: ἀκρόπολις Ἑλληνις)). Sometimes a town, said by Hekataios to be native (e.g. Choirades (fr. 204)), is made into a polis Hellenis by Ps.-Skylax (86). As later geographers have no such burgeoning of poleis on these shores, it is clear that these idiosyncratic entries should not be trusted. But it is possible that the numbers implied in this text contributed to the notion, mentioned above, that Miletos (no. 854) founded seventy-five or ninety colonies in the region.

Apart from the doubtful cases of poleis mentioned above, a number of other settlements are mentioned by name by Classical authors or, with retrospective reference, by Hellenistic or Roman writers as e.g. polichnia, emporia, katoikiai, teiche, phouria, hiera or komai.

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements
not Attested as Poleis

Akounai (Ἀκόναι) A kome of the Mariandynoi (Theophr. Hist. pl. 9.16.4), or a polichnia, according to Steph. Byz. 61.4; its location is unknown, and while Plin. HN 6.4 describes it as a port east of Herakleia (no. 715), Steph. Byz. simply says πλησίον Ἀρκλείας (61.4). Barr. 86, unlocated and dated HR, but Theophr. Hist. pl. 9.16.4 suggests C.

Alopekia (νήσος Ἀλωπεκία) Perhaps Elizavetovskoye in the Don delta. According to Strabo 11.2.3, it was a “katoikia of mixed people”. Shelov (1970) 69–75 argued in some detail that Elizavetovskoye, a large fortified site occupied in C5–C3, was Strabo’s Alopekia, on an island in front of the Tanais (Don). Barr. 84 dates it C but treats it as unlocated (Elizavetovskoye?).

Anchiale (Ἀγχιάλη) Paleokastro/Pomorye, south of the Gulf of Burgas, Bulgaria. A πολιόχυνον Ἀπολλωνιαστῶν
(Strabo 7.6.1). The salt production at Anchiale has been studied (by Khrischer et al. (1982)). This resource is likely to have been used from an early date. Barr. 22, C.

Antheia (Ἀνθεία) Probably the peninsula of Atiya on the Bay of Burgas west of Apollonia (no. 682). According to Plin. HN 4.45, Antheia was a former name of Apollonia in the territory of the Astai. Steph. Byz. 96.3 makes it a separate colony of Milesians and Phokaians. Archaic sculpture and numerous pieces of bronze arrow money have been found there (Isaac (1986) 240–46). Not in Barr.

Anthemous limne (Ἀνθεμοῦσις λίμνη) Steph. Byz. 96.9 mentions an Άνθεµουσίς λίµνη Μαριµαινών, presumably somewhere in the territory of Herakleia (no. 715). Barr. 86: coast near Heraclea, H.

Apatouron (Ἀπάτουρον) A temple on the Taman Peninsula, on the east side of Kimmerian Bosporos. A sanctuary of Aphrodite Apatouria, outside Phanagoria (no. 706), near Kepoi (no. 699) or Hermonassa (no. 697) (Strabo 11.2.10). An inscription from a rural sanctuary east of Kepoi mentions an Aphrodite Ourania and dates it to C4 (Tokhtasiev (1983) 111–17, (1986) 140; Tsetskhladze and Kuznetsov (2000)). Barr. 87, unlocated (Taman?), HR.

Arkiriossa (Ἀρκιρίοσσα) Steph. Byz. 121.9 has Ἀρκιρίοσσα, πόλις ἐν Πόντῳ, Ἡρακλείας ὑποτελής = Domitius Kallistratos (FGrHist 433) fr. 6. Barr. 86, unlocated (Taman?), H.

Aulaiouteichos, Agathopolis (Ἀυλαίου τεῖχος, Ἀγαθόπολις) Akhtopol, on the Bulgarian coast south of the Bay of Burgas. Aulaiouteichos appears in Roman sources (Arr. Peripl. M. Eux. 36). Agathopolis has been supposed to be a late Roman/Byzantine renaming. Recently, however, two inscriptions and bronze coins of C4–C3e have been used to argue for the existence of Agathopolis much earlier (Velkov (1994); Jurukova (1994); Stancomb (1998)); but it is now argued (Avram (2002)) that these two inscriptions are actually of Apollonia (no. 682), moved to Akhtopol only in post-Classical times. Barr. 22, RL.

Harmene (Ἀρμηνή) Akliman, to the west of Sinope (no. 729). A harbour in the territory of Sinope (Xen. An. 6.1.15, 17). According to Ps. Skylax 89, it was a polis Hellenis (actually a harbour of Sinope with accompanying buildings?); see Flenssted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 149. By Strabo’s time it was a kome with walls, about which he quotes local opinion that they were “the work of people who had nothing better to do” (12.3.10). Barr. 86, C.

*Hermesion (Hermium) On the European side of the Kimmerian Bosporos, unlocated; Pompon. 2.3; Plin. HN 4.87. A place lost or re-named by C1 to first century AD. Barr. 87 inset: unlocated, R.

Hieron Achilles (Ὑερὸν Ἀχιλλέως) Leuke Island, Phidonisi, Zmejniq Island, lying to the north-east of the Danube delta. A centre of a cult of Achilles Pontarces with a temple. It seems to have been known already by Alkaios (fr. 354, LP), Pind. Nem. 4.48–50 and Ps. Skylax 68, and by many Hellenistic and Roman writers. Archaeological finds from C6 onwards are discussed by Okhotnikov and Ostroverkhov (1996) and in their monograph on Leuke (1993). Barr. 23, AC.

Hieron Demetros (Ὑερὸν Δημητρίου) Cape Stanislav, between the rivers Hypanis and Borysthenes (Bug and Dnieper). A shrine of Demeter on a cape called Hippoleos, lying across the estuary of the Bug from Olbia (no. 690) (Hdt. 4.53.6). Site not located. Barr. 23, C (Stanislavskoye).

Hieron Dios Ouriou (Ὑερὸν Δίος Ὄιρου) Anadolu Kavagi on the north coast of Turkey near the entrance to the Black Sea. The temple of Zeus Ourios (“Zeus favourable to sailing”) at the entrance to the Euxine Pontos (Polyb. 4.39.6). Hdt. 4.85, 87 mentions it as a good place from which to admire the sea, as did Dareios in 513/12. It was a collecting point for ships in large-scale convoys and merchant fleets (Didymos 10.54–11.7). The C4 Olbian decree about the exchange rate of their coinage was found there (IOSPE ii 24 = Dubois (1996) 14). Barr. 53, HRL.

Kieros (Κίερος) A settlement of unknown status (called πόλις Ἡρακλεωτῶν in Memnon (FGrHist 434) fr. 27 (rHell.)) probably Mariandynian in origin. By C4 it was incorporated in the territory of Herakleia (no. 715) (Memnon (FGrHist 434) frr. 16, 27); by early Hellenistic times it was renamed Prusias-ad-Hypium (Memnon (FGrHist 434) fr. 27). It has been suggested that it had some earlier independent existence as a polis, which might be the case if a brief coin issue of C4e can be attributed to Kieros (E. S. G. Robinson (1921) 3–7; Burstain (1976) 108 n. 52). Barr. 86, R.

Korokondame (Κοροκονδάμη) Settlement on a lake in the Taman Peninsula, on the Asiatic side of the Kimmerian Bosporos. By Strabo’s time it was a kome (11.2.8 and 14). The Tuzlinskij cemetery (Sorokina (1957)) may have belonged to this settlement, in which case it was of considerable
importance in C6. Barr. 87 inset, C, but A would be attested if the cemetery (supra) belongs to Korokondame.

**Kremnoi** (Κρημνοί) Emporion of the Royal Skythians on the north-western side of the Sea of Azov, or at Pantikapaion (no. 705) (Hdt. 4.20, 110). For the latter location, see Hind (1997) 111–15. Barr. 87 inset, unlocated, AC.

**Naulochos** (Ναύλοχος) Obzor, north of the Bay of Burgas, Bulgaria. A minor town (polichnion) belonging to the Mesambrians (no. 687) (Strabo 7.6.1). It is not known how early it became such. Barr. 22, HR.

**Ordessos** (Ὀρδησσός) A polis, probably of mixed population, if this is the same as Καρδησσός (καὶ Ὀρδησσός ?). A polis of Skythia, according to Hecat. fr. 188; perhaps Kosharskoye on the right bank of Tiligul. Kosharskoye has produced a considerable amount of Greek imported pottery of C5–C4 (M. J. Treister and Vinogradov (1993) 533). Barr. 23, unlocated, HR, but Hecat. fr. 188 may indicate A.

**Panelos** (Πάνελος) According to Steph. Byz. 500.5–7, a πόλις περί τῶν Πόντων, named after a Herakleiotoriginating from Boiotia, and so presumably an early venture, but nothing is known of the place (Burstein (1976) 25).

**Porthmion** (Πορθμίων) Situated in the European part of the Kimmerian Bosporos. The toponym is Πορθμίων (Steph. Byz. 533.4; Anon. Peripl. M. Eux. 50) or Παρθένιων (Strabo 7.4.5, 11.2.6; Hdn. 111.1 360.17). The site lies at a strategic point on the north-west coast of the Kerch Strait, not far from Pantikapaion (no. 705), and the town controlled the crossing of the strait (Strabo 7.4.5). No source classifies Porthmion as a polis, and the site-classification found in the late sources quoted above is kome. The only source for a city-ethnic is Stephanos. Thus, it may have been a mere teichos (cf. IOSPE τείχος 401 = Syll. 3 360; Tsetskhladze (1997b) 68–69). Porthmion was founded most probably by Pantikapaion in C6, and thus it was dependent on Pantikapaion from the beginning (ibid. 62, 68, 79). The first walls of Porthmion were erected in C6l/C5e (Vakhitina (1995)). The west wall, a tower and new gates were built in C3e (Y. A. Vinogradov (1995a) 157 n. 35; Tolstikov (1997) 209, 223–26). Stone and mudbrick buildings date from C6l. The town was regularly planned as twelve blocks, separated by streets, following the major points of the compass. The blocks were 42 m long by 11 m wide, except for the two central blocks of the eastern half, which were 63.5 m long (Koshelenko et al. (1984) 69–70; Hind (1983–84) 87). Barr. 87 inset, C.

**Priola** (Πρίολα) A πόλις πληγαίον Ἡρακλείας, otherwise unknown (Steph. Byz. 535.9). Barr. 86, unlocated, H.

**Stratokleia** (Stratoclia) An unlocated town on the Asiatic side of the Kimmerian Bosporos. Mentioned by Plin. HN 6.18, it may have been a renamed earlier settlement of C5–C4. Barr. 87 inset, unlocated, C?ΗΡ?

**Tamyrake** (Ταμυράκη) Named as a gulf and cape (Strabo 7.3.19). Some rare silver and bronze coins with the legend TAM are of a polis of Tamyrake C5–C4 according to Kutajsov (1996) 299–301. But no such city has yet been found, nor is one mentioned by the ancient sources. Barr. 23.

**Tirizis** (Τιριζίς) Cape Kali Akra, coast of Bulgaria. A promontory used as a stronghold/treasury by Lysimachos, but probably existing earlier (Strabo 7.6.1). Barr. 22, HRL.

**Tirikos** (Τορικός) On Gelendzhik Bay, perhaps Tonky Mys, North Caucasus. Torikos has been identified with remains, including a large stone building of c.500, found at Tonky Mys (Onajko (1980)). In literary sources Torikos is mentioned by Ps.-Skylax 74, but his many poleis in this region are of doubtful status (see supra). Barr. 84, AC.

These poleis and lesser settlements, after a tentative false start at Sinope probably in C8l, really got under way in C7s and continued to be founded, especially at times of stress in the homeland, at various times in C6. Sub-colonies of C5 and C4 filled up the gaps in exploitation of land or trade. The shores of the Euxine Pontos were thus linked together for the first time, and were tied into an Aegean and East Mediterranean network of communications. In the Hellenistic and Roman period more and more “towns” in the urban sense claimed the title polis if they were possessed of local autonomy within a king’s or the Empire’s rule. In an earlier age many of these might have been komai or katoi-kiai of “Mixed Folk”, like Herodotos’ Kallippidai near Olbia (4.17: ἐν τῇ ἐλληνικῇ Σκόταια), or of those settlers at Alopoeia in the Don delta. An interesting case of “polis inflation” in these later times is Abonoutichios (Inebolu on the western half of the north coast of Turkey). From being the “Fort of Abonos” in the time of Mithridates VI (Head, HN 2 505), it progressed to claiming the name “Ionopolis” (now Inebolu) under M. Aurelius, thus hinting at an origin in the days of Milesian colonisation—perhaps wishing to be on a par with those four cities that had made up the koinonia of
Anastas. As we have already seen, at some disputed date between the fourth and fifth centuries AD the town of Aulaiouteichos on the Bulgarian coast effected its name change to Agathopolis.

II. The Poleis

1. The Coasts of Thrace, Getike and Western Skythia

**682. Apollonia** (Apolloniates) Map 22, Lat. 42.25, long. 27.40. Size of territory: 5. Type: Α. The toponym is invariably Ἀπολλωνία, -ών (Hdt. 4.90.2, 93.1; Arist. Pol. 1306’γ); ATL i. 49 = IG i2 71.14.128 has been restored [Ἀπόλλωνια]. For supplementary precision ancient writers usually add ἐν τῷ Ἐποίκου (Eustath. Pol. 90.2; Arist. Pol. 1306’γ). The city-ethnic is Ἀπολλωνιάτης (Arist. Pol. 1303’6–37 and Aen. Tact. 20.4, both adding ἐν τῷ Ἐποίκου). Apollonia is called a polis in the urban sense by Aen. Tact. 20.4, and in Ps.-Skylax 67 it is the first toponym listed after the heading πόλεις Ἑλληνίδες αἵδε (Hdt. 4.90.2; Arist. Pol. 1303’6–26 and 36–37, where Apollonia is one of eight examples subsumed under the heading polis. Strabo 7.6.1 retrospectively describes it as ἀστικοῦς and κτίσμα.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form on C55 coins (infra) and externally at Aen. Tact. 20.4 and Arist. Pol. 1303’6–37 (cf. the inscription from Pistiros (Vetren) SEG 43 486.32 (C45)). The external and individual use is found in an inscription from Vetren (IGBulg. 111.1 1068 (C4–C3)) and in later documents.

Apollonia is located at modern Sozopol (Bulgaria), partially on a peninsula (cf. Hind (1983–84) fig. 3). The earliest archaeological finds are of C71 (ibid. 72; Panayotova (1998) 97; for the earliest finds in the cemetery, see T. Ivanov in I. Venedikov et al. (1963) nos. 780–81; cf. for new material (Wild Goat style and related East Greek pottery) Reho (1986)). The earliest stone inscription is C6: IGBulg. 17 404. For some rural settlements, see Hind (1992–93) 85.

Apollonia was colonised by Miletos (no. 854) 50 years before the reign of Kyros (i.e. c.610): Ps.-Skynnos 730–33; cf. Anon. Peripl. M. Eux. 85–86; Diller. The possibility that Rhodians joined the Milesians in founding Apollonia (Steph. Byz. 160.2) is to be rejected. According to Ael. VH 3.17, the founder was Anaximander the philosopher, but Anaximander was 64 years old in Ol. 58.2 (i.e. 547; cf. Diog. Laert. 2.2), so he was born c.611 and he can hardly have been the oikistes of Apollonia if we accept the traditional dating (strongly supported by the archaeological evidence). Steph. Byz. 96.2–4 also mentions Ἀνθεία καὶ τοῦ Πότνου πόλεις πρὸς τῇ Θράκῃ, Μιλησίων καὶ Φωκαέων ἀποικοὺς, ἃς μείνωνται πολλοί καὶ Φίλειας (cf. Plin. HN 4.11.45: Astice regio habitat oppidum Anthium; nunc est Apollonia). It might have been a minor Milesian foundation identified with a settlement on the Atiya peninsula (Antheia > Atiya) which produced early Greek material (Hind (1983–84) 73). See also the astakos (crayfish) symbol on C5m–C4 coins of Apollonia, which may be a pun on the region, Astike (Hind (1985a)).

Apollonia was a member of the Delian League; at least, it was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i2 71.14.128). Athenian influence is attested in the calendar, which includes the specifically Athenian month Mounychion (IGBulg. i3 469 bis), dated C3–C2 but perhaps introduced in C5 (Trümpy, Monat. 91). In 341 Apollonia had a treaty with Philip II of Macedon (Just. Epit. 9.2.1), perhaps in a subordinate position, and in 313 it probably joined the alliance with Kallatis (no. 686), Istrons (no. 685) and other west Pontic cities against Lysimachos (Diod. 17.73).

Apollonia originally (C6) had an oligarchic constitution; cf. Arist. Pol. 1305’39–1306’6–9, where a stasis is mentioned in a discussion of how oligarchies change. At Pol. 1303’36–38 Aristotle mentions that “the people of Apollonia on the Euxine Sea after bringing in additional settlers (ἐτοίκους) fell into faction (ἐστασίασαν”). These references probably refer to two different moments: the affair of the epoikoi suggests an Archaic context, close to the foundation, while the change in oligarchy seems to indicate rather elaborate institutions (Danov (1976) 210; Gehlke, Stasis 24, 255).

An extra-urban sanctuary of Apollo Ietros on St Cyriacus (Svet Kirik) island (known from Hellenistic inscriptions) is indirectly attested for C5, in so far as the statue of Apollo captured in 72 by the Romans (Plin. HN 4.13, 34.7; App. Ill. 30) was a work of Kalamis (Strabo 7.6.1), whose activity falls c.475–450. The sanctuary is surely as old as the city itself. In C5–C4 a megaron of Ge Chthonia is also mentioned (IGBulg. i2 398). Other attested cults are those of Artemis Pytheia of Milesian origin (graffito in SEG 3 557 (C6)) and Aphrodite (Archaic terracottas; cf. Hoddinott (1975) 38).

Aen. Tact. 20.4 refers to pylai at Apollonia in C4m and thus to the existence of fortification walls. The two harbours are attested only in the Hellenistic period.
Apollonia struck silver coins on the Attic standard from C3 onwards. Denominations: tetradrachm, drachm, diobol and fractions of obol. (1) C5: type: Ὺ. anchor (and crayfish l. or r.); legend: A or ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝ; rev. swastika in incuse or Gorgoneion in concave field. (2) C4: ῳ. anchor (and crayfish l. or r.); legend: A and magistrate’s name (Head, ἝΝ ² 277–78; Price (1993) pl. VI nos. 148–63; Zaginajlo (1974) 49–50 for the weight standards). Before the coinage of silver drachms Apollonia seems to have struck bronze arrowhead money (Balabanov (1986); Preda (1991)).


Bizone is called a polichnion by Anon. Peripl. M. Eux. 75 = Ps.-Skymnos fr. 3. However, it was a C6 colony (infra) and presumably founded as a polis. The territory of Bizone is called chora in an external inscription (Istros: I.Histriae 15.26 (C3)). In the neighbouring area μεγάδες Έλληνες are attested (Ps.-Skymnos fr. 2b, Marcotte), i.e. Greeks, (Thracian) Krobysians and Scythians. The city was destroyed by an earthquake (Strabo 1.3.10, 7.6.1; Pompon. 2.2.22; Plin. ἝΝ 4.11.44) in C3 and then refounded in the Imperial period.

Bizone is located at modern Balchik; no archaeological remains are pre-Roman (Hind (1983–84) 74), but the earliest inscriptions are C4 (IGBulg. 1.9 bis, 25–27).

Dionysopolis was possibly colonised by Miletos (no. 854), perhaps not directly, but the metropolis is never mentioned (cf. Ehrhardt (1988) 65–66; Avram (1996) 294, 298–99). The probable existence of the Ionian phylai points to a C6–C5 date for the foundation; there is no proper foundation myth, but the tradition about the statue of Dionysos may suggest a refoundation in C4.

Grants of proxeny are attested only in C3 (IGBulg. 1.13 bis, for a citizen of Odessos (no. 689), and 13 ter, for a citizen of Kallatis (no. 866)). A citizen of Dionysopolis received proxeny from Kallatis: I.Kallatis 14 (C3).

The seven phylai mentioned in IGBulg. 1.15 ter = 30 (Roman period) “are probably identical with the seven phylai of Odessos, viz. the traditional sixfold Ionian division plus the later addition, the ‘Romans’” (Jones, POAG 276). The oldest attested public enactments are the two proxeny decrees of C3 (IGBulg. 1.13 bis, which also mentions ἐγκκτησις, and 13 ter). The eponymous magistrate was in the Hellenistic period the priest of Dionysos (IGBulg. 1.22 (C2)), but there is no evidence for the Classical period. The earliest mentions of the boule and of the assembly (demos) are from C3 (IGBulg. 1.15 ter) and Cim (IGBulg. 1.13).

685. Istros (Istrianos) Map 22. Lat. 44.35, long. 28.45. Size of territory: 5. Type: Α. The toponym is Ιστριή (Hdt. 2.33.4) or Ιστρός (Dubois (1996) 58.3 (C5); Arist. Pol. 1303b5). The city-ethnic is Ιστριανός (Hdt. 4.78.1) or Ιστριανός (I.Olbia 7 = Dubois (1996) 19; Athens: SEG 24 258; IG II² 8940 (all C4)).
It is called a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skymnos (fr. 6, Marcotte, referring to the time of foundation) and in the political sense by Arist. Pol. 1305b5–6 and, retrospectively, Diod. 19.73.2 (1313). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form on coins (infra) and externally in Diod. 19.73.2 (1313). The individual and external use is found in IG II² 8940; SEG 24 258 (Athens); and I. Olbia 7 (all C₄). Istrōs is called patra (= patris) in I.Histrae 171 (C₄) (cf. CEG 11 882).

Istrōs was founded by Miletos (no. 854) (Hdt. 2.33; Ps.-Skymnos fr. 6, Marcotte) in 657 (Euseb. Chron. 95b) or some time later (Ps.-Skymnos fr. 6); archaeological evidence favours the earlier dating (Alexandrescu (1978a) 19–21, (1990) 50–51). Istrōs itself founded Ἴστρων ἀλμύν north of the Dniester (Arr. Peripl. M. Eux. 20; Anon. Peripl. M. Eux. 61, Diller) and perhaps Nikomion (no. 688), in the same region. Orgame (no. 692) was probably also an Istrīan foundation.

Istrōs was perhaps a member of the Delian League, though there is no positive evidence. In 313 it was allied with Callatis (no. 686) against Lysimachos (Diod. 19.73.2–4). At the end of C₄ an isopoliteia with Miletos (no. 854) is attested (I.Histrae 62). The earliest proxeny decree is from C₅/C₄ (Avram (1999a)); a grant of proxeny to a citizen of Istrōs is found at Olbia (no. 690) in C₄ (I.Olbia 7 = Dubois (1996) 19).

The evidence for civic subdivisions from the Late Hellenistic and Imperial period (four attested Milesian phy-lai) undoubtedly indicates an earlier existence: Aigikoreis (I.Histrae 333 (third century AD)); Argadeis (I.Histrae 334 (third century AD)); Boreis (I.Histrae 97 (C₁), 319 (first early century AD)); Geleontes (SEG 50 849 (Roman)). The original oligarchic constitution was replaced through a stasis by a democratic regime (Arist. Pol. 1305b1–12), possibly as a consequence of Perikles’ expedition in the Black Sea and the progress of Athenian influence (Plut. Per. 20; cf. Alexandrescu (1990) 70–74).

Several officials are attested in the Hellenistic period, but their Milesian origin indicates an earlier existence. The eponymous official was the priest of Apollo Ietros (implicitly I.Histrae 169 (C₄e), 144 (C₄)), attested explicitly only from C₅ (I.Histrae 54) onwards.

Istrōs is located near the village of Istria, Romania. The acropolis (with the temenos), an Archaic city wall (C₆s, destroyed at the end of C₆) and a Classical city wall (C₅–C₄, possibly destroyed by Lysimachos in 313; cf. Diod. 19.73.4) have been identified through excavations. The early city walls enclosed an area of 60 ha distributed between the temenos on the acropolis and the civil settlement on the west side of the city (Alexandrescu (1978b), (1990) 51–52; Dupont et al. (1999)).

Local inscriptions mention the agora (from C₅f onwards: I.Histrae 1, 3, 8, etc.). The sanctuary of Apollo Ietros is attested only from C₅f onwards (I.Histrae 6, 65, etc.), but it may originate in C₆. For the temple of Zeus Polieus with altar (I.Histrae 8 (C₃)) and the temple of Aphrodite there is archaeological evidence from C₆m (Pippidi (1962); Zimmermann (1981); Alexandrescu (1990) 56–57). A theatre is mentioned in C₅f (I.Histrae 65).

The main attested cults are those of Zeus Polieus (I.Histrae 8 (C₃), etc.), Apollo Ietros (I.Histrae 169 (C₄e), 314A (C₄), 104, 144 (C₄–C₃), etc.; cf. Apollo Φωλευτήριος I.Histrae 105 (C₃)); Leto (I.Histrae 170 (C₄)); I.Histrae 101 (C₆m), 108 (C₄), 113 (C₃), etc.). The festivals of Thargelia (I.Histrae 65 (C₅f)) and Taurea (I.Histrae 60 (C₂); cf. 61 (C₂)) are also attested in the Hellenistic period but they might be very old. The early Milesian calendar is suggested by the mention of the months Taureon (I.Histrae 26; cf. the festival of Taurea), Thargelion (cf. the festival of Thargelia), Anthesterion (I.Histrae 58 (C₂)) and Artemesion (I.Histrae 54 (C₁)) (Trümper, Monat. 89).


686. Kallatis (Kallatiainos) Map 22. Lat. 43.50, long. 28.35. Size of territory: 5. Type: [A]:α. The usual toponym is Κάλλατισ, -ος, -ίους, η (Ps.-Skylax 67; Strabo 12.3.6; IOSPE i² 27.6 (C₃)), Κάλλατις (Anon. Peripl. M. Eux. 73, Diller); Καλλατία also occurs (Diod. 20.112.2 (r302/1)). Pliny’s isolated report (HN 4.11.44) that Callatis antea vocabatur Cerbatis (MSS differ in this respect: Ceruatis, Aceruatis)
found a spectacular confirmation through the inscription IG Bulg. v 501 (Dionysopolis (early first century AD)); however, Καρπάτις seems to be a river rather than a toponym (cf. Avram (1991) 106). The city-ethnic is Καλλατιανός (C4 coins, infra; Arr. Anab. 6.23.5 (r325/4)) or Καλλαντιανός (Diod. 19.73.1, 4–6, 20.25.1, in all passages in the plural).

In Ps.-Sky lax 67 Kallatis is the fourth toponym listed after the heading πόλεως 'Ελληνιδὲς αἴδε (cf. Diod. 19.73.5 (r313)); politai and politeia occur in proxeny decrees passim from C4 onwards. It is called ἄποικια by Ps.-Skymnos fr. 4, Marcotte, and described as ἀποικίας by Strabo 7.6.1.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form on coins (infra) and in C3 inscriptions (SGDI 3089 = I.Kallatis 7, etc.) and externally in Diod. 19.73.4–6 (r313). The individual and external use is found in Arr. Anab. 6.23.5 (r325/4); I.Sinope 3 (Sinope (C4)); and CIG 3317 = I.Smyrna 147 (C4–C3). It is called patra (= patris) in CEG ii 731 = I.Kallatis 130 (C4).

Kallatis was colonised by Herakleia (no. 715): Ps.-Skymnos fr. 4, Marcotte; cf. Strabo 7.6.1; Memnon (FGrHist 434) fr. 13 (21), etc. Pompon. 2.2.22 (Milesis deducta Callatis) must be a mistake. The dating depends on the identification of Amyntas (1 or III), to whom the source of Ps.-Skymnos (Demetrios of Kallatis) refers. It is possible that Demetrios of Kallatis had Amyntas I (c.540–498) in mind, so that Kallatis may have been founded at the end of C6. But for this early dating there is no archaeological evidence (Hind (1992–93) 89).

Kallatis was probably a member of the Delian League, although in the assessment decree of 425/4 the attractive restoration Καλλάτισ (λατις) is not certain (Pippidi (1971) 63–64 = SEG 22 9 versus Καλλάτισ (περιτις) in IG i2 71.1.165). Around 313 Kallatis led a symmachia with Istrōs (no. 685) and other west Pontic cities against Lysimachos (Diod. 19.73.2–4). After the conquest of Kallatis by Lysimachos, refugees from Kallatis were settled by the Bosporan king Eumelos in Ψῶνα: Diod. 20.25.1.

The first attested grant of proxeny is from c.311/10 (I.Kallatis 2), while the first known received proxeny is presumably by Istrōs (no. 729) in C4 (I.Sinope 3, which is probably a grant of proxeny and other privileges, though the fragmentary text preserves only a grant of citizenship). The oldest attested public enactment is the proxeny decree from c.311/10, and the same inscription also records the boula. The eponymous official was, as in Megara (no. 225), the basileus, attested from C3 onwards: I.Kallatis 3; SGDI 3089 = I.Kallatis 7, etc. The same inscriptions as well as I.Kallatis 4 mention probouloi for each month. The president of the assembly was the proaisymnon (pr(0)aisym- non): Avram (1994) 170–75 (from C3 onwards). More officials are mentioned in Hellenistic inscriptions.

Kallatis is located at modern Mangalia (Romania). The earliest ceramic finds are C4e. Some public buildings attested through Hellenistic inscriptions could be older: a bouleuteron (I.Kallatis 49 (C2)), a prytaneion (I.Kallatis 3; SGDI 3089 = I.Kallatis 7 (C3)), a theatre (I.Kallatis 3 (C3)). The earliest city wall was erected in C4f (Preda (1968) 22 and recent unpublished excavations); its existence is also suggested by Diod. 19.73 and 20.25.1 (r313/12 and 309–307?), the two sieges under Lysimachos.

The evidence for cults is mostly Hellenistic, but in some cases one may suspect an early Megarian origin. Attested patron deities are Zeus Polieus (I.Kallatis 22), Zeus Soter (I.Kallatis 254 (C4e)) and Athena Polias (I.Kallatis 76 (C4)). A typical communal cult of Megarian origin is that of Dionysos Patroos and Dasyllios, attested through a list of deities from C4 (I.Kallatis 48A). The same list also mentions Aphrodite Pandamos, Peitho, Kronos and (Damater) Chthonia. Among the attested festivals, the Dionysia ξένια (I.Kallatis 3 (C3)) may be of earlier origin. Eight attested months from the local calendar indicate a Megarian origin (Avram (1999b), complete restoration of the calendar). Evidence for oracle consultation is first given by Ps.-Skymnos fr. 4, referring to the foundation of Kallatis κατὰ χρησμόν (the oracle of Delphi), and by a series of oracular inscriptions from C4–C2 (I.Kallatis 48–50).

Kallatis struck silver coins from C4 onwards; the earliest coins are drachms and hemidrachms. Obv. head of young Herakles r. in lion skin; rev. corn-ear, club and bow-case; legend: ΚΑΛΑΤΙΑΤΙ or ΚΑΛΑΑΑΑ. Possibly also some types of bronze coinage (Pick (1898) nos. 196–204; Head, HN2 273–74; Price (1993) pl. VII nos. 203–4). That ΚΑΛΑΤΙΑΤΙ is an abbreviated form of the city-ethnic is indicated by the form, ΚΑΛΑΑΤΙΑΤΙΝΟΝ on C3 coins (SNG Cop. Thrace 176).

687. Mesambria (Mesambrianos) Map 22. Lat. 42.40, long. 27.45. Size of territory: 5. Type: Α. The toponym is Dorian Μεσσαμβρία or Μεσαμβρία (derived from coin legend), Ionian Μεσσαμβρία (Hdt. 4.93, 6.33.2), koiné Μεσεμβρία (e.g. Ps.-Sky lax 67); Μεσεμβρία occurs only once (IGBulg. i2 345, a carmen epigraphicum); cf. Velkov (1969) 27–28, with an exhaustive list of the attested forms. Of the corresponding city-ethnics, Μεσσαμβριανός is found in IGBulg. i2 307.17 (C3f); META on C5 coins is probably an abbreviation of Μεσσαμβριανός, found unabridged on later
coins; and Μεσηµβριανός is found in IOSPE i² 20.5 = Syll.³ 219 = Dubois (1996) 15 (C4f).

Mesambria is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 4.91.1, and in Ps.-Skylax 67 Mesambria is the second toponym listed under the heading πόλεις Ἑλληνίδες αἰτίας. Polis in the political sense is attested at Hdt. 6.33.2, as well as in local inscriptions of C3f (e.g. IGBulg. i² 307). The cognates politai and politiea occur in the local proxeny decrees (infra). The city is also poetically called patris (IGBulg. i² 345). It is described as ἀποικὸς by Strabo 7.6.1 and as κτίσµα by Eust. 803 (GGM 11 356–57).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is found internally in abbreviated form on C5 coins (supra) and in inscriptions of C3 (IGBulg. i² 307, 309, 317) and externally in Polyb. 25.2.14 and IGBulg. i² 388 bis (C2). The external individual use is found in IG i² 9338 (C4m) and Syll.³ 219 = IOSPE i² 20 (Olbia, C4f).

Mesambria is located at modern Nesebar ("a classical peninsula site": Hind (1983–84) 73). "For the classical period, an estimate of the population of Mesambria has been made at 3,000–4,000 inhabitants (of whom about 700–800 might be hoplites), disposing of a city area of about 300 ha, and with a capability of launching up to 50 ships" (ibid. 74); but cf. Hind (1992–93) 86: "revised estimates of the size of the ancient city suggest that to the present peninsula should be added areas to the north and the south now under water, giving an area of some 40 hectares".

Mesambria was colonised by Kalchedon (no. 743) and Megara (no. 225) at the time of Dareios' campaign against the Skythians (5.513/12: Ps.-Skymnos 739–42, Diller; cf. Anon. Peripl. M. Eux. 83–84, Diller) or by refugees from Kalchedon (no. 743) and Byzantion (no. 674): Hdt. 4.93 (Mesambria mentioned as toponym while relating the campaign of Dareios) and 6.33 (about its "foundation", which would fall in 493); cf. Eust. 803 (GGM 11 356–57). The first dating (C6f) is more likely to be correct (Ehrhardt (1987) 92; Avram (1996) 290–92). Mena as κτίστης is recorded by the source of Strabo 7.6.1 in an attempt to explain the etymology of the name (cf. Plin. HN 4.11.45). See also the epigram IGBulg. i² 345.4: Μεσηµβρία (sic) δὲ μὲν (sic) πατρίς ἀπὸ [Μ]έσημβρα καὶ βρία, bria being the Thracian word for polis (Steph. Byz. 446.15–16, citing Nic. Dam.; Strabo 7.6.1; IGBulg. i² 345 comm.).

Mesambria founded Naulochoi (modern Obzor, north of Nesebar) at an unknown date: Strabo 7.6.1: Μεσηµβριανοὺς πολέµιους (cf. 9.5.10; Plin. HN 4.11.45). Ps.-Skymnos (fr. 3, Marcotte) reports a tradition that Mesambria founded Bizone (no. 683), but since Bizone does not appear to be Dorian, the tradition is questionable.

Mesambria probably joined the Delian League—at least, it was probably assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.iV.161, where M[———] may refer to Mesambria). In C4 it had, perhaps as subordinate, treaties with some Thracian kings: IGBulg. i² 307 = v 5086 (rC3f). In 313 it was probably allied with Kallatis (no. 686), Istros (no. 685) and other west Pontic cities against Lysimachos (cf. Diod. 19.73).

Citizens of Mesambria received proxenies from Olbia (no. 690) (Syll.³ 219 = IOSPE i² 20 = Dubois (1996) 15 (c.375–350)) and Oropos (no. 214) (IG vii 281 = I.Oropos 50 (C3)). The proxeny decree and the treaty concluded with the Thracian king Sadalas (IGBulg. i² 307 (C3f)) are the earliest attested public enactments. The eponymous official was, as in Megara (no. 225), the basilicus (IGBulg. i² 322 bis (C3)).

Evidence for public architecture is also Hellenistic, but the theatre (IGBulg. i² 307, 308 bis, 308 ter (C3)) and the sanctuaries of Apollo (IGBulg. i² 307, 307 bis, 308 bis (C3), etc.) and Dionysos (IGBulg. i² 308 ter (C3)) may be earlier than their first attestation.

For the city walls (C5 or C4e) (pseudo-isodomic and isodomic work) there is only scanty archaeological evidence, since they were destroyed by the construction of the late Roman and Byzantine citadel (Velkov (1969) 31–37).

Some of the cults attested in Mesambria in the Hellenistic period are certainly or possibly of Megarian origin and so ought to be early: Zeus Hyperdexios (IGBulg. i² 322 bis (C3)) and Athena Soteira (IGBulg. i² 326 (C1)) as patron deities, Apollo (supra, about his sanctuary), Dionysos (sanctuary: IGBulg. i² 308 ter (C3)); Eleuthereus: IGBulg. i² 324 (C1); festival of the Dionysia: IGBulg. i² 307, 308 bis, 308 ter (C3)), (Damater) Malophoros (IGBulg. i² 370 bis (Imperial period), the Dioskouroi (festival of the Dioskouria: IGBulg. i² 308 septies (C3), etc.

Mesambria struck coins from C5m onwards. The earliest coins are silver drachmae. Types: obv. crested Corinthian helmet facing or head of Athena; rev. incuse square; legend: META in a spoked wheel (Head, HN² 278–79; Price (1993) pl. X nos. 265–71; Zaginajo (1974) 50–51 for the weight standards; Karayotov (1994) 18–19).

688. Nikonion Map 23. Lat. 26.10, long. 30.25. Size of territory: 3. Type: Α. The toponym is Νικωνίον, τό (Ps.-Skylax 68) or Νικωνία, η (Strabo 7.3.16) or Νικώνον (Anon. Peripl. M. Eux. 61, Diller) or Νικώνων (Y. G. Vinogradov (1999) (C3f)). Apart from Steph. Byz. 476.2 there is no attestation of a city-ethnic.
Nikonion is called a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 68. That it was a polis in the political sense too is indicated by its registration in the Athenian assessment decree of 425/4 as a member of the Delian League (IG i̊ 71.147).

Nikonion was colonised in C6 by Miletos (no. 854) or, more probably, by Istrros (no. 685). Cf. Avram (1999). Nikonion was under the protectorate of the Skythian king Skyles (C5m, infra) and then joined the Delian League; at least, it was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i̊ 71.147; NK[ovíα] or rather NK[óveov]; cf. Avram (1995) 197). C.331 it was destroyed by Zopyrion (Y. G. Vinogradov (1997) 323) and then refurbished (C3f) by Teras (no. 694) with the support of Istrros (Y. G. Vinogradov (1999)).

Nikonion is located at modern Roksolanskoye gorodishe (Ukraine), on the left bank of the estuary of the Dniester. The site had a defensive wall, uncovered in the north-western part of the upper terrace (c.475–450). No inscriptions on stone have been found, while ceramic material (including graffiti) suggests the floruit of the site in C6–C5 (Sekerskaya (1989); Zaginajlo and Sekerskaya (1997)). Some of the minor settlements identified in the lower Dniester River region (Okhotnikov (1990)) may belong to the territory of Nikonion.

In C5–m Nikonion cast bronze coins imitating the Olbian and Istrrian coins. Obv. owl; legend: δΚ, δKY or δKY.L; rev. wheel with four spokes. These coins were formerly attributed to Olbia (no. 690), but their concentration in the area of Roksolanskoye gorodishe suggests that they were issues of Nikonion (Zaginajlo and Karyshkovskij (1990); Y. G. Vinogradov (1997) 35, 209). On the other hand, their legend indicates that the Skythian king Skyles exercised a protectorate over Nikonion. In addition to its own issues, Nikonion regularly used Istrian silver and bronze coins (Karyshkovskij (1966); Preda (1973) 33).

689. Odessos (Odess(e)it)es) Map 22. Lat. 43.15, long. 27.55. Size of territory: 5. Type: [A]:α. The toponym is _Storef (Hippoc. Prorheticon 1.72.3; Ps.-Skymnos fr. 1, Marcotte; Diod. 19.73.3, 20.112.2; IGBulg. i 222.7), the Doric being Οδήσσας (IG xii.1 147 = GVI 1257 = 200) or Οδησσάσταλις (e.g. Ps.-Skylax 67). The city-ethnic is _Storef (cf. IGBulg. i 79–88; SEG 38 114.v.128 (C25)) or Οδασσάστας (I.Rhod.Per. 267 (C4)).

In Ps.-Skylax 67, Odessos (Οδησσάσταλις) is the third toponym listed after the heading πόλεις Ἐλληνιδῶν αἰῶν, where polis is used in the urban sense; in the political sense, polis is used retrospectively by Diod. 19.73.3 (r313). Strabo 7.6.1 describes it as ἄρτοκος.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on Hellenistic coins (Head, HN2 276) and in C3 inscriptions, the earliest possible instance being IGBulg. i 37, restored (C3). The external individual use is attested by I.Rhod.Per. 267 (Ὁδασσάστας [sic] (C4); IOSPE 11 295 = CIRB 237 (Pantikapaion, C4l/C3e); IGBulg. i 12 bis (Dionysopolis, C3).

Odessos was colonised by Miletos (no. 854) at the time of Astyages’ reign in Media (Ps.-Skymnos fr. 1, Marcotte; c.593/587 as the beginning of his reign); cf. Strabo 7.6.1 (Plin. HN 4.11.45). Scholars assume a date of c.585–570 (Hoddinott (1975) 49) or c.560 (Danov (1976) 209). The earliest archaeological finds are from the second quarter of C6: Toncheva (1967) 157–60; cf. Hind (1983–84) 74.

Despite the lack of positive evidence, Odessos is considered to have joined the Delian League (G. Mihailov, IGBulg. i 2 p. 80). About C4m it was subjected to the Getai; it was liberated in 341 by Philip II of Makedon and concluded a subordinate treaty with him (Jord. Get. 10.65; cf. Theopomp. fr. 217). In 313 it was allied with Kallatis (no. 686), Istrros (no. 685) “and the other neighbouring cities” against Lysimachos (Diod. 19.73.2–3).

The seven phylai mentioned explicitly in IGBulg. i 47 bis (Roman period) have names which “except for the later addition, Romaioi, presumably descended from the foundation in the sixth century” (Jones, POAG 275).

The Milesian cult of Apollo is attested in C5 through a dedication (Hind (1983–84) 74), and a marble head of the god (Hoddinott (1975) 51 and pl. 22 (C5i??)). Three attested months (IGBulg. i 39: Artemision; 47: Boedromion; 50: Apaoureon) indicate the use of the Milesian calendar.

Odessos is located at modern Varna (Bulgaria). There is no archaeological evidence for early city walls (but cf. Jord. Get. 10.65 for gates in the time of Philip II, and Diod. 19.73.3 for a poliorkia in 313) or urbanisation of Odessos. The city struck coins from C3 onwards; its earliest coins are gold staters and tetradrachms of Alexandrine or Lysimachian types (cf. Head, HN2 276–77).

690. Olbia (Olbiopolites)/Borysthenes (Borysthenites) Map 23. Lat. 46.50, long. 32.00. Size of territory: 5. Type: Δ. There are two toponyms: (a) Βορυσθένης and (b) Ολβία, with variants; and two corresponding city-ethnics: (c) Βορυσθη(ε)τής and (d) Ολβιοσαλήτης. Their use depends on the date, the toponographical meaning, internal versus external use, and on other criteria.
(a) Borysthenes is found in SEG 36 693 = Dubois (1996) 90 (C550-523); SEG 48 1024.1 (C530-510); and Syll.³ 218.1 (C4f): [εἶς Βορυσθενῆς ἐσπλέκει At 4.24.1 Herodotos refers to Βορυσθήνης ἐμπόρων (cf. Βορυσθενεϊτών ἐμπόρων at 4.17.1); at 4.78.5 he has ἐν Βορυσθενεῖ, and the context suggests that the reference is to the city in the urban sense (cf. Βορυσθενεϊτών ἀστυ at 4.78.3, and οἱ ἐν Βορυσθενεϊτών τῇ πόλις at 4.79.2).

(b) Olbia. OABIH is found on C4e coins (infra), in IOSPE i² 164 (C5f: 'Ολβίας [βέης], restored Y. G. Vinogradov (1989) 111 n. 124) and seems to be an abbreviation of the full form 'Ολβίης πόλεως attested in inscriptions from the city itself (Rusyaeva (1986) 26 = Dubois (1996) 93 (C6s); DGE 735.2, 24 (C330)); 'Ολβία is found in DGE 735.15; 'Ολβιόπολις is found in IOSPE i² 325 (C330-320, restored Y.G. Vinogradov (1989) 165).

(c) Borysthenes is found in Hdt. (e.g.) 4.17.1, 4.54, 4.78.3, 4.79.2, 4, and CEG i 723 = SEG 39 568 (C4) (Amphilochis, individual use).

(d) Olbiopolites is found in Hdt. 4.18.1; IOSPE i² 20.2 (C5l/C4e), 21.2 (C4); and OABIO(-) occurs on coins from C4f onwards.

It is generally assumed that the first Greek (surely Milesian) settlement (C7m) was on the island of Berezan (infra), that the beginning of the site on the mainland dates to c.600 or some time later, and that the latter included Berezan in the community later known basically as Olbia. Some scholars assume that the emporion and the polis (asty), originally called Βορυσθήνης, were identical, while some others distinguish between the asty and the emporion. The latter differ in more points. Some of them distinguish between Βορυσθενεϊτών ἐμπόρων and Βορυσθήνης ἐμπόρων, at Hdt. 4.17.1 (emporion belonging to the community of the citizens called Borysthenitai) versus Hdt. 4.21.1 (emporion as a city with flourishing trade activities) (Y. G. Vinogradov (1997) 133-45), while others assume that both records indicate a section of the city (e.g. Hind (1985b) 105-9, (1995-96) 116, (1997) 107-11). On the other hand, even if one accepts that the emporion was (at least in Herodotos' time) only a part of the city (for this particular meaning of emporion, see Hansen (1997c) 86-87, 100-1), views differ on the question of its location: the earliest settlement at Berezan (Y. G. Vinogradov (1997) 133-45) or the harbour of the "lower town" (Hind (1997) 111; Hansen (1997c) 102). The toponym Βορυσθήνης occurs on a bone chip with a graffito (Dubois (1996) 90 (C6m)) found at Berezan which may support the equation Berezan = Borysthenes.

None the less, the fine distinction between Borysthenes and Olbia remains subject to dispute. Quasi equivalence is suggested by the local coin law from C4f: Syll.³ 218.1 = Dubois (1996) 14 line 1: [Βορυσθήνης] and 15-16: τὸ ἀργύριον [τὸ] ᾽Ολβιοπολιτικὸν. Further testimony is given (retrospectively) by Strabo 7.13.17; cf. Steph. Byz. 176.14-16. Ps.-Skymnos fr. 10, Marcotte, seems to have contaminated more sources, and is rather puzzling; cf. Dubois (1996) p. 3.

It has also been assumed that after the mainland community absorbed Berezan, the inhabitants called themselves Olbiopolitai and their city Olbia, while Borysthenes and Borysthenitai were used by non-native Greeks (Y. G. Vinogradov (1997) 143). This might have been true in C5 (no external inscriptions), but at least from C4 onwards it is not only Βορυσθενήτης (e.g. CEG i 723; cf. Y. G. Vinogradov (1997) 31, Amphipolis; IG ii 8423, Athens; E.Delphi 111.3 207.4 (C3f); Maiuri, Nuova silloge 95, Rhodos (Hell.)) which occurs, but also ['ΟΛΒΙΟΠΟΛΙΤΕΩΣ (IOSPE i² 345, Chersonesos (C4)); cf. Y. G. Vinogradov (1997) 491], 'ΟΛΒΙΟΠΟΛΙΤΗΣ (Sovlach (1960) 4, 173-79, Tyras (C5f), 'ΟΛΒΙΟΠΟΛΙΤΗΣ (I.Kallatis 166 (C2)), 'ΟΛΒΙΑ (I.Tomis 5 (Cal)), etc., and not only in inscriptions from Pontic cities, whose vicinity could suggest the influence of the internal use, but also in Asia Minor (Klaros: 'ΟΛΒΙΟΠΟΛΙΤΙΩΝ τῶν καὶ Βορυσθενεῖτῶν (sic); Robert (1980) 85). The restored ['ΟΛΒΙΑΝΟΣ τῶν πρόσ] Ὕπαυγ (I.Kalchedon 413) is in many respects suspect; 'ΟΛΒΙΟΠΟΛΙΤΗΣ should be expected (Ehrhardt (1988) 355 n. 591).

Olbia is called a polis both in the urban sense (Dubois (1996) 23.12 (C6s); Hdt. 4.79.2; SEG 42 711 (C4s)) and in the political sense (Dubois (1996) 14.15 (C4f) = Syll.³ 218; SEG 32 794.3 (C4s)). A C6l graffito: πάλεως, may be an example of the political use as well (SEG 42 719). The territorial sense is presumably a connotation in a C5f funerary epigram (IOSPE i² 270 = Dubois (1996) 44.1 = CEG i 173). Politeia occurs in proxeny decrees (infra); polietai is found in SEG 31 701 (C5m). The ἀστυν and the προάστειον ("Vorstadt") are mentioned at Hdt. 4.78.3. Strabo 7.3.17 describes the former as a κτίσμα (for the problem of the ἐμπόρων, supra). [πατρις] has been restored in SEG 39 568 (C4), and patriis is found in SEG 46 949 (cf. SEG 31 702; CEG i 884; see Lebedev (1996) and Raafelba (2000) 261–65. Olbia (Borysthenes) is called an asty by Hdt. 4.78.3.

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is attested in SEG 31 701 (C5m) and in several decrees of C4 (e.g. IOSPE i² 20; I.Olbia 3, 4, 9) and is abbreviated OABIO(-) on C5l coins (infra); it is also found in an isopoliteia between the
city and Miletos (no. 854) (Staatsverträge 408). The internal individual use is found in Dubois (1996) nos. 58.4 (C5f) and 49.2 (C4f). (For the external individual and collective use of the city-ethnic, see the discussion of Olbiopolitai/Borysthenitai above.)

Olbia is located at modern Parutino, in the confluence area of the rivers Bug (Hypanis) and Dnieper (Borysthenes). Some 38 km south-west from Parutino and 2 km from the mainland is situated the island of Berezan, a former peninsula jutting south at Viktorovka (near Ochakov). It is assumed that it became an island after the first Greek settlement (Solovyov (1999) 1–113).

The earliest among the more than 100 rural settlements around Olbia that have been surveyed produced archaeological materials from C6f. A large choros bordering basically on the right bank of the river Bug is attested in C6 (Kryzhitskij on the right bank of the river Bug is attested in C6 et al. (1985)). It was laid waste by the Skythians in C5e and then repopulated from C4e to C3m (Ruban (1985) 30–36).

Olbia was founded by Miletos (no. 854) (Hdt. 4.78.3; Ps.-Skymnos 813–14, Diller; Steph. Byz. 176.15). The foundation year (647/6) given by Euseb. Chron. 92b surely refers to Berezan, where the earliest archaeological materials are from C7s (a few sherds are from the second quarter of C7: Kopejkina (1973)). The earliest finds in Olbia are from C6e (Y. G. Vinogradov (1997) 377–84), with the exception of two sherds of C7s (Kopejkina (1976) 138–39; Rusyaeva (1986) 42 and n. 85). This would correspond to the synchronism suggested by Ps.-Skymnos with the “power of the Medians”, so Olbia may have been founded c.600 (Kopejkina (1976) 139; Y. G. Vinogradov (1997) 383) or some time later (Kryzhitskij (1985) 57). Epoikoi from the metropolis and inhabitants from Berezan installed the new centre on the mainland (Y. G. Vinogradov (1989) 33–39; Y. G. Vinogradov et al. (1990); cf. Ehrhardt (1988) 74–78).


It is assumed that the original aristocratic constitution (Y. G. Vinogradov (1989) 69–80) was replaced c.480 by a tyranny (ibid. 109–26; cf. the name of a certain Paus(aniyas) on coins and the aisymentes of the Molpoi. Hdt. 4.78–80 and the numismatic evidence suggest that in C5m a kind of protectorate over Olbia was exercised by the Skythian king Skyles (Y. G. Vinogradov (1989) 90–109), as in Nikonion (no. 688) or Karkinitis (no. 698) (SEG 40 625; cf. BE (1989) 478, (1990) 566). In C4e the tyranny and the Skythian protectorate had been abolished (Y. G. Vinogradov (1989) 135–50, (1997) 229). Some numismatic evidence and the emergence of a new formula in the local decrees indicate the rise of a moderate democratic constitution (Y. G. Vinogradov (1989) 146–50; more democratic reforms (naturalisation of foreign residents, abolition of debts, etc.) were accomplished in 331 (Macrob. Sat. 1.11.33; SEG 32 794; supra).

The earliest public enactments are revealed by some graffiti with ΠΟ, ΠΟΛΕ, ΠΟΛΕΟΣ (Y. G. Vinogradov (1989) 62–63 and fig. 4 (C6l/C5e); cf. SEG 42 719). The earliest decree is a grant of ateleia to a Sinopean (I.Olbia 1 = Dubois (1996) 1 (C5f)), followed by the grant of citizenship, ateleia and enktesis ges kai oikies to the previous tyrant of Sinope and his brother (supra), and by the grant of citizenship and ateleia to Satyros I (433/2–389/8), archon of Bosporos (Y. G. Vinogradov (1997) 515–25 (c.392–389)). A possible grant of ateleia seems to be attested through I.Olbia 2A (cf. Y. G. Vinogradov (1997) 188 n. 86 (C5s)). Through the isopoliteia from c.329 (Syll.3 286 = Staatsverträge 408), ateleia was also granted to Milesians.

The original eponymous magistrate was the aisymentes of the Molpoi (I.Olbia 58 restored by Graf (1974) 210) and, from
C₄ onwards, the priest of Apollo Delphinios (Karyshkovskij (1978)). The council (boule) and the assembly (demos) are attested from C₄f onwards (Dubois (1996) 14,2–3; IOSPE ² ² 26; IOSPE ² ² 325; SEG 32 794). Other officials are the agora-nomoi (Y. G. Vinogradov and Kryzhitskij (1995) 92, from C₅ onwards) and the commission of five τειχοσποιαι (SEG 32 795 = Dubois (1996) 13 (C₄m)).

There is a rich epigraphical and archaeological documentation for Olbian patron deities, especially for Apollo. Apollo Delphinios (first dedications from C₃m onwards: I.Olbia 55–59), whose sanctuary was the central temenos, became the main deity from C₆ onwards. His cult was observed by the Molpoi (whose aisymentes was the eponymous official: SEG 28 647; see also I.Olbia 55, 56, 167) and the Numeniastai (Dubois (1996) 96). Apollo letros (Y. G. Vinogradov (1997) 80; Ehrhardt (1988) 145–46; but cf. Ehrhardt (1989)), whose sanctuary was the western temenos (see especially the kalyper with the graffito ΗΗΠΟΟΝ: Rusyaeva (1986) 45 fig. 4.7.3.6 = Dubois (1996) 59 (C₆s)), is attested through graffiti from C₆f onwards (LSAG ² 416 pl. 72 no. 61; Graf (1974); Rusyaeva (1886)). The earliest dedications are from C₅f (IOSPE ² ² 164 (cf. SEG 28 657); Rusyaeva (1992) 35 fig. 9; I.Olbia 167, restored). A graffito on a skyphos (Y. G. Vinogradov and Rusyaeva (1980) 25 = Dubois (1996) 99 (C₃m)) mentions Apollo Delphinios, letros, Thargelios and Lykeios. Artemis is attested as Delphinia (Y. G. Vinogradov and Rusyaeva (1980) 29), Pythia (Y. G. Vinogradov (1997) 78) and Ephesia (SEG 32 741). Zeus and Athena are entemenioi theoi in the central temenos (Levi (1964) 141; see also the dedications to Athena and Zeus I.Olbia 64 (C₆l/C₅e), and 106 (C₅s), restored by Y. G. Vinogradov (1997) 374). Zeus, attested through graffiti from C₆ onwards (Levi (1964) 151, etc.), is later known as Eleutherios after the abolition of the tyranny (C₄d) (cf. Y. G. Vinogradov (1997) 212–15) and as Soter (Dubois (1996) 11 (C₄l)), while Athena is represented on the earliest Olbian aes (infra). Notable among other communal cults is that of Dionysos Bakcheios, Bakchos and Iakchos (from C₆ onwards: Rusyaeva (1979) 83, (1992) 96–100; Yajlenko (1982) 290 no. 104, etc.). Mysteries are recorded at Hdt. 4.78–80, while some bone chips (C₅) attest the existence of Orphics (Rusyaeva (1978) = Dubois (1996) 94; cf. M. L. West (1982); Ehrhardt (1987) 116–17; Zhmud (1992); Y. G. Vinogradov (1997) 242–49). Aphrodite Apatoura, Patroia, Syria is attested through graffiti (Yajlenko (1982) 288–89 nos. 91, 92, 94; cf. Rusyaeva (1992) 100–6) from C₆l onwards. Graffiti from C₅f and C₄f mention ἀβατα (pl.) of Aphrodite in the western temenos (SEG 30 975; Dubois (1996) 71a–b). Aphrodite and Hermes (attested through graffiti from C₆ onwards (Tolstoj (1953) 24, 44; SEG 30 878, 909; cf. Hermes Patrolos: Yajlenko (1982) 291 no. 110; priest of Hermes: SEG 34 770 (C₅e); oracle: SEG 34 771 (C₅), etc.) were lords of the western temenos (Y. G. Vinogradov and Rusyaeva (1980) = SEG 30 972–74). Other attested cults are those of Demeter and Kore-Persphone, Kybele, the Kabiroi, the Dioskouroi, Hekate, Themis (Y. G. Vinogradov and Kryzhitskij (1995) 114–16) and Achilles (from C₆ onwards: Rusyaeva (1992) 70–83; Hommel (1980); Ehrhardt (1988) 179–80; Hedreen (1991)), whose sanctuary was on the island of Leuke, protected by Olbia (cf. IOSPE ² ² 325).

All twelve months of the Milesian calendar used in Olbia are named by a graffito on a skyphos (Y. G. Vinogradov and Rusyaeva (1980) 25 = Dubois (1996) 99 (C₃m)).

Early ties (C₆s) with the oracle from Didyma are attested by a graffito from Berezan (Rusyaeva (1986) 26 = Dubois (1996) 93; Burkert (1990)). The only attested communal dedication is to Zeus Soter (Dubois (1996) 11 (C₄l)).

Olbia is topographically distributed between two terraces: the upper town (acropolis) with the agora and the two temene divided by a street running north–south, including an area of c.16.5 ha (Y. G. Vinogradov and Kryzhitskij (1995) 28); and the lower town (urbanised from C₅f onwards) with a harbour (whose early existence is suggested by the privilege of εἰςπλούς καὶ ἔκπλοις conceded by proxeny decrees from C₅f onwards) which seems to be now under water. The early walls, towers and gates (cf. Hdt. 4.78–79) have not been discovered; they were repaired through the five τειχοποιαὶ (Dubois (1996) 13 (C₄m)). The first archaeologically attested walls (“Lehmziegelmauern”) are those identified in the area of the Hellenistic West Gate, restored in C₄l/C₃e (Kryzhitskij (1985) 88–93). In C₅f the two parts of the city included an area of c.44–47 ha (Y. G. Vinogradov and Kryzhitskij (1995) 33). Early traces of urbanisation (C₆s) are also attested on the island of Berezan.

Public buildings are attested by both inscriptions and archaeological finds (cf. Y. G. Vinogradov and Kryzhitskij (1995) 27–41): an ekklesiasterion (Dubois (1996) 14,9–10 (C₄m)), a dikasterion (rebuilt in C₄l/C₃e), a gymnasion (located south-west of the agora, c.475, then rebuilt in C₄l/C₃e), a theatre (SEG 32 794; cf. Y. G. Vinogradov (1997) 390 n. 44 (C₄); cf. TGR iii. 538), possibly also a hestiatorion (C₆l, located on the place of the later gymnasion; cf. Y. G. Vinogradov (1989) 62). The earliest archaeological evidence for the agora is of C₆. A 30–35 m deep fountain has been excavated south of the gymnasion (Karasyov (1972).
40–44), and several drains have been identified. Olbia had two *temene*; the central (or the eastern) *temenos* (from c. 530 onwards; cults of Apollo Delphinios, Athena and Zeus) containing the main altar and the temple in *antīs* of Apollo Delphinios (Karasyov 1964: 49–97; Pichikyan 1984: 178–84 (C5)), a treasure house (Kryzhitskij 1985: 64–65) and some minor buildings; and the western *temenos* (from C6 onwards; cults of Apollo letros, later also Hermes, Aphrodite and Kybele; cf. Rusyaeva 1986, 1994) containing the temple of Apollo letros dating from C6/C5 (Kryzhitskij 1997), more altars, possibly also a second temple. In the western *temenos* a stoa has been identified (Kryzhitskij 1985: 74–75).


**691. Ophioussa** Map 23. Unlocated. In Barr. identified with Tyras (no. 694). Type: Α.α. Called πόλεις (*’Ελληνις*, by implication) in Ps.-Skylax 68. Possibly absorbed by Tyras at an unknown date.

**692. Orgame** (= Lat. *Argamum (Argamenos)*) Map 22. Lat. 44.55, long. 28.50. Size of territory: 1. Type: Ca. The only attestation of the Greek toponym is *'Οργάμη* (Hecat. fr. 172 = fr. 83, G. Nenci (Steph. Byz. 494.16)). *Argamum* has been derived from *Argamenes* in *I.Histriae* 67–68 (Istros) and *Argamo* (Procop. Aed. 4.11.20).

No Archaic or Classical source calls Orgame a *polis* (πόλις in Steph. Byz. 494.16, quoting Hecat. fr. 172, need not have been in Hekataios’ original; cf. Hansen (1997a) 17–18), and the only reason to include it as a type C here is the possibility that it may have been assessed for tribute in 425/4 as a member of the Delian League (IG i3 71.1V.162, where ’Ο[——] has been restored ’Ο’Οργάμης; cf. Avram (1995) 197). It is, however, also possible that Orgame was merely a dependent community in the territory of Istros (no. 685).

Orgame is located at Cap Dolojman, near the village of Jurilovca (Romania). Archaeological excavations (Coja 1972; Mănuču Adamesteanu (1985), (1992), (2000)) brought to light a fortification on an acropolis and a part of the city wall (perhaps of C4). The urban remains of C6–C4 are poor, because the early levels were destroyed by the Late Roman citadel, but the tumular cemetery produced archaeological remains from C7m to C4 (Lungu (2000)). Orgame was founded directly by Miletos (no. 854) or rather by Istros (no. 685) in C7m, according to the archaeological evidence (Middle Wild Goat style ware, etc.).

**693. Tomis** (Tomites) Map 22. Lat. 44.10, long. 28.40. Size of territory: 4. Type: Ca. The toponym is *Τομη/οι* (Ps.-Skynnmos fr. 5, Marccotte) or *Τόμοι* (Apollod. Bibl. 1.9.24) or *Τόμεις* (Mennom (FGHist 434) fr. 13 (21); Strabo 7.6.1) or *Τομείς* (Arr. Peripl. M. Eux. 24.2; Anon. Peripl. M. Eux. 71, Diller; *I.Histriae* 4 (C3m)). The city-ethnic is *Τομή/εις* but it is not attested until C2 (e.g. *I.Histriae* 38, 48); the plural city-ethnic *Τομείοι* is attested at Anon. *Peripl. M. Eux. 72, Diller.*

Tomis is called a *polis* in late sources only (Anon. *Peripl. M. Eux. 71; Steph. Byz. 628.6). Strabo 7.6.1 describes it as a *polichoon*, and it is called *patris* in the local inscription (I. Tomis 2 (Cal.)). Mennom (FGHist 434) fr. 13 (21) calls it an *emporion* (*rC3m*), and the same historian mentions (implicitly) the territory of Tomis as bordering on that of Kallatis (no. 686); however, the best evidence that it was a *polis* in the Classical period would be membership of the Delian League, but it is uncertain whether *T*[——] in IG i3 71.1V.160 should be restored *T* [6μοι].
Tomis is located at modern Constanța (Romania), on a peninsula. It was colonised by Miletos (no. 854) (Ps.-Skymnos 764, Diller), possibly through Istris (no. 685) (Avram 1996: 297–98); archaeological evidence points to a foundation in C6.

All the original Milesian phylai are mentioned, but, except for Argadeis (I. Tomis 35 (C1c)), only in inscriptions from the Imperial period: Aig(gi)koreis (I. Tomis 164, 251–53); Argadeis (I. Tomis 52, 179); Boreis (I. Tomis 123); Geleontes (I. Tomis 300, 301); Oinopeis (I. Tomis 255, 375); Hopletes (I. Tomis 123, 254); cf. Doruți Boila (1970); Jones, POAG 276–78. The earliest attested public enactments (C2l) are a sacred regulation (I. Tomis 1 = LSGC 87) and a decree concerning the city defences (I. Tomis 2 = Syll. 3:731).

Several officials are mentioned in the late Hellenistic period. The eponymous official was the priest of Apollo, first attested c.100 (I. Tomis 2 and 5) but surely of Milesian origin. All the evidence for deities is late, but Milesian origin is not in doubt for the cult of Apollo (I. Tomis 2 and 5 (c.100)). The calendar is surely Milesian, although only one month is attested: [Αἱματος] [Πειρῶν] [ἴδια] or [Ταύρος] [Πειρῶν] (I. Tomis 1b (C2l)).

**694. Tyras (Tyranos)** Map 23. Lat. 46.10, long. 30.20. Size of territory: 5; Type: Bα. The toponym is Τύρας, 6 (Ps.-Skymnos fr. 9, Marckote; Steph. Byz. 642.4–5). The city-ethnic is Τυρανός (I. Kallatis 10 (C38); Alex. Polyh. (FGrHist 273) fr. 138), attested on C4 coins (infra). Τυρίται at Hdt. 4.51 could simply mean “men of the river Tyras” and not “citizens of the city of Tyras”.

Tyras is called a polis only in late sources (Ps.-Skymnos fr. 9; Steph. Byz. 642.4; Ptol. 3.10.8), but its status as a polis in the Classical period is indicated by its presumed membership of the Delian League (infra) and by its C4m coinage (infra). The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C4m coins (infra). The external and individual use is found in SEG 30 923 (C3) and I. Kallatis 10 (C38), and later.

Tyras was colonised by Miletos (no. 854) (Ps.-Skymnos 799–800, Diller; cf. Anon. Peripl. M. Eux. 62, Diller). The foundation year is not known, but some archaeological finds (East Greek ware) suggest a date in C6. Connected with the foundation is the problem of Ophiousa, a site first mentioned by Ps.-Skylax (68: Ὄφιοβοσα πόλις, listed under the heading πόλεις . . . Ἐλληνίδες αἰδε), then by Strabo 7.3.16 (as a polis), by Plin. HN 4.122(26).82 (Τυρα . . . ὑπ’ αὐτὴν Ὀφιοσα δικεβατη), by Ptol. Geog. 3.10.8 (toponym), and by Steph. Byz. 642.7–8 (Τύρας . . . ἐκαλεῖτο δ’ Ὀφιοβόσα). The name Ophiousa(s) suggests that the settlement was of Milesian origin (cf. Teichiousa in Miletos’ territory), but its location remains unknown. It has been tentatively located on an island at the mouth of the Dniester; if correct, it is possible that, as at Berezan/Olbia (cf. no. 690), the mainland community (Tyras) absorbed Ophiousa (Ehrhardt 1988: 73), a suggestion which would explain the tradition that the name was at one point in use for Tyras itself (Steph. Byz.). The terminus ante quem of this synoecism depends on the date of the source of the C4 text of Ps.-Skylax. Έρμωνακτος κόμης was probably a rural settlement in the χώρα (Strabo 7.3.16; Ptol. Geog. 3.10.7).

Tyras joined the Delian League; at least, it was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.1v.165: Τῦρας or, alternatively: Τυρας) (infra). The earliest public enactments are the honoriﬁc decrees Dacia 3–4 (1927–32) 566–69 no. 2 (C4l–C3); SovArch (1960) 4, 173–79 (C3f) (cf. Y. G. Vinogradov (1997) 220 n. 251); and Y. G. Vinogradov (1999) (C3f). The same inscriptions attest for the first time the boule and the assembly called demos.

Among the deities mentioned in Hellenistic inscriptions, only Apollo latros (Dacia 3–4 (1927–32) 564–66 (C3)) can be confidently assumed to be early (the patron deity). The three attested months (Kalamaion: Y. G. Vinogradov (1999) (C3f); Artemeision: IOSPE i2 2 (AD 181); Lencen: IOSPE i2 4 (AD 201)) suggest the original use of the Milesian calendar.

Tyras is located at modern Belgorod Dnestrovskij (Turkish Akkerman, Romanian Cetatea Albă), Ukraine, c.19 km up the estuary of the river Dniester (Τύρας; Τύρας (Ps.-Skylax 68) was perhaps the original form). The Archaic and Classical site was destroyed by the mediaeval citadel. There is very little evidence for the urbanisation of Tyras in C6–C4: excavations (Karyshkovskij and Kleiman (1985); Samojava (1988)) have brought to light some remains of a defensive wall (C4), which was replaced in the Hellenistic period by a more extensive one.


2. The Coasts of Skythia, Taurike and Sindike

**695. Chersonesos (Chersonesites)** Map 23. Lat. 44.35, long. 33.30. Size of territory: 5 by C4l. Type: Aα. The local,
Doric form of the toponym was Χερσόνασος, ā (IOSPE i² 401.6 = Syll.³ 360, in DGE 173 dated C4/C3e). For the Ionic form Χερσόνησος, see Ps.-Skylax 68. The city-ethnic is found in a restored C4 proxeny decree of Olbia, [Χερσο]νησιτής (I.Olbia 3 = Dubois (1996) 16). The city was defined in various ways geographically: “Chersonesos by Taurika” (Χερσόνασος ā πολι τῇ Ταυρικῇ, IOSPE ἤν 71, 72); “Chersonasitai from the Pontos” (Χερσονασιταί οἱ ἐκ τοῦ Πόντου, Syll.³ 585, 604); “Chersonasitai in Skythia” (τοὺς ἐν Σκυθίᾳ Χερσονασιταῖς, Memnon (FGrHist 434) fr. 34.3).

The earliest literary reference calls it emporion, not polis (Ps.-Skylax 68), leading to a suggestion that it was a trading settlement dependent on Herakleia (no. 715) during the first two generations of its existence (Kats (1990)); but the site-classifications of Ps.-Skylax in this part of his work are not to be trusted (see introduction). Moreover, the classification of Chersonesos as an emporion is fully compatible with its being a polis as well (Hansen (1997) c–g–91). In the famous citizen’s oath of C4/C3e (IOSPE i² 401 = Syll.³ 360) Chersonesos is called a polis both in the urban sense (l. 3) and in the political sense (l. 6). The collective and internal use of the city-ethnic is attested in the citizen’s oath (ll. 4–5) and (abbreviated as XEP) on coins (infra). For the external use, see CID 11 5.1.9–10 (358). The individual use is attested externally in C4 sepulchral inscriptions from Pantikapaion (IOSPE 11 302–3 = CIRB 194–95).

By C4m Chersonesos commanded a “near territory” of 120 km² on the “Heraklean Peninsula” (the supposed isthmus being a line from Inkerman to Balaklava). The native Tauri had been evicted from their settlements and incorporated in the city or on farms, or had been pushed out to a series of villages at its eastern edge along the Sapun Gora ridge (Savelya (1979); Shcheglov (1981)). Some “Kizyl-Koba” type pottery (Senatorov (1987)) and crouched burials from the north-east part of the city and the north cemetery may represent this native element (Belov (1950); Saprykin (1998) 232), though some scholars argue that the latter were Greek (Kadyev (1973)). The lack of pre-colony (C5) imported objects in Taurian settlements (Savelya (1979) 170–71) suggested to those who studied them that no significant or long-lived trading settlement preceded the Herakleiot colony. By c.350 approximately 11,000 ha of this home territory were parcelled out into 400 main lots, each having six subdivisions, producing 2,400 small allotments, mainly put to viticulture, fruit trees, etc. (Strzhelets’kij (1961) 14–116; Y. G. Vinogradov and Shcheglov (1990) 312–14; Saprykin (1997) 11–105; Zherebtsov (1994)). Some Chersonasitai seem to have settled and carried out burials in the Upper Quarantine Valley before this full exploitation of the Herakleian Peninsula (Strzhelets’kij (1948a)). A recent suggestion is that the 4,000 ha along its northern coast were among the earliest allotments laid out (Nikolaenko (2001)). By C4m–I Chersonesos also had a mini-empire in north-western Crimea, including Karkinits (no. 698), Kalos Limen and a series of forts (τα τείχη) which may well have been detached from earlier Olbian influence (Y. G. Vinogradov and Shcheglov (1990) 311–14).

The sole specific account of the first foundation of Chersonesos is to be found in Ps.-Skymnos (822–30, Diller): Chersonesos was founded by Herakleia (no. 715) within the Euxine Sea along with Delians (no. 478) in accordance with an oracle, reasonably assumed to be that of Delphi. Some scholars have emended Delioi, repeated twice, to Delphians (no. 177) or Teians (no. 868), as the co-colonisers. A majority view emerged after the Second World War to accept the view of Schneiderwirth and Tyumenev that the Herakleiot and Delians may have collaborated in a colony, if only temporarily, in 424–422 (Tyumenev (1938); Saprykin (1998)). Most recently this consensus can be seen to be crumbling, Y. G. Vinogradov and Zolotaryov (1999) 118–19, 124 suggest a foundation by Herakleiot and Delians in 528, the last year of Peisistratos’ rule at Athens. By contrast, C5 or C4e is adhered to in another suggestion in which Delieis from Delion, the area of Boiotia from which some Herakleioti came (i.e. Tanagra (no. 220)—coastal Boiotia) are proposed as the originals of the co-colonists, only later misunderstood by Ps.-Skynnos or his source (Hind (1998) 141–48) for the better-known Delioi.

In the citizen’s oath Chersonesos is described as a democracy (IOSPE i² 401.14 = Syll.³ 360), and some forty-five inscribed ostraka from C5 may attest to the institution of ostracism and a vigorous democracy throughout Č5 (BE (2000) no. 487). Magistrates attested are basileus (IOSPE i² 186–87); aisynnatai (Belov (1948) 69); damiorgoi (IOSPE i² 402, 424, 429); nomophylakes (IOSPE i² 351, 359); astynomoi (Kats (1994) passim (C3e)); agoranomoi (ibid. 88 no. 16 (C3e); Monakhov (1999) 28–29). The council had twenty-four members, and the citizen body was organised in hekatostyes. On the council were the magistrates, five archontes, a prodikos, a grammateus, a hieres, three nomophylakes (Solomonik (1976); Saprykin (1991), (1994) 139–42). The calendar was Megarian, similar to those at Byzantium (no. 674), Kalchedon (no. 743) and Kallatis (no. 868); Kadyev (1996) 141–48; Trümpy, Monat. 149; Avram (1999b).
Proxeny decrees of C₄ are rare, and they are from neighbour states to the west and the east of Chersonesos (I.Olbia I.3 = Dubois (1996) 16 (Olbia); IOSPE 11 302–3 = CIRB 173, 195 (Bosporos)). From Chersonesos itself comes a copy of a C₄ Olbian decree for a Chersonesite (IOSPE i² 21).

The city’s main deities—Zeus, Gê, Helios, Parthenos and the other Olympians—are mentioned in the preamble to the citizen’s oath (IOSPE i² 401). Dionysos and Herakles protected the end bastions of the isthmus wall of the “old Strabo’s Chersonesos” (infra).

The city stood for over 1,700 years down to the fourteenth century AD on a blunt headland, jutting north-eastward into Quarantine Bay, some 3 km west of Sebastopol. The earliest structural remains are of C₅/C₆, found in the north-east part of the later city over an area of some 12 ha, around which several cemetery areas were grouped to the south-west, the south and the south-east (Belov (1948) 135ff, (1950) 272ff, (1977); Zedgenidze and Savelya (1980)). A stretch of the southern city wall has been found (Grinevich (1927), (1959) 115–17). Red-figure pottery occurs from C₄e, increasing in amount in C₄m–l (Grinevich (1959); Zedgenidze (1978)). Of C₄ is the small Doric temple and possible altar (restored from fragments) once in the public square, with a statue base dedicated to Athena (IOSPE i² 406; Zolotaryov and Bujskikh (1994)). The mass of Classical material from Chersonesos (pottery, sculptural elements, building remains, burials and coins) has been determined as being of C₄m–l, with a small amount of pottery being of C₅s (Zedgenidze (1979), restated with further detail (1993)). The significance of the relatively small amounts of C₅ material (red-figure vases, striped Ionic ware, Chiot and Samian remains, provenance and dating by pot form and lettering. It is not yet clear whether it represents a polis, or some lesser settlement in touch with the Tauroi before the Herakleiot colony. Zedgenidze (1993) has refuted in detail the view that the pottery and other evidence is sufficient for a polis of C₅ on the Quarantine site (sectors VI and VII). Her view has not yet been acknowledged, still less answered by the supporters of a C₆l/C₅e Chersonesos (Y. G. Vinogradov and Zolotaryov (1990), (1999)).

A separate polis is mentioned by Strabo, “the Old Chersonesos in Ruins” (ἡ παλαιὰ Χερρόνησος κατεσκαµµένη, 7.4.2). It lay 100 stades from the (Quarantine Bay) city, and nearby was Cape Parthenion with a temple of Parthenos, and an early statue (xoanon) of the goddess. The temple has disappeared, some placing it on Cape Fiolent to the west, others on the tip of Cape Chersonesos near the lighthouse. Excavations and surveys (in 1899, 1903, 1986) have proved the existence of a “town” on the isthmus, defended by two parallel walls across it, some 900 m long and enclosing an area of 18 ha. The walls had interval towers, and towers at the ends, one dedicated to Herakles and the other having a small shrine to Dionysos.

The peninsula itself leads northwards to Mayachny (Lighthouse, also Fanari Point, and comprises some 380 ha. These were divided into twenty-five major allotments, each subdivided into four, resulting in 100 plots on a different alignment, which is usually assumed to be earlier, from those on the larger “peninsula”. All the small allotments were about 4–4.5 ha in area. Nestling behind the double walls on the isthmus, they were protected on the landward side by fortification of some of the highest ground overlooking that peninsula to the east. This “Old Chersonesos”, or “Strabo’s Chersonesos”, is 10 km west of the long-lived city on Quarantine Bay. It occupied some 18 ha on the isthmus of the only true Chersonesos (peninsula) in south-western Crimea; it was protected by the two parallel walls: in turn it guarded the 100 earliest allotments, and held the oldest cult statue of the polis. It is tempting to suggest that the isthmus site and land behind it (Mayachny Peninsula) was the earliest area of the Herakleiot colony (Hind (1998) 146–52; Saprykin (1998) 242–44; Y. G. Vinogradov and Zolotaryov (1999) 117), though other suggestions have been made that it was an early fort, subsidiary to the main city (Chtcheglov (1992) 228), or a protection for the ancient lighthouse (Nikolaenko (2001)). A small amount of pottery (red-figured) of C₅l/C₄e and a relief sculpture depicting Herakles and the horses of Diomedes, from an altar of C₄, tend to confirm the early, if not primary, position of this isthmus settlement in the overall sequence of settlements (Blavatskij (1953) 26–27, 40–44; Zedgenidze (1996); Strzheletskij (1948b)). After a decade or two, when the Quarantine Bay polis was already established, it perhaps became a chorion or phourion in the near territory of the city, perhaps that obscurely referred to as the saster in the citizen’s oath (ll. 24–25) as one of the places or institutions they vowed to protect (Hind (1996a)).


\textbf{696. Gorgipp(e)ia (Gorgippeus)} Map 84. Lat. 44.55, long. 37.20. Size of territory: 1. Type: B/B. Gorgippia was situated in the Asiatic part of the Kimmerian Bosporos (Strabo 11.2.10). The toponym is \textit{Γοργίππεια} (Steph. Byz. 211.7), \textit{Γοργίππια} (Strabo 11.2.10) or, earlier?, \textit{Σινδικὸς λιμήν} (Ps.-Skylax 72; Ps.-Skymnos 888; Strabo 11.2.14), \textit{Σινδικὴ} (Arr. Peripl. M. Eux. 18.4–19.1). The city-ethnic is \textit{Γοργίππειος} (C2–C1 coins, infra).

At Ps.-Skylax 72 \textit{Σινδικὸς λιμὴν} is one of the toponyms listed after the heading \textit{πόλεις δὲ \'Ελληνιδὲς αἰδε}, where the term \textit{polis} is used in the urban sense (cf. Strabo 11.2.14). The earliest explicit reference to a \textit{πόλες \textit{Γοργίππεων} is in a letter of \textit{σωναρχ} (SovArch (1965) 197 A). The internal and collective sense of the city-ethnic (\textit{ΓΟΡΓΙΠΠΙΕΩΝ}) is found on C2–C1 coins (Price (1993) 986) and in an inscription of the first century \textit{AD} (\textit{CIRB} 1118; Boltunova (1986) 46–48).

The location of Gorgippia and Sindike/Sindikos harbour is a matter of scholarly debate (latest discussion in Alekseeva (1991) 3–7). They were situated in the territory inhabited by the indigenous population, the Sindoi (for the people, \textit{Σινδοὶ), see \textit{CIRB} 8; Hdt. 4.28.1; Ps.-Skylax 72; for the territory, \textit{Σινδική}, see SEG 34.774, restored; Hdt. 4.86.2; Strabo 11.2.12). Strabo’s passage (11.2.10) about the location of Gorgippia provides grounds for different interpretations. Some scholars interpret Strabo’s information to mean that Gorgippia was the capital of the Sindoi. The most widespread opinion is that Sindike/Sindikos harbour/Gorgippia were the same place, but with different names in use at different times. Sindike/Sindikos harbour was renamed Gorgippia some time in C4, when the territory of the Sindoi was incorporated into the Bosporan Kingdom by Leukon I (389/8–349/8) (37–82). The city was named after a member of the Spartokid dynasty, Gorgippos (ruling together with his brother Leukon I (389/8–349/8)), who was probably installed as a local governor of the city. This interpretation is supported by the “royal” tiles of C4, which carry the stamp: \textit{ΓΟΡΓΙΠΠΙΟΥ} (Alekseeva (1997) 39).

Sindike/Sindikos harbour was established by Greeks in C6 as a trading centre in the territory of the indigenous population, the Sindoi (Alekseeva (1991) 7–27, (1997) 11–36). From C4e the city was part of the Bosporan Kingdom and dependent on Pantikapaion (no. 705) (\textit{CIRB} 6, 6a, 8, etc.; Hind (1994) 484–86; Tsetskhladze (1997b) 66, 68–80). According to Ps.-Skymnos 887–89, Diller, it was settled by Greeks from the neighbouring places.

A study of the rural settlements in the territory of Gorgippia is at an early stage. About fifteen settlements have been surveyed or partly excavated, mainly those of C4. Very few date to the late Archaic period (Alekseeva (1991) 28–50). Sindike and its successor Gorgippia are located beneath modern-day Anapa. The location of Gorgippia is firmly documented thanks to coins and inscriptions found in Anapa. It is possible that a settlement here had appeared even earlier (C7l). A fragment of a Rhodo-Ionian cup with bird decoration has been found at the Alekseevskoe settlement not far from Anapa (Kharaldina and Novichikin (1996) 349–50 fig. 2). Much firmer evidence is needed than one single fragment of pottery in order to postulate the existence of a C7l settlement (Tsetskhladze (1997b) 42 n. 4). The first settlers lived in semi-dug-outs (Alekseeva (1991) 7–27, (1997) 11–36). One funerary inscription of C5e shows the presence of a Peloponnesian from Helike (Boltunova (1986) 60–61), thus suggesting the presence of free non-citizens. Archaeological investigation has yielded the remains of stone buildings, fortification walls and towers, streets, etc. dating from C4, the period when the town was renamed Gorgippia (Koshelenko et al. (1984) 82–83; Alekseeva (1997) 83–148). Aphrodite, Herakles and Demeter were the main civic cults (Alekseeva (1997) 213–50). Fragments of monumental buildings may be remains of temples dedicated to these and other divinities (ibid. 100–48).

There are fairly numerous silver coins with the inscription \textit{ΣΙΝΔΟΝ} dating from c.440–400 (Stolba (1998) 603–4). These coins may have been minted in Sindikos Limen (before it was renamed Gorgippia) on behalf of the local Sindoi (Shelov (1981); Price (1993) 1008–9; cf. Strabo 11.2.10). Alternatively, they were minted by the Sindoi, proving the existence of a Sindic kingdom (Kruchkoi (1971) 89–90). Recently, a third interpretation has been advanced: that the coins were an “alliance” issue of the Greek cities situated on the Taman Peninsula (since this area was known as Sindike, after the local population—the Sindoi) who had united against the aggression of the Spartokids (Zavoikin and Boldyrev (1994); Tokhtasiev (2001) 68–79). The city-ethnic \textit{Γοργιππεων} is found only on Gorgippian coins of C2l–C1 (Price (1993) 986).
697. Hermonassa (Hermonaseites) Map 87. Lat. 45.15, long. 36.45. Size of territory: 1. Type: Ἀξα. Hermonassa was situated on a small island (Ps.-Skmynos 886–91; Steph. Byz. 27810) in the Asiatic part of the Kimmerian Bosporos (Strabo 11.210). The toponym is Ἑρµώνασσα (Hecat. fr. 208; Ps.-Skmynos 886). The city-ethnic is Ἑρµονασσεῖτης (IOSPE IV 334 = CIRB 495 (first century AD)).


The foundation of Hermonassa is dated archaeologically to about 580–570 (Kuznetsov (1991b) 34). In the written sources the origin of the colonists is confused. Arrian (Bith. fr. 55, Roos = FGrHist 156, fr. 71) links the foundation to Hermonassa, the wife of a certain Semandros from Aiolian Mytilene (no. 798). Citing Dionysios and Ps.-Skmynos, Stephanos of Byzantion calls it an Ionian colony (27811–12). Eustathios (GGM 11 324) informs us that the oikistes of Hermonassa was a certain Hermon and that Hermonassa had been colonised by Ionians. Some scholars have attempted to resolve the contradiction found in the written sources as follows: Arrian’s mention of Aiolians should be explained by the fact that certain Aiolians, in particular inhabitants of Mytilene, had also been involved in the founding of Hermonassa side by side with the Ionians. One name in an Archaic graffito (Y. G. Vinogradov (1983) 369 n. 20) is of Aiolian origin (or influence), but in C4, according to an inscription (CIRB 1056), the population of the city was mainly Ionian. From C5e the city was part of the Bosporan Kingdom and dependent on Pantikapaion (no. 705) (Hind (1994) 484; Tsetskhladze (1997b) 55–57, 68–80).

The chorai of Hermonassa was not seriously studied until 1996. Excavations by the State Hermitage Museum yielded a rural settlement established in the late Archaic period (Solovyov and Butyagin (1998a)).

The Archaic and Classical levels of the town have not been studied extensively because those levels of the city lie at a depth of 12 m and the Greek and Roman levels at 6 to 7 m. The rest are Byzantine-mediaeval. Some Archaic pits have been discovered, and the remains of Classical stone and mudbrick buildings (Koshelenko et al. (1984) 81–82; Korovina (1992)). Although architectural remains of the Archaic period are scanty, other categories of archaeological material provide evidence of intense economic and cultural activity at Hermonassa in C6/C5e (Zeest (1961), (1968), (1974)). The most interesting material includes dedicatory inscriptions of C5–C4, to Apollo Ietros (Pichikyan (1984) 152), the Ephesian Artemis (a temple probably existed here; cf. M. J. Treister and Vinogradov (1993) 559 fig. 26), Apollo Prostates (CIRB 1034, 1044) and Apollo Delphinios (CIRB 1038). Probably this temple and the walls existed in the Classical period.

Important finds are two measures bearing the name of an agoranomos by the name of Apollodoros (Hind (1983–84) 90). One graffito of the third quarter of C6 from the site indicates the presence of a craftsman from Eleutherna in Crete (M. J. Treister and Shelov-Kovedyaev (1989)).

698. Karkinitis (Kerkinites) Map 23. Lat. 45.10, long. 33.10. Size of territory: 2. Type: Ἀξα. The toponym is Καρκινίτις, -ιδος (Hecat. fr. 153; Hdt. 4.55, 99.2), from c300 Κερκινίτις (IOSPE 13 401, 453; Att. Peripl. M. Eux. 30). The city-ethnic is Κερκινίτης (IGII2 1008.114 (C21)).

Karkinitis was listed in Hekataios’ Periodios and may in this work have been classified as a πόλις Σκυθική (FGrHist 1) fr. 184 = Steph. Byz. 360.1), which ought to mean geographically within Skythia. Karkinitis is called a polis (sc. “Greek”) in the urban sense by Hdt. 4.55, 99.2. The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is presumably attested in abbreviated form on C5–C4 coins (infra).

Hdt. 4.99.2 locates Karkinitis in ἄρχαιη Σκυθική, toward mountainous Taurica, east of Ὑλάει (“Woodland”) and near the joint mouths of two of his Scythian rivers, Hypakiris and Gerrhos, where Scythian Nomades ranged the interior. Strabo (7.3.18, 4.2) mentions two “gulfs”, one Tamyrake, near the isthmus of the Crimea (Perekop), and a second, Karkinitis, which “comes next and is very large”, though he also gives both names to one gulf. Arrian’s Periplus (30) gives the important information that Karkinitis was 600 stades from Chersonesos, which directs us to Eupatoria. These sources have prompted some scholars to posit a Karkinitis/Carcine and a quite separate Karkinitis (Minns (1913) 490; Rybakov (1979) 50; Barr. Map 22). But the Greek settlement found on the Quarantine headland, just west of Eupatoria, dating from C6 and fortified from C5m, seems to fit the description in our earlier and better-informed sources (Nalivkina (1963); Kutajsov (1990) 15–18, 48–55).

Pottery of C6–C5 has been found (1950s, 1980s), as well as early pit shelters and a C5 defensive wall (Kutajsov (1990) 35–39, 40–55). The original area is said to have been some 3.5 ha, but was by C4 over 5 ha. Some 270–90 households are estimated to have dwelt within, and an external chorai to the
west of about 1,400 ha was divided on the Chersonesite model into allotments of 4.3 ha (ibid. 150). Dating to C4 is a letter written on an amphora sherd from one Apatourios to a Neomenios, concerning tribute owed to the Skythians (Solomonik (1987); Y. G. Vinogradov (1997) 21).

The sole inscription on stone is a stele for Αμβατιάς τα’Ηροδότου IOSPE i² 339, of C4 and in Doric dialect. The suggestion that Karkinitis was a member of the Delian League rests on a massive restoration of the name from the first two letters Ka[r(wi)τες] (IG1³ 71.165). An alternative conjecture is Kallatis (no. 695) in unknown circumstances (Rusyaeva (1986) 57; Zolotaryov (1986) 92). It has been suggested that north-western Crimea was, in C5 and until C4m, under the political influence of Olbia (no. 690), but was then appropriated by Chersonesos (no. 695) in uncertain circumstances (Rusyaeva (1986) 57; Zolotaryov (1986) 92). But it is preferable to see Karkinitis as an independent polis, though one in a general cultural relationship with its more flourishing fellow Ionian city (Kutajsov (1990) 153–57). By C4m it was a part of the Chersonesite polis, and included in the citizen's oath of C4/C3e (IOSPE i² 401.8, 20 = Syll. 3 360). The attestation of the city-ethnic in an Athenian list of epheboi (IG11² 108.11.14) of C2l indicates that it had become a dependent polis rather than just a civic subdivision of Chersonesos.

The earliest struck coins of Karkinitis are of bronze and date to c.350 (according to Stolba (1996) 236–37 they were issued for only a few years, c.345–340). Types: (1) obv. Nike walking; legend: KAPK; rev. lion attacking bull. (2) Obv. head of goddess in turreted crown l.; rev. rider to r. with raised r. hand; legend: KAPK. (3) Obv. head of Herakles in lion skin r.; rev. eagle on thunderbolt l.; legend: KAPKINI. Types and style betray a close relationship with the mint of Chersonesos (no. 695) (Medvedeva (1984); Price (1993) nos. 693–95). Cast bronze arrowheads and fish money, on the pattern of those current at Olbia (no. 690), but of local types, and some round cast bronze coins with the legend KA or Κ, circulated at Karkinitis earlier in C5–C4 (Kutajsov (1995)).

699. Kepoi (Kepites) Map 87. Lat. 45.20, long. 37.00. Size of territory: 1 (infra). Type: [A] α. Kepoi was situated on what was once an island in the Asiatic part of the Kimmerian Bosporos (Ps.-Skylax 72; Strabo 11.2.10). The toponym is Κηπωί (Aeschin. 1.171; Ps.-Skylax 72). The city-ethnic is Κηπιτης (CIRB 188 (C4m)).

At Ps.-Skylax 72 Kepoi is one of the toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις δὲ Ἐλληνίδες αἴδε, where the term polis is used in the urban sense. See also Harp. s.v. Κηπωί. The external and individual use of the city-ethnic is found in a burial inscription of C4m from Pantikapaion (CIRB 188).

According to Plin. HN 6.18 and Ps.-Skymnos 899, Diller, Kepoi was founded by Miletos (no. 854). Several dozen fragments of East Greek pottery date the foundation to about 580–70 (Kuznetsov (1991a), (1991b) 34). From C5e the city was part of the Bosporan Kingdom and dependent on Pantikapaion (no. 705) (Aeschin. 3.171; Hind (1994) 484; Tsetskhladze (1997b) 57, 68–86).

It was believed that Kepoi was situated some 3 km east of Phanagoria (no. 706), and that its area was 20 ha. The site is so damaged by quarry workings that it is very difficult to be certain that the site really is Kepoi. So far, no inscriptions have been found on the site to confirm its location. The Archaic and Classical levels were destroyed in Antiquity, first of all in C6l by a levelling of the area after a fire. Furthermore, in the Hellenistic period the whole area was terraced. Excavation reveals scant remains of stone and mudbrick dwellings of C6l/C5e. Several Archaic pits contained large amounts of pottery. Fragments of a kouros and of marble sculptures of Aphrodite were also found (Sokolskij (1963); Kosheenko et al. (1984) 84–86; Kuznetsov (1991a), (1992)). Most probably two temples of Aphrodite existed in Kepoi, one situated on the north-west edge of the city and the other on the south-east edge (Tsetskhladze and Kuznetsov (2000)). The cult of Aphrodite is attested by dedicatory inscriptions of the Classical period (ibid. (2000) 353 with refs.; cf. SEG 45 990). Strabo 11.2.10 mentions a “sanctuary of Aphrodite, called Apatouron” in the Taman Peninsula (the Asiatic part of the Bosporan Kingdom). Some scholars think that Apatouron was situated in Kepoi (Tsetskhladze and Kuznetsov (2000) 353 with refs.). No fortification walls or local coinage are known so far. The view of Tokhtaysiev (1986) that Apatouron was a separate site in Taman is preferable.

700. Kimmerikon Map 87. Lat. 45.00, long. 36.10. Size of territory: 1. Type: Ca. Kimmerikon was situated in the European part of Bosporos (Strabo 11.2.5, but at 11.2.4 he mentions Kimmerikon as a kome in the Taman Peninsula (Asiatic Bosporas) as well). The location is a matter of scholarly dispute (cf. Ps.-Skymnos 896–99; Usacheva and Kosheenko (1994); Zavojkin (1997), (1999a), (1999b)). The toponym is Κημερικόν (Strabo 11.2.5; Anon. Peripl. M. Eux. 76). Strabo classifies the place as a polichnion (7.4.5) but says that it had once been a polis (11.2.5).

As pottery finds suggest (Gorlov and Lopanov (1997) 141), Kimmerikon had some east Greek settlers by C6m. It has
been suggested that the place was a member of the Delian League, but this is based on an uncertain restoration of the name Κυρίκερικον (IG v 7 111.166 has Κυρίκερικον) (cf. Avram (1995) 195; Tsetskhladze (1997a) 462–65). From C5e the city was part of the Bosporan Kingdom and dependent on Pantikapaion (no. 705) (Tsetskhladze (1997b) 64, 68–71).

The site has not been well studied. The first walls with towers were erected in C5l/C4e (Gorlov and Lopanov (1995), (1997) 141). The walls enclose an area of 2 km². The city was situated on terraces. Early Greek pottery dates from C6m. All architectural remains date from the Hellenistic and Roman periods (Koshelenko et al. (1984) 71–72; Gorlov and Lopanov (1997)). According to Ps.-Skynnos 895–7, Diller, Kimmeris (sic) was a foundation of the Bosporan rulers.

701. Kytaia Map 87. Lat. 45.05, long. 36.25. Size of territory: 1. Type: [A]:α. Kytaia was situated in the European part of Bosporos (Ps.-Skylax 68; Plin. HN 4. 86; Anon. Peripl. M. Eux. 50; Tpl. Geog. 3.6.5). The toponym is Κύταια (Ps.-Skylax 68; Lycoph. Alex. 1312). At Ps.-Skylax 68 Kytaia is one of the toponyms listed after the heading πολεῖς δὲ ἐκ τῆς Ἑλληνίδος αἵδε, where the term polis is used in the urban sense.

Kytaia was already occupied by east Greeks by C5e (Molev (1985) 59). From C5e the city was part of the Bosporan Kingdom and dependent on Pantikapaion (no. 705) (Tsetskhladze (1997b) 64, 68–80).

A defensive wall was erected in C4e. Its destruction dates from C3–C2, after which the wall was strengthened from a width of about 3 m to nearly 3.5 m (Molev (1985); Koshelenko et al. (1984) 71). The city had stone buildings from C5, but their state of preservation and the small scale of excavations do not allow us to establish the character of these buildings and the plan of the city (Molev (1985)). The excavator proposed a location of the agora in excavation trench no. V (Molev (1985) 59). Excavation of the site produced a shrine/cultic ash mound (eshkarai) (Moleva (1997)). Aphrodite, Apollo, Herakles, Demeter, Zeus, Artemis were objects of communal cults (Moleva (1997); Semicheva (1997)).

702. *Labrys or, rather, Labryta Map 87. Lat. 45.10, long. 37.35. Size of territory: ? Type: Αγ. The inscription was located in Semibratnee, c35 km north of Gorgippia. The name of the polis is attested in lines 2–3: Απόλλωνι . . . τῶι ἐν Λ[αμβρν]–τῶι πόλεωι μεθέων Λαβρυτων. The toponym *Labrys is derived from what is commonly believed to be the city-ethnic: the gen. plur. Λαβρυτῶν, in nom. sing. Λαβρύτης. The problem is that names in the genitive governed by μεθέων are always toponyms and never ethnics; cf. e.g. IOSPE II 23 and IG xii.5 893.1. It follows that Λαβρυτῶν is probably the genitive of the toponym Λάβρυτα, τά (cf. Βούχετα, τά, Dem. 7.32) whereas the city-ethnic is unattested. Labryta is called a polis both in the political sense (I. 3) and in the urban sense (I. 7). It appears from the dedication that Apollo was the patron deity of the city. There is no other evidence of Hellenisation, and Labryta was presumably a predominantly barbarian site.

703. Myrmekeion Map 87. Lat. 45.20, long. 36.30. Size of territory: 1. Type: [A]:α. Myrmekeion was situated in the European part of the Kimmerian Bosporos (Ps.-Skylax 68; Strabo 7.4.5, 11.2.6). The toponym is Μυρµήκειον (Ps.-Skylax 68); later authors have Μυρµήκαιον (Strabo 7.4.5; Steph. Byz. 464.1).

At Ps.-Skylax 68 Myrmekeion is one of the toponyms listed after the heading πολεῖς δὲ ἐκ τῆς Ἑλληνίδος αἵδε, where the term polis is used in the urban sense; there is no evidence that Myrmekeion was ever an independent polis (Y. A. Vinogradov (1993), (1995a) 159–60, (2000)).

Pottery finds indicate Ionian settlers from c580–560 (Kuznetsov (1991b) 33). The city’s armed forces are possibly mentioned in one very fragmented inscription of C4 (CIRB 869). From C5e the city was part of the Bosporan Kingdom (Y. A. Vinogradov (1993); Tsetskhladze (1997b) 61–62, 68–71).

Myrmekeion had an acropolis protected by a wall of C6l/C5e (Y. A. Vinogradov and Tokhtashev (1994); Y. A. Vinogradov (1995b)). The city covered an area of 6 ha (Tsetskhladze (1997b) 62) and had a defence circuit erected in C4e (Koshelenko et al. (1984) 66); the north fortification wall with tower was built in C4e. The first inhabitants lived in dug-outs. Stone architecture dates from C6l/C5e after the city was attacked by Skythians. From C5 the city had a rectangular plan and temples (Gajdukevič (1987) 5–36; Y. A. Vinogradov (1991), (1993); Y. A. Vinogradov and Tokhtashev (1994); Tsetskhladze (1997b) 61–62).

The patron deity was Apollo letros (Y. A. Vinogradov and Tokhtashev (1998) 25–29). Other communal cults include those of Herakles, Aphrodite, Zeus and the Nymphs (SEG 27
mentions the name of the (Gajdukević of Nymphaion must have been Samos (no. tery finds had led some scholars to assume that the been established by Milesians in the sense is probably attested on coins (infra (Gajdukević of C (Shelov (1956) 28–30; Frolova (1992) 205–7).

704. Nymphaion (Nymphatos/Nymphaietis) Map 87. Lat. 45.15, long. 36.25. Size of territory: 1. Type: [A]: β. Nymphaion was situated in the European part of the Kimmerian Bosporos (Ps.-Skylax 68; Strabo 7.4.4). The toponym is Νύμφαιον (Aeschin. 3.171); Ps.-Skylax 68 has Νύμφαια. The city-ethnic is Νύμφατος (IOSPE π.201 (C4) now lost) or Νύμφατης (Syll.3 1126 (C2)). At Ps.-Skylax 68 Nymphaia is one of the toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις δὲ ἑλενικὲς αἰδε, where the term polis is used in the urban sense. The external and individual use of the city-ethnic is found in two inscriptions: a tombstone from Pantikapaion (IOSPE π.201) and a dedication from Delos (Syll.3 1126). The internal and collective sense is probably attested on coins (infra.

Nymphaion, it has recently been suggested, may have been established by Milesians in the 560s (Kuznetsov (1991b) 33), but this is unproven. Until 1983, when inscriptions with the names of the months of an east Greek calendar were discovered (Y. A. Vinogradov and Tokhtasiev (1994)), pottery finds had led some scholars to assume that the metropolis of Nymphaion must have been Samos (no. 864) (Gajdukević (1949) 175). None of the written sources mentions the name of the metropolis.

Nymphaion was a member of the Delian League and was assessed to pay a tribute of 1 tal. (Krateros (FGHist 242) fr. 8 = IG i 100; Tsetskhladze (1997a)). But Νύμφαειον at IG i 190 has been changed into [Ἀργ[ος)] λιον at IG i 71.111.176. Nymphaion was lost c.410–405 (Aeschin. 3.171; ATL i. 527–28) and incorporated into the Bosporan Kingdom by Satyros I (433/2–389/8) (Shelov-Kovedyaev (1985) 90–91; Zavoijn (1995) 92). Hereafter Nymphaion was a dependency of Pantikapaion (no. 705) (SEG 45 996 (389–349); Hind (1994) 498; Tsetskhladze (1997b) 78–80).

C3 inscriptions on a wall record, inter al., the months of the year Thargelion, Taureon, Kalamaino, indicating the use of the Milesian calendar in Nymphaion (Y. A. Vinogradov and Tokhtasiev (1994); Trümper, Monat. 93).

In the Archaic period the chora of Nymphaion was small, and only a few rural settlements are known; the Classical and Hellenistic settlements number a few hundred. In 1993–97 a joint Russian–Ukrainian–Polish team surveyed the chora of Nymphaion (Scholl and Zinko (1999)). Before this joint project, which included excavation of a limited number of rural settlements and burial sites, as well as a survey (Wasowicz (1994); Solovyov and Zinko (1994); Zinko (1996), (1998); Vlasova and Solovyov (1998)), the question of the overall area of the chora and the ethnic composition of its population were far from clear and subject to heated debate.

The city walls of Nymphaion were probably erected in C3e (Tolstikov (1997) 209) and the acropolis was fortified in C6l/C4e (Chistov (1998a)). The first colonists lived in dug-outs (Butyagin (1997); cf. Solovyov and Butyagin (1998b)). After C6m stone and mudbrick buildings appear and a shrine dedicated to Demeter was constructed (cf. Tsetskhladze (1997b) 50 n. 29) in a temenos which in C3 had a walled area of 60 m³. The shrine was destroyed by fire in C6l. In C5–C4, monumental buildings (some in the Ionic style) began to be constructed in the city: an acropolis, streets and a new temple to Demeter and Aphrodite. In C4e the city was destroyed, but was soon rebuilt with a new fortification system and monumental, richly decorated buildings. The discovery of a pottery kiln and wine-making complexes shows the city to have been a craft and agricultural centre in C6–C4 (Koshelenko et al. (1984) 63–64; Grach (1989); Sokolova (1997); Chistov (1998b); Borisokovskaya (1999)). Strabo 7.4.4 stresses the city’s good harbour, the location of which is problematic (Belenkij (1998)).

As studies of the Nymphaion cemetery (Grach (1999); Vlasova and Solovyov (1998)) demonstrate, the population of the city had close connections with the Skythians (cf. Grach (1981); Butyagin (1998)). Finds of hand-made pottery, jewellery and rich tombs with Skythian burial customs (Vickers (1979); Grach (1999)) show that the Skythian nobility probably participated in the life of the city.

In C3l Nymphaion struck coins of silver (very rare drachms, diobols and hemiobols), Obv. head of nymph l. with hair bound up; rev. bunch of grapes; legend: ΝΥΝ or ΝΥ in C3l (Anokhin (1986) 15, 29, 138). The mysterious mint issuing coins briefly (obv. head of nymph r.; rev. head of lion r. in incuse; legend: ΣΑΛΜΑ) has recently been suggested to be Nymphaion (Stolba (1998)); Sammas is supposed to have been a refugee and tyrant at Nymphaion c.439–436.
Pantikapaion (Pantikapaïtes)/Bosporos (Bosporites)

Map 87. Lat. 45.20, long. 36.30. Size of territory: 3/4. Type: [A]:β. Pantikapaion was situated in the European part of the Kimmerian Bosporos (Strabo 11.2.10). The toponym is Παντικάπαιον, τό (Dem. 35.31–34; Ps.-Skylax 68) or, alternatively, Βόσπορος, ó (CIRB 6; Dem. 34.36). In the opinion of some scholars the early name for the city was Kremnoi, mentioned by Hdt. 4.20.1 as an empire (Hind (1997) 111–15). The city-ethnic is Παντικαπαιής (CIRB 37 (c.370)) or, later, Παντικαπαιεύς (Syll.¹ 585 (197–75)) or Παντικαπαιεύς (RPh 63 (1937) 325–33 (C₄)) or Βοσπορίτης (IG II² 8429 (C₄s)).

At Ps.-Skylax 68 Pantikapaion is one of the toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις δὲ Ἑλληνιδεῖς αἰών, where the term polis is used in the urban sense; cf. also Anon. Peripl. M. Eu. 50. At Dem. 20.33 and 34.34 Bosporos (= Pantikapaion) is described as an empire (Hind (1997) 111–15).

The external and individual use of the city-ethnic (Παντικαπαιής) is found in a fragmentary decree of c.370 found at Pantikapaion, a copy of an honorific decree for Leukon I (389/8–349/8) passed by the Arkadian Federation (CIRB 37). The internal collective use is found in abbreviated form on coins (Price (1993) 918–58; Frolova (1996) 152–53). For proxeny decrees issued by the Bosporan kings, see CIRB 1–5; twelve such decrees are now known (M. J. Treister and Vinogradov (1993) 545). A citizen of Pantikapaion was awarded prosernia by Chios (no. 840) in C₄ (PEP Chios 50.20 = RPh 63 (1937) 325–33).

Pantikapaion was founded c.575. Written sources attest that it was Milesian (Strabo 7.4.4; Plin. HN 4.86; Amm. Marc. 22.8.36), and archaeological evidence agrees (Kuznetsov (1991b) 33).

C₄.80 (Diod. 12.31.1) Pantikapaion became the capital of the Bosporan Kingdom (Ephor. fr. 158), created primarily by the need to withstand Skythian pressure on the Greek cities situated on the Kerch and Taman peninsulas, i.e. the Kimmerian Bosporos (Gajdukević (1971); Y. G. Vinogradov (1997) 100–32; Hind (1994): contra, for a later date of creation of the Bosporan Kingdom, Vasiliev (1992); Zavojkin (1994)). Thus, the Greek poleis of the Kimmerian Bosporos (except Theodosia (no. 707), Nymphaion (no. 704) and possibly Phanagoria (no. 706)) were united under the auspices of Pantikapaion (Blavatskij (1964) 24–93).

The Bosporan Kingdom was first ruled over by the Archaianaktida (probably of Milesian origin), a clan of tyrannoi whose power lasted for 42 years (Diod. 12.31.1). All cities were self-governing poleis, but all were dependent on Pantikapaion. None of the other cities possessed a separate coinage until 450–425; and C₄ rulers spent much time keeping the cities within their kingdom. At the same time the Pantikapaion tyrants started to establish new towns (Tsetskhladze (1997b) 79 with refs.). A new dynasty, the Spartokids (of Thracian origin) came to power in 438/7, and the creation of the Bosporan state was nearly complete (Y. G. Vinogradov (1997) 115–16, 129–30). This dynasty ruled for more than 300 years (until 109). Its rulers called themselves “Archon of Bosporos and Theodosia and King of the Sindoi, Toretai, Dandarioi and Pessoi” or of “the Sindoi and Maiatoi” (CIRB 6, 8–11, 37, 113, 972, 1013–15, 1037–40, 1111; Hind (1994) 495–502). From the outset the main aim of the new dynasty was to incorporate Theodosia (no. 707), Nymphaion (no. 704) and possibly Phanagoria (no. 706) into the Bosporan Kingdom by force, these three independent poleis being opposed to the rulers of Pantikapaion. Several dynasts were preoccupied with this: Satyros I (433/2–389/8), Leukon I (389/8–349/8), Spartokos II (349/8–344/3) and Pairisades I (344/3–311/10) (Hind (1994)). From C₅m it was the policy first of the Archaianaktida and then of the Spartokidai to incorporate the local population of the Taman Peninsula (Asiatic Bosporos) into the kingdom through the establishment of Bosporan emporia in their settlements (Tsetskhladze (1997b) 60–71). This task was virtually completed by Leukon I (389/8–349/8), and the Sindoi and others were incorporated peacefully. In the time of Pairisades I (344/43–311/10) Bosporan territory reached its maximum extent, stretching from the Tauri to the Caucasus. For a C₄ treaty of symmachia between Leukon I (389/8–349/8) and Olbia (no. 690), see SEG 45 1000.

In the Archaic period the territory of Pantikapaion was small. In C₆ the towns of Myrmekion (no. 703), Tyritake (no. 708) and Porthmion were established by Pantikapaion, probably as dependent poleis (the first two) and a teichos (the last) to protect its territory from the local population (mainly Skythians) (Tsetskhladze (1997b) 68–69, 72). For C₆ six rural settlements are recorded; for C₅ about twenty; and more than 200 from C₄ (Tsetskhladze (1997b) 72). To establish the exact extent of the territory of Pantikapaion is very difficult, because, after the creation of the Bosporan Kingdom, three types of land ownership were established: civic community land, royal land (Isoc. 17.3; Dem. 20.31) and temple land (Maslennikov (1998a) 26–36; Tsetskhladze (1998b) 39). Excavations during the last decade have yielded several dozen very rich farmhouses in the eastern Crimea (Maslennikov (1998a), (1998b); Vinokurov (1998)). They probably belonged to the royal family and to rich citizens of Pantikapaion.
The town of Pantikapaion can be traced back to c.575 (pottery finds: Kuznetsov (1991b) 33) and was built on the site of an earlier local settlement, Pantikapa (Strabo 7.4.4; Plin. *HN* 4. 26; Blavatskij (1964) 9–23). The city walls were erected in C5e (Tolstikov (1997) 214–26). The fortification walls of the acropolis date from C3/i/C4f (Tolstikov (1984b)). The city occupied the summit and slopes of Mt. Mithridates and a lower seaside terrace in modern-day Kerch. For a description of the city, see Strabo 7.4.4. In C4 the city covered c.10 ha (Kosheleko et al. (1984) 125). Archaeological excavation has demonstrated that the first Greeks lived in dug-outs (Tolstikov (1992), (1996)). The beginning of stone architecture dates from the third quarter of C6, and the appearance of streets, monumental buildings and town planning to the last quarter of C6. To this latter period is dated the building of a tholos. All of this indicates the transformation of Pantikapaion into a typical Greek *polis* (Tolstikov (1996)). It is thought that in C6 there was a sanctuary for Apollo on the upper plateau of Mt. Mithridates (Tolstikov (1992) 62–66). In C6l/C5e dug-out constructions again appear, a phenomenon that some scholars connect with the difficult political situation (Skythian pressure) on the Kimmerian Bosporos. In C5m comes a period in which monumental stone architecture is a characteristic type of construction. In C5m a huge temple to Apollo was erected in the *temenos*/acropolis of the city (Pichikyan (1984) 156–65). C4 was a period of prosperity that saw many grand public buildings (some with mosaic floors: so-called *andron* with pebble mosaic of C5l–C4e) and temples constructed, and the acropolis (the western part of whose fortification system was built in C4e: Tolstikov and Zhuravlyov (1998) 25) enlarged. By C4l/C3e the royal palace was built there. Finds of architectural details, sculptures, etc. show that the buildings were richly decorated (Kosheleko et al. (1984) 59–63; Tolstikov (1987), (1992) 78–94; M. J. Treister and Vinogradov (1993) 544–46). Epigraphic evidence and dedicatory inscriptions indicate that from about 540 there was a temple on the upper plateau of Mt. Mithridates dedicated to Ephesian Artemis (M. Y. Treister (1990)). From at least C4e there were temples, altars and shrines on the acropolis dedicated to Apollo Prostates (*CIRB* 6, 10, 25; Tolstikov (1992) 95 n. 9), Artemis (*CIRB* 64), Zeus (Tolstikov (1992) 95 n. 11), Aphrodite (Tolstikov (1992) 95 n. 12) and Demeter (*CIRB* 8). From C6, Pantikapaion became a centre for crafts and trade. Workshops for metal working were found on the northern slope of Mt. Mithridates, and on the western plateau, where the earliest dug-outs of the first settlers were discovered (M. Y. Treister (1987), (1992), (1998)). From C6l the city produced also painted pottery, clay weights, terracotta figurines, etc. (Kosheleko et al. (1984) 59–63).

Pantikapaion struck coins of silver from C5e onwards and of gold in C4. (1) Silver and bronze C5e onwards: denominations: drachm, hemidrachm, diobol. Types: *obv.* lion’s scalp facing; *rev.* incuse square with symbol; legend: ΠΑΝ or ΠΑΝΤ or ΠΑΝΤΙ, on some ΑΠΙ or ΑΠΙΩ. (2) Silver and bronze C4: *obv.* head of Pan or satyr; *rev.* head of bull, or griffin, or lion, or lion with spear in mouth; legend: ΠΑΝ or ΠΑΝΤ or ΠΑΝΤΙ. (3) Gold in C4: denominations: stater, hemistater. Types: *obv.* bearded head of Pan or satyr; *rev.* griffin with spear in mouth standing on ear of corn; legend: ΠΑΝ (Frolova (1992); Price (1993) 836–917; SNG Cop. *Thrace* 17–24). The full form of the city-ethnic, ΠΑΝΤΙΚΑΠΑΙΤΩΝ, appears on coins of C3 and later (SNG Cop. *Thrace* 27). Coins of c.460–440 with the inscription ΑΠΙΩΛ (as well as ΠΑΙ/ΑΠΙ) cause problems. The prevailing view is that these coins were struck at the mint of the temple of Apollo in Pantikapaion (built in the second quarter of C5) as an “alliance” issue of the cities of the Kimmerian Bosporos. These coins were not minted for long—until the last quarter of C5, when the need for the confederation of Bosporan cities had passed (Y. G. Vinogradov (1997) 22–23; Tolstikov (1984a) 47–48 n. 47; Frolova (1995)).

**706. Phanagoria (Phanagorites)** Map 87. Lat. 45°15′ long. 37°00′. Size of territory: 4. Type: Α-α. The city was situated in the Asiatic part of the Kimmerian Bosporos (Strabo 11.2.10). The toponyms are Φαναγόρα, Φαναγόρεια, Φαναγόρευα (Ps.-Skymnos 886–89; Strabo 11.2.10). The city-ethnic is Φαναγοριτής (SEG 41 625 (C1)).

Phanagoria is called a *polis* *Hellenis* by Ps.-Skylax 72, using *polis* in the urban sense; quoting Hecat. fr. 212, Steph. Byz. (657.8) lists Phanagoria as a *polis*, but it is uncertain whether the site-classification stems from Hekataios (Hansen (1997a) 17–18). *Polis* status, however, is strongly indicated by a fragmentary C4 proxeny decree from the site mentioning the rights of *enktēsis* and *politeia* (Hind (1983–84) 90).

ΦΑ, attested on measuring vessels of C3, and ΦΑΝΑ or ΦΑ, attested on coins of C3/C4, are probably abbreviated forms of the city-ethnic used in the internal and collective sense. The full form, ΦΑΝΑΓΟΡΙΤΩΝ, is found only on C2l–C1 coins (Price (1993) 995–1007) whereas the external and individual use appears in App. *Mith.* 108.

Phanagoria was founded by Teians (no. 868) (Ps.-Skymnos 886) and, according to Arrian, the *oikistes* was Phanagoros of Teos, who had sought refuge from Persian
influence (\textit{FGrHist} 156) fr. 71). Thus, Phanagoria must have been founded c.545–540, a date confirmed by excavation in the upper city of Ionian pottery, some belonging to the late stage of the late Wild Goat style and of contemporary Attic pottery (Kuznetsov (1998) 9; Arafat and Morgan (2000)). Most probably Phanagoria was forced to join the Bosporan Kingdom either by Leukon I (389/8–349/8) contemporaneously with Theodosia (no. 707), or by Spartokos II (349/8–344/3) and was thereafter a \textit{polis} depending on Pantikapaion (no. 705) (\textit{Syll.} 214–16; \textit{SEG} 45 1016, all found in Phanagoria; Gorlov (1986); Hind (1994) 498).

The \textit{chora} of Phanagoria is completely unknown, as are those of the other Greek colonies in the Taman Peninsula. A survey of the whole Taman Peninsula established that there are about 237 rural settlements of the Graeco-Roman and mediaeval periods, more than 500 barrows, and 150 km of ancient roads (Paromov (1990), (1992), (1997), (1998)). At the present level of knowledge it is impossible to identify which rural settlements belonged to which \textit{polis} (Tsitskhladze (1997b) 72–73 and (1998b) 38–39, both with refs.). Two very rich farms near Phanagoria may have been situated in its \textit{chora} (Savostina (1987), (1998)).

The first defensive walls of Phanagoria were erected in C\textsubscript{5}l (Gorlov (1986) 136). The city was situated on two plateaux on the coast of the Gulf of Taman in the Taman Peninsula. The city covered c.75 ha, but c.25 ha of the site is now under water. The city is surrounded by hills on which three large cemeteries are situated (Tsitskhladze (1997b) 51–55 with refs.). In C\textsubscript{6} Phanagoria was situated on the upper plateau and had a rectangular plan of approximately 440–450 × 500 m (20–22.5 ha). Remains of C\textsubscript{6} include dwelling houses built of mudbrick without any stone foundation and streets. Twelve houses built of either wattle or mudbrick were found, dating from 630–620 to 500–480. In C\textsubscript{5}e the city was extended towards the south. In the cultural level of C\textsubscript{5}m to C\textsubscript{4} were remains of workshops. In C\textsubscript{6}l houses on the upper plateau were destroyed, and the destruction level bears traces of fire. In C\textsubscript{5}e a large amount of construction work was undertaken. In the south-west part of the city the remains of the city gates were found. The houses were built from mudbrick, sometimes on stone foundations. During C\textsubscript{5} the city spread on to a number of terraces and filled up the area between the upper and lower plateaux. Finds of, e.g., Ionic and Doric capitals point to monumental architecture. In C\textsubscript{4} the city grew towards the east. The old fortification walls were destroyed in C\textsubscript{4}e as a result of a siege; afterwards large (\textit{re})construction works began, and the houses were built of limestone and other stones rather than mudbrick. The city had several shrines and temples, including “a notable temple of Aphrodite Apatouros” (Strabo 11.2.10). In C\textsubscript{6}l there was a wooden shrine which was destroyed by fire in C\textsubscript{5}e. Terracotta figurines of Demeter, Artemis and Aphrodite have been found in a shrine not far from the city. Inscriptions were found in or near the agora or nearby; there was a temple of Aphrodite Ourania (Apatouron; \textit{CIRB} 971–72), located on a hill not far from the city (\textit{CIRB} 1111 = Tod 115C). According to Tokhtasiev (1986), the Apatouron was a separate shrine on the Taman Peninsula.

From the outset, Phanagoria was a very important city with its own diversified economy and craft production. Local painted pottery dates from C\textsubscript{6}l–C\textsubscript{5}; pottery kilns date from C\textsubscript{4}. There were workshops for the production of architectural terracottas, bronze and iron objects, and life-size bronze statues. Study of fragments of stone sculptures and gravestones confirms the existence of local sculptors. Finds of imported tableware, amphoras and foreign coins show that Phanagoria was a trading centre (Smirnov (1956); Kobyлина (1983), (1989); Kosheenko \textit{et al.} (1984) 77–81; Dolgorukov (1990); Dolgorukov and Kolesnikov (1993); Paromov (1993); Kuznetsov (1998), (1999) 555–58).

The city struck silver coins in C\textsubscript{5}l/C\textsubscript{4}e. Diobol: \textit{obv.} beardless or more rarely a bearded head of a Kabyros (??) l. wearing high-crowned \textit{pilos}, sometimes with laurel wreath; \textit{rev.} bull, or forepart of bull l.; to r. an ear of corn; legend: \textit{ΦΑΘΕΟΔΕΟ}. Trihemiobol: \textit{obv.} same, but with more conical \textit{pilos}; \textit{rev.} forepart of bull l., ear of corn to r.; legend: \textit{ΦΑΝΑΝΑ}. Tetartemorion?: \textit{obv.} beardless head left; \textit{rev.} grain of corn; legend: \textit{ΦΑΘΕΟΝΑΘ} (Shelov (1956) 49–51; Price (1993) 987–94; Zavojkin (1995)). Phanagoria resumed its minting in C\textsubscript{3}l.

\textbf{707. Theodosia} (Theodosieus) \textit{Map} 87. Lat. 45.00, long. 35.25. Size of territory: 1. Type: [A];\textit{β}. Theodosia lay to the W. of the European part of the Kimmerian Bosporos (Ps.-Sklax 68; Strabo 7.4.4; \textit{Arr. Peripl. M. Eux.} 19.3). The toponym is \textit{Θεοδοσιά} (Ps.-Sklax 68; Dem. 20.33). The city-ethnic is \textit{Θεοδοσιανός} (\textit{CIRB} 231 (C\textsubscript{4}f)); C\textsubscript{5}–C\textsubscript{4}e coins (\textit{infra}) are inscribed \textit{ΘΕΟΔΕΟΣ} or \textit{ΘΕΟΔΕΟΣ}, which presumably attests an unknown form of the city-ethnic.

At Ps.-Sklax 68 Theodosia is the first toponym listed after the heading πόλεις δὲ Ἐλληνίδες αὐτὲς, where the term \textit{polis} is used in the urban sense. At Dem. 20.33 Theodosia is called an \textit{emporion}. The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is attested on coins (\textit{infra}). The external and individual use is attested on a grave stele from Pantikapaion (\textit{CIRB} 231 (C\textsubscript{4}f)).
Theodosia was founded by Miletos (no. 854) (Arr. Peripl. M. Eux. 19.3; Anon. Peripl. M. Eux. 51) c.570 (pottery find: Kuznetsov (1991b) 33). From the beginning the city was hostile to Pantikapaion (no.705), opposing its tyrants during C₃ and not joining the Bosporan Kingdom (Petrova (1991)). It was aided by Chersonesos (no. 695) and Herakleia (no. 715) against the encroaching archontes of the Bosporan Kingdom (Saprykin (1997) 91–98). C.370 Leukon I (389/8–349/8) conquered Theodosia and made it part of the Bosporan Kingdom, and thus it became dependent on Pantikapaion (no. 705) (Strabo 7.4.6 (rC₄f)). In contemporary inscriptions C₄ kings are described as “archon of Bosporos and Theodosia” (CIRB 6, 6a, 8, 1014, 1037, 1111 (Syll.³ 214); cf. Burstein (1974); Petrova (1991); Hind (1994) 498; Saprykin (1997) 91–98; Hansen (1997c) 90). Anon. Peripl. M. Eux. 77 mentions some refugees from “Bosporos” in Theodosia. It is believed that this information goes back to C₅, and that the refugees were from Pantikapaion, people who did not support the new dynasty, the Spartokids, who came to power in 438/7 (Gajdukevič (1971); Petrova (1991) 98–99).

Dem. 20.33 and Strabo 7.4.4 underline the city’s fine harbour and fertile land, and the export of its grain to Athens. Archaeologically the city is not well known. During small-scale excavations a stone and mudbrick building dating from C₅ overlaid by one of C₄–C₃ was uncovered (Peters and Golentsov (1981); KosheLenko et al. (1984) 63; Hind (1983–84) 85, (1992–93) 100). The chora is not well known. Minor settlements and a fortified farm of C₄ have been excavated to the south and the west of Theodosia; the chora was populated both by Greeks and local people (Petrova (1996) 146–50; Beyens et al. (1997)).

Theodosia struck coins of silver, probably in the 430s, and bronze C₄e. Obv. helmeted head of Athena; rev. bull’s head facing; legend: ΘΕΟΔΕΟΛΟΘΕΟΔΕΛΕΟ. Minting stopped most probably c.370 when the city was conquered by the Bosporan king Leukon I (389/8–349/8) and resumed in C₄ (Anokhin (1989) 15–16, 29–30, 57–58, 138–39, 141; Stolba (1996) 235; Hansen (1997c) 90).

708. Tyritake


Tyritake was established in 580–560 by Ionians (? from Miletos (no. 854)) as is documented by pottery finds (Kuznetsov (1991b) 33). The settlement was probably a secondary one from the start, dependent on Pantikapaion (no. 705) (Tsetskhladze (1997b) 62, 68–80).

City walls were erected in C₅e (Tolstikov (1997) 209). The Archaic and Classical city is not well studied. Stone houses appear in C₆s (remains of only two buildings have been excavated; cf. KosheLenko et al. (1984) 67–68). Aphrodite and Demeter were amongst communal cults (Denisova (1981) 83–88). The Tyritake rampart—a boundary line for strategic defence—stretches for a distance of over 25 km and was built to protect the chora of the European Bosporos in C₅ from the local population (Tolstikov (1997) 209).

3. The Coasts of the Caucasus and Kolchian Lowlands

709. Dioskouris

Map 87. Lat. 43.00, long. 41.00. Size of territory: 4. Type: Aα. Dioskouris was situated in Kolchis, Eastern Black Sea (Ps.-Skylax 81; Strabo 11.2.16; Arr. Peripl. M. Eux. 10.4). The toponym is ΔΙΟΣΚΟΥΡΙΣ in Ps.-Skylax 81, but ΔΙΟΣΚΟΥΡΙΑΣ in later sources (Strabo 1.3.2; Steph. Byz. 233.15). The city is called polis by Ps.-Skylax 81 using polis in the urban sense, and repeatedly in a fragmentary bronze inscription of C₄ł/C₃e found in Eshera, not far from Dioskouris. Here polis is presumably used both in the political and in the urban sense (Y. G. Vinogradov (1997) 596–601; Tsetskhladze (1998a) 23–24).

Amphora handles of C₃ produced by Dioskouris are stamped with ΔΙΟΣΚΟΥΡΙΣ, an abbreviation of either the toponym or, more likely, the city-ethnic used in the internal and collective sense (Tsetskhladze (1991) 362–63, 377). The bronze inscription from Eshera mentions events possibly linked with some military operations (Y. G. Vinogradov (1997) 596–601).

According to Arr. Peripl. M. Eux. 10.4, Dioskouris was founded by Miletos (no. 854) (Tsetskhladze (1998b) 16–19), and modern writers suppose it to date to C₆m. Other writers relate foundation myths set in the epic period and which are poetic in nature (App. Mithr. 101; Luc. 3.3.269; Paus. 3.19.7, 24.7; cf. Braund (1994) 31–33).

The chora of the city spread up to a 10 km radius around the city. Eshera, the largest settlement in the area, was probably part of the chora. Finds of helmets may mark the edge of the chora of Dioskouris: the local population of north-eastern Kolchis was engaged in piracy and used to attack the coastal cities including Dioskouris (Diod. 20.25; Strabo 11.2.12, 16, 19, 11.3.6; Plin. HN 6.15–16; cf. Shamba (1980); Voronov (1991); Tsetskhladze (1998a) 15–25).
There has been no large-scale archaeological investigation of the city (modern-day Sukhumi in Abkhazia, northwestern Georgia). Part of the city site is under water, and the remainder is covered by the modern city. Rescue excavations demonstrate that the city had monumental stone buildings from at least C4. Material shedding light on the early history of the city has not been found apart from a few fragments of C6l–C5 pottery and a Greek marble burial stele dated to 430–420 (Lordkipanidze (1968); Voronov (1980); Nikonov (1996); Tsetskhkladze (1998a) 15–25). The patron deities seem to have been the Dioskouroi (inference from the toponym). Another communal cult was that of Demeter (Tsetskhkladze (1998a) 16–17).

710. Gyenos  Map 87. Lat. 42.45, long. 41.25. Size of territory: 1 (Shamba (1988) 7). Type: A;β. The toponym is Γηνός (Ps.-Skylax 81); possibly Cycnus in Pompon. 1.110 (Inadze (1968) 124; Lordkipanidze (1979) 130–31; Shamba (1988) 6); Braund (1994) 103; Tsetskhkladze (1998a) 12–13). It was situated in Kolchis, eastern Black Sea (Ps.-Skylax 81). Gyenos is called a polis Hellenis by Ps.-Skylax 81, using polis in the urban sense.

Gyenos was settled by some east Greeks including merchants in C6m (Tsetskhkladze (1998a) 12–15). Pompon. 1.110 relates the city’s foundation myth (Braund (1994) 103). Gyenos was probably a mixed Hellenic–barbarian polis; material culture shows both Greek and local Kolchian features (Shamba (1988); Tsetskhkladze (1998a) 12–15).

Ancient Gyenos has been located in an area near the modern city of Ochamchire (Abkhazia, north-western Georgia). According to the survey carried out on the site of the supposed ancient city, its area measured 65 ha (Shamba (1988) 7). It is difficult to accept this because of doubts as to the actual location and the very poor preservation of the site itself. The settlement ranged across three artificial hills and the surrounding plain on the left bank of the river Dzhikimir where it joins the sea. Only the edge of one hill (C) has been partly excavated; the other two hills have been completely destroyed by modern construction work. Two Archiac wooden dwellings have been well preserved. They had straw roofs. In the Archaic level East Greek pottery accounts for 28.5 per cent of the total pottery finds. By C4e habitation on hill C came to an end and was replaced with burials of horses’ heads, equipped in Skythian fashion (Shamba (1988)).

711. Phasis (Phasianos)  Map 87. Lat. 42.05, long. 41.45. Size of territory? Type: A;β. The city was situated in Kolchis, eastern Black Sea (Ps.-Skylax 81; Strabo 11.2.17, 12.3.17). The toponym is Φασίας (Hdt. 4.86.2; SEG 44 1298 (C5l)). The city-ethnic is Φασιανοί (HeracL Lemb. 46).

Phasis is called a polis Hellenis by Ps.-Skylax 81, using polis in the urban sense; Hippoc. Aor. 15 calls Phasis an emporion. It had its own constitution, included in the Aristotelian corpus of 158 politeiai (HeracL Lemb. 46; Arist. no. 141, Gigon). The external and collective use of the city-ethnic Φασιανοί is attested at Xen. An. 5.6.36–37; HeracL Lemb. 46; cf. Hind (1996b) 209–11; Braund (1994) 96.

Phasis is said to have been founded by Milesians (HeracL Lemb. 46; Pompon. 1.110; Steph. Byz. 661.1), and some date the foundation to C6m, others to a much later date (Lordkipanidze (1985) 22–34; Tsetskhkladze (1998a) 7–12). The oikistes’ name is given as Themistagoras of Miletos (Pompon. 1.110; cf. Steph. Byz. 661.1: ἐκτίσθη δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἡμιταγόρος), a name found both at Miletos (no. 854) and Sinope (no. 729). Phasis was probably a mixed Hellenic–barbarian polis (Tsetskhkladze (1994b) 211–12), and the emporion served merchants visiting there at least from C5l/C4e (Hippoc. Aor. 15; Hind (1996b) 209–11). Lordkipanidze (2000) has restated the case for the existence of a Greek apoikia polis at Phasis in the Archaic and Classical periods; however, his treatment of the literary evidence is uneven, and that of Herodotos incorrect. The discussion of the Kolchian/Phasian coin types is also selective and unconvincing; see further Hind (2002).

Phasis has not been located. According to Arrian, the old fortifications of Phasis consisted of an earth rampart with wooden towers, in the Roman period replaced with walls of burnt brick (Arr. Peripl. M. Eux. 9). The patron deity seems to have been Apollo Hegemon (SEG 44 1298 (C5l); Tsetskhkladze (1994b)). Late writers mention the goddess of Phasis (Rhea or Artemis?) (Arr. Peripl. M. Eux. 9; Zos. Historia Nova 1.28). Literary and epigraphic evidence suggest that temples to these deities existed in the city (Zubov inscription on phiale (C5l); Tsetskhkladze (1994b); Arr. Peripl. M. Eux. 9; Zos. Historia Nova 1.28).

It has been suggested that silver coins “Kolkhidiki” (Dundua (1987) 9–32) were minted by Phasis or the Phasians between C5e and C3. Tetradrachms have on obv. lion’s head which may derive from the lion of Miletos (no. 854). A small percentage of type B hemidrachms are inscribed with Greek letters (initials for the names of magistrates?; cf. Dundua (1987) 9–32; Tsetskhkladze (1993) 236–40; Hind (1996b) 204–9). Hind studied the exceptional variety of C5m–I coin types, and suggested that Milesian die-makers may have been working for the Phasian skeptouchoi in Kolchis (Hind (1996b) 204–9).
4. The Coasts of the Mariandyanoi, Paphлагones and Kappadokes

712. Amisos (Amisenos)/Peiraeus (Peiraeus) Map 87. Lat. 41.20, long. 36.20. Size of territory: ? Type: Bca. The toponym is Ἀμισος ὁ Ἀμισήνος (Hecat. fr. 199 apud Strabo 12.3.25; Ephor. fr. 162.12; Arist. Hist. an. 554b75), to which corresponds the city-ethnic Ἀμισηνός (SEG 28 725 (c.300)); the city was renamed Πειραιεὺς in C55 (Strabo 12.3.14; cf. infra); the corresponding city-ethnic Πειραιαῖ or Πειραιαῖσ is found in a C4 inscription from Pantikapaion (CIRB1 = Syll. 3 217; note, however, that LGPN II Διονύσιος no. 622 treats this man as an Athenian from the deme of Peiraeus) and on coins (Head, HN2 496; Malloy (1970)); it reverted to its former name by C3e. The territory was size 5 by Hellenistic times; earlier probably much smaller.

According to Ps.-Skymnos 957, Diller, Amisos was an apoikia of the Phokaians (no. 859), hence probably a polis in the political sense (date retrospectively given as c.650); Theopomp. fr. 389 apud Strabo 12.3.14 considered it a Milesian foundation originally. Probably c.436, in connection with the Pontic expedition of Perikles (Plut. Per. 20), it received a contingent of Athenian settlers led by Athenokles, and its name was changed to Peiraeus (Theopomp. fr. 389: ὃν Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ Ἀθηναίων ἐποικισθέασαν Πειραιαῖ metonouµασθῆναι; cf. infra and Sinope (no. 729)).

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic Πειραὶ (i)eus is found on C4 coins (infra). The external individual use of the city-ethnic Amisenos is found in CIRB 249–50 (C4/C3e); SEG 28 725 (c.300); and IG II² 8062, 8072 (C3); this use of Peiraeus is found in CIRB 1 = Syll. 3 217, a C4m record of a proξenos of Pantikapaion (no. 705). The external collective use of the city-ethnic is not attested until the Hellenistic period (e.g. Strabo 12.3.13).

The chorà of Amisos included Saramea, and reached the river Halys to the west, and Themiskrya and Sidene to the east. The native peoples were variously known as Syroi (Hdt. 2.104), Assyrioi (Ps.-Skylax 89), Leukosyroi (Ps.-Skymnos 956, Diller; Strabo 12.3.12, 25) or Kappadokes (Strabo 12.3.9).

Amisos (present-day Samsun) lies 165 km east of Sinope (no. 729), on the flat top and eastern slopes of a plateau headland (Kara, Eski Samsun) to the west of the town of Samsun (Maximova (1956) 52–54; Atasoy (1997) 25ff). It possessed no fine natural harbour; nor was it near the mouth of any major river (Wilson (1976a)). Its main assets were the “Amisene” iron, probably traded from the Chalybes (Arist. Mir. ausc. 833b33), its lands productive of olives (Strabo 2.1.15, 12.3.30), some local silver from the Pontic Mountains, and the overland route across the so-called isthmus of Asia which led to Tarsos via Amaseia, Zela and Kaisareia (Hdt. 1.72, 2.33; Ps.-Skymnos 961–62, Diller; Strabo 12.1.3). The sea routes along the coast and across the Euxine to the mouth of the Danube, southern Crimea and the Kimmerian Bosporos were largely in the sphere of Sinope. It has been supposed that Amisos was in competition with Sinope (Magie (1950) 184), though it was probably not powerful enough to be so down to the end of the Classical period. Maximova (1956) 82–83 sees it as having, rather, a junior collaborative role. Two points tend to uphold this view. First, the colonisation by Athenokles and the party of Athenians at Amisos (Theopomp. fr. 389 apud Strabo 12.3.14) may well have taken place at about the same time and in the same sort of circumstances as Perikles’ reported intervention at Sinope and dispatch of 600 colonists there (Plut. Per. 20). Secondly, the silver coinage of both cities displays somewhat similar reverse types (birds of prey with outstretched wings). The smaller denominations of Sinope in particular have their eagle en face with outstretched wings, as though to acknowledge the facing owl of Amisos.

From the time of the Athenian settlement, democracy lasted for a while until the Persians gained Amisos (App. Mith. 83; Polyaen. 7.21.1). The satrap Datames had designs on it, wishing to use it as a mint (Polyaen. 7.21.1), c.370. From C3m it lost its autonomy and became part of the Pontic kingdom under Mithridates II or Ariobarzanes.

There have been no planned excavations at Kara Samsun (Atasoy (1997) 109), the plateau being occupied by an American radar station. In the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth century, activity in the cemetery brought to light much jewellery, some of C5–C4 (Marshall (1911) pl. 31 nos. 1706, 1808, 1816), a grave stele of C4 (Mendel (1912) no. 7), a bronze decoration from below the handle of a C4 hydria (Wiegand (1923); Züchner (1942) 175). There is also a small amount of imported pottery of C6–C4 (Atasoy (1997) 39). Contacts with Greek cities in the form of Amisenes abroad in the Classical and Hellenistic periods spread fairly widely (Maximova (1956) 89; Debord (1990); Atasoy (1997) 86).

About 18 km south-west of Samsun is Ak Alan, a fortified hill-top settlement, probably the centre of a Kappadokian chieftain. Here were found, in addition to native pottery, some terracotta architectural ornaments (simae, friezes) in a north Ionic or Aiolic Greek style, and pottery fragments from one or more Wild Goat style oinochoai of c.625–600 (Macridy (1907); Cummer (1976)).

These early contacts of Greeks with the Kappadokians and knowledge of the route to Tarsos were, perhaps, initiated by
Milesians from Sinope even before the foundation of Amisos. Hdt. 1.76–78 mentions Pteria, the strongest place, east of the river Halys, where the major battle between Kriosos and Kyros took place. This site is said to have been inland, on a line with Sinope on the Black Sea. Some have sought to identify Pteria with Ak Alan, but Pteria is now persuasively argued to have been at the huge IA fortification at Kerkenes Dağ (Mitchell 1999) 187–88.

Some Greeks (Hecat. fr. 199; Zenodotos apud Strabo 12.3.25) took Amisos to be the Enete of Hom. II. 2.352, and in hoards (ΠΕΙΡΑΕUS can be traced through finds of these coins singly (Hanhart 1993). The full name appears on the reverses of the earliest coins of C5/LC (Price 1993) pl. VII). The city-ethnic is Ἡρακλεῖα (Hermokles and the Athenians) (Lasserre (e.g. Arist. Met. 367a); Ποντος Ἡρᾶκλεα is found in the epigram in IG viii 2531 (C4). The name as used in the epigraphs of Lykia. The collective use of the city-ethnic is found internally on C4l coins (infra 4) and externally in Xen. An. 5.6.19; Aen. Tact. 12.5; and IG i 71.14.127 (425/4). The individual and external use is found in IG i 74 (442/3) and IG ii 486 (c330) Dem. 52.6 and I.Oliba 6 = Dubois (1996) 20 (C4).

The chorai (mentioned in L.Sinope 1.4 (353/2–346/5) Ἡρᾶκλεωτίς (Thuc. 4.75.2; Xen. An. 6.2.19)—described as situated ἐν τῷ Ἡμίων ἰπτέρα κυπελλων, Xen. An. 6.2.1—in C5 stretched to the Kales and to the river Kallichoros to the west, and to the south–east to the area between the rivers Lykos and Billaios. Eventually, Herakleia’s coastal influence reached out westwards beyond the river Hypios to the major river Sangarios, via an emporion at Eleious, and beyond to Thrainos Island (Dörner and Hoepfner 1962) 583–93; Hoepfner (1966) 19; Burstein (1976)). The city was strategically situated one long day’s sail (210 km) from the entrance to the Pontos (Xen. An. 6.4.2), with no city in that direction, only an uninhabited peninsula, Kalpe, which Xenophon fleetingly hoped to colonise, at the halfway stage (Xen. An. 6.3.1, 4.1.6). To the east was Sinope (no. 729), almost twice the distance (two days’ sail and 350 km; Xen. An. 6.2.1), but Cape Kambris, and the shortest crossing of the Pontos, lay between. Nearer to Herakleia lay four minor Milesian poleis or katoikiai, in one case an emporion of Sinope (see Tiedeman (no. 733), Kromna (no. 723), Sesamos (no. 728) and Kytoros (no. 724)). None of these could be much of a threat to Herakleia until they were synoecised under the name Amastris c.300–290 (see Sesamos (no. 728)). Herakleia, however, was well placed to let or hinder shipping from outside the Black Sea, going west or east along its southern shore, and across it to, or from, the Crimea and South Russia.
The isolated statement of Strabo 12.3.4 that Herakleia was a Milesian colony is an error (contra Asheri (1972) 14), compounded by attributing the first subjection of the Mariandynoi to them and ignoring Megarians totally. All other sources attribute the settlement of Herakleia to Megara (no. 225) (Xen. An. 6.2.11) or to Megarians with Boiotian participation (Ps.-Skymnos 1016–17, Diller; Ephor. fr. 44b). According to Ap. Rhod. 2.846, Nisaioi (i.e. from east coast Megara) were the colonists along with Boiotians. Paus. 5.26.7 says the Boiotians were from Tanagra (no. 220), an important coastal state in C6 (Buck (1979) 99). Suda s.v. Ἡρακλείδης Εὔφρονος, makes them Thebans (no. 221). The oikistes was Gnesiochos, a Megarian (Euphorion fr. 90, Scheidewin; Ephor. fr. 44b; Collectanea Alexandrina (Oxford, 1925) fr. 177). It has also been suggested that Thessalians took part (Asheri (1972) 14). The Boiotians’ plight, leading to their sending out colonists after two oracles from Delphi, was due to plague and to Phokian raids (Just. Epit. 16.3.8). The foundation date is given by correlation with Persian/Median history, “the Boiotians and Megarians founded it (κατὰ θουσία) within the Kyanei Rocks about the time when Kyros captured Media” (Ps.-Skymnos 1017–19, Diller). This ought to mean c.550, at any rate before the collapse of Lydia in 547; Megara’s reason was pressure from Athens (Hind (1998) 134).

Local historians of Herakleia were concerned to give their city a “pre-history”—a connection with Herakles, or with the Argonaut Idmon, or with a Mariandynian hero, Agamemnon (Herodoros (FGrHist 432) fr. 3; Promathidas (FGrHist 430) fr. 3). Agamemnon (or Idmon) was polioichus, with an old olive tree in his honour on show in the agora (Ap. Rhod. 2.841–50). At least in Roman times Herakleia was claimed as ktonos on coins (Head, HN2 216). The celebration of Dionysia is attested in Diod. 16.36.3 (133).

Herakleia founded colonies across the Pontos at Kallatis (no. 686) and Chersonesos (no. 695) perhaps during the troubles of C5/C4, though some date them to C6 or C5 (Hind (1998) 139–52; Saprykin (1998) 236; Ivanitch (1998) 322 n. 77). Her wars with Bosporus ensued c.390–370 (Burstein (1974); Hind (1994) 498). A small settlement of Herakleiotics also existed on Thynias Island (νῆσος Θυνιᾶς (οἰκονομίας δὲ αὐτῆς Ἡρακλεώται), Ps.-Skylax 92; Ἡρακλεώτων ἀποικίας, Ps.-Skymnos 1026, Diller) towards the entrance to the Black Sea. This island is called Apollonia and Daphnousia by writers of Roman date, and the Herakleiot settlement is named Thynias (Plin. HN 6.32; Ptol. Geog. 5.1.13; Anon. Peripl. M. Eux. 18).

A number of early wars with the local population are referred to at Just. Epit. 16.3.7–8; the citizen levy is referred to at Polyaean. 2.30.3. According to Arist. Pol. 1327b14–15, the Herakleiotics entertained a large navy (πολλὰς ἐκπληκτικὰς θρυψεις; cf. Polyaean. 6.9.4), and Arist. Oec. 1347b9 refers to a navy of forty ships (τραγвро); Ae. Tact. 12.5 attests to the hiring of a substantial mercenary army by the city. Strategoi are referred to at Arist. Oec. 1347b13 (τραγвро).

In Cyn Athens sought to make Herakleia a tribute-paying city, and the city’s name appears more reliably than most in the tribute assessment decree of 425/4: [ἡρακλεία] (IG 15 ἑ 114.127). Athens’ general, Lamachos, seems to have been attempting to assert her control over the near region when he lost his contingent of ships in a flash-flood in the river Kales (Thuc. 4.75.2). At this time, in general, some leaders at Herakleia seem to have favoured dependence on Persia and declined to pay a monetary contribution to Athens (Just. Epit. 16.2.8). Others were prepared to help the stranded Athenians out of trouble on this or a later occasion (e.g. Sotimos, A. B. West (1935) 74–75; cf. IG 17 74 (424/3)). After the passing of Athens’ brief hegemony in (at least parts of) the Pontos, Herakleia continued to be in a position to interfere with shipping going between Bosporos and the Aegean (e.g. in 360 and 330; cf. IG 11 117.20–23, 360.35–40). On the other hand, Herakleiot merchants were honoured at Athens for services rendered (IG 11 408).

Politically Herakleia is said to have been a “democracy” (Arist. Pol. 1304b31–34; Ae. Tact. 11.10; cf. E. W. Robinson (1997) 111–13)—perhaps rather a settlement of relatively poor allotment-holders led by an oikistes together with a group of refugees from Boiotia (Just. Epit. 16.3). Passage of time, growth, prosperity, war with, and subjection of, the local people, Mariandynoi, brought inequalities, and these led to stasis (Burstein (1976); Saprykin (1981); Gehrke, Stasis 70–72). There were perhaps two leaders described as “tyrants” (Eurytion, Arist. Pol. 1306b39–40; Euopios, Suda s.v. Κλέαρχος). The nobles were driven out by “demagogues”, but returned to overthrow the “many” (Arist. Pol. 1304b31–33). The oligarchic restriction of citizenship to heads of families was apparently dropped, and the number of those having full privileges under the oligarchy was raised to 600 in C5 (Arist. Pol. 1305b2–3). These troubles probably occupied the late C5 and early decades of C4 (civic unrest are also referred to by Ae. Tact. 11.10, 12.5). In 364 Klearchos founded a “tyrant” dynasty that lasted more than 70 years: Klearchos (364–c.353/2); Satyros (c.353/2–345); Timotheos (c.345–337); Dionysios (345–305); Amastria, wife of Dionysios, later of Lysimachos (305–290) (Apel (1910);
Burstein (1972), (1976); Frolov (1974); Saprykin (1997).

I. Sinope 353/2–346/5 is a treaty of symmachia between, on the one hand, Sinope (no. 729) and, on the other, “Satyros and the sons of Klearchos”. It is a mutual defensive pact by which both contracting parties undertake to support the other in case of attack on the territory or on the city, excepting aggression by the Great King or aggression by a third party sanctioned by the Great King: such aggression is to be negotiated by envoys sent to the king by the parties involved; if the aggressor is unwilling to conduct such negotiations, then he may be attacked by the two contracting parties who thus explicitly recognise the suzerainty of the Great King. The poleis of Kromna (no. 723) and Sesamos (no. 728) may, if they wish, be included in the alliance. In addition to such alliance arrangements, the treaty includes stipulations to the effect that (a) Sinopean and Herakleian exiles may remain ἐν ταῖς πόλεσις πόλεων; it is, however, not clear exactly what is meant here: it may mean that Herakleian exiles are allowed to remain at Sinope, and vice versa; or it may mean that exiles are allowed to remain in any polis to which they had fled (as suggested by the editor); this would imply that Herakleia and Sinope could conclude a treaty whose stipulations were valid for other (dependent) poleis, and in fact Sinope is known to have ruled its colonies as dependent poleis (Gschnitzer (1958) 18–19; Nielsen (2000) 135; cf. Kerasous (no. 719), Kotyora (no. 722), and Trapezous (no. 734)); (b) that full support is to be given in the case of attempts to overthrow the existing constitutions of Sinope and Herakleia.

Pace Jacoby (FGrHist i11 435 p. 368) and Gigon, fr. 501.56, there is no direct evidence that the politeia of Herakleia was described by Aristotle. Magistrates: baseileus and aisymnatai are assumed for Herakleia, as derivative offices are known at her colonies, Kallatis (no. 686) and Chersonesos (no. 695) (Hanell (1934) 12ff, 135ff). The council was of 300 members (Polyaen. 2.302). The calendar was Megarian, like those of Byzantion (no. 674), Kallatis (no. 686) and Chersonesos (no. 695) (Avram (1999b); Trumpy, Monat. 150). Nomophylakes and prodikoi, from their presence at Chersonesos (IOSPE 112 342, 343, 359), are assumed to have existed also at Herakleia. Agoranomoi are taken to be represented on amphora stamps (infra). Dikasteria are attested during the democracy of C5l (Arist. Pol. 1305b34).

Relations with other poleis are attested in IG 11 74 (424/3), a grant of proxeny by Athens (no. 361) to Sotimos of Herakleia; a C4 proxenos at Athens is attested by Dem. 52.5 and IG 11 2 408 (c.330) is an honorific decree for two Herakleiots. A proxenos at Argos (no. 347) is attested by Dem. 52.10. IG 11 2 117.19–22 and 360.35ff record Athenian decisions to send envoys to Herakleia. Herakleia entered into negotiations with Xenophon’s army (An. 5.6.21, 6.2.7) and was of logistic assistance in various ways (An. 5.6.35, 6.2.3) though relations were uneasy (An. 6.2.8).

The citizens were divided into the three Doric tribes, and each tribe seems to have been subdivided into four hekatostyes (making a total of twelve) until a politically motivated increase to sixty hekatostyes gave the democratic faction greater political participation (Aen. Tact. 11.10). For alternative interpretations of the two-tier system, see Jones, POAG 281–83. At this stage the adult male citizen population can be accepted at some 6,000 (Beloch apud Burstein (1976) 115 n. 61).

The native Mariandynoi are said to have ceded some of the territory to the colonists in return for support against the neighbouring Kaukones, and then to have lost more in warfare against their protectors. In 480 they were still an independent tribe, sending troops to Xerxes as their overlord (Hdt. 3.90, 7.72). Later they were in group subjection to the Herakleiots, tied to the land and bound to row in the fleet, but safe from sale overseas (Strabo 12.3.4). Different terms are used, and two groups of dependants may be intended, perioikoi and georgountes (Arist. Pol. 1327b11–12), and a third, dorophoroi, indicating tributary status (Poll. 3.83). The class was a famous case of Dorian subjection of men within their state (Arist. Pol. 1327b11–15; Paus. 5.26.7; Ath. 6.263c–D). It brought prosperity, but also political strains and excesses (Just. Epit. 16.3.8; Frolov (1981); Saprykin (1981); Avram (1984)).

Products of the area were tunny fish, walnuts and timber, but especially wine and the associated pottery products (trade amphoras). The trade amphoras of Herakleia are found widely in the Black Sea area, characterised by so-called englyphic stamps. They are numerous on sites of c.400 through C4 and beyond (Grakov (1926); Balabanov (1982); Brashinskij (1984)). The cross-Pontic interests of Herakleia show up in the C4 proxeny decrees at Olbia (no. 690) (I. Olbia 2 and 6 = Dubois (1996) 20) and grave stelai at Nymphaion on the Bosporos (CIRB 923, 925). Influence of Herakleia has been detected on the coin types of Theodosia (no. 707), Phanagoria (no. 706) and the Sindoi (Sindikos Limen), and also on those of her own colonies, Chersonesos (no. 695) and Kallatis (no. 686), these types being a buttressing bull and the head or the club of Herakles.

By C5s Herakleia was a fortified city (Xen. An. 6.2.8); at Themistius 20.239c, Dindorff, is a reference to a proasteion where the C4 Athenian politician Anytos was buried;
Theopomp. fr. 181 refers to private houses. Diog. Laert. 5.91 has a reference to a theatre in a C4 context, and Polyain. 2.3.2.1 has one to a bouleuterion during Klearchos’ rule (364–352) (cf. Hansen and Fischer-Hansen (1994) 39). The town was grid-planned, perhaps already in the Classical period (Hoepfner and Schwander (1986) 3–4), but there are few archaeological traces of the Classical period at Herakleia: a late Archaic head in east Greek style (Akurgal (1986)), and coins of the tyrant dynasty (Franke (1966)). But Herakleiotiots commissioned several works in Greek sanctuaries, a statue group of Herakles’ deeds, to commemorate the repulse of the native Mariandynoi, at Olympia (Paus. 5.26.7), and a statue of Apollo at Delphi (Paus. 10.51.1).

Herakleia possessed no natural harbour or major river estuary, but a bay with a projecting headland (Baba burun) to the north-east. Ancient moles, perhaps Hellenistic and Roman, improved protection for shipping (Lehmann-Hartleben (1923) 13; Wilson (1976b)). The headland was Acherousias, where the small river Acheron (Soonautes) flowed and was said to descend deep into Hades (Xen. An. 6.2.2). Beyond the bay to the south-west, some 5 km distant, was the river Lykos, and further again at 15 km the small river Kales, scene of the Athenian naval losses and an emporion of the Herakleiotai (Dörner and Hoepfner (1962) 579).

Herakleiot silver coinage (on a standard similar to the Aiginetan used at Sinope (no. 729)) began in C4. Denominations: tetradrachm, drachm, hemidrachm, tetrobol, diobol, obol. Types: (1) obv. Herakles wrestling with lion; rev. squared square; legend: ΗΡΑΚ / ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΑ; (2) Obv. head of Herakles; rev. bull butting; legend: ΗΡΑΚ / ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΑ; (3) Obv. same; rev. club; legend: ΗΡΑΚ / ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΑ. (4) Obv. same; rev. head of Hera wearing stephané; legend: ΗΡΑΚ / ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΑ. A change of type occurs with Timotheos and Dionysios (c.345). Obv. head of Dionysos with thyrsos; rev. Herakles holding a lion skin and erecting a trophy; legend: ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΥ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ. The full city-ethnic ΗΡΑΚΛΕΩΣΤΑΝ appears on coins from C4 onwards (Price (1993) pls. LVII–LVIII; SNG Cap. Bithynia 405–23).

716. Iasonia Map 87. Lat. 41.10, long. 37.40 (promontory). Size of territory: ? Type: Αξα. The toponym is Iασoνια in Ps.-Skylax 88, where it is described as an akropolis Hellenis in the territory of the Chalybes. Xen. An. 6.2.1 calls it akte, whereas other writers make it a promontory, akra/akron (e.g. Strabo 12.3.17). Perhaps Ps.-Skylax has here combined Iasonia akra with a polis Sidé/Polemonium (cf. Müller GGM 1 65 note ad § 88).

717. Karambis Map 86. Lat. 42.00, long. 33.20 (promontory). Size of territory: ? Type: Αχα. The toponym is Κάραµβις in Ps.-Skylax 90, where it is called a polis Hellenis. In all other sources (e.g. Ps.-Skymnos 998, Diller; Strabo 12.3.10), except Plin. HN 6.2.6 (oppidum), Karambis is a cape or promontory.

718. Karoussa Map 87. Lat. 41.50, long. 35.10. Size of territory: ? Type: Αχα. The toponym is Κάρωσσα in Ps.-Skylax 89, where it is called polis Hellenis. It lay close to, and was probably a limen and emporion of, Sinope (no. 729) (Anon. Peripl. M. Eux. 24). It has been suggested that the place was a member of the Delian League, but this is based on an unconvincing restoration of the name [Κάρο]αα (IG i³ 71.1.166).

719. Kerassos (Kerasountios) Map 87. Lat. 40.55, long. 38.20. Size of territory: ? Type: Αξα. The toponym is Κέρασος in Xen. An. 5.3.2; Ps.-Skylax 89). The city-ethnic is Κέρασοντιός in Xen. An. 5.7.17.

Kerasos is called polis in the urban sense at Xen. An. 5.3.2 and Ps.-Skylax 89 (cf. Diod. 14.30.5); it was certainly also a polis in the political sense: the collective use of the city-ethnic is found several times in Xen. An. (5.5.10, 7.13, 20, 22, 24, 31); like Trapezous (no. 734) (Xen. An. 4.8.22) and Kotyora (no. 722) (Xen. An. 5.5.3), it is described as a colony of Sinope (no. 729), and since both Trapezous (Xen. An. 5.5.15) and Kotyora (Xen. An. 5.5.7) were poleis in the political sense, so should Kerasos be. Finally, both Trapezous and Kotyora paid tribute to Sinope, and so did Kerasos (Xen. An. 5.5.10); the inference is that Kerasos was a polis in the political sense, though, like Trapezous and Kotyora, it must have been a dependent polis, i.e. a colony dependent on its metropolis (Hansen (1997b) 33; Nielsen (2000) 135).

Kerasos was situated among the Kolchoi, some 3 days’ march west of Trapezous (Xen. An. 5.3.2, 7.13–30). The army of Xenophon’s men in retreat from Kounaxa (400) was counted there, 8,600 remaining. They stayed at the city and used an external market for 10 days, but then caused disturbance and offence when leaving. The city was a colony and dependency of Sinope (supra), which had driven the natives out and protected the citizens, who in turn paid a tax (δασµός, Xen. An. 5.3.2, 10). During Athens’ brief exercise of sea power in the Black Sea, Kerasos was probably, along with Apollonia (no. 682) and Herakleia (no. 715), a tribute-paying member of the Euxine section of the Delian League (Κέρασος ααος) in IG i³ 71.1.169, one of the more plausible restorations in the assessment list of 425(4).

The Classical site was probably at Foli Bazar (Giresun Dere Su). Pharnakes I of Pontos moved the population to a new
site at Pharnakia, which was perhaps previously called
Choireades, near the Isle of Ares (Kerasu Ada). Ps.-Skylax 86
calls this Choireades a polis Hellenis. A Kerasus is placed
by Ps.-Skylax 89 west of Sinope, but this appears to be a
misplaced reference to the Kerasous east of Sinope, i.e. the
present one, perhaps to be located at Fol Bazar.

720. Kinolis  Map 86. Lat. 42.00, long. 34.10. Size of territ-
ory: ? Type: A: a. The toponym is Κίνωλις in Ps.-Skylax 90,
where it is called a polis Hellenis, on the coast of Paphlagonia.

721. Koloussa  Map 86. Lat. 41.55, long. 34.15. Size of territ-
ory: ? Type: A: a. The toponym is Κόλουσσα in Ps.-Skylax 90,
where it is called a polis Hellenis, on the coast of Paphlagonia.

722. Kotyora (Kotyorites)  Map 87. Lat. 41.00, long. 37.50.
Size of territory: ? Type: A: a. The toponym is Κότυορα
(Xen. An. 5.5.3), spelled Κύτωρος by Strabo 12.3.17, probably
in confusion with Κύτωρος west of Sinope. The city-ethnic is
Κοτυωρίτης (Xen. An. 5.5.10).

Kotyora is called a polis in the urban sense at Xen. An.
5.5.3.11, and in the political sense at Xen. An. 5.5.7. The city-
ethnic Κοτυωρίτης is repeatedly given in the plural by
Xenophon (Xen. An. 5.5.10f). By Csil Kotyora had walls and
could provide a market; private houses are mentioned at
Xen. An. 5.5.11. Kotyora excluded the troops of Xenophon’s
army because of their riotous behaviour on leaving the sister
town Kerasous (no. 719) (Xen. An. 5.7.18–30). The troops
spent 45 days outside Kotyora, waiting for the merchants of
Sinope and Herakleia to gather transport ships to take the
army westward (Xen. An. 5.5.3).

The territory of Kotyora is termed χώρα at Xen. An. 5.5.7;
it was in the territory of the Tibarenoi (Xen. An. 5.5.3). The
chora was apparently won for it by the Sinopeans, for which
it paid a tax (δασιμέκ) to them, and was administered by a
governor (ἄρχων) appointed by them (Xen. An. 5.5.10,
20). It was a colony of Sinope (no. 729), and a dependency at
least in Csil/Cae (Xen. An. 5.5.3).

Kotyora (modern Ordu) lay 300 km east of Sinope. It was
at least partially depopulated by Pharmakes I of Pontos to
make up his new polis of Pharmakia in C2e. By the time of
Strabo (12.3.17) it was a πολέχρη.

723. Kromna (Kromnites)  Map 86. Lat. 41.50, long. 32.40.
Size of territory: ? Type: Ba: a. The toponym is Κρόμνα, ἦ
(Hom. Il. 2.855, cf. Strabo 12.3-5); the legend KPΩMNA is
found on C4 coins. The city-ethnic is Κρομνίτης (CIRB 199
(C4f); I.Sinope 1.24 (353/2–346/5)).

According to Strabo 12.3.10, Kromna was one of four
katoikiai which were drawn into a now unified polis,
725. Limne Map 87. Not in Barr. Size of territory?: Type: Aγ. The toponym is Λίμνη, η, a polis, not specified as Ηλληνις, located east of Trapezous (no. 734) in the territory of the Ekecheireis (Ps.-Skylax 83).

726. Lykastos Map 87. Lat. 41.05–20, long. 36.00–20 (river). Size of territory?: Type: Αα. The toponym is Λύκαστος, η (Ps.-Skylax 89; Eust. II. 2.647, quoting Steph. Byz.). According to Ps.-Skylax, Lykastos is the name of both a river and a polis Ηλληνις. Same information in Plin. HN 6.9. Steph. Byz. classifies Lykastos as a settlement, probably a polis. According to Pompon. 1.105, Λυκαστος was an urbs. Anon. Peripl. M. Euξ. records only the river Lykastos.

727. Odeinios Map 87. Lat. 41.00, long. 40.45 (river). Size of territory?: Type: Αα. The toponym is Ωδεινιος in Ps.-Skylax 83, where it is called polis Ηλληνις, in the territory of the Ekecheireis. This is almost certainly the river Adiēnos of Att. Peripl. M. Euξ. 8 and Anon. Peripl. M. Euξ. 39. A native polis then?

728. Sesamos (Sesamenos)/Amastris (Amastrianos) Map 86. Lat. 41.45, long. 32.25. Size of territory: unknown in C6–C4. Type: Αα. The toponym is Σήσαμος, η (Hom. Ill. 2.853, discussed by Strabo 12.3.10; Ps.-Skylax 90). The city-ethnic is Σήσαμηνος (I.Sinope 1.24 (353/2–346/5)).

At Ps.-Skylax 90, Sesamos is one of the many places labelled πόλις Ηλληνις (cf. 928). C300–290 Sesamos became the centre of the newly synoecised city Amastris, which was formed by Queen Amastris, formerly wife of Dionysios of Herakleia and latterly wife of Lysimachos, out of four pre-existing katoikiai (Strabo 12.3.10). The synoecised communities are called poleis and attributed to Miletos (no. 854) by Ps.-Skymnos 1005, Diller, probably referring to the time of foundation which is, however, unknown. The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found abbreviated on C4s coins (infra); the external collective use is found in I.Sinope 1.24 (353/2–346/5).

The treaty of symmachia between Sinope (no. 729) and “Satyros and the sons of Klearchos” of Herakleia (no. 715) (I.Sinope 1.23–34 (353/2–346/5), on which see 957) stipulates that the Sesamenes may, if they wish, be included in the alliance. Enmity between Sesamos and the Persian satrap Datames is alluded to at Polyaena, 7.21.2. In Hellenistic and Roman times it became a large and beautiful city on a peninsula and with two harbours (Lehmann-Hartleben 1923 13–22; Wilson (1976a)). The koinonia of C4/C3e propelled the city into new prominence. It was near, but not on, the large river Parthenios, at the modern Turkish town of Amsara. See further Kromna (no. 723), Kytoros (no. 724) and Tiecion (no. 733).

Sesamos struck coins of silver and bronze in C4s. (1) Silver on the Rhodian standard: denominations: tetrobol, diobol. Types: obv. head of Zeus; rev. head of Demeter r. with corn-ear in hair; legend: ΣΗΣΑΜ or ΣΗΣΑΜΗ. (2) Bronze: obv. head of Zeus, or Apollo; rev. head of Demeter(?), or Kantharos; legend: ΣΗΣΑ (Head, HN² 507; Price (1993) pl. IV). Later silver of Amastris was struck on a local Herakleiot standard and has legends ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΣ ΧΑΜΣ ΑΜΑΣΤΡΙΟΣ or ΑΜΑΣΤΡΗΝΩΝ (Price (1993) pl. LXI).

739. Sinope (Sinopeus) Map 87. Lat. 42.00, long. 35.10. Size of territory: 5. Type: Αα. The toponym is Σινώπη, η (I.Sinope 1.10 (353/2–346/5?); Hdt. 1.76.1; Xen. An. 5.5.7). Σινώπα in Doric (I.Cos 20.21 (C4f)). The city-ethnic is Σινωπεύς (I.Olbia 1 = Dubois (1996) 1 (C5f); I.Sinope 1.2; Xen. An. 5.5.8; Aen. 3.40.4).

Sinope is called a polis both in the urban sense (Hdt. 4.12.2; Xen. An. 5.5.23; Ps.-Skylax 89) and in the political sense (I.Sinope 5.5 (C4); Xen. An. 5.5.8). A C4l decree from Kos refers to the δάμος ο Σινωπεύς (I.Cos 20; cf. I.Sinope 1 = SEG 35 1356 (C4) which also grants politia. Patris is found in AG Appendix Epigr. Sepulchr. 254,3 and patra in 709,5. Sinope’s politia was among those described by Aristotle (Arist fr. 599).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is found internally in I.Sinope 1.2 (353/2–346/5) and 5.4–5 (C4) and may also be attested in abbreviated form on coins (infra); externally it is found at Xen. An. 5.5.8,13; Aen. 3.40.4; and I.Cos 20 (C4l). The external individual use of the city-ethnic is found in I.Olbia 1 (C5f); IG ii 10327 (C4f), 10334/5 (C4m), 10343 (C4f), 10345 (C4f), etc.; I.Oropos 520.25 (329–325); RPh 63 (1937) 325–32 A.14 (C4, Chios); CIRB 208 (C4, Pantikapaion), and SEG 28 725 (c.300, Eretria).

All are agreed that Sinope was a colony of Miletos (no. 854), but the complex foundation story is found in only one source (Ps.-Skymnos 981–97, Diller). This comes in four parts. First, an Amazon Sinope was its eponym (in some perhaps earlier versions Sinope was a nymph, daughter of Asopus). At this stage the Leukosyroii lived there, but they were driven out by the Thessalian heroes Autolykos, Phlogios and Deileon, who had been followers of either Herakles against the Amazons (Plut. Luc. 23) or Jason (Strabo 12.3.11). Then Habron (Habrondas) came, a Milesian by birth, but seemingly he was killed by the Kimmerians. Then after the Kimmerians came Koos and Kretines, who were exiled from Miletos; these men jointly refounded it when the host of the
Kimmerians overran Asia. The first stage is aetiological, attempting to explain a difficult name, which was perhaps Kappadokian, but ancients sought to link it with a Thracian origin in the meaning “drunken”. The conversion of Sinope from nymph (Eumelos (FGrHist 451) fr. 5) to Amazon was probably brought about by the absence of a significant river at Sinope and by the proximity of “Amazon” country to the east. The episode of the Thessalian heroes was taken seriously at Sinope, where an oracle of Autolykos existed, and he was venerated as oikistes and a god (Strabo 12.3.11); but this was probably intended to lay down a claim for Sinope as a participant in Jason’s voyage to Kolchis. A cult statue of Autolykos, probably intended to lay down a claim for Sinope as a participant for the satrap Ariaramnes to take across the Black Sea (before the expedition of Dareios into Skythia? Ktesias (FGrHist 688) fr. 13 (20)). Similarly some of the eighty ships from the Hellespont and Pontos will have been provided for Xerxes’ fleet by Sinope (Diod. 11.3.8). L.Sinopei (355/2–346/5) is a treaty of symmachia between, on the one hand, Sinope and, on the other, “Satyros and the sons of Klearchos”, for which see further supra 957, 959.

By the 370s her maritime interests brought Sinope into conflict with Sestos (no. 672), which was perhaps interfering with her shipping on its way to the Aegean (Polyaen. 7.21.2), and towards the end of the century (309–304) Eumelos of Bosporos was said to have greatly aided Sinope and Byzantium (no. 674) in their wider Black Sea interests (Diod. 20.25). Sinope increasingly came under threat from the peoples and rulers inland: Korylas (Xen. An. 5.6.8), Otis of the Paphlagonians (Hell. 4.1.13; Ages. 3.4), and the Persian satrap Datames (384–c.362), who besieged the city (Polyaen. 7.21.2, 5; cf. Aen. Tact. 40.4). The latter (with legends in Greek) and the satrap Aribazranes (in Aramaic lettering) issued silver coins of Sinopean type, showing by imitation her commercial success (Price (1993) pl. LIII; SNG Cop. PaphLAGONIA 290).
The constitution was described in the lost Aristotelian Politia (Arist. fr. 599). In C4, it was a democracy: I.Sinope 1.27–28 (353/2–346/5) describes the constitution as demos = democracy, and I.Sinope 3.1 (C4) uses the enactment formula ἐδοκεῖ τῷ δήμῳ.

At least from the period of Athenian influence it had a boule and an ekklēsia (D. Robinson (1905) no. 40); a bronze heliast's ticket has been found there, inscribed ΔΣΤΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΔΑΜΕΟΣ (Robert (1937) 296ff no. 13). Magistrates were prytaneis and agoranomoi (Ehrhardt (1988) 207); strategoi are mentioned as movers of a decree in I.Sinope 3 = SEG 35 1356 (C4). I.Sinope 7 (C48) attests a nomophylakos and a boules epistates and grammateus. State cults typical of Miletos (no. 854) were Apollo Ietros, Delphinios (deduced from personal names (Ehrhardt (1988) 142, 144)) and Poseidon Helikonios (ibid. 171–72).

Unique to Sinope was Zeus/Dis as a supposed prototype for Sarapis (Tac. Hist. 4,85), and the oracle cult of Autolykos, the legendary founder. He had a C4 statue in the city made by Stenniss (Strabo 12.3.11), which was carried off by Lucullus. I.Sinope 7 (C48) is a dedication by a board of prytaneis to Hestia Prytaneia (which presumably means that there was a prytaneion at Sinope).

I.Sinope 5 (C4) is a grant of proxeny by Sinope to a citizen of Kos (no. 497); I.Sinope 3 is a fragmentary C4 grant of citizenship (and presumably other privileges) to a citizen of Kallatis (no. 686), and I.Sinope 6 (C4) likewise preserves a grant of citizenship; I.Sinope 4 (C4) is a fragmentary decree for an unknown man who in the preserved text is granted ἀτέλεια ἑκατὸν στατήρων χρυσοῦ (“exemption from all taxes up to 100 gold staters” (editor)) as well as the right to enter and leave the harbour ἀσυλε ἡ ἀσυνοδε (“inviolably and without treaty” (editor)). A C5f proxeny decree for a Sinopean is known from Olbia (no. 690; I.Olbia 1 = Dubois (1996) 1), and a C4 grant is known from Chios (RPh 63 (1937) 325–33 A.14). Burial stelai of Sinopeans of the period are well represented at Athens (Osborne and Byrne (1996) 289–93), and one comes from Pantikapaion (CIRB 298). A citizen of Sinope achieved a victory in the pankration at the Amphiaraia at Oropos in C4s (IG vii 11 414.25 = I.Oropos 520 (329/8 or 325/4); SEG 30 1456 is a C5f bronze prize hydria from the Hekatombaion Games of Hera Argeia, found in a grave at Sinope, and suggests that a Sinopean was victorious in these games.

The nearer chorai of Sinope lay on the peninsula, which the ancients likened to a steering oar (πηδάλιον, Plut. Luc. 23); some moderns have imagined that it resembles a boar’s head (Maximova (1956) 32 n. 1, quoting D. Robinson with approval). It is termed χώρα in I.Sinope 1.6 (353/2–346/5) and at Xen. An. 5.6.11, and called Συνωπϊκή γῆ (Strabo 3.2.6), while at Xen. An. 6.1.15 the toponym Συνωπιτη presumably designates the territory. Above the town were many garden allotments and suburbs, and the fertile peninsula’s shores were protected by cliffs and sharp rock formations at and below sea level (Strabo 12.3.11). Her coastal region stretched westward to Harmene (walled townlet), which served as a harbour, at which to keep Xenophon’s army quarantined from the city (Xen. An. 6.1.15), and eastward via Karousa to the river Haly. On the landward side Sinope seems to have been confined to the coastal strip, partly by the natural lay of the mountains, and partly by the Paphlagonian or Kappadokian (Pontic) kings. The resources from the coastal strip were olives, maple and box-tree, shipbuilding and furniture timber, nuts and cherries (Strabo 12.3.12). Her colonies to the east—Kotyora (no. 722), Kerasous (no. 719) and Traceous (no. 734)—were, by the time of Xenophon, dependent poleis, colonies of Sinope (Kotyora (no. 722) paid a dasmos to Sinope: Xen. An. 5.5.10). They gave her access to the silver, iron and slaves—resources of the coastal Kolchoi, Chalybes and Tibarenoi. As “Paphlago” was regarded as a typical slave-name in Classical Greece it is likely that Sinope traded profitably in Paphlagonians too. From inland came the Kappadokian ruddle called Sinopis (red earth for rendering ships water-tight (Theophr. De lapidibus 52)) and there was the long-range overland journey across Asia, from Amisos (no. 712) to the eastern Mediterranean at Tarsos, in which Sinope seems to have had a strong interest. But above all, the métier of Sinopio seems to have been the sea: her catch of tunny fish was famous (Strabo 12.3.11), and her site on the peninsula, opposite the southern tip of the Crimea (Strabo 12.3.10), not far from a recognised crossing to Sindike on the Asiatic side of the Kimmerian Bosporos opposite Bata (Strabo 11.2.13) on the Caucasus coast, made her the ideal harbour on which to converge from all shores of the Black Sea. The matchless virtues of its site on the long Turkish coast have already been remarked on. Clearly the sea was, in a real sense, her territory even more than the Pedalion (the peninsula), the narrow stretch of Sinopitis, and the vulnerable lands around her colonies.

Sinope receives two detailed descriptions in ancient literature (Polyb. 4.56; Strabo 12.3.11). It lay on an isthmus 400 m wide at its narrowest and on part of the peninsula (modern Ince Burun), pushing eastward from the mainland of Turkey. It was a little more than halfway (560 km) along the coast from the entrance to the Black Sea. It was three days’
sail on to the river Phasis and Kolchis, and a day-and-night’s sail (from Cape Karambis) to the southern tip of the Crimea. Sinope possessed harbours to the north and south of the isthmus; that to the south is the finest natural harbour on the whole 900 km stretch of the modern Turkish Black Sea coast (Maximova (1956) 37, map of the eighteenth century; Akurgal (1976)). Local Pontic tradition speaks of three harbours, July, August and Sinop, ensuring safety for ships!

Archaeological material from Sinope consists of chance finds from the cemetery to the west of the town, made during the building of a match factory in the 1920s and sporadically from the 1930s to 1980s. There were excavations in 1951–53, during which a Hellenistic temple and altar (to Sarapis?) were brought to light and left conserved in the public park (Akurgal and Budde (1956) 27–41). The earliest pottery found dates from C31 and C6e (Boysal (1959) 8–9). Sculptured grave stelai, in what seems local work of C51, were found in 1925 (Akurgal (1948) 581–88), and there are more standard types of stelai of C5–C4. A number of simple column stelai of C4–C3 have been published recently, bearing such Milesian theophoric names as Delphinios and Molpagoras (Jones (1988); French (1990)). Two bronze hydriae from the cemetery give some idea of wealth in C4 (Akurgal and Budde (1956) 12–16; Uygur (1989) 209–11). Finds of deposits of Sinopean olive oil and wine trade amphoras (French (1985)), and most recently of kilns for their production (at Zeytinlik on Sinope’s southern bay and at Demirai 15 km away) are recent indicators of Sinope’s most prominent branch of production (Kassab-Tezgör (1999)). From c.360–350 Sinope produced bulk-carrying amphoras for her olive oil and perhaps some wine, which were exported all over the Black Sea region until c.200/183 (Gronov (1929); Tsekhmistenko (1958) 56f; Brashinski (1962); Monakhov (1993); Conovici (1998) 21–51). It appears from Aen. Tact. 40.4 that Sinope was fortified by c.370 (cf. Whitehead (1990) ad loc.)

The earliest coinage of Sinope dates from before the Athenian colony, perhaps c.480–460 when silver coins were struck on the Aiginetan standard. Denomination: drachm. Types: obv. head of eagle, below a small dolphin, on many examples the head is very crude, on some very fine; rev. incuse, opposed lozenges with dots or finely stippled (Hind (1976); Kraay and Moorey (1981); Price (1993) pl. LI; SNG Cop. Paphlagonia 272–73). A change of type comes in C4, perhaps after the departure of the Athenian colonists: obv. head of nympha Sinope, sometimes in a ring of dots; rev. eagle flying, apparently clutching a small dolphin; legend: ΣΙΝΩΣ. Smaller denominations (hemi- or quarter-drachms and obols) have the eagle facing with wings outstretched, perhaps hinting at a connection with Amisos (no. 712) (Price (1993) pls. LI–LIV; SNG Cop. Paphlagonia 274–89). The theme of the eagle on dolphin, repeated with variants at Istros (no. 685) and Olbia (no. 690), suggests that this may be an “alliance type” such as noted in Ionia and Hellespont, and at Byzantium (no. 674)/Kalchedon (no. 743) at roughly the same time, taking the cult of Zeus Ourios as its patron (Hind (1999b)). An alternative view is that all three cities adopted symbols of Zeus (eagle) and Apollo (dolphin) to advertise their civic cults (Karyshkovskij (1982)). The legend on the reverses of the silver coins of c.410–300 is ΣΙΝΩΣ, which could be an abbreviated form of the toponym or the collective city-ethnic. That it is the city-ethnic is indicated by the Aramaic inscription on the C4 coins (“people of Sinope”). That it is the toponym is indicated by the later Hellenistic coins inscribed ΣΙΝΩΠΗΣ (SNG Cop. Paphlagonia 302–13).

730. Stameneia Map 87. Lat. 41.05, long. 37.45. Size of territory: ? Type: Ά. The toponym is Σταμανέια (Ps.-Skylax 88, conj. for MS Μιανέια). According to Ps.-Skylax, a polis Hellenis in the territory of the Chalybes, located east of Amisos (no. 712). Stamene (sic) is mentioned by Hecat. fr. 196 = Steph. Byz. 584.18: σύνθεσις της Χαλυβιών. Therefore a barbarian polis?

731. Tetrakis Map 86. Unlocated. Size of territory: ? Type: Ά. The toponym is Στεράκις in Ps.-Skylax 89, where it is called a polis Hellenis. It is otherwise unknown, but placed by Ps.-Skylax west of Sinope (no. 729) and Harmene in the lands of the Assyrioi (= Leukosyroi).

732. Themiskyra Map 87. Lat. 41.15, long. 37.00. Size of territory: ? Type: Ά. The toponym is Θεμισκύρα, η (Ps.-Skylax 89) or Θεμισκύρη, η (Hdt. 4.86.3; Steph. Byz. 677.4). Ps.-Skylax calls it a polis Hellenis. According to most authors (e.g. Hdt. 4.86.3; Pompon. 1.105), it was a former city of the Amazons or of the Leukosyroi, situated by the river Thermodon. By Strabo’s time it was a “plain and former abode of the Amazons” (12.3.14–15; cf. Steph. Byz. 677.4).

733. Tion (Tianos) Map 86. Lat. 41.35, long. 32.00. Size of territory: ? Type: Ά. The toponym is Τίειος, τό (Ps.-Skylax 90; Strabo 12.3.10 (conj.), 4.7). Alternative forms are Τιος, η (Mennon (FGRh Hist 434) 15.19; Pompon. 1.104) or Τιος, τό (Ael. NA 15.5; Ptol. Geog. 5.1.3). The city-ethnic Τιανός is found on Cal/C3e coins (infra).

Tieon is called a polis Hellenis in the urban sense at Ps.-Skylax 90; it was one of four settlements (katoikiai) brought
together in the new foundation Amastris, by the former wife of Dionysios, tyrant of Herakleia and latterly wife of Lysimachos C300–290 (Strabo 12.3.10). The synoecised communities are called polesis and attributed to Miletos (no. 854) by Ps.-Skymnos 1005, Diller, probably referring to the time of foundation, which is, however, unknown; Pompon. 1.104 also says that Tieion was Miletian. The collective city-ethnic is attested internally on coins (infra); the external individual use is found in three sepulchral inscriptions from Athens (IG ii² 10488 (Tiavý, C4m), 10449 (C4m) and 10450 (C5l)).

Soon after the synoecism, Teyion became independent again from the koimonia (Strabo 12.3.10). Bronze coinage of C4l/C3e, inscribed ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΙΑ, reflects these events (infra).

Teyion (Hisarenu) lay at the mouth of the river Billaios (Filyos-Çayı) in the territory of the Kaukones (Strabo 12.3.5). To the west lay Bithynia and, to the east, Paphlagonia—with the river Parthenios some 20 km distant.

Nothing of Classical date is known from the site, except for its general layout (Bean (1976)). Foundation legends search for heroic connection; Dionysos is κτίστης on coins of Roman date (Head, HN 1 518); Tios, a Miletian priest, was the founder, according to Philon apud Steph. Byz. 624.20–21; one Pataros took the land of Paphlagonia and named it Dia ἐκ τοῦ τιμᾶν τὸν Δία (Demosthenes' Bithyniaka apud Steph. Byz. 624.21–23). See also Kromna (no. 723), Kytoros (no. 724) and Sesamos (no. 728).

Teyion struck bronze coins in C4l/C3e. Types: obv. head of Zeus; rev. eagle; legend: ΤΙΑΝΟΣ, or: obv. female head in stephane and splendone; legend: ΤΙΑΝΟΣ; rev. Eleutheria seated; legend: ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΙΑ (Head, HN 2 518; Price (1993) pl. LIX).

734. Trapezous (Trapezountios) Map 87. Lat. 41.00, long. 39.45. Size of territory in C5–C4: ? Type: A-α. The toponym is Τραπεζοῦς, -τους, ἦ (Xen. An. 4.8.22; Ael. NA 5.42; Ps.-Skylax 85). The city-ethnic is Τραπεζοῦντιος (Xen. An. 5.4.1).

Trapezous is called polis both in the urban sense (Xen. An. 4.8.22; Ps.-Skylax 85; πόλις Ἐλευθερία) and in the political sense (Xen. An. 5.5.15). The collective use of the city-ethnic may be attested internally in abbreviated form on C5l/C4e coins (infra) and is attested externally in several passages of the Anabasis, e.g. 4.8.23, 5.1.11. The external individual use is found at Xen. An. 5.4.2: Τιμησθέω ὁ Τραπεζοῦντιος who was proxenos of the Mossynoikoi.

According to Xenophon, Trapezous was a colony (apokia) of Sinoe (no. 729) in the land of the Kolchoi, who lived in komai in its territory (Xen. An. 4.8.22; Hansen (1995) 79–80). The Armenian version of Eusebios provides a date for Trapezous that is precise but wrong (Ann. Abr. 1260 = 757/6),1 which is almost certainly a confusion with the entry for Kyzikos (no. 747) in the Latin of Jerome (Hind (1988) 213–14; Huxley (1990) 199; Ivanitchk (1998) 314–18). This unreliable tabular date apart, there is no trace of a colonisation date for Trapezous.

The army of Xenophon borrowed from the Trapezountians two ships, one pentekonter and one triakonter, with which to commandeer transport ships (which were sailing past to Phasis and back) in order to convey the troops westward (Xen. An. 5.1.1, 3.11). Some Arkadians from Trapezous (no. 303) in Arkadia are said to have joined this colony after refusing to join the synoecism of Megalopolis (Paus. 8.27.6); if historical, the many Arkadians in the army of the Ten Thousand may have provided information to their fellows about the city with the same name in the Pontos that had been so welcoming to Greeks (Xen. An. 4.8.23, 5.1.14, 2.2). At the end of C5 Trapezous was a dependant polis, paying tribute (dasmos) to Sinoe (no. 729) (Xen. An. 5.5.10).

Trapezous (modern Trabzon) lies 460 km east of Sinoe. It profited from the coastal route east to Phasis, and from a route inland to the south. It had supplies of timber and silver in the hills. Its greatest period of glory was in Roman and Byzantine times, when it outlasted Byzantion itself by eight years, succumbing to the Ottomans in 1461.

Trapezous struck silver coins on the Persic standard in C5l–C4e. Denominations: drachm and quarter. Types: obv. head of young man with short, stubby beard; rev. table with pile of coins; legend: ΤΡΑ. The reverse type, a money-changer’s table = πράξεις, seems to be a clear case of a punning type (Head, HN 2 499; Price (1993) pl. XLVIII). That the legend is an abbreviated form of the city-ethnic is indicated by the attestation of the full form of the ethnic on coins of the Imperial period.
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THE PROPONTIC COAST
OF ASIA MINOR
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I. The Region

It is difficult to define the frontiers of the regions of north-western Asia Minor between the entrance to the Black Sea (the hieron of Zeus Ourios) and the Hellespont. Different toponyms are used by different ancient writers: Bithynia, Mysia, Phrygia, Troas, Propontis, Hellespontos, and they denote different regions in different contexts. Modern scholars allow for a certain “mobility” of the frontiers; cf., e.g., the Archaeological Reports, where the evidence concerning the Asian coast of the Sea of Marmara is grouped under the headings “Mysia and the Propontis” (Mitchell (1985) 74), “Bithynia, Mysia and the Propontis” (Mitchell (1990) 89) and “Bithynia and the Propontis” (Mitchell (1999) 129).

It is generally assumed that the Propontis includes both the European and the Asian shores of the Sea of Marmara, whereas the geographical term Hellespontos (discussed by Leaf (1923) 50–52) is used for the region of the Dardanelles. However, there has never been agreement about where to draw the line between the Propontis and the Hellespont. This problem is explicitly summarised by Strabo 7 fr. 58: καλοῦσιν ‘Ελλήσποντον...οἱ µὲν τὸ ἀπὸ Σιγείου ἐπὶ Οἰκίνῳ καὶ Κύζικον ἢ Πάριον ἢ Πρίαπον. For Strabo himself, Parion (no. 756) is a city in the Propontis (10.5.7); for Herodotos (4.138.1) and Steph. Byz. 505.13 it is in the Hellespont, while Eustathios wavers between the Propontis (Comm. Dionys. Per. 517) and the Hellespont (Od. 5.125).

Again, confusion reigns about how to subdivide north-western Asia Minor. There are four main sources: (1) Herodotos describes the administrative organisation of the Persian Empire under Dareios I (3.90–97; cf. Debord (1999) 72–82); (2) from 443/2 the members of the Delian League were grouped into districts, one of which was called the Hellespontine; (3) Ps.-Skylax 92–94 describes the coastline of north-western Asia Minor; (4) Strabo repeatedly discusses conflicting opinions found in the sources he used.

In the view of Ps.-Skylax, Bithynia (92) begins with the ἱερὸν ἐν τῷ στόματι τοῦ Πόντου (the hieron of Zeus Ourios; see Kalchedon (no. 743)) and continues to the Gulf of Izmit, called ὁ κόλπος ὁ ’Ολβιανός (see Astakos (no. 737) and Olbia (no. 753)); Mysia (93), described as a peninsula (ἀκτῆς), continues from the left side of the same gulf as far as the Kian Gulf and includes Kios (no. 745), while Phrygia (94) includes the coastal cities of Priapos (no. 758), Parion (no. 756), Lampsakos (no. 748), Perkote (no. 788), Abydos (no. 765) and τὸ στόμα κατὰ Σηστὸν τῆς Προποντίδος as well as the islands of Bysbikos (Besbikos), Prokonnesos and Elaphonnesos. Now it is generally assumed that Mysia was bordered by Mt. Ida (north-west) and Mt. Olympus (north-east), and that the territory of Kios belonged to Mysia (Hdt. 5.122; Xen. Hell. 1.4.7; Hell. Oxy. 17.37), which invites us to follow Ps.-Skylax and allow Mysia to have a coastline (Debord (1999) 75, 92, 150).

No less fluctuating are the frontiers between Phrygia/Mysia and the Troad. The different views are summarised by Strabo 13.1.4: for Eudoxos of Kyzikos the Troad begins at Priapos (no. 758), for Damastes of Sigeion at Parion (no. 756), and for Charon of Lampsakos (FGrHist 262 fr. 13) at the river Praktios. Given the authority of Charon, who excludes his own polity from the Troad, we have preferred to extend Phrygia, if not as far as Abydos as recorded in Ps.-Skylax, then at least to include Lampsakos (no. 748). One has to impose conventional subdivisions, since it seems impossible to harmonise the contradictory pieces of information found in the sources. Ancient geographers seem sometimes to have combined different traditions, like Ptol. Geog. 5.2.2, for whom e.g. Parion and Lampsakos are ἐν Προποντίδι Μυσίας Μικρᾶς τῆς ἐφ’ Ἐλλησπόντῳ.

By and large, this chapter follows Ps.-Skylax and assigns to Bithynia the poleis of Kalchedon (Kadıköy), Astakos and Olbia (in the area of the Gulf of Izmit), all situated on the coast. To Mysia belong, on the coast, Kios (Gemlik) and the unlocated city Kallipolis (no. 744) (between Astakos and
Kios) and, inland, Pythopolis (no. 760) (= Sölőzü, near Kios) and Zeleia (no. 764) (= Sari Köy). The enigmatic Mysia (not considered to be a polis here, cf. infra) remains unlocated, and Helikore too is excluded; cf. the list of non-polis settlements infra.

All the other poleis of the Inventory are to be assigned to Phrygia. Myrleia (no. 752) (= Mudanya), Tereia (no. 763) (παρὰ [Br] ἄλλοις: IG i 3 71.111.111–12), Daskyleion (no. 740) (= Eskel Limanı), the unlocated Plakia (no. 757) (= Kurşunlu?) and Skylake (no. 761), then Artake (no. 736) (Erdek, near Kyzikos), Kyzikos (no. 747) (Balkız), Harpagion (no. 742) (near the mouth of the river Granikos), Priapos (Karabiga), Parion (Kemer), Paisos (no. 755) (= Fanous?), Lampsakos (no. 748) (= Lapseki) were (or must be looked for) on the coast. Further inland were situated, on the river Rhynاداتos, Miletopolis (no. 750) (Melde), Miletouteichos (no. 751), perhaps Artaïou Teichos (no. 753) and Didymon Teichos (no. 741), probably situated on the river Granikos. Finally, there are the poleis on the islands of Bysbikos (no. 738) (= İmralı Adası) and Prokonnesos (no. 759) (= Mermaradasi) and there are the unlocated poleis of Kolonai (no. 746) (in the area of Lampsakos) and Metropolis (no. 749) (near Priapos).

Three poleis remain without any location: (1) Dar(i)eion (no. 739) described at IG i 3 71.111.109–10 as a community παρὰ τὲµ Μυσίαν and at Steph. Byz. 291.11 as a πόλις τῆς Φοργύλας; (2) the community called Otlonoi (no. 754) which is recorded among the Hellespontine poleis in the Athenian assessment decree of 422/1 (IG i 3 77.4.6); and (3) Sombia (no. 762), whose location on the south coast of the Propontis, though very likely, is not certain.

Other settlements recorded by Barr. are excluded from this Inventory. For Hellenistic Prusa (Bursa), Koerte (1899) 412 n.1 and, more recently, Corsten (1993) 22–25 suggested a foundation in C6, citing Strabo 12.4.3 followed by Steph. Byz. 537.5–10, who name as founder a certain Prusias who fought a war against Kroisos. However, taking into account that there is no evidence antedating Strabo and that the first local coinage is dated to C1, it is hard to believe in the historicity of this rather contaminated version of a foundation myth.

Apollonia on the Rhynاداتos (Gölyazi) is also attested in Hellenistic sources only. The first testimony is an inscription found in the Delphinion at Miletos (Milet. 1.3 155 (C2m)) concerning an embassy claiming a Milesian origin for Apollonia. This tradition was accepted by Bilabel (1920) 45–46, 143–44 and especially by L. Robert (1979) 292–93 (cf. L. Robert (1980) 89–98, (1983) 501 n.18), while Seibert (1963) 197–200, Moretti (1979) and Ehrhardt (1988) 47 contested its historicity with various arguments. An attractive solution is the one suggested by Schwertheim (1983) 88–89 and Abmeier (1990) 9–11, who prudently take into account the possible identity between the later Apollonia and Miletouteichos (no. 751).

In the Athenian tribute list of 454/3 are recorded some Μυσαί paying a tribute of 2,000 dr. (IG i 3 259.15), and in the assessment decree of 425/4, among the Hellespontine members, we find a community called Μυσαίοι here, while becoming a regional ethnic denoting all inhabitants of the region of Mysia (Hdt. 1.171.6; Xen. An. 1.9.14). Thus, the Kians were Mysians (Ps.-Skylax 93), but in the tribute lists they are called by their city-ethnic. Also, the small amount paid shows that the Mysio in question must have been the inhabitants of a fairly small community, probably situated somewhere in Mysia. Now, the peninsula north of Kios, the central part of Mysia, is called ἀκτη at Ps.-Skylax 93 and could be described as a Χερσόνησος as well (ΑΠ.Π. Ἰ. 523–24). At the eastern end of the peninsula flows the river Kios and, according to schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.1177, it "encircles Mysia", τῆν Μυσίαν περιμέρων. Here Mysia possibly denotes a settlement rather than a region. Wendel suggested inserting πόλιν after Μυσίαν. His conjecture makes perfect sense, but is probably superfluous. If this interpretation is on the right lines, Mysia was a nucleated settlement inhabited by the Mysioi, i.e. Μυσάς, which is in this context a city-ethnic and not a regional ethnic. It was situated in the Mysian peninsula and near the river Kios. As a parallel one can adduce Ηλίαν, both a city and a region, and Ηλείος, both a city-ethnic and a regional ethnic (see supra 495). Alternatively, Mysia may have been situated north of Mt. Olympos; cf. Strabo 12.4.10: οἱ σερὶ τῶν Ὀλυμπίων Μυσαίοι, οίς οὖν Ἑλλησπόντῳ καλουμένης, οἱ δ’ Ἐλλησπόντιοι compared with Μυσάς Ελλησπόντιος in some ephebic lists from Pergamon (L. Robert (1962) 81). Μυσαίοι πόλεις in Soph. fr. 377, Nauck, is probably a reference to the whole of Mysia, undoubtedly in a mythological context, rather than to a specific polis inhabited by Mysians (Hansen (1998) 129, 131). It cannot be excluded that the Mysioi of the tribute lists is a city-ethnic denoting a polis. However, as the evidence stands, it is preferable to mention the Mysioi in the introduction rather than include them in the Inventory.

“Northern Mysia is still a Cinderella area hardly touched by archaeologists” (Mitchell (1985) 74), and “there is still little archaeological activity in north-western Turkey outside the Troad” (Mitchell (1999) 129). This explains why more
settlements recorded by written sources remain unlocated and why it is so difficult to attain certainty about many of the cities discussed below. It also explains why so few non-polis settlements of the Archaic and Classical periods are known. Almost all attested second-order settlements are Hellenistic or Roman. In the eastern part of the region the only one that reaches back beyond the Hellenistic period is Helikore, a predecessor of Nikaia, the city founded by Lysimachos. A few more second-order settlements are found in the westernmost part of the region in the territories of Parion and Lampsakos. The evidence is as follows.

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Polis


Adrasteia (Ἀδράστεια)  The Homeric Adrasteia (II. 2.828) is mentioned by Strabo 13.1.13 as a polis between Priapos and Parion (cf. Steph. Byz. 28.4; Eust. II. 2 556.9ff, van der Valk). Plin. HN 5.141 notwithstanding, Adrasteia cannot be the former name of Parion (Olshausen 1970 983). Leaf (1912) 184 suggested that Homer’s Adrasteia was the plain on the lower Granikos and located the homonymous town at Örtülüçe, c.12 km south-east of Parion. Barr. C.

Helikore (Ἐλικόρη or Ἰγκώρη)  Steph. Byz. 474.17–18 has Νίκαια πόλις Βιθυνίας . . . ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ πρῶτον Ἰγκώρη. Probably following Arrian’s Bithyniaka, the very late Byzantine Notitia episcopatum has Νίκαια . . . ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ πρῶτον Ἐλικόρη. Merkelbach (1985) suggested reading Ἐλικόρη for MSS Ἰγκώρη in Steph. Byz. However, even accepting this emendation, the evidence is insufficient to assume the early existence of a polis called Helikore prior to its (re)foundation as Nikaia under Lysimachos, but Helikore may have been a village transformed into the polis Nikaia. Barr. C.

Hermamon (Ἑρμαῖων)  Mentioned as the frontier town between Parion and Lampsakos after the Ç5–Ç4m integration of Païos into Lampsakos (Polyaen. 6.24), it has been located at Otlukdere, c.10 km south of Parion, and identified with Hermoton (Arr. Anat. 1.12.6) by Leaf (1923) 100–1; contra Ruge (1942b) 2456; Frisch (1978) 105 n. 5, (1983) 49; Olshausen (1970) 983 rejects the historicity of this record. Barr. C.

Linon (Λίνων or -ος)  Strabo 13.1.15 records Linon (or Linos) as a χωρίον ἐπὶ θαλάσση between Parion and Priapos. Barr. H.

Pitya (Πίτυα)  Strabo 13.1.15; Πίτυα δὲ ἐστὶν ἐν Πιτυοῦντι τῆς Πιτυείας, i.e. lying between Parion and Priapos. Ap. Rhod. Argon. 1.933. This Pitya may have been different from Πιτυεία, which, according to the Homeric tradition, would have been the earlier name of Lampsakos (Leaf 1912) 185–87, (1923) 87–88; R. Kiepert tentatively located it at Aksaz, in the middle of the gulf between Parion and Priapos (Philipppson 1910 map 1; Frisch 1983 51–52). Not in Barr.

II. The Polis

735. Artaiou Teichos (Artaioteichites)  Map 52. Lat. 40.20, long. 28.30. Size of territory: ? Type: C: β. The toponym is Ἀρταιοῦ τείχος, τὸ (IG i³ 71.11.114, 77.14.4–5). According to Steph. Byz. 127.12, quoting Krateros, the city-ethnic is Ἀρταιοτειχίτης (cf. IG i³ 100. fr. 7 = Krateros (FGrHist 342) fr. 6). In spite of the text printed in IG i³ we have no guarantee that the city-ethnic stems from Krateros, and thus from the tribute lists. [Ἀρταιοτε]χίτης at IG i³ 283 11.10 lends some support to the ethnic reported by Stephanos, but is heavily restored.

Stephanos’ note at 127.10–12 suggests the ephemeral existence of a polis in the region of the river Rhynakos: ἐστὶ καὶ Ἀρταιοῦ τείχος πολίχνιον ἐπὶ τῷ Ῥυνδάκῳ ὀσμῷ, ὡς Κράτερος ἐνάτον περὶ ψηφισμάτων. τὸ ἔθνικὸν Ἀρταιοτειχίτης. The name shows that Artaio Teichos was a fortified settlement, and its attestation in an Athenian assessment decree and, possibly, tribute lists shows that it was a political community. Stephanos’ classification of the community as a polichnion carries no weight; but Artaioi Teichos may have been a small polis as indicated by the assessment of 1,000 dr. in 422/1 (IG i³ 77.14.4–5). The name is obviously of Persian origin, since the Persians called themselves Ἀρταίοι (Hdt. 7.61.2; cf. 7.22.2 and 66.2). Hirschfeld (1895a) cautiously identified Artaioi Teichos with Ariace, inserted at Plin. HN 5.142 between Plakia (no. 757) and Skyalke (no. 761), but Ariace is more likely to be identified with Artake (no. 736). A preferable location on the lower Rhynakos is suggested by ATL i. 471.
The city had disappeared: Polyaenus (r3.21). Artake is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 4.14.2, and in Ps.-Skylax 94 Artake is one of the toponyms listed after the heading πόλεως Εὐλυνίδες αἰδε. For the collective and external use of the city-ethnic, see IG i3 261.1.14.

Artake was located on the island of Kyzikos facing Priapos (no. 758) (Strabo 13.1.4), near Kyzikos (no. 747) (Hdt. 4.14.2), and the isthmus (Ps.-Skylax 94), and has been identified with modern (Turkish) Erdek c.7–8 km west of Kyzikos. The modern toponym derives from Greek Artaki (Hirschfeld 1895b) 1304. For descriptions of the site, see Texier (1862) 164–65; Philippson (1910) 52–53; and L. Robert (1955) 131–33, using Radet’s survey from 1887. Of the few archaeological remains, the most important is an Archaic kourion (Laubscher 1963–64) 73ff.

Artake was colonised by Miletos (no. 854) (Anaximenes of Lampsakos (FGrHist 72) fr. 26; cf. Stephan. Byz. 127.13; schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.955). Artake took part in the Ionian Revolt and was burnt by the Persians in 493 (Hdt. 6.33.2). Later it joined the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded from 454/3 (IG i3 259.11.8) to 418/17 (IG i3 287.11.11) a total of sixteen times, twice completely restored, paying a tribute of 2,000 dr. (IG i3 261.11.4), raised to 4,000 dr. in 418/17 (IG i3 287.11.11). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.11.12). Coinage is not attested, which may suggest a rather early incorporation of Artake into Kyzikos, perhaps simultaneously with Prokonnesos (no. 759), i.e. in C4 (Ehrhardt 1988) 38 with n. 244. Strabo 13.1.4 speaks only of a mountain, an island and, in another context, a chorion, while Plin. HN 5.141 mentions the harbour and writes that the city had disappeared: Artace portus ubi oppidum fuit; but cf. HN 5.151: Artaceon cum oppido. The toponym does not occur in Pomponius Mela.

737. Astakos (Astakenos) Map 52. Lat. 40.45, long. 29.55. Size of territory: ? Type: Ba. The toponym is Αστακός, ή (Strabo 12.4.2) or, once, Οστακός, ή (Charon of Lampsakos (FGrHist 262) fr. 6). The city-ethnic is Αστακείας, attested in the Athenian tribute lists in its collective and external use (IG i3 259.111.27). Astakos is not attested as a polis in sources of the Archaic and Classical periods, but deserves inclusion as a polis type B since (1) it had a mint (infra); (2) it was a member of the Delian League (infra); and (3) it is retrospectively classified as a polis in later sources (Diod. 19.60.3 (1315); Polyaen. 2.30.3 (1363–352)).

The ancient site must have been somewhere on the south coast of the Gulf of Izmit called κόλπος Αστακείας (Strabo 10.2.21, 12.4.2; Stephan. Byz. 238.17) or κόλπος Ολβίανος (Ps.-Skylax 92; Pompon. 1.100). Astakos may have been situated near modern Yuvacik (Ruge 1896) 1774), but a location closer to the sea, at “Baş İskele, dans la zone du port militaire de Gölçük”, seems more likely, since this site produced some Archaic (?) and Classical pottery (BE (1974) 574 summarising Şahin (1974) 66–85). The territory of Astakos is described by Polyaen. 2.30.3 as a marshy χώρα inhabited by Θρήκες (perhaps Bithynian “helots”: Burstein (1976) 130 n. 64). A πολίχνιον Μεγαρίκων (Att. (FGrHist 156) fr. 18 = Plin. HN 5.148: Megarice oppidum) tentatively located by R. Kiepert at Cape Çatal Burun (Ruge 1931) clearly indicates colonisation by Megara (no. 225).

According to Charon of Lampsakos (FGrHist 262 fr. 6), Astakos was founded by the Kalchedonians (no. 743). But other sources mention Megara (no. 225) as the metropolis (Strabo 12.4.2; Pompon. 1.100; Memnon (FGrHist 434) fr. 12 (20), whose source was Nymphis of Herakleia (C4–C3); cf. Toepffer (1896) 126). Both Memnon and Strabo mention the later Athenian colony (infra) and local Bithynian settlers as well. Combining the sources, we may infer that Astakos was founded by Kalchedonians (Merkelbach 1980) 91 but possibly reinforced by Megarians, since a πολίχνιον Μεγαρίκων is attested in the territory of Astakos (Hanell 1934) 120; Loukopoulou (1989) 51, 53). The foundation year of 712/11, given by Memnon ((FGrHist 434) fr. 12 (20)) and by Euseb. Chron. 91, Helm, is too early, since Kalchedon itself was founded about 685. Scholars generally assume a date in C7 (Hanell 1934) 120; Merkelbach (1980) 91). According to Memnon, the oecist was Astakos, a descendant of the Spartans from Thebes, while for Arrian (FGrHist 156 fr. 26) Astakos was son of Poseidon and the nymph Olbia (cf. Asheri 1978).

Astakos was a member of the Delian League. It is recorded from 454/3 (IG i3 259.111.27) to 444/3 (IG i3 268.1.33; almost completely restored) a total of five times, paying a tribute of 3,000 dr. in 454/3–453/2 (IG i3 259.111.27, 260.viii.18), reduced to 1,000 dr. in 450/49 (IG i3 263.vi.16). It is absent from the full panel of 442/1 (IG i3 270.1.35–11.30). Accepting Niese’s attractive emendation of Diod. 12.3.5 (Στακακός for MSS Λετανόν), we can infer that the Athenians in 435/4 placed a colony at Astakos (Meiggs (1972) 198; Schuller (1974) 30–31, 155; cf. Strabo 12.4.2 and Memnon (FGrHist 434) fr. 12 (20)). Astakos was unsuccessfully besieged c.363–352 by Klearchos, the tyrant of Herakleia Pontike (no. 715) (Polyaen. 2.30.3; cf. Burstein (1976) 55–56), and in 315 by
Zipoïtes (Diod. 19.60.3). Both references to sieges show that the city was fortified. In 281, however, Astakos was destroyed and replaced by Nikomedia, settled *inter alios* with the inhabitants of Astakos (Strabo 12.4.2; Paus. 5.12.7).

Astakos struck silver coins in C5 on the Persian standard. Denominations: drachms and smaller fractions. Types: *obv.* lobster or crayfish, i.e. an *άστακος*, a pun on the toponym; *rev.* female head, first of Archaic style (*c*.500–435), later of Classical style (*c*.435–400), incuse square, swastika; legend: ΑΣ (Head, ΗΝ 510).

**Bryleion** (Bryleanos) See no. **752: Myrleia** (Myrleanos).

738. **Bysbikos** (Bysbikenos) Map 52. Lat. 40.35, long. 28.30. Size of territory: 1 (10 km²). Type: [A]? The toponym is Βυσβικενός (*IG i³ 278.vi.34*) or Βέσβικος (*Ps.-Skylax 94*; Agathokes (*FGrHist* 472) *fr. 2* (in both cases explicitly denoting the island)). The city-ethnic is Βυσβικενός (*IG i³ 287.11.13: *Βυσβικενοι*).

Bysbikos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded from 434/3 (*IG i³ 278.vi.34*) to 418/17 (*IG i³ 287.11.13*) a total of four times, once completely restored. The tribute list for the year 434/3 records Bysbikos under the heading πόλεις ήα ήοι ἴδιοιτα ἐνέγραςαν φόρον ἄρειν (where polis is used in the political sense) with a tribute of 3,000 dr. (*IG i³ 278.vi.34*); thereafter the city is listed as having been assessed by the boule and a dikasterion in 430/29 (restored in *IG i³ 281.111.65*) and in 429/8 (*IG i³ 282.11.48*). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (*IG i³ 271.110.86*).

The Bysbikenians inhabited the island of Βέσβικος situated in the Sea of Marmara outside the mouth of the river Rhynndakos (*Ps.-Skylax 94*; Plin. ἹΝ 5.151: circumference 18 Roman miles) and probably to be identified with modern İmralı Adası (Hasluck (1910) 53–55), which, however, has a circumference of no more than 13 Roman miles. For a different identification, see the garbled passage at Strabo 12.8.11 and Amm. Marc. 22.8.6. If we can trust some of Strabo’s garbled account, Bysbikos was a dependency of Kyzikos (no. 747), a piece of information which may be linked to the tradition that Kore (whose worship is attested in Kyzikos by coins from C4 onwards) played an important role in the battle of the Giants (cf. L. Robert (1987) 166).

Quoting Agathokes of Kyzikos (*FGrHist* 472) *fr. 2* (*C₃*), Steph. Byz. 165.10–166.5 says that the island originally was a stone thrown by the Giant Bysbikos and transformed into an island by his opponent, the goddess Kore. Agathokes also reports what must be a rival foundation myth according to which Bysbikos was a Pelasgian (Tümpel (1897)).

So far no remains of an ancient town have been found on the island, but its classification by Agathokes as a κτίσια indicates some kind of nucleated settlement.

739. **Dar(i)leion** Map 52. Unlocated, not in *Barr*. Type: B? The toponym is Δαρίλειον (IG i 3 71.111.109) or Δαρίλειον (Steph. Byz. 291.11). In the assessment decree of 425/4, among the Hellespontine members is recorded a Δαρίλειον παρὰ τέµ Μυσίαν. The tribute is assessed at 400 dr. minimum. The only other source is Steph. Byz., who describes Darleion as a πόλις τῆς Φρυγίας without quoting any source (Bürchner (1901); *ATL* i. 479).

740. **Daskyleion** (Daskyleianos) Map 52. Lat. 40.25, long. 28.40. Size of territory: ? Type: Bα. The toponym is Δασκυλέιον (IG i 3 278.18.7–8). The city-ethnic is Δασκυλειανός (IG i 3 278.4.9). The only author to call Daskyleion a polis is Strabo at 12.8.10, but the reference is to his own time.

Among the five homonymous sites recorded by Steph. Byz. s.v. Daskyleion (220.9–17), two have sometimes been confused by ancient sources (e.g. Strabo 12.8.10) and modern authors (e.g. Ruge (1901)): ... τετάρτη [sic. πόλει] πέρι Βυθωνίαν [i.e. the polis Daskyleion], πέμπτη τῆς Ἀλοδίου καὶ Φρυγίας [i.e. the seat of the Persian satrapy]. Recent excavations (reported in Mitchell (1990) 89 and (1999) 130) have finally confirmed the identification of the satrap’s residence with the mound called Hisartepe near Ergili, on the south-western shore of the Manyas Gölü, consequently to be identified with the Δασκυλειανός λίμης recorded by Strabo 12.8.10, 11 (Aurgal 1976a 259 and map 5). Preserving its ancient name in Byzantine sources, ancient Greek Daskyleion was easily identified with modern (Turkish) EsKel Limani, on a peninsula jutting into the Sea of Marmara. This was presumably the harbour, while the main site has been found in the area of the village Esence (former Eskel or Eskel köy) lying c.2 km inland (Corsten (1988) 54–57 with figs. 1–3). The site was not excavated, but the field surveys yielded ceramics of C4 as the earliest material (Bittel (1953) 6), and some late inscriptions have been found by chance (Corsten (1988) 72–77 nos. 1–6, (1990) 43–46 nos. 7–10).

In spite of the lack of positive evidence, one may suppose that Daskyleion was colonised by Miletos (no. 854). According to Nikolaos of Damaskos (*FGrHist* 90) *fr. 63*, a certain Miletos, probably a Milesian, was married into the Lydian royal family but went into exile and came first to Daskyleion, later to Prokonnesos. If we can trust these late sources, Daskyleion was a Milesian foundation (Ehrhardt (1988) 47; Corsten (1988) 63–64).
Daskyleion was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG 12 259.16–17) to, possibly, 429/8 (IG 12 282.37) a total of seven times, twice completely restored, paying in all years a phoros of 500 dr. (IG 12 281.3–11). It is absent from the full panel of 42/1 (IG 12 270.135–11.30) but was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG 12 71.113.75).

741. *Didymon Teichos (Didymoteichites) Map 52. Lat. 40.15, long. 27.15. Size of territory: ? Type: B?. The toponym Δίδυμον τείχος is reconstructed from the ethnic Δίδυμοιτείχηται, recorded in the Athenian tribute lists next to the Διωνειτείχητοι in the years from 443/2 (IG 12 269.1.4–3) to 417/17 (IG 12 287.11.19–20). Taking the juxtaposition of the two teiche to indicate geographical proximity, ATL i. 481–82 located Didymon Teichos next to Daunoteichos on the northern coast of the Propontis. But following L. Robert (1937) 195, Barr. identifies Δίδυμον τείχος with the Δίδυμα τείχη mentioned at Polyb. 5.77.8 and located at Dimetoka on the river Granikos; see also Isaac (1986) 204 and Sayar (1998).

Didymon Teichos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded from 454/3 (IG 12 259.11–18) to 417/17 (IG 12 287.11.19) a total of sixteen times; down to 430/29 it paid a phoros of 1,000 dr. (IG 12 278.111.22), but in 420/19 a higher sum, probably 2 tal. (IG 12 287.11.19). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG 12 71.113.95).

742. Harpagion (Harpagianos) Map 52. Lat. 40.20, long. 27.25. Size of territory: ? Type: B?. The toponym Ἀρπάγιον (Thuc. 8.107.1). The city-ethnic is Ἀρπαγιανός (IG 12 267.1.23) or Ἀρπαγιανίος (IG 12 270.11.4).

According to Strabo 13.1.11, Harpagion (τὰ Ἀρπάγια) was situated between Kyzikos (no. 747) and Priapos (no. 758). It has not been convincingly located (Olshausen (1974) 483), but a position near the mouth of the river Granikos was suggested in ATL i. 470.

Harpagion was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 448/7 (IG 12 264.111.37) to 429/8 (IG 12 282.111.36) a total of fourteen times, twice completely restored, paying in all years a phoros of 300 dr. (IG 12 264.111.37). It was perhaps assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG 12 71.111.68, completely restored). Harpagion is not mentioned in later historical sources, and one may assume that it was incorporated, possibly in C4l, into either Priapos (no. 758) or Kyzikos (no. 747). In C4, before the incorporation, Harpagion struck bronze coins. Types: obv. nymph, head tureted; rev. fish, below corn-ear; legend: ἈΡΠΑΓΙ (Fritze (1913) 14 no. 597).

743. Kalchedon (Kalchedonios) Map 52. Lat. 41.00, long. 29.00. Size of territory: 5. Type: Αα. The toponym is Καλχηδὼν, ή (Thuc. 4.75.2; Xen. Hell. 1.3.4; I.Histriae I 5 (C3)) or in Doric Καλχαδών, ή (SEG 28 1661 (C3); I.Kalchedon 33.9 (undated)) or Χαλκηδών, ή (Ps.-Skylax 92; Dem. 15.26; Diod. 13.61.1; I.Kalchedon 22.8 (fifth century AD)). The city-ethnic is Καλχηδώνιος (IG 12 285.11.83; Hdt. 4.144.1) or in Doric Καλχαδώνιος (coins, infra; IG 12 8949 (C48); SEG 31 1062 (undated)) or Χαλκηδόνιος (Aen. Tact. 12.3; Arist. Pol. 126639) or Χαλκηδόνιος (IG 12 263.17; I.Kalchedon 101.1 (Imperial)). Kalchedon is attested as a polis both in the urban sense (Xen. Hell. 1.3.5–6; Ps.-Skylax 92; Arist. Oec. 1347b20) and in the political sense (Xen. Hell. 4.8.31; Aen. Tact. 12.2, 4; Arist. Occ. 1347b20, 23, 29; Orat. Adespota fr. 8, 8auppe). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form on C4 coins (infra) and externally in e.g. IG 12 263.17 and 285.11.83. The individual and external use is attested by Plato’s mention of Θρασύμαχος οἱ Καλβηδώνιοι (Resp. 328B) and Aristotle’s of Φαλέας οἱ Χαλκηδώνιοι (Pol. 126639). The territory of Kalchedon (χώρα: Hdt. 6.32.2) is called Καλχηδόνια (Hdt. 4.85.1; Xen. Hell. 1.1.22, An. 6.6.38). Patris is found in Thrasymachos T8, DK.

According to Euseb. Chron. 93b, Helm, Kalchedon was founded in 685. Hdt. 4.144.1 reports that the city was founded seventeen years before Byzantion (no. 674) and that the colonisers were said to have been “blind” because they had not realised the advantages of the European shore of the Bosporos (the later Byzantion); cf. Caecorum oppidum (Plin. HN 5.149). All sources agree that Megara (no. 225) was the metropolis (Thuc. 4.75.2). Pompon. 1.101 calls the oecist (auctor) Archias Megarensium princeps. The city’s history is blank down to Cel. In 514/13 Dareios crossed the Bosporos at Kalchedon (Hdt. 4.85.1, 87.2), but when the king returned to Asia after the failed Scythian expedition, he destroyed the city because the Kalchedonians allegedly had intended to demolish the bridge (Ktesias (FGrHist 688) fr. 13.21; Polyena. 7.11.5, see Merle (1916) 11; Merkelschbach (1980) 92, 120; Loukopoulov (1989) 88–89). The main source for these events (Hdt. 4.143.1) indicates the Hellespont for Dareios’ retreat, but Loukopoulov argues that Dareios first punished Kalchedon and then for security reasons chose the Hellespontine route. Some years later Kalchedon was taken by the satrap Otanes (Hdt. 5.26). The regime established by
the Persians may have induced the Kalchedonians to join the Ionian Revolt. This is only suggested by Hdt. 5.103.2 (Βυζάντιον τε καὶ τὰς ἄλλας πόλεις πάσας τὰς ταύτης), but Kalchedonian participation in the Revolt is securely established by the fact that in 493 some of the Kalchedonians fled to Mesambria on the Pontos Euxineus when the city was attacked by a Persian–Phoenician fleet (see Mesambria (no. 687) and infra). Pausanias’ conquest of Byzantion in 478 (Thuc. 1.94.2) probably marks the end of Persian supremacy over Kalchedon (Merkelbach (1980) 92).

At an unknown date Kalchedon joined the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded from 453/2 (IG I² 260.Ⅷ.12) to 418/17 (IG I³ 287.Ⅺ.16) a total of nineteen times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of 71/2 tal. (452/1), 3 tal. (450/49), 9 tal. (448–438) and 6 tal. (434–429). It was perhaps assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG I³ 71.111.61, completely restored). Kalchedon fought with Athens in 424 (Thuc. 4.75.2), but in 412 or 411 it was occupied by a Spartan garrison under a harmostes (Plut. Alloc. 29.6; Diod. 13.66.2). Except for a short break in 409 (Xen. Hell. 1.3.1–12) Kalchedon remained under Spartan occupation (Xen. Hell. 2.2.1 (1405)) until 389, when Thrasybulos restored Athenian control (Xen. Hell. 4.8.27–28). In 387 it was conquered once again by Sparta (no. 345) (Xen. Hell. 5.1.25; Polyga. 2.24). By the King’s Peace of 387/6 Kalchedon fell to Persia, and in 357 it was conquered by Byzantion (Dem. 15.26; Theopomp. fr. 62). In 362 Kalchedon, Byzantion and Kyziko (no. 747) had been allied with Thebes (no. 221) and captured Athenian merchants (Dem. 50.6.17; cf. Arist. Oec. 1347² 20–30). However, a crown dedicated to Athena in Athens by the Kalchedonian state indicates friendly relations with Athens in 354/3 (IG II² 1347.16). At an unknown date in Catt, perhaps the 360s, Kalchedon was besieged and assisted by a contingent of Kyzikene soldiers (Aen. Tact. 12.3; cf. P Oxy. 305) and so was probably allied to Kyziko. In Catt Kalchedon joined the κοινῷ τῶν Τιεκῶν (L. Robert (1966) 31, 39).

The only thing we know about the type of constitution is that, as a result of the conquest of Kalchedon by Byzantion in 357, a moderate form of constitution was changed into a radical democracy (Theopomp. fr. 62). Civic subdivisions are attested in Hellenistic sources only (especially I.Kalchedon 6 and 7), but since they are of Megarian origin, they may go back to the foundation of Kalchedon in C. The citizen body was subdivided into, probably, hundreds (ἐκατοστάτες; cf. Jones, POAG 283–84; Loukopoulos (1989) 141–42). The names of several of the hundreds are attested as sub-ethnics in Hellenistic dedications, e.g. Βύρρακος Ἀλεξηδα Ιππωνής (I.Kalchedon 7.11). The presence of metics is attested in Arist. Oec. 1347² 20–30.

Some of the known officials are common for all (or some) Megarian foundations; consequently the Hellenistic sources can be interpreted retrospectively. This applies to the eponymous magistrate, called basileus (I.Kalchedon 7.1, 8.1). A hieronmnon (I.Kalchedon 4.5, 7, 42) is not attested at Megara (no. 225); at Byzantion he was the eponymous magistrate; while at Kalchedon he clearly accompanied the basileus (Hanell (1934) 151) and indicates a Kalchedonian origin for the Byzantine hieronmnon (Loukopoulos (1989) 145–46). Also of Megarian origin were the aiynynatai. Like the Athenian prytenaeis, they were perhaps members of the Council (I.Kalchedon 10.10) selected by lot every month (I.Kalchedon 6.1–2). One of them seems to have been the ἄγεμων βουλᾶς (I.Kalchedon 7.8; see Hanell (1934) 150; Loukopoulos (1989) 145). The council itself (βουλᾶ), as well as the assembly (δῆμος), is attested in I.Kalchedon 1 (Cze) and 10 (C3–C2). A board of strategoi (I.Kalchedon 1.73–74) may also go back to the Archaic and Classical periods. Since Kalchedon was a Megarian colony, a number of attested civic subdivisions may be evidence of hekatostyes (I.Kalchedon 6 and 7; see supra). Citizens of Kalchedon were granted proxenia by Karthaia (no. 492) (IG XI.5 542.10 (Cami)) and Pantikapaion (no. 705) (IOSPE II 2 = CIRB 2 (C45)).

Kalchedon is located on the promontory Kadiköy, on the Asiatic shore of modern Istanbul. The ancient topography is imperfectly known (see a plan at Merkelbach (1980) 143). However, mediaeval testimonies attest remains of a harbour between Kadiköy and Haidar Paşa (Ruge (1919a) 1558); a cemetery has been identified (Asgari and Fıratlı (1978)); and some inscriptions and architectural or sculptural remains have been found by chance or through minor excavations (see also Müller-Wiener (1977)). City walls are explicitly mentioned by Polyga. 7.11.5 (1513) and can be inferred from the numerous siege of Kalchedon (Xen. Hell. 1.3.4 (409); Polyga. 2.24 (1387); Aen. Tact. 12.3 (3605?); Diod. 19.60.3 (1315)). Evidence for public architecture is late, and the lack of excavations does not allow a closer examination of the literary and epigraphic testimonies. The town had two harbours, one on each side of the peninsula (Dionysios of Byzantion 111 p. 33, Güngerich), but the most important seems to have been the unlocated Φρίξου λίµήν (Diod. 18.72.4 (1318); Dionysios of Byzantion 99 p. 31, Güngerich; Steph. Byz. 672.15, quoting Nymphis of Herakleia (C4–C3)). Oberhummer (1897) 753 suggests that the Phrixos harbour was located at Kanlıçe at the far end of the Bosphoros.
The most important and best-attested settlement in the territory of Kalchedon is Chrysopolis, located at Üsküdar (former Skutari) (Xen. Hell. 1.1.22, 1.3.12, An. 6.6.38; Diod. 14.31.4 (1400); P Oxy. 303). In 410/9 it was fortified by Alkibiades (Xen. Hell. 1.1.22; cf. Diod. 13.64.2–3). Another settlement (ἐπτοικία) called Ἀμυκος is mentioned in schol. Ap. Rhod. 2.159b, quoting Androiota of Tenedos (C4–C3).

Of sanctuaries in Chalkedon’s territory, the most famous was the hieron (Dem. 20.36, 35.10, 50.17 and 58; Ps.-Skyllas 67 and 92) at the Euxine end of the Bosphorus (located at Anadolu Kavâğı-Yenimahalle). According to the tradition, Jason sacrificed here when he returned from Kolchis (Pind. Pyth. 4.203–7; Polyb. 4.39.6) and various testimonies record a sanctuary of Zeus Ópios (Arr. Peripl. M. Eux. 12, 25) and the Twelve Gods (Polyb. 4.39.6, 50.2) with an altar Syll.3 1010 = (I.Kalchedon13 (C3)). Diod. 20.111.3 (1302) shows that the sanctuary belonged to Kalchedon, though it was repeatedly claimed (and sometimes also occupied) by Byzantion (no. 674) (Polyb. 4.50.2–3). An extra-urban sanctuary of Herakles remains unlocated (Xen. Hell. 1.3.7 (1409)). His priest is attested at Syll.3 1011 = I.Kalchedon 10.4 and 11 (C3–C2). There is no early evidence for the sanctuary of Artemis (Ptol. Geog. 5.2) located more likely at Phrixos (Hanell (1934) 184; Avram (1998–2000)) than at Chrysopolis (Merkelbach (1980) 131).

As in the metropolis Megara (no. 225), the patron deity of Kalchedon was Apollo Pythios or Chresterios (I.Kalchedon 5.5), whose priest (προφήτας) is mentioned in inscriptions side by side with the highest city officials: the basileus and the hieromnamon (I.Kalchedon 7.3). His sanctuary was the oldest in the city (Luc. Pseudomantis 10; Dionysios of Byzantion 111 p. 35, Gümürgić; see also SEG 4 720) and was declared ἄσυλος by Delphi (Syll.3 550 (C2)). An attempt to reconstruct the local calendar, based on comparison with the other Megarian colonies, is proposed by Avram (1999) 30.

The first silver coins of Kalchedon were minted c.387/6–340 on the Rhodian standard. Types: obv. bearded head l.; rev. wheel in which ΚΑΛΧ (drachms); obv. young head l.; rev. wheel in which ΚΑΛΧ (hemidrachms); obv. bull on corn-ear l., above ΚΑΛΧ; rev. quadripartite stippled incuse square (tetradrachms and drachms); obv. bull forepart on corn-ear l., above ΚΑ; rev. three corn-ears (hemidrachms) (Price (1993) pl. IV 84–111; SNG Cap. Bosphorus-Bithynia 346–56). These issues are followed c.340–320 by the coinage on the Persian standard. Denominations: sigloi, fifths and tenths. Types: obv. bull l. on corn-ear, above ΚΑΛΧ, sometimes ΚΑ; rev. quadripartite mill-sail incuse square (Price (1993) pl. V 112–26). For the chronology, see Le Rider (1963) 44–50. The close relationship to Byzantion is illustrated by the fact that the types of these series are quite similar to Byzantine types; they “differ only in one respect, viz. that the bull on the money of Byzantium stands upon a dolphin, while at Kalchedon he stands upon an ear of corn” (Head, ΗΝ 512). The sympoliteia with Byzantion of 357 is attested in the C3–C2 bronze coins with the legend ΒΥΖΑΝ ΚΑΛΧΑΔΩ (Schöner-Geiss (1970) 78–80 nos. 1252–1301 pl. 59–62; Price (1993) pl. IV 80; SNG Cap. Thrace 531).

Kalchedon was involved in three colonial foundations, but only one of them can be considered a purely Kalchedonian colony, viz. (1) Astakos (no. 737), founded in C7 according to Charon of Lampskos (FGrHist 262) fr. 6. (2) Kalchedonian participation in the foundation of Byzantion (no. 674) is indicated by Hesychios of Miletos ((FGrHist 390) fr. 20–23; cf. Hanell (1934) 123–28) and by the existence of the office of hieromnamon both at Kalchedon and Byzantion compared with its absence at Megara (no. 225) (Loukopoulou (1989) 146). Nevertheless, the idea of a direct foundation of Byzantion by Kalchedon (Loukopoulou (1989) 52, 146) remains a hypothesis. (3) Jointly with Megara (no. 225), Kalchedon founded Mesambria in C6, at the time of Dareios’ campaign against the Scythians (Ps.-Skymnos 739–42; cf. Anon. Peripl. M. Eux. 83–84, Diller), and in 493 the colonists were reinforced by refugees from Byzantion and Kalchedon (Hdt. 6.33); see Mesambria (no. 687) and Avram (1996) 290–92.

744. Kallipolis (Kallipolites) Map 52. Unlocated, not in Barr. Type: Αξα. The toponym is Καλλιπόλις οι (Ps.-Skyllas 93). Kallipolis is classified as a polis in the urban sense at Ps.-Skyllas 93: Καλλίπολις καὶ λιμῖνιν, with πόλις understood before καὶ (Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 142) and listed under the heading πόλεις Ἑλληνίδες αὑτῆ. The political sense is attested in the Athenian tribute lists, where the Kallipolitai are recorded under the heading πόλεις (IG13 278.v1.5–6, 12, though see infra). The settlement was presumably situated between Astakos (no. 737) and Kios (no. 745), but the exact location is not known (Ruge (1919b)). The scarce evidence suggests that at an early date it was integrated into one of the neighbouring cities. In Ps.-Skyllas 93 this Kallipolis is situated in Mysia and is accordingly different from (a) the Kallipolis situated on the Chersonese north of Sestos (no. 672) (Ptol. Geog. 3.11.9) and opposite Lampskos (no. 748) (Strabo 13.1.18); (b) the Kallipolis situated on the Thracian side of the Bosphorus at the so-called Anaplous (Steph. Byz. 349.16). All three cities were located in the
Hellespontine district of the Delian League. In the assessment decree of 425/4 and in some of the tribute lists is recorded a community called Καλλιπολῖται. As the evidence stands, it is impossible to decide with which of the three cities the following information should be connected.

Kallipolitai are attested in the tribute lists from 434/3 (IG i3 278.vi.12) to, possibly, 418/17 (IG i3 287.i.29: Κ[αλλιπολῖται]) a total of six times, twice completely restored, paying in all years a phoros of 1,000 dr. (IG i3 279.ii.87). In the years from 434/3 to 431/30 Kallipolis is listed under the heading πόλεις Ἀθηναίων (IG i3 278.vi.5–6 and 12, 279.ii.76–77, 87, 280.ii.68–70, restored). In 430/29 and 429/8 it is recorded as having been assessed by the taktai (IG i3 280.ii.74, 281.ii.15.4–5, 55, 56, 282.ii.34–36, 37). In the assessment decree of 425/4 (IG i3 71.iii.96) and possibly in the list of 418/17 (IG i3 287.ii.29) Kallipolis is listed among the Hellespontine members.

745. Kios (Kianos) Map 52. Lat. 40.25, long. 29.10. Size of territory: 4. Type: Α.α. From the foundation of the city until its destruction in 202 the toponym is Κίος, ἕ (Hdt. 5.122.1; Hell. Oxy. 25.3; SEG 23 189 11.14 (C48)). The city-ethnic is Κιανός (I.Kios 2.5 (C4m) = Tod 149). Kios is called a polis both in the political sense (I.Kios 1–2 (C4)); tentatively restored in SEG 45 208.5 (C4l) and in the urban sense (Ps.-Skylax 93, where Κίος πόλες is listed under the heading πόλεις Έλληνιδες αἵδε). The collective and internal use of the city-ethnic is attested in an honorific decree of C4m (I.Kios 2.5) and on C4 coins (infra). The external use is found in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 259.vii.17). For the individual and external use, see the C4 Athenian tombstone set over two men and four women from Kios (Agora xvii 519).

Kios is located at modern (Turkish) Gemlik, where, in 1835, Texier could see remains of ancient walls and scattered architectural fragments (Texier (1862) 113). Its territory was presumably bordered towards the north by the mountains Karlı-Dağı, towards the east by the Askanian lake (İzık Gölü), towards the south-east by Mt. Kurban-Dağı, perhaps halfway between Kios and Prusa, in the area of the villages of Dürdane, Selçukgazi and Seçköy, and towards the south by the territory of Myrlea (no. 752) (= the later Apameia), in the region between the villages Kuruşu ('belonging to Apameia) and Tuzlaçiftilli (Corsten (1985) 9–10). Pythopolis (no. 760), in C4 a Kian kome near the Askanian lake 120 stades from Kios (Arist. Mir. ausc. 834c34), has been identified with modern Sölöz, on the south shore of the İzık Gölü (Corsten (1987) 148–49) and thus indicates the limit of the Kian territory in this direction.

According to Euseb. Chron. 97b, Helm, Kios was founded in 626/5. A Milesian origin is invoked as a reason for the isopolitía between Miletos (no. 854) and Kios c.228 (Milet. 1.3 141.6–7; cf. Plin. HN 5.144)., and foundation by Miletos is further indicated by a phiale which the Kians dedicated to Apollo of Didyma in 276/5 (infra). Also, the two attested months—Ἀνθεστηριών (I.Kios 1.1) and Ἀχιβαίνων (I.Kios 27)—suggest a Milesian origin (Samuel (1972) 117).

According to Aristotle (Arist. fr. 519.1–2), first a Mysian and then a Karian colony preceded the Milesian foundation of Kios. Aristotle mentions the hero Kios as the oecist of the Milesian foundation, and this tradition can be traced back to an Attic documentary relief (IG i3 184; Lawton (1995) no. 9) dated 406/5 and representing a man called KΙΟΣ with helmeted Athena (Ehrhardt (1995) 31–33). According to a different tradition, Kios was founded by the Argonaut Polyphemos with Herakles’ approval. This version of the foundation myth is known from Ap. Rhod. 1.122ff, 1.135–57 and 4.146ff, but its earlier origin is attested by schol. Ap. Rhod. 4.1470, which quotes the C4 historian Nymphodoros of Syracuse ((FRHist 572) frs. 16 bis, ter). Nothing is known about the city’s early history. Kios was under Persian domination from 547/6 onwards. It took part in the Ionian Revolt and was conquered by Hymaias in 497 (Hdt. 5.122.1).

At an unknown date Kios joined the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded from 454/5 (IG i3 259.vi.7) to 418/17 (IG i3 287.ii.12) a total of twelve times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 1,000 dr. (IG i3 265.ii.48). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.iii.89, heavily restored). Before 408 (Xen. Hell. 1.4.7) Kios came under Persian control. It may have joined the Delian League once again in 406/5 after the Athenian victory at Arginusai (Attic relief: IG i3 124 = Meyer (1989) 272 A 22 = Lawton (1995) no. 9; Ehrhardt (1995) 31–33). But after 404 Kios was certainly under Persian domination (Corsten (1985) 25).

The Aristotelian collection of constitutions included a Κιανῶν πολιτεία (Arist. fr. 519). Two honorific decrees, both of C4m (I.Kios 1.2), testify to democratic institutions: a popular assembly [(κυρία) ἐκκλησία] presided over by a prytanis, passing bills moved by boards of archontes and strategoi, and to be published in a sanctuary of Athena. The eponymous magistrate was a ἄρχων (I.Kios 1.1, 2, c. Corsten (1985) 50–51). A board of hieropoioi (I.Kios 1.15) and a board of, probably, synedroi (I.Kios 25.3 (C4m)) are also attested. The Kianoi granted proxenia to a citizen of Sigeion (no. 791) (I.Kios 1 (C4)), and some citizens of Kios were
awarded proxenia by Karthaia (no. 492) (IG xii.5 542.58 (C4m)). From 337 to 302 Kios was ruled by Mithridates II (Diod. 20.111.4; cf. Corsten (1985) 30; Debord (1999) 101–2). C.330 a theorodokos was appointed to host theoroi from Argos (no. 347) (SEG 23 189.11.14).

Given the Milesian origin of the city, Apollo was presumably the patron deity of Kios. The god is represented on coins (infra) and his cult is implicitly attested by the communal dedication of a φιόλη παρά Κιανών to Apollo from Didyma in 276/5 (I. Didyma no. 427.6–7).

Kios struck coins from C4m: (1) silver drachms on the Rhodian standard, followed by (2) gold staters on the Attic standard, and (3) silver drachms, hemidrachms and quarter-drachms on the Persian standard. Types: obv. head of Apollo, r.; rev. prow ornamented with star. Legend: (1) ΚΙΑΝΩΝ, (2) signature of official, e.g. ΣΩΣΑΝΔΡΟΣ, (3) ΚΙΑ and signature of official. References: (1) Reinach (1908) no. 27 with pl. XLIX; Babelon, Traité ii. II. no. 2957, dated to c.350–345 (Le Rider (1963) 31–32). (2) Head, HN² 513, dated to c.345/340–320/315 (Le Rider (1963) 32–39). (3) SNG Cop. Bosporus-Bithynia 369–79, dated to c.335–320/315 (Le Rider (1963) 37–39). The circulation of all the Kian coin series of C4k seems to have been rather limited (ibid. 60–61).

746. Kolonai (Koloneus?) Map 51. Lat. 40.20, long. 26.55, but not securely located, see infra. Type: B? The toponym is Kolonai, αἰ (Strabo 13.1.19; Arr. Anab. 1.12.6) and the city-ethnic [Κolo]νας was tentatively restored in the assessment decree of 425/4 (IG 10 71.111.87). At Arr. Anab. 1.12.6 (1334) Kolonai is called a polis in the urban sense. Strabo locates Kolonai in the territory of Lampaskos (no. 748) and considers it to be a Milesian colony founded inland. The settlement has been hypothetically located at Cataltepe, c.18 km east-south-east of Lampaskos or, alternatively, at Arabakanagı, more towards the south-east (Büchner (1921); Leaf (1923) 101–2; Frisch (1978) 106 n. 6) and is to be distinguished from Kolonai at Alexandria Troas, on the coast (Cook (1973) 216–21). Strabo is probably wrong about Miletos (no. 854) as the metropolis of Kolonai, and it seems preferable to assume foundation by Lampaskos (Ehrhardt (1988) 35–36) followed by a later reintegration into the metropolis (Jones (1971) 86). For a parallel, see Paisos (no. 755).

747. Kyzikos (Kyzikenos) Map 52. Lat. 40.25, long. 27.55. Size of territory: 5. Type: Ασ. The toponym is Κύζικος, ἦ (Hdt. 4.14.1; Thuc. 8.107.1; Xen. An. 7.2.5; Milet. 1.3 137 = Staatsverträge 409.16 = Gawantka (1975) no. 19 (shortly after 334)). The toponym is used about both the island and the city (Strabo 12.8.31). The city-ethnic is Κύζικηνος (Milet. 1.3 137.4, 8–9, 14, 16). Kyzikos is called a polis in the urban sense at Eupolis, Poleis fr. 233 and Xen. Hell. 1.1.20; in Ps.-Skylax 94 Kyzikos is one of the toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις Ἑλλήνων ἄδει. For polis in the political sense, see Hdt. 4.15.1; Syll. 3 4A.1, B.1 (C61); and SEG 36 116.A12, B8 (C4). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins (infra) and externally in the C4 isopolitiea treaty with Miletos (no. 854) (Milet. 1.3 137.4) and in Xen. Tact. 12.3; Dem. 50.6. The individual and external use is found in a C4 dedication on Samos (SGDI 5526) and in Herodotos’ mention at 4.138.1 of Αἱρεταγάρχους Κυζικηνός, the tyrant of Kyzikos in c.513. Patra (= patris) is found in CEG II 850 (345–335).

The ancient city is located at Balkız (Turkish name), on the isthmus of the Kapu Daği peninsula (ancient Arktennesos) jutting out from the south-west coast of the Sea of Marmara. Ps.-Skylax 94 mentions that Kyzikos was οὐ χερσόνησος (cf. Steph. Byz. s.v. Κύζικους), Plin. HN 5.142 (relating that Alexander the Great insulam continenti iuxit in 334). The island of Arktennesos became a peninsula through the construction of two parallel dykes and accumulations of sand. It is assumed that the isthmus had been connected with the mainland shortly before the first testimonies, but that the insular tradition was so strong that some writers continued to describe Kyzikos as an island (cf. Philipsson (1910) 50; Ruge (1924) 228; Akurgal (1976b) 473).

The main contribution to the topography of Kyzikos has been produced by Hasluck (1902) and (1910); for supplements see especially L. Robert (1955) 124 n. 7; Schwertheim (1978) 227–28; Vian (1978), while some archaeological excavations (Akurgal (1956) 15–20) brought to light orientalising ceramics from C7l/C6e. Unfortunately, Kyzikos remains “the least studied of the great cities of Asia” (Mitchell (1999) 130) and “its history is only illuminated by stray finds” (Mitchell (1985) 74), as, for example Archaic sculptural and architectural marbles from C6s (Akurgal (1965); Koenig (1981)). Moreover, there is no complete corpus of the huge number of inscriptions (list at Hasluck (1910) 263–95; funerary inscriptions at Schwertheim (1980); cf. BE (1980) 389–423), and only the Hellenistic and Roman funerary stelae have been brought together (Cremer (1991)).

Kyzikos controlled a large territory inhabited by the indigenous Δολίνωι (Hecat. fr. 219; Strabo 14.5.29, quoting Alexandros of Aitolia (C4–C3); schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.943, 961,
1024, 1037). Originally, the territory did not comprise the whole island, since at least Artake (no. 736) was a *polis* with its own territory; but Kyzikos later absorbed many other settlements which are known to have been *polis*: Prokonnosos (no. 759) (shortly after 362/1; Dem. 50.5; Paus. 8.46.4), Artake (no. 736) (perhaps about the same time), Plakia (no. 757) (towards the end of C4), Skylake (no. 761), Tereia (no. 763) and the island of Bysbikos (no. 738) (at latest in C4) and the satrap’s residence of Daskyleion (at latest in the early Hellenistic period: Robert and Robert (1976) 231 with n. 321, 232–35). At an unknown date the western limit between the territories of Kyzikos and Priapos (no. 758) was at the unlocated *τὰ Ἀρπάγια τόπος* (Strabo 13.1.11; see Harpagion (no. 742)). More toponyms are recorded by Steph. Byz. s.v. *Μέλισσα* (442.16–17), *Ποιμανγηνός* (530.9–10), and *Σκύρος* (579.14). Poimainennon is surely late (first mention c.80: Kaufmann and Staubuer (1992) 45) and so may the other settlements be. For later extensions of the territory of Kyzikos, see Jones (1971) 86–88, 94.

Kyzikos was founded by Miletos (no. 854) (Anaximenes of Lampsakos (FGHist 72) fr. 26). Two dates are given for the foundation year: 756 (Euseb. Chron. 88b, Helm) and 679 (ibid. 93b). Assuming a “double colonisation”, some scholars have accepted the earlier date (Graham (1958) 32, (1971) 39–42, (1983) 107), but the archaeological record supports only the second (Akurgal (1956) 15, 19, (1976b) 474; Laubscher (1963–64) 74; Kiechle (1959–60) 96; Ehrhardt (1988) 42, 49–50, 52; Cremer (1991) 9). Thus Kyzikos—together with Prokonnosos, the earliest colony in the Propontis—must have been founded c.680. Alföldi (1991) 137 suggests an overland expedition from Miletos to Kyzikos.

Kyzikos came under Persian domination after 547 and was included in the third satrapy ruled from Daskyleion. A failed attempt to establish a tyranny is recorded under Kyros (Ath. 1.30α), while about 514/13 Aristogaras of Kyzikos is mentioned among the Hellespontine tyrants (Hdt. 4.138.1). Kyzikos took part in the Ionian Revolt but was subjected by Oinoabares, the satrap in Daskyleion (Hdt. 6.33.3). About 478 it joined the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded from 452/1 (IG 13 261.v.30) to 418/17 (IG 13 287.11.16) a total of thirteen times, once completely restored, paying a *phoros* of 4,320 dr. in 447/6 (IG 13 265.1.95), but 9 tal. from 443/2 on (IG 13 269.11.23).

A change of the constitution towards democracy is to be assumed thanks to Athenian influence (see the *pytaniæ* of the *phylai*). The change may perhaps be connected with the story told at Arist. *Occ.* 1347b30–34: after a *stasis* the democratic faction got the upper hand over the oligarchs; but instead of killing their opponents, they exacted a ransom and had them exiled. In 411 Kyzikos defected from Athens (Thuc. 8.107.1), but was soon reconquered (Xen. Hell. 1.11.14, 16–18). After the Peloponnesian War Kyzikos was allied with or perhaps even controlled by Sparta (no. 345) (Xen. Hell. 3.4.10, Ant. 7.2.5) and took part in the *symmachia* with Rhodes (no. 1000), Knidos (no. 903), Iasos (no. 891), Ephesos (no. 844), Samos (no. 864), Byzantion (no. 674) and Lampsakos (no. 748) (Karwiese (1980), but cf. Debord (1999) 273–77 for a date post-394). In consequence of the King’s Peace, Kyzikos may have been subject to Persia for a short time after 387/6. If we can trust schol. Dem. 21.173 (586, Dilts), Kyzikos seems to have joined the Second Athenian Naval League, and in 364 Timotheos assisted Kyzikos when besieged by, probably, a Persian satrap (Diod. 15.81.5; Nep. Timoth. 1.2). Shortly afterwards, in 362, Kyzikos, like Kalchedon (no. 743) and Byzantion (no. 674), captured Athenian merchantmen (Dem. 50.6). During the Social War (357–355) the Athenians captured Kyzikos’ merchantmen (Dem. 21.173); Kyzikos then broke with Athens (schol. Dem. 21.173).

An alliance with Kalchedon at an unknown date in C4f, perhaps in the 360s, is attested by the fact that Kyzikene soldiers assisted the city of Kalchedon during a siege (Aen. Tact. 12.3; P Oxy. 303, perhaps also Arist. Oec. 1347b20–30). At the beginning of Alexander’s campaign Kyzikos was unsuccessfully besieged by the satrap Memnon (Diod. 17.7.3; Polyain. 5.44.5).

An isopolity treaty with Miletos (no. 854) (Milet. 1.3 137 = Gawantka (1975) no. 19) is attested shortly after 334 (Ehrhardt (1987) 114–16) but may go back to C5 or even earlier (Graham (1983) 117, cf. 107–8; Ehrhardt (1988) 235–38). Citizens of Kyzikos were awarded *proxenia* by Karthaia (no. 492) (IG xii.5 542.54–55 (C41m)) and Chios (no. 840) (PEP Chios 50.12 (C4)).

Local inscriptions (starting with Michel 533.1 (c.390)) produce evidence for all the six Milesian *phylai*: Geleontes, Aigikoreis, Argadeis, Hopletes, Boreis, Oinopes (Jones, POAG 287–90; Ehrhardt (1988) 384 n. 24) and for the six *φιλαρχαί* (Michel 596.3; Hasluck (1910) 250–51; Bilabel (1920) 120–21; Ehrhardt (1988) 107–9).

A popular assembly (*δήμος*) and a council (*βουλή*) are attested in a probouletic decree of C4 (BCH 13 (1889) 514–18). Assembly and council were presided over by monthly shifting *pytaniæ* belonging to one of the six tribes, so that each tribe must have been in ptytany twice during a year (Michel 533 (c.390); Hasluck (1910) 251–52 and 266 with...
the list of inscriptions). There was a prytaneion. Meetings of the demos were chaired by a daily epistates assisted by a grammateus (Michel 533; cf. Ehrhardt (1988) 100; Rhodes, DGS 415–17). The original eponymous magistrate may have been a πρύτανεις (unattested, but highly probable by reason of the Milesian model: Ehrhardt (1988) 194–95). In C4f the eponymous magistrate was an archon (SGDI 5523, perhaps attesting some passing Athenian influence; see Ehrhardt (1988) 195). From about C4m he was replaced by a ἵππαρχης (Michel 596), perhaps in connection with the conquest of neighbouring communities (Hasluck (1910) 254–55, cf. 304–5; list of the attested eponyms). Other officials are a board of strategoi (Michel 596.2 (C4f)) and hieronmomenes (SGDI 5523.3 (C4m)).

Kyzikos had no walls in 410 when the city was attacked by Athens (Thuc. 8.107.1; Diod. 13.40), but the Athenians presumably fortified the city since it was taken by the Spartans and Persians in 410 “after a siege” (σπολορρείν, Diod. 13.49.4). Defensive walls are attested in a building inscription of C4f (Michel 596) and their existence can be inferred from the account of the siege of Kyzikos in 364 (Diod. 15.81.5; Nep(81.2).

The evidence of public architecture is remarkably rich. A prytaneion is mentioned in a dedication of C6f (Syll. 3 4.5–6). An honorific decree of C3e (Michel 534) refers to a theatre (12, 21; TGR iii. 390), an agora (14), and a Doric stoa (24: πρό τῆς στοάς τῆς Δωρικῆς), which indicates that these monuments existed at least in C4i if not earlier. A temple (νεώς) is attested by an inscription of C6 recording the building of its roof by means of the income produced by the sacred lands and the sale of the skin of sacrificed animals (Robert and Robert (1950) 78–80). At Kyzikos was located “the earliest sanctuary in Asia” for Athena (Anth. Pal. 6.342.5–6), which is perhaps to be identified with the ὀρὸς Ἀθηνᾶς (cf. Hasluck (1910) 236) and with the τέμενος τῆς Αθηνᾶς τῆς Πολιάδος (SEG 28 953.79; for the restoration, see Sève (1979) 359 n. 189).

Strabo 12.8.11 records two harbours, one on either side of the two bridges that connected the island with the mainland (Lehmann-Hartleben (1923) 63–64, 262–63; L. Robert (1955) 122–25 with pls. XXI no. 2, XXII nos. 1–2). The channels between the bridges formed a kind of “third” harbour (Philipsson (1910) 50), presumably identical with the λιμήν mentioned at schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.940 and the λιμήν recorded by Syll. 3 799.11.2 (Sève (1979) 349–51). For the topography, see Hasluck (1902) pl. XI: plan by R. de Rustafjaell; cf. L. Robert (1955) 122–25. The western harbour has been identified (Sève (1979) 351) with the χώρος λιμήν recorded at schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.987a (quoting the local writer Deiochos). Minor harbours belonging to the Kyzikene territory were at Panormos (schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.954: Πάνορμος λιμήν τῆς Κυζικοῦ), located at modern Bandirma (Lehmann-Hartleben (1923) 293 n. 4) and Bathys Limen, which could be sought at Artake (no. 736) or on the north coast of the island, in the area of the village of Kerek (Greek Vathy): cf. L. Robert (1955) 128–31; Sève (1979) 351 n. 132.

Kyzikos’ patron deity was Apollo (Hecat. fr. 217; SNG Cop. Mysia 43, 57; cf. Hasluck (1910) 228–32; Ehrhardt (1988) 135). In addition to Athena Polias (supra), there is evidence for an Athena called ΣΩΤΕΙΠΑ on a coin (Imhoof-Blumer (1890) 614 no. 168), and her worship is also attested by Ap. Rhod. 1.955. A very popular civic cult, at least from C4 onwards, was that of Kore with the epithet soteina (App. Mithr. 75) attested on C4 coins (SNG Cop. Mysia 53–56, 58–62, infra). Other communal cults are attested by various sources: Γῆ Καρθακαίας (cf. L. Robert (1950) 236) or on the Rhyndakos (Abmeier (1979) 351). For the topography, see Sève (1979) 359 n. 189.

Through Ap. Rhod. 1.936ff a foundation myth can be traced back to the local writer Deiochos (C3–C4f). He tells the story of Kyzikos, the young king of the Doliones who was killed by a terrible mistake by Jason. The hero Kyzikos can be recognised on electrum coins of C5f (BMC Mysia 21 no. 23). On the other hand, a Milesian origin of the city is also attested in the Classical period (Anaximenes of Lampsakos (FGHist 72) fr. 26 and Kyzikos’ isopolity treaty with Miletos).


Kyzikos possessed a practical monopoly of coining the so-called Kyzikenes. From C6f to C4, they were the most

Strabo 13.1.12 records a tradition that Kyzikos founded Priapos (no. 758). Taking a strange coincidence revealed by the calendars into consideration (supra), another Kyzikene foundation might have been Apollonia on the Rhynados (supra 975). In both cases primary Milesian foundation is the alternative (and perhaps more likely) explanation.

748. Lampakos (Lampsakenos) Map 51. Lat. 40.10, long. 26.20. Size of territory: 4. Type: Α. The toponym is Λάμπακας, η (LSAG p. 367 no. 47; Hecat. fr. 220; Dem. 50.19). Before the colonisation of Lampakos in C7m the toponym seems to have been Πιτύεις (Charon of Lampakos (FGHist 262) fr. 7a) or Πιτύεια (Hom. Il. 2.829; schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.933; Steph. Byz. 410.18, quoting Deiochs of Kyzikos (C₅–C₄)). It is possible that the Homeric Πιτύεια existed before the proper foundation of Lampakos (infra). The city-ethnic is Λαμφακηγός (I.Lampsakos 1.20 (c.300)). Lampakos is called a polis both in the urban sense (Hdt. 5.171.7; Xen. Hell. 2.1.19; in Ps.-Skylax 94 Lampakos is one of the toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις 'Ελληνικές αὐτοῦ and in the political sense (I.Lampsakos 1.20 (c.300), 8.2–4 (C₄)); Arist. Oec. 1347b¹; Hdt. 4.157.2, 138.1, list of tyrants with the heading ἐκαστὸς αὐτῶν τωρινεύει πόλιος). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form on coins (infra) and in inscriptions (I.Lampsakos 1.20) and externally at Hdt. 6.37–38; Thuc. 8.62.2; Xen. Ant. 7.8.11; IG i² 269.11.10. For the individual and external use, see Hdt. 4.138.1; Thuc. 6.59.3; Aeschin. 2.83. The citizens are referred to as politai (Arist. Oec. 1351b⁴). Patris is found in Dem. 23.142.

Lampakos is located at modern Lapseki (Turkish name), which has preserved the ancient toponym. Some testimonies of the eighteenth century attest walls and architectural remains (but Texier (1862) 174–76 reported that he found no ancient monument in 1835), while various objects continue to be found occasionally: Leaf (1923) 93–97; Bürchner (1924b) 591; MacKay (1976) 480 and map 7; Mitchell (1999) 142. The best evidence is produced by inscriptions (Frisch 1978), but almost all are of the Hellenistic and Roman periods.

The territory of Lampakos was originally called Βέβρυκεια after the name of the native Βέβρυκας (Charon (FGHist 262) fr. 8; cf. fr. 7a). The countryside was renowned for its vineyards (Thuc. 1.138.5; Diod. 11.57.7 (1464)). The territory (Bürchner 1924a; Frisch 1978) 105–7) was bordered to the west by Perkote (no. 788) (= modern Umurbey) situated c.12 km from Lampakos, and to the north-east by Paison, c.12 km from Lampakos and incorporated after 425/4 (see Paison (no. 755)). According to an anecdote told by Polyean. 6.24 the frontier between Lampakos and Parion (no. 756) was placed at Hermaion = modern Otłukdere, c.10 km south of Parion, according to Leaf (1923) 110–1 to be identified with Hermoton (Arr. Anab. 1.12.6; contra Ruge (1942b) 2436; Frisch (1978) 105 n. 5.

There is evidence of a number of settlements in the territory of Lampakos. Κολωναί was probably a dependent polis (Arr. Anab. 1.12.6 (1334); Strabo 13.1.19) and perhaps a secondary colony founded by Lampakos (see no. 746). Μυμισσός (Steph. Byz. 164.8–9, quoting Polemon: πόλις πέρι Λάμφακον) and Πολυδός (schol. Eur. Med. 484) were perhaps situated close to Lampakos. Άβαραντος ο Άβαραντος was a settlement near the homonymous promontory (Hecat. fr. 220; Xen. Hell. 2.1.29; Ephor. fr. 46), tentatively located c.8 km north of Lampakos, at Çardak Burnu (Leaf (1923) 93); according to Steph. Byz. 4.4, it was a polis. Other settlements are attested only in late sources.

Lampakos was founded in 654/5 (Euseb. Chron. 95d, Helm; Synkellos 213b, p. 402, Dindorf) by colonists from Phokaia (no. 859) (Charon of Lampakos (FGHist 262) fr. 7a and b; Polyaden. 8.37; Steph. Byz. 4.13–14, quoting Ephor. fr. 46). That Phokaia was the metropolis is confirmed by the tradition that the citizens of Lampakos called themselves brothers of the Massaliotai (cf. Massalia (no. 3), so a Phokaian colony; I.Lampsakos 4.26), and by the name of the month Heraion, attested both in Lampakos (I.Lampsakos
In C6m Lampsakos was a dependency of Lydia, and when the Lampsakenes had captured Miltiades, the Athenian tyrant of the Chersonese, they were forced by Kroisos to set him free (Hdt. 5.37–38). After the fall of Lydia in 547, Lampsakos came under Persia; in 499 the city joined the Ionian cities in their Revolt, and the winged horse on Lampsakos' coins was used by the Ionian koinon on some of their issues (Meiggs (1972) 27); but Lampsakos was conquered by Darius in 498 or 497 (Hdt. 5.117). Lampsakos remained under Persian domination, and in 464 it was given by King Artaxerxes to the exiled Themistokles (Thuc. 2.68). Lampsakos was probably at some point controlled by Persia, but in the last years of the Peloponnesian War; Frisch (1978) 127). From c.310 onwards Lampsakos was a member of the koinon τῶν Ἴλιεων (L. Robert (1966) 18–46). Moreover, a kind of sympoliteia with Ilios (no. 779) is probably attested by a unique silver tridrachm: obv. head of Athena wearing Corinthian helmet, r.; rev. winged horse r. under the horse: ΛΑΜΨΑΚΗΝΩΝ, above it: ΛΑ(ΙΕΩΝ) (Frisch (1975) XV, (1978) 129–30 (c.300)).

A tradition that Lampsakos was originally ruled by kings is reported by Charon of Lampsakos ((FGrHist 262) fr. 7ab). After the Persian conquest, 531, Lampsakos was ruled by a tyrant, Hippoklos (Hdt. 4.1381). His son Aiantides married Archidike, the daughter of Hippias, the tyrant of Athens (Thuc. 6.59.3), and the epigram on Archidike's gravestone (Thuc. 6.59.3 = I.Lampsakos 244 (C5e)) testifies to a third generation of tyrants (Frisch (1978) 113–14). We have no further information about the constitution of Lampsakos until C4f, when we hear about another tyrant, Astyanax, who was overthrown and killed (Aen. Tact. 31.33, tentatively dated to c.355 by Berve (1967) 331). A few years later a pupil of Plato, Euaion, held the acropolis as security for a public debt. He attempted to set up a tyranny, but was eventually paid off and expelled (Ath. 508f; cf. Berve (1967) 312–13). Inscriptions attesting democratic institutions all belong in the Hellenistic period; see especially I.Lampsakos 4.34. Only I.Lampsakos 1 and 8 may perhaps be dated as early as C4 (for the date of 8, see Wilhelm (1974) 46–48). In these inscriptions we learn about a popular assembly called demos, cf. the statue of Anaximenes of Lampsakos set up in Olympia by τῶν Λαμψακηνῶν τοῦ δήμου (Paus. 6.18.2 (Fr48)). Furthermore, the inscriptions mention a council (boule), a tamias, a board called οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς διοίκησις, and an envoy elected by a show of hands (Rhodes, DGS 412–14). In 346 a citizen of Lampsakos was sent by the Odrysian dynasty Eresbolpetes to Athens (Aeschin. 2.83). Citizens of Lampsakos became proxenoi at Chios (no. 840) (Vanseveren (1937) 325 A.10–11 (C4m)), at Epidaurus (no. 348) (IG IV2.1 51 (C4)) and at Athens (no. 361) (IG II2 205 (351/501)). In C4a Lampsakos had a theorodokos to host theoroi from Nemea (SEG 36 331 B.26 (331/30–313)).

The acropolis of Lampsakos is mentioned at Ath. 508F (1350). The city was not yet fortified when it was conquered

8.5) and Phokaia (Samuel (1972) 125, 131). Strabo 13.1.19 erroneously states that Lampsakos was colonised from Miletos (no. 854).

Like all other cities of Asia Minor, Lampsakos fell to Persia by the King's Peace of 387/6. Together with other Hellespontine cities, it belonged to the satrapy ruled from Daskyleion, conceded by Ariobarzanes to the hyparchos Philikos of Abydos, who was killed by two citizens of Lampsakos (Dem. 23.142). During the Social War (357–355) Lampsakos was conquered by the Athenian strategos Chares (Dem. 2.28; schol. Dem. Olynth. 3.31), and in the 340s it was ruled by Memnon of Rhodes (Arist. Oec. 2.1351a1; cf. Frisch (1978) 127). From c.310 onwards Lampsakos was a member of the koinon τῶν Ἴλιεων (L. Robert (1966) 18–46). Moreover, a kind of sympoliteia with Ilios (no. 779) is probably attested by a unique silver tridrachm: obv. head of Athena wearing Corinthian helmet, r.; rev. winged horse r. under the horse: ΛΑΜΨΑΚΗΝΩΝ, above it: ΛΑ(ΙΕΩΝ) (Frisch (1975) XV, (1978) 129–30 (c.300)).

A tradition that Lampsakos was originally ruled by kings is reported by Charon of Lampsakos ((FGrHist 262) fr. 7ab). After the Persian conquest, 531, Lampsakos was ruled by a tyrant, Hippoklos (Hdt. 4.1381). His son Aiantides married Archidike, the daughter of Hippias, the tyrant of Athens (Thuc. 6.59.3), and the epigram on Archidike's gravestone (Thuc. 6.59.3 = I.Lampsakos 244 (C5e)) testifies to a third generation of tyrants (Frisch (1978) 113–14). We have no further information about the constitution of Lampsakos until C4f, when we hear about another tyrant, Astyanax, who was overthrown and killed (Aen. Tact. 31.33, tentatively dated to c.355 by Berve (1967) 331). A few years later a pupil of Plato, Euaion, held the acropolis as security for a public debt. He attempted to set up a tyranny, but was eventually paid off and expelled (Ath. 508F; cf. Berve (1967) 312–13). Inscriptions attesting democratic institutions all belong in the Hellenistic period; see especially I.Lampsakos 4.34. Only I.Lampsakos 1 and 8 may perhaps be dated as early as C4 (for the date of 8, see Wilhelm (1974) 46–48). In these inscriptions we learn about a popular assembly called demos, cf. the statue of Anaximenes of Lampsakos set up in Olympia by τῶν Λαμψακηνῶν τοῦ δήμου (Paus. 6.18.2 (Fr48)). Furthermore, the inscriptions mention a council (boule), a tamias, a board called οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς διοίκησις, and an envoy elected by a show of hands (Rhodes, DGS 412–14). In 346 a citizen of Lampsakos was sent by the Odrysian dynasty Eresbolpetes to Athens (Aeschin. 2.83). Citizens of Lampsakos became proxenoi at Chios (no. 840) (Vanseveren (1937) 325 A.10–11 (C4m)), at Epidaurus (no. 348) (IG IV2.1 51 (C4)) and at Athens (no. 361) (IG II2 205 (351/501)). In C4a Lampsakos had a theorodokos to host theoroi from Nemea (SEG 36 331 B.26 (331/30–313)).

The acropolis of Lampsakos is mentioned at Ath. 508F (1350). The city was not yet fortified when it was conquered
by the Athenians in 411 (Thuc. 8.62.2), and the first defence circuit was erected by the Athenians under Thrasyllos and Alkibiades in 409 (Xen. Hell. 1.2.14; cf. Diod. 13.66). These walls are also mentioned by Plut. Lys. 9.5 in connection with the conquest of the city by the Spartan commander in 405. The city also had a harbour (Strabo 13.1.18).

The patron deity was Priapos (Paus. 9.31.2; cf. the testimonies collected by Frisch (1978) 150–52). A cult of Dionysos is attested through the mention of a sanctuary for Dionysos in I.Lampsakos 8.6–7; cf. 34.34–35. A local agon is known from a C5 bronze hydria inscribed δῆλον ἐγν Λαμψάκο (LSAG 367 no. 47).

The earliest coins of Lampasakos (Head, HN² 529–30) are electrum staters of c.525–500. Types: obv. forepart of winged horse (Pegasos), above, acanthus; rev. quadripartite incuse square. After an interruption, Lampasakos started again from c.450 to strike electrum staters of two main types (1) obv. forepart of winged horse, sometimes in vine wreath; rev. quadripartite incuse square; (2) obv. Ianiform female head of Archaic style; rev. head of Athena in incuse square. Between the two series there was an issue of lighter standard, interpreted as a local coinage connected with the Ionian Revolt (Baldwin (1914); Gaebler (1922); for the coinage of the Ionian Revolt: Gardner (1911), (1918) 91–103; Meiggs (1972) 441–42; cf. IGCH no. 1167). The later series of electrum staters is also mentioned in the Athenian accounts of the Parthenon as χρυσὸς στατερες Λαµψακενων (IG 13.4 436–49 (447/6–433/2)). The local gold mines mentioned in Polyaeon. 2.1.26 (1396) must have provided the metal for the gold staters struck c.390–330 on the Persian standard. Obv. different types; one is the infant Herakles strangling the serpent (cf. supra); Baldwin (1920) and, for the chronology, Baldwin (1924); rev. forepart of a winged horse in incuse square (Head, HN² 529–30). The C4 gold staters, referred to as χρυσὸς Λαμψακανω στ[ατερε] (IG 11. 2418.9 = Syll.3 201) became almost an “international” currency (Baldwin (1924); Regling (1924) 590; SNG Cop. Mysia 187). Furthermore, from C6l to C4 (and later) Lampasakos struck silver staters and smaller fractions sometimes on the Persian, sometimes on the Attic standard (Gaebler (1923); cf. Le Rider (1963) 51, 55). Bronze coins were struck in C4. Obv. heads of different deities; rev. mostly forepart of winged horse; legend: ΛΑΜ or ΛΑΜΨΑ (SNG Cop. Mysia 180–86, 188–98).

749. Metropolis  Map 52. Unlocated. Not in Barr. Type: B1a. The toponym is Μητρόπολις (IG 13.4 77.14.8–9). Our only source for this community is the Athenian assessment decree of 422/1 in which Metropolis is recorded among the Hellespontine members (IG 13.4 77.14.8–9: Μητρόπολις παρὰ Πρίαπον). Thus, the Athenians claimed that the community was a member of the Delian League and had it assessed for a tribute of 1 tal. The Greek name suggests that it was a colonial foundation and a polis. It was situated on the south coast of the Propontis near Priapos (no. 758).

750. Miletoupolis (Miletopolites) Map 52. Lat. 40.05 long. 28.20. Size of territory: ? Type: B1a. The toponym is Μιλητούπολις, ἤ (Strabo 12.8.10; Suda M 1061). The city-ethnic is Μιλητοπολίτης (SNG Cop. Mysia 249) or Μιλητοπόλιος (I.Kyzikos 11.64 (second century AD)). The earliest attestation of Miletoupolis as a polis comes from a decree of the first century AD (I.Kyzikos 11.25.2). But polis status in the Archaic and Classical periods is strongly indicated by (1) the toponym, (2) the C4 mint, and (3) the cult of Zeus Polieus. The collective and internal use of the city-ethnic is attested on C4 coins (infra). For the individual and external use, see an Athenian sepulchral inscription of C4f (SEG 18.120) and a C3 Milesian citizenship decree (Milet, 1.3 67.7).

Combining Strabo 12.8.10 with the evidence of coin finds, it is now generally assumed that Miletoupolis was at modern Melde (Turkish name), c.5 km north-west of Mustafakemalpaşa (formerly Kirmasti) (Schwertheim (1981) 89–92). Some excavations took place in 1975, but only Roman monuments were found (ibid. 90, 127–28). The Turkish name Melde derives from Miletos, through Meletos (L. Robert (1962) 192).

The territory of the city was bordered to the north by the mountains Kara Dağları (including Lake Miletopolis which belonged to the city (Strabo 12.8.10)), to the west by the hills situated east of Lake Daskylitis, to the south by the Rhynakos valley, and to the east by Lake Apolloniatis, which belonged to the later Apollonia on the Rhynakos (L. Robert (1986) 97–98; Schwertheim (1983) 100–1). At the western end of this lake lay Miletou Teichos (no. 751), a fortified settlement (Hell. Oxy. 25.3) and in C4 probably a dependency of Miletoupolis.

The foundation of Miletoupolis is not mentioned in any source. Some late coins inscribed ΜΕΙΛΗΤΟΣ ΚΤΙΣΤΗΣ indicate that the city was named after a hero founder called Miletos (Schwertheim (1983) 81 nos. 28–29). According to Nikolaos of Damaskos (PGHist 90) fr. 63, this Miletos, probably a Milesian, married into the Lydian royal family but went into exile and came first to Daskyleion (no. 740), later to Prokonnesos (no. 759). If we can trust these late sources, Miletoupolis was a Milesian colony and probably
founded in C71/C6e (Schwertheim (1983) 102–6). The types used for the coins, the calendar used by the Miletopolitai (infra), as well as a late sepulchral inscription referring to “Attic blood” (I. Kyzikos II 64 (second century AD)) testify to close ties with Athens.

A C4 festival calendar (I. Kyzikos 11 1; cf. Schwertheim (1983) 107–12) mentions cults of Hermes, Aphrodite, Zeus Polieus, Olympios and Agoraioi, Apollo Karneios, Herakles, (Herakles) Alexiakakos, Eirene and Ilithya (midwife goddess). However, the possibility remains that the stone is a pierre errante recording the calendar of an Attic deme (Habicht (1999) 26–29). The calendar records sacrifices in the month of Skirophorion, elsewhere attested only in Athens and Iasos (Trümpy, Monat. 294) and thus points to Athenian influence. The head of Athena on the earliest coins (infra) may indicate a cult of Athena.

Miletoupolis struck bronze coins from C4 onwards (Head, HN 531; Schwertheim (1983) 78 nos. 1–6 and 8). Types: obv. head of Athena, or young male, r.; rev. bull, or owl; legend: ΜΙΛΗ, ΜΙΑΝΤΟ or ΜΙΑΝΤΟΠΟΛΕΙΤΩΝ (BMC Mysia 91 nos. 1–5; SNG Cop. Mysia 246–47).

751. Miletouteichos (Miletoteichites) Map 52. Lat. 40.15, long. 28.25. Size of territory: ? Type: B:a. The toponym is Μιλητοτειχός (Hell. Oxy. 25.3; SEG 23 189.11.16 (c.330)). The city-ethnic is, possibly, Μιλητοτειχιτίς (IG i3 100.111.5 (410/9)); see infra. There is no reference to Miletouteichos as a polis in any source, but polis status in the Classical period is indicated by membership of the Delian League and the attestation in C4s of a theorodokos.

Miletouteichos was completely unknown until the discovery first of the Hell. Oxy. and then of the C4s list of Argive theorodokoi (SEG 23 189). In Hell. Oxy. 25.3, Chambers, we learn that Agesilaos in 395 on his march from Kios (no. 745) to Phrygia attacked a place called Miletou Theichos, but failed to take it and then marched along the river Rhynakos to Daskyleion (no. 740). In the Argive theorodokoi list of c.330 Miletouteichos is listed after Kios and Bryleion (= Myrleia) and before Iasos (SEG 23 189.11.16). These two sources are still the only ones we have, but a third can be added if, in the Athenian assessment decree of 410/9 (IG i3 100.111.5), we accept the restoration Μιλητοτειχός instead of Μιλητοτειχίται in the edicto princeps: Hesperia 5 (1936) 387 (see Schwertheim (1983) 107).

The relationship between the two toponyms Miletoupolis and Miletouteichos is a moot point. Some scholars have assumed identity between Miletouteichos and Miletoupolis (Charneux (1966) 217–18; Ehrhardt (1988) 43;

Debord (1999) 250). That the two toponyms denote different sites has been argued forcefully by Schwertheim (1983) 95–99, followed by Barr., Map 52. Miletouteichos should be placed north-west of Lake Apolloniatis, according to Barr. at modern Ulubat, a location which fits the description of Agesilaos’ march route in Hell. Oxy. Schwertheim (1983) 98–99 prefers to identify Miletouteichos with the later Apollonia on the Rhynakos = modern Golyazi.

A possible reconstruction of our sources is that, after Alkibiades’ naval victory at Kyzikos in 410, Miletouteichos was founded as an Athenian colony and incorporated into the Delian League (Meiggs (1972) 369, 438–39; Schwertheim (1983) 107; Ehrhardt (1988) 43). It was probably an Athenian settlement and, at first, independent of the neighbouring poleis. In C4, on the other hand, the fortified settlement may have become a dependency of neighbouring Miletoupolis (no. 750); and the Athenian influence on Miletoupolis’ coinage and calendar indicates a fusion of the population of the two settlements. Since the appointment of a theorodokos was an act of a polis rather than of a fortress (Perlman (2000) 45–60), the presence of a theorodokos in Miletouteichos c.330 indicates that Miletouteichos was a (dependent) polis and not just a fortress lying in the territory of Miletoupolis. For the polis status of a teichos, cf. e.g. Neon Teichos (no. 824), one of the eleven Aiolian poleis (Hdt. 1.149.1, 150.2).

752. Myrleia (Myrleanos) Map 52. Lat. 40.20, long. 28.55. Size of territory: ? Type: [A]:α. The toponym is either Βρύλλειον (IG i3 71.111.12; SEG 23 189.11.15) or, later, Μυρλεαία, η (Ps.-Skylax 94; Strabo 12.3.22). The corresponding city-ethnics are Βρύλλεανος (IG i3 280.11.18) and Μυρλεανός (on coins, infra). Both Bryleion (SEG 23 189.11.15) and Myrleia (Strabo 12.4.3) are attested as neighbours of Kios (no. 745). Stephanos (187.13–14) quotes Ephor. fr. 45 for the view that Bryleion is identical with Kios: Εφορος δὲ ἐν τῷ Ἐφησῶ τῆς Κίου αὐτήν φησαν εἶναι. The error disappears if one for Kίον reads Kίων: ”Ephoros δὲ ἐν τῷ Κίω αὐτήν φησάν ἐναι.” The identification of Bryleion and Myrleia as successive names of the same settlement is based on two observations: (1) all references to Bryleion concern C3–C4, whereas attestations of Myrleia belong in C4,–C2; (2) both names are variants of the same (barbarian?) toponym: change of β into μ, and metathesis μβ > νβ (Corsten (1987) 4–6). Since the first coins, of C4, have the legend MYΡΑ, Corsten assumes that Myrleia became the
official name shortly after c.330. In 202 Myrleia was destroyed by Philip V of Makedonia and refounded as Apameia (Strabo 12.4.3).

In Ps.-Skylax 94 Myrleia is the first toponym listed after the heading πόλεις Ἑλληνίδες αἰώνες where polis is used in the urban sense. That Myrleia was a polis in the political sense too is strongly indicated by its coinage and its membership of the Delian League. The collective and internal use of the city-ethnic is attested on the coins (infra), the external use is attested in an Attic decree of 304/3 (IG ii² 703.10). For the individual and external use, see the numerous references to Μακεδονίας ὁ Μυρλεανός (C3–C2) (Ath. 50D).

Myrleia is located at Mudanya (Turkish name), c.20 km west of Kios (for some earlier descriptions, see Texier (1862) 113–15; Perrot (1872) 12–14). According to Ps.-Skylax 94, Myrleia belonged to Phrygia; later it was part of Bithynia.

Myrleia was colonised by Kolophon (no. 848). The testimonies are late but leave no doubt: Pompon. 1.99; Plin. HN 5.143; Steph. Byz. 463.18. The foundation year is not attested.

Brylleion was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 433/2 (IG i² 279.11.18) to 418/17 (IG i² 287.11.23) a total of four times, paying a phoros of 3,000 dr. (IG i² 279.11.18). It is absent from the full panel of 442/1 (IG i² 270.1.35–11.30).

From 337 to 302 both Kios and Myrleia were ruled by Mithridates II (Diod. 20.111.4, as emended by Post). From Cα4 to C3 Myrleia (Bryllion) belonged for a short time to the κοινόν of the sanctuary of Athena Ilias (L. Robert (1966) 31–33, 39). C.330 a theoreodokos was appointed to host theoroi from Argos (no. 347) (SEG 23 189.11.15).

The first coins were minted at a time when the official name of the city was Myrleia, i.e. Cα4–C3. Reinach (1908) 247–49 distinguished twenty-seven types: obv. heads of different gods, also wheel, humped bull, horseman, lyre, corn wreath, etc.; rev. legend: ΜΥΡΛΕΑ, ΜΥΡΛΕΑΝΩΝ or ΜΥΡΛΑ, sometimes with monograms (names of magistrates?); cf. Head, HN 509.110.

753. Olbia

Map 52. Unlocated. Type: A:α. The toponym is Ὄλβια (Ps.-Skylax 93; cf. Ptol. Geog. 5.1.2 and Steph. Byz. 475.16, 489.5). Olbia is classified as a polis in the urban sense at Ps.-Skylax 93: Ὄλβια καὶ λιμήν, with πόλεις understood before καὶ (Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 142) and listed under the heading πόλεις Ἑλληνίδες αἰώνες. Ps.-Skylax includes Olbia among the poleis in Mysia, whereas Steph. Byz. 489.5 describes Olbia as a πόλις Βασιλίας.

Some scholars argue that Olbia should be identified with Astakos (no. 737) and that the change of name from Astakos to Olbia took place in 435 in connection with an Athenian settlement (Ruge (1896) 1774; but cf. Ruge (1937); Jacoby, FGrHist 11 D pp. 565–66). Olbia is identified with Nikomedia by Steph. Byz. 475.15–16, followed by Tschirikower (1927) 46; Hanell (1934) 121; Marek (1993) 15. Both identifications, however, are contradicted by Ptol. Geog. 5.1.2, which lists Astakos, Olbia and Nikomedia side by side. The preferable view seems to be that Olbia was a settlement in the territory of first Astakos, later Nikomedia. Whatever the position of Olbia, the settlement had some importance, as the Gulf of Astakos was also called Ὅλβιανος (Ps.-Skylax 92; Pompon. 1.100).

Nothing is known about the history of the city. Olbia seems at an early date to have been incorporated into, probably, Astakos. In spite of the lack of evidence, Olbia might have been founded by Megara (no. 225), since the whole neighbouring region belonged to the area of Megarian colonisation.

754. (Otlenei)

Map 52. Unlocated, not in Barr. Type: C:?. The city-ethnic is Ὅτλενος. The only explicit evidence concerns the ethnic and comes from the Athenian tribute lists. In the assessment decree of 422/1, among the Hellespontine members is recorded a community called Otlenei paying a tribute of 2,000 dr. (IG i² 77.11.6). On the basis of this entry Ὅτλενος has been restored in the assessment decree of 425/4 (IG i² 71.111.116) and Ὅτλενοι in the tribute list of 415/14 (IG i² 290.111.1). Nothing more is known about the community (Ruge (1942a); ATL i. 529).

755. Paisios

Map 51. Lat. 40.25, long. 26.50. Size of territory: presumably 1 or 2. Type: Α:α. The toponym is Παίσιος (Hdt. 5.117), Ἦ (Eust. Il. i 558.8–9). The city-ethnic is Παίσιον (IG i² 272.1.32). Paisios is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 5.117. The external and collective use of the city-ethnic is attested in the Athenian tribute lists.

Paisios has tentatively been located at Fanous (Turkish name Fanar on R. Kiepert’s map), c.12 km east-north-east of Lampsakos (no. 748), at the extreme north point of the coast, c.30 km west of Parion (no. 756) (Leaf (1923) 99–100 and photo pl. V A; Ruge (1939) 559, (1942b) 2435; Frisch (1978) 105 n. 4). The river Paisos could be modern Bairam Çayı (Karanly Dere on Kiepert’s map: Ruge (1939) 559). The relationship with Homer’s Παίσιος (Il. 2.828, 5.612) remains obscure (Strabo 13.1.10, 19; Steph. Byz. 102.16; Eust. Il. 1 558.8–9).

Paisios was colonised by Miletos (no. 854) (Anaximenes of Lampsakos (FGrHist 72) fr. 26), presumably in C7 like the other Milesian colonies in the Ponticis. In 499 Paisos
joined the Ionian cities in their revolt against Persia and was subjected by Daurises in 498 or 497 (Hdt. 5.117). The city was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 453/2 (IG i² 260.viii.15) to 430/29 (IG i² 281.i11.28) a total of twelve times, once completely restored, paying in all years a phoros of 1,000 dr. (IG i² 260.viii.15). It was presumably assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i² 71.111.90).

According to Strabo, Paisos was destroyed and the citizens moved to Lampsakos (Strabo 13.1.19: κατέσταται ἡ πόλις, οἱ δὲ Παισηνοὶ μετέβησαν εἰς Λάµψακον). The destruction of Paisos can be dated to the period c.425–350: in the tribute lists Paisos is not recorded later than 430/29 and is missing from the full (?) list of 429/8 (IG i² 282). But so is Priapos (no. 758), and if the [Παριανοὶ] are correctly restored in IG i² 71.111.5, the terminus post quem must be 425/4. The fact that Paisos is not mentioned between Parion and Lampsakos in the list of Hellespontine poleis in Ps.-Skylax 94 indicates a terminus ante quem of C4m. Leaf (1923) 100 suggests that Paisos fell to Lampsakos after the competition between Parion and Lampsakos reported in Poly. 6.24 (rC4).

756. Parion (Parianos) Map 52. Lat. 40.25, long. 27.00. Size of territory: 5. Type: Aa. The toponym is Πάριον, τό (Archestratos fr. 7.2, Olson and Sens; IG i³ 71.111.98; Xen. An. 7.2.7). The city-ethnic is Παριανός (CID ii 5.11.2 (358)). Parion is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 5.117.1, and in Ps.-Skylax 94 Parion is one of the toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις Ελληνίδες αἵδε. The earliest explicit attestation of Parion as a polis in the political sense is at Diod. 20.111.3 (3902). The collective and internal use of the city-ethnic is attested on coins (infra). The external use is attested in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i² 260.x.4) and in Xen. An. 7.3.16. For the individual and external use, see the C5m Athenian proxeny decree for one or more citizens of Parion (IG i² 18) and the C4m sepulchral monument (IG i² 100.45 (C4m)).

Parion is located at modern Kemer (Turkish name), north-east of the mouth of the river Kemer Dere. Here some ancient remains were found in 1801 by P. Hunt and J. D. Carlyle (Walpole (1818) 87–88; Ewers (1822) 427–30), in 1835 by Texier ((1862) 174), and in 1978 marble blocks including uninscribed stelae were found on the acropolis (Frish (1983) 54).

Since Asia Minor was never clearly subdivided into political and/or geographical regions, Parion is variously placed in Phrygia (Ps.-Skylax 94), in the Troas (Strabo 13.1.4, quoting Eudoxos of Kyzikos, Damastes of Sigeion and Chon of Lampsakos), in Mysia (Ptol. Geog. 5.2.2), in the Propontis (Strabo 10.5.7; Eust. Comm. Dionys. Per. 517), in the Hellespont (Hdt. 4.138.1; Steph. Byz. 505.13) and in the Hellespont or the Propontis (Strabo 7 fr. 58).

The territory of Parion was called Παριανὴ (Anaximenes (FrHist172) fr. 25). It was bordered to the west by Paisos (no. 755) but after the integration of this city into Lampsakos (no. 748) in C5l–C4m Parion and Lampsakos became neighbours, with the frontier between the two cities at ’Ερμαϊος, 70 stades from Parion and 200 stades from Lampsakos (Polyaen. 6.24; see supra 976). To the east Parion bordered on Priapos (no. 758).

According to Euseb. Chron. 9.19, Helm, Parion was founded in 709; cf. Ath. 116A–D. The sources disagree about the metropolis. Erythrai (no. 845) and “Ionia” (Paus. 9.27.1); Thasos (no. 526) (Eust. Comm. Dionys. Per. 517); Paros (no. 509) (Strabo 10.5.7); Miletus (no. 854), Erythrai and Paros (Strabo 13.1.14). Since the toponym Parion is obviously derived from Paros, there can be no doubt that Paros was the main coloniser (Frisch (1983) 60), while the version concerning Thasos may be explained by the fact that Thasos was a foundation of Paros; but in that case the foundation year 709 must be lowered, because Thasos itself was founded c.710–680 (Poulloux (1954) 24; Frisch (1983) 59). Erythraian participation is supported by the officials called ἐξετασάτα (I.Parion 1.22) attested also in Erythrai (I.Erythrai 2014c.6), but not at Miletus and Paros (Bilabel (1920) 49; Frisch (1983) 59). Ehrhardt (1988) 36 also adds the name Damalis as an onomastic link between the two cities. Strabo’s error about the foundation of Lampsakos discredits his information about Parion. For an attempt to harmonise all these traditions, see Burn (1935) 132 with n. 7.

Parion must have come under Persian domination after 547, and in reference to c.514/13 Herophantos of Parion is mentioned among the Hellespontine tyrants by Hdt. 4.138.1. Parion took part in the Ionian Revolt (Hdt. 5.103), but by chance it escaped being conquered by Daurises in 497 (Hdt. 5.117.1). Parion joined the Delian League, perhaps in 478/7. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i² 259.vi.15) to 481/7 (IG i² 287.11.15) a total of fourteen times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of first 1 tal. (IG i² 259.vi.15), reduced to 2,000 dr. in, probably, 443/2 (IG i² 269.11.19), but raised again to 1 tal. in 435/4 (IG i² 277.v.4). It was presumably assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i² 71.111.71). During the Peloponnesian War Parion supported Athens (ATL; Xen.
Hellen. 1.1.13). The Attic proxeny decree for Phanokritos of Parion, who revealed the plans of the Spartan fleet to the Athenians (387/6), suggests that Parion continued to be an ally of Athens during the Corinthian War (IG ii² 3822 = Syll. 3 137). Parian envoys to the Odrysian king Medokos are mentioned by Xen. An. 7.3.16 (1400). By the King's Peace of 387/6 Parion fell to Persia, and c.360 it was besieged and conquered by Iphiaides of Abydos (Aen. Tact. 28.6–7).

City walls (τείχης) and their gates (πύλαι) are attested by Aen. Tact. 28.6–7 in his account of the conquest of Parion by Iphiaides of Abydos (c.360). In 1801 the walls of Parion still stood, and were built of large blocks of squared marble without mortar (Hunt and Carlyle quoted by Frisch (1983) 54). The existence of a harbour is implicitly suggested by Xen. Hellen. 1.1.13 (1410) and explicitly mentioned by Strabo 13.1.14. There is no evidence about public architecture in Parion with the exception of an extra-urban oracular sanctuary (μαντεῖον) of Apollo Aktaios and Artemis at Adrasteia. Possibly in C4 it was demolished, and the marble was reused for the altar of Apollo Aktaios at Parion, a work of Hermokreon (Strabo 13.1.13; cf. 10.5.7 and bronze coins of c.350–300, infra); cf. Leaf (1923) 84–85; L. Robert (1966) 43–44.

The most important god of the city was Apollo Aktaios, whose position as the protective deity of Parion is later attested by a silver tetradrachm of c.150 bearing the legend ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΟΣ ΑΚΤΑΙΟΥ ΠΑΡΙΑΝΩΝ; cf. Seyrig (1958) 611–12; L. Robert (1966) 43; Price and Trell (1977) 121. Of other communal cults attested in later sources, there is evidence for pre-Hellenistic worship of Eros (Paus. 9.27.1), because his statue was made by Praxiteles (Plin. HN 36.22) before 354 (Wolters 1913; Mirone 1921; L. Robert (1966) 43–44); Bonacasa (1976)), and for Priapos, of Lampsakene origin and very popular in the whole region (Robert and Robert (1950) 80–93), who acquired a local epiklesis in Parion (Hsch. s.v. Παριανός, ἕξ ἐπιθέτου Πρίας). Parion struck electrum coins of the Gorgoneion type from C5e (Head, HN ii 531; Babelon (1950) 42, with a too early date). In C5e the city also started to strike silver coins. Types: obv. Gorgoneion; rev. incuse square containing a cruciform pattern: e.g. BMC Mysia pl. 21.6, dated to c.500–475 (Price and Waggoner (1975) 84; SNG Cop. Mysia 256). C.350–300 (Le Rider (1965) 53–55) Parion struck silver hemidrachms on the Persian standard. Types: obv. bull looking back, with various symbols; legend: ΠΑ ΡΙ; rev. Gorgoneion (SNG Cop. Mysia 257–67). A series of bronze coins may be dated to c.350–300 or later. Types: obv. bull; rev. the great altar of Parion built by Hermokreon (supra) (Head, HN ii 531; SNG Cop. Mysia 270–71).

757. Plakia (Plakianos) Map 52. Lat. 40.25, long. 28.15. Size of territory: ? Type: A/B. The toponym is ΠΛΑΚΙΑ (Ps.-Skylax 94). The city-ethnic is ΠΛΑΚΙΑ (vōs) (SNG Cop. Mysia 545), in Ionian ΠΛΑΚΙΝΟΣ (Hdt. 1.57.3). Plakia is called a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 94. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form on C4 coins (infra) and externally by Hdt. 5.157.3.

Plakia is placed in Phrygia by Ps.-Skylax 94, in the Hellespontine region by Steph. Byz. 525.14. Describing the coast from west to east, Pompon. 1.98 and Plin. HN 5.142 mention Plakia as an oppidum after Kyziks (no. 747) and before the river Rhynndakos, and they also write that the Mt. Olympos was behind it (a tergo). Consequently, Plakia has tentatively been located at Kursunlu (Turkish name), halfway between the isthmus of Kyziks and the mouth of the river Rhynndakos (Philippon (1913) map 3; Schmidt (1950)).

Plakia is described by Herodotos as a semi-barbarian community in which Pelasgians lived side by side with Athenians (1.57.2) (cf. Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 1.29). In Ps.-Skylax 94 Plakia is listed under the heading πόλεις Ἐλληνίδες αἵδε. Herodotos’ account implies that Plakia, in so far as it was a Hellenic community, was an Athenian foundation. Plakia may have been incorporated into Kyziks, the end of the local coinage being a terminus post quem.

Plakia introduced into the region the worship of Kybele under the name of Μιήτηρ Πλακιανής. The head of the goddess, sometimes turreted, appears on the obverse of the small bronze coins dated to C4. The reverse has the legend ΠΛΑΚΙΑ οτ ΠΛΑΚΙ or ΠΛΑΑ and a lion to r., or a lion’s head, or a walking bull (Imhoof-Blumer (1871) 375–76; Head, HN ii 537; SNG Cop. Mysia 543–45).

758. Priapos (Priapenos) Map 52. Lat. 40.25, long. 27.20. Size of territory: probably 2 or 3. Type: Aα. The toponym is ΠΡΙΑΣΟΣ (Thuc. 8.107.1; IG i³ 77.11.9), ο (Strabo 13.1.4, 11) or ἦ (Strabo 13.1.14; Steph. Byz. 535.3). The city-ethnic is either ΠΡΙΑΣΕΥΣ (SNG Cop. Mysia 548 (C3); IG xii.8 184.5 (C4)) or ΠΡΙΑΣΕΥΣ (IG i³ 261.14.11). Priapos is called a polis in the urban sense at Ps.-Skylax 94, where πόλεις ἐστὶ Πρίασος is listed under the heading πόλεις Ἐλληνίδες αἴδε. The only attestation of polis in the political sense is at Arr. Anab. 1.12.7 (3343). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins (SNG Cop. Mysia 548 (C3)) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i³ 261.14.11). The only attestation of the individual and external use is in a C1 list of mystai from Samothrake (IG xii.8 184.5).
Ps.-Skylax 94 lists Priapos among the poleis in Phrygia, whereas Strabo 13.1.4, quoting Eudoxos, states that the region of Troas begins at Priapos. Priapos is located at modern Karabiga (Turkish name), north-west of the mouth of the river Granikos = modern Kocabaş Çayı. Lehmann-Haupt (1918) 429–31 and Leaf (1923) 73–75 reported some ancient remains, especially traces of a harbour at Kale Burun, to be identified with the harbour of Priapos mentioned at Strabo 13.1.12 and 14. Some late inscriptions have been found by chance: Le Bas and Waddington (1870) nos. 1750–51; Legrand (1893) 549–50 no. 45; Lehmann-Haupt (1918) 430; BE (1972) 362 (to add some of the monuments belonging to Priapos but included in the Kyzikene corpus by Schwertheim (1980): nos. 337, 426, 444, 458; cf. BE (1980) 395). The territory was originally contiguous with the territories of Parion (no. 756) and Lampsakos (no. 748) (Strabo 13.1.11) to the west, and to Kyzikos (no. 747) to the east (Strabo 12.4.6; cf. 13.1.11).

According to the traditions paraphrased by Strabo 13.1.12, Priapos was founded either by the Milesians (no. 854) contemporaneously with Abydos (no. 765) and Prokonnesos (no. 759), or by Kyzikos (no. 747). The synchronism with Abydos and Prokonnesos suggests a date of C7e.

Priapos joined the Delian League, presumably from the beginning. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG 13 259.11.13) to 428/7 (IG 13 283.11.17–18) a total of thirteen times, once completely restored, paying in all years a phoros of 500 dr. (IG 13 266.1.18). It was presumably assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG 13 71.111.97). It is recorded sometimes by toponym (IG 13 266.1.18) and sometimes by city-ethnic (IG 13 261.11). Priapos was involved in some war operations at sea in 411 (Thuc. 8.107.1). It fell to Persia by the King’s Peace of 386/7, and in 334 it willingly opened its gates to Alexander the Great (Arr. Anab. 1.12.7).

The city is called after its patron divinity Priapos (Strabo 13.1.12), whose cult was originally limited to the Propontis (Herter (1954) 1894; L. Robert (1979) 263–64), and Priapos constitutes a rare case of the toponym being identical with, and not derived from, the name of the god (Herter (1954) 1915).

759. Prokonnesos (Prokonnesos) — Map 52. Lat. 40.35–40, long. 27.30–45. Size of territory: 3 (110 km²). Type: Α. The toponym is Προκόννησος, Ἰ (Hdt. 4.14.2; Dem. 18.302; IG 11² 10113 (C4j)), the name of the city being identical with that of the island (Ps.-Skylax 94). The city-ethnic is Προκοννήσιος (IG 13 1508.4 (C6m) from Sigeion; LLampsakos 26.2 (C4j)).

Prokonnesos is attested as a polis both in the political sense (Hdt. 4.15.1) and in the urban sense (Hdt. 4.14.2; Ps.-Skylax 94, where πόλις Προκοννήσιος is listed under the heading πόλεις Ελληνιδές αἰδε). For the political sense, see also Hdt. 4.138.1: Μητρόδωρος Προκοννήσιος in a list of tyrants with the heading ἐκατόν αὐτῶν τυραννεύει πόλιοι (4.137.2). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on the coins (infra) and externally in a reference to the Prokonnesioi as Athenian allies (Dem. 50.6). For the individual and external use, see the Ionian–Attic monument from Sigeion (IG 13 1508.4 (C6m)) and the Prokonnesian attested in the Karthaian list of prayers (IG XI.5 542.57 (C4m)).

The city is located on Marmara island (Mermeradası in Turkish), north-west of the Kyzikene peninsula. Strabo 13.1.16 makes a distinction between ancient Prokonnesos (which could be the island of Halone, in front of Kyzikos: Frisch (1983) 50) and contemporary Prokonnesos. The ancient urban centre (not recorded in Barr.) was in the south-west part of the island (Danoff (1974) 560).

The territory of Prokonnesos comprised the whole island (Gedeon (1895); Hasluck (1909) 9–13; Danoff (1974) 560; L. Robert (1978) 327–28) and was famous for its marble (Strabo 7 fr. 55, 13.1.16). The remains of the quarries—described by Texier (1862) 161–62, Hasluck (1909) 11–13 and Holbach (1909)—are now meticulously researched by N. Asgari (Mitchell (1990) 88–89, (1999) 129–30). In Cağ Prokonnesos controlled a neighbouring island called Elaphonnesos (Ps.-Skylax 94). According to later authors, Elaphonnesos and Prokonnesos were the same island (Danoff (1974) 560).

Prokonnesos was founded by the Milesians (no. 854) contemporaneously with Priapos (no. 759) and Abydos (no. 765) (Strabo 13.1.12). For various etymologies of the toponym, see schol. Ap. Rhod. 2.279. Prokonnesos may indeed belong to the first stage of Milesian colonisation of the Propontis together with Abydos and Priapos, both founded c.670 (Loukopoulos (1989) 46, 48; Ehhardt (1988) 38 suggests a date close to that of Kyzikos’ foundation, C7e).

Under Persian control after 547, Prokonnesos was ruled by Metrodoros, recorded among the Hellespontine tyrants at Hdt. 4.138.1. The city took part in the Ionian Revolt and was burnt by the Phoinikian fleet in 493 (Hdt. 6.33.2). At an unknown date it joined the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 452/1 (IG 13 261.11.17) to 418/7 (IG 13 287.11.14) a total of fourteen times, paying in all years a phoros of 3 tal. (IG 13 271.1.33). It was perhaps assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG 13
760. **Pythopolis** (Pythopolites)  Map 52. Lat. 40.25, long. 29.25. Size of territory: ? Type: B:?

The toponym is Πυθόπολις (Arist. Mir. ausc. 834b34; Menekrates (FGrHist 701) fr. 1). The city-ethnic is Πυθοπολίτης (IG i² 77.1v.7). The toponym as well as the membership of the Delian League suggest that Pythopolis was originally a polis, but at Arist. Mir. ausc. 834b34 it is classified as a kome. The presumption is that the polis Pythopolis was subdued by Kios (no. 745) and turned into a civic subdivision.

Ps.-Aristotle locates Pythopolis on the Askanian lake (= İznil Gölü), 120 stades from Kios, and considers it a “village”, apparently a second-order settlement in the territory of Kios. According to Menekrates (FGrHist 701) fr. 1, it was close to the river Soloeis. A combination of these two sources suggests a location at the village of Solöz, on the south shore of İznil Gölü (Corsten (1987) 148–49).

The Pythopolitai are recorded among the Hellasplitne members in the Athenian assessment decree of 422/1 (IG i² 77.1v.7), and the city-ethnic is restored in the assessment decree of 425/4 (IG i² 71.11.117). Thus, the Athenians claimed that they were members of the Delian League.

According to Menekrates (FGrHist 701) fr. 1, Pythopolis had been founded by Theseus and named after the Pythian Apollo.

761. **Skylake**  Map 52. Lat. 40.25, long. 28.25. Size of territory: ? Type: C:β. The toponym is Σκυλάκη (Hecat. fr. 218; Hdt. 1.57.2). The only attestation of a city-ethnic is at Steph. Byz. 579.4. Quoting Hekataios, Steph. Byz. 579.3–4 states that Skylake was a polis near Kyzikos: Σκυλάκη, πόλις περὶ Κύζικον. ‘Εκαταίος Ασίας. There is no reason to doubt the location, but we have no guarantee that the site-classification stems from Hekataios (Hansen (1997) 17–18). Thus, the main reason for including Skylake in this Inventory of poleis is the analogy with Plakia (no. 757): like Plakia, Skylake is described by Hdt. 1.57.2 as a semi-barbarian community in which Pelasgians lived side by side with Athenians. Herodotos’ account implies that Skylake, in so far as it was a Hellenic community, was an Athenian foundation.

From the information provided by Steph. Byz. 579.3–4, Pompon. 1.98, Plin. HN 5.142, and Valerius Flaccus, Argonautica 3.34–36, we must presume that Skylake was situated near Plakia at the mouth of the river Rhynodakos (Lolling (1882) 152 n. 2). Philippson (1913) map 2 located Skylake at Yeni Köy, on the coast, c.12 km west of the mouth of the Rhynodakos. The city seems to have disappeared very early (Bürchnerr (1927)), and was presumably integrated into Kyzikos (no. 747).

762. **Sombia**  Map 52. Unlocated. Not in Barr. Type: B:

The toponym is Σωμία, Ἢ (IG i² 285.11.86).

Sombia was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district (IG i² 287.11.21) and is recorded...
in the tribute lists in 428/7 (IG i3 283.11.23), in 421/0 (IG i3 285.11.86) and in 418/7 (IG i3 287.11.21), paying a phoros of 4,000 dr. (IG i3 285.11.86, amount partly restored). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.11.113, partly restored) and in 422/1 (IG i3 77.11.3) for 4,000 dr. The position of Sombia in the lists strongly suggests that, within the Hellespontine district, it was located somewhere in the Propontis, rather than in Troas or Chersonesos. Further specification is impossible. In the assessment decrees Sombia is listed together with communities lying on the south coast (Tereia (no. 761), Artaiou Teichos (no. 775), Otlenoi (no. 754)), but in the tribute lists it is placed among communities, some of which were on the north coast (Daunion Teichos, Serrion Teichos and Perinthos) and some on the south coast (Myrelia and, probably, Didymon Teichos). The evidence slightly favours a position on the south coast, but is—strictly speaking—inconclusive. So a location on the north coast is equally possible.

763. Tereia  Map 52. cLat. 40.25, long. 28.45, unlocated in Barr. Size of territory: ? Type: C? Τηρεία is recorded among the Hellespontine members in the Athenian assessment decree of 425/4 (IG i3 71.11.113–12: [T]ηρεία παρὰ Βρύλλιον), and the toponym is restored in the assessment decree of 422/1 (IG i3 77.11.1–2). Thus, the Athenians claimed that Tereia was a member of the Delian League. According to the evidence of the assessment decree, Tereia was situated east of Kyzikos near Myrelia and must accordingly be different from the Tereia mentioned by Strabo at 12.4.6 as lying west of Kyzikos (ATL i. 476; Charneux (1966) 211–12).

764. Zeleia (Zeleites)  Map 52. Lat. 40.15, long. 27.35. Size of territory: ? Type: A? The toponym is Zeleia (II. 2.824; Dem. 9.43; IG i3 1129.11.38). The city-ethnic is Zeleιτής (IG i3 352.11.38). Zeleia is called a polis in the urban sense in the local decree SGDI5532 = Syll.3 279.2, and in the political sense in the same inscription (15, 19, 39) and in SGDI 5533a–b, d–e (both from c.334). In both inscriptions are attested the cognate terms politai (Syll.3 279.3, 7, 28) and politeia (SGDI 5533a–d). The collective and internal use of the city-ethnic is attested on coins (infra), the external sense in Arr. Anab. 1.17.2 (1334). For the individual and external use, see the references to Αρθρίοις Πυθώνακτος Ζελείτης (Dem. 9.42–43; Aeschin. 3.258; Din. 2.24; cf. Meiggs (1972) 508–12).

Strabo locates Zeleia 190 stades from Kyzikos and 80 stades from the sea (13.1.10), at the foot of Mt. Ida (13.1.5, 33), which was for him rather a mountain range separating Troy from Mysia (Texier (1862) 41). The site has been identified with Sari Köy (Turkish name), on the Sari Çayı, a left-bank tributary of the river Aisepos (= Gönen Çayı): Philippson (1910a) map 1; Hasluck (1910) 101–3; Leaf (1923) 66–67; ATL i. 488.

No reliable reconstruction of the extent of Zeleia’s territory can be obtained from Strabo’s contradictory accounts at 12.4.6, 13.1.10, 17, 45. For an attempt, see Haussoullier (1902) 107–8.

Nothing certain is known about the foundation of Zeleia. It was not a Milesian colony (Bilabel (1920) 47–49; Ehrhardt (1988) 38). Early Ionian Hellenisation of a pre-existing settlement is sometimes presumed (Bilabel (1920) 49; cf. L. Robert (1967) 122; Herrmann (1981) 17 n. 48). At an unknown date in C5 Zeleia began to collaborate with Athens, at least through one of its citizens (Meiggs (1972) 508–12), and in 441/40 the city occurs once in the tribute lists among the Hellespontine members (Ζέλεια: IG i3 271.11.38). The toponym is completely restored in the assessment decree of 425/4 (IG i3 71.11.102). Under Persian domination from, at latest, the King’s Peace of 387/6, Zeleia supported the Persians against Alexander the Great in 334 but obtained an amnesty from the conqueror (Arr. Anab. 1.17.2). Some decrees passed in the wake of the battle of Granikos testify to a democratic constitution (infra). Finally, like many other settlements in the region, Zeleia was eventually subdued by Kyzikos (no. 747) (Strabo 13.1.5; cf. 12.4.6, 13.1.10) and, probably, turned into a fort (φρούριον) in the Kyzikene territory (cf. Steph. Byz. 295.7).

Almost all information about institutions, officials, cults and calendar stems from two inscriptions (SGDI 5532 = Syll.3 279 = Michel 530 and SGDI 5533 = Michel 531) connected with the establishment of a democratic regime after 334 (cf. Lolling (1881), (1884) 58–60). They attest a popular assembly called δήμος (5532.1, 5533b–f), an ἐπιστάτης (5532.1, 5533b–e), the “officials” (ἄρχοντες: 5532.22, 33.38), δικασταὶ and σύντομοι νήσων (5532.27, 30–32; see also δήμος: 11.26, 34; γνώμη: 13). SGDI 5532 and 5533f concern the regulation of the possession of public land (cf. δημόσια χώρα: 5532 passim). The reference to land belonging to exiles testifies to a stasis in connection with the change of constitution (καὶ γένεις τῶν φιλόχων: 5533f). The decrees SGDI5533a–c grant politeia, ateleia and proedria to foreigners; 5533d grants politeia, land, ateleia and proedria to an inhabitant of Zeleia; while 5533e grants land (as above), ateleia and proedria to a Zeleian citizen. Of the foreigners honoured, one is a proxenos of Zeleia in Eresos (no. 796) (5533c) and one is from Thourioi (no. 74) (5533b).
SGDI 5532 mentions the acropolis of the city (6–7), the sanctuary of Apollo Pythios (36–37) as well as other public sanctuaries (38). Strabo 13.1.13 mentions that there had once been an oracle (μαντεῖον) in Zeleia, probably to be connected with the cult of Apollo Pythios. A public oath invoking Artemis (SGDI 5532.10, 32) as well as coin types (infra) testify to a cult of Artemis. From SGDI 5532.17, 23–24 are known the names of three months of the local calendar: ‘Ἡραῖος, Ἐκκυπάσιος and Ἀκάταλλος (Samuel (1972) 131). The two last are not known from other poleis.

Zeleia struck bronze coins in C4s. Obv. head of Artemis, wearing stephanos; rev. stag standing or symbol; legend: ZEAE (Head, HN 2 550; SNG Cop. Troas 501–4).
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I. The Region

The Troad is the name given by modern scholars to the north-west region of Asia Minor. It is called Ἑ Τρῳας (Hdt. 5.26.1), but this name was also applied to the city of Alexandria, which was founded at the end of C4 from a synoecism of the communities of Kolonai, Larisa, Chrysa, Hamaxitos, Neandreia, Kebren and Skepsis (L.Alexandria Troad 4–8). So Phaidimos, an Olympic victor of 200 from Alexandria, was referred to as Αἰολεὺς ἐκ πόλεως Τρῳαδος (Paus. 5.8.11), a designation which combined a mention of his ethnic origin with that of his place of residence. The ethnic Τρῳαδεύς was applied in particular to inhabitants of this city (L.Alexandria Troad 3–4). In Antiquity the boundaries of the Troad were not firmly fixed, and the ancient authorities give varying information about its geographical extent. Strabo 13.1.4 summarises earlier opinions. According to Hom. II. 2.825, the eastern boundary was the river Aisepos, while Eudoxos of Knidos (frr. 7–8, Gissinger) set this limit at Priapos (modern Karabiga) and Artake (modern Erdek). Damastes (FGrHist 5) fr. 9 reckoned that the territory extended from Parion to Cape Lekton, while Charon of Lampskos (FGrHist 262) fr. 13 placed the limits at the river Praktios and at Adramyttion. Skylax, cited by Strabo and followed by Ps.-Skylax 95, indicated that the Troad began at Abydos, but extended only as far as Hamaxitos, while the southern coastline as far as Antandros belonged to Aiolis (Ps.-Skylax 96). Xenophon in An. 5.6.23 also assigned the inland cities of Kebren, Skepsis and Neandreia to Aiolis, and in Hell. 3.1.15–18 deemed Gergis, Ilios and Koyklioun to be Aiolic, but it is clear that this is partly for the reason that these places belonged to the Persian satrapy of Aiolis, controlled by Pharnabazos (Hell. 3.1.10; cf. Winter (1994) 4–6). Ephor. fr. 163 indeed reckoned the entire coastline from Abydos to Kyme to be part of Aiolis. Herodotos, on the other hand, described Antandros as being in the Troad (5.26.1). The term Aiolic may be applied to settlements in north-west Asia Minor not on narrowly geographical grounds, or with reference to the political conditions of the Persian Empire, but in recognition of the ethnic or tribal origins of the inhabitants (Ruge (1939) 526). Thus the label of Aiolic city was given even to Ilion, located at the actual site of ancient Troy (Xen. Hell. 3.1.16). Modern scholarship has tended to follow the definition set by Charon of Lampskos, and assign to the Troad the coastal cities of the Hellespontos, of the Aegean coast from the Sigeion promontory to Cape Lekton, and along the north side of the Gulf of Adramyttion as far as Antandros and Asyra. The Troad also included the inland communities within this geographical definition, especially in the basin of the river Skamandros north of Mt. Ida.

The sources make clear that the Troad had an indigenous population, some of whose settlements were clearly identified as such by Greek writers. These include Antandros, which Hdt. 7.42.1 calls Pelasgian Ἀντανδρος Ἡ Πελασγίς. Homer mentions the tribes of the Pelasgians that inhabited Trojan Larisa (II. 2.841). Assos and Gargara were occupied by Lelegians. Gergis or Gergithe seems effectively to have been a barbarian polis, inhabited by what Hdt. 5.122.2 refers to as οἱ υπολειφθέντες τῶν ἀρχαίων Τευκρῶν, the descendants of the ancient people of Troy. A passage of Xenophon implies that the population of Skepsis also included an indigenous element, who were incorporated as free citizens within the polis (Xen. Hell. 3.1.21).

The Troad received Greek colonies. Several of its cities are said to have been colonised from the island of Lesbos: Tenedos was settled from Lesbos (Hdt. 1.151.1–2), Achilleion specifically from Mytilene (Strabo 13.1.39), and Assos probably from Methymna (Strabo 13.1.58). There is probably no truth in the supposition that Arisbe was connected with the homonymous settlement on the island of Lesbos, since it is more reliably identified as a Milesian foundation (Strabo 14.1.6). Assos in turn created a sub-colony at Gargara (Strabo 13.1.58). Ilion, Kolonai, Lamponeia, Neandreia and Antandros are simply said to be Aiolic cities, but Kebren was founded specifically by Kyme. Abydos (Thuc. 8.62.1) and Arisbe, which was incorporated into Abydan territory (Polyb. 5.111.5), were Milesian foundations, probably of C7.
Dardanos (settlers unknown) and Rhoiteion, founded by DORians from AstypalaiA (Strabo 13.1.42), were other new coastal settlements of C7–C6. Sigeion is reported to have been established by the Athenian Physkon at the end of C7 (Strabo 13.1.38). Athenian control was contested by the Mytilenians in early C6 but was consolidated under the Peisistratid tyrants. There were twenty-nine attested poleis of the Archaic and Classical periods in the region of the Troad. The sites of only five of these—Abdios, Assos, Dardanos, Ilion and Sigeion—are guaranteed by the firmest criterion, the discovery of an inscription naming the city at the site itself. All the other cities listed in the Inventory below have been identified by other less certain arguments with appropriate archaeo-

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis

At least thirteen further named settlements existed in the Troad during this period, and in each case there are some grounds for believing that they may have been recognised as poleis. Of these only Achaiion and Palaiperkote have been identified with reasonable confidence, while the other locations are at best tentative. These other settlements are as follows.

Achaiion (ἈΧαίιων) Ps.-Skylax 95 identifies an ἀκρωτήριον Ἀχαίων. This reading derives from an emenda-
tion by Leaf (1911–12) 299 of the MS κρατήρες Ἀχαίων. Strabo 13.1.46 calls the place τὸ Ἀχαίων and refers to it as a πόλισμα (13.1.47). The site, called Han Tepe (Cook (1973) 196), has been located at Kum Burnu (“sandy promontory”) by Leaf (1923) 168. Achaiion was part of the Tenedian peraia (Strabo 13.1.44. 46, 47), adjoining Achilleion on the north and Larisa on the south. It was next to the city of Alexandria. The ethnic ΑΧαίιων is attested on C2 bronze coins: obv. head of Zeus, or Artemis the huntress; legend: ΑΧαίιων or ΑΧαίιτων; or obv. head of Apollo; rev. tripod; legend: AXAI arranged in a square. Imhoof-Blümer (1915) 103–4 attributed these coins to Achaiion and suggested that the C4 bronze coins with the monogram AX, normally attributed to Achilleion, might also have been issued by the city (cf. L. Robert (1951) 8–9 n. 2). Barr. AC.

Aiantaion (Αιαντεῖον) A harbour settlement called Aiantaion is reported by Plin. HN 5.125 to have been founded by the Rhodians at the site where the hero Ajax was buried. An Athenian inscription of c.375 mentions an Athenian expedition in the area commanded by Chabrias: [οἱ στρατιῶται οἱ ἐν τῷ ἈΙ|ντεῖῳ τῶι [ἐν 'Ελλησπόντο|ν] |στρατιῶται] ©μαχεῖον (Burnett and Edmonson (1961) 80). The harbour existed in the Roman Imperial period up to AD 324 (Philost. VA 4.13; Zos. 2.23–24). The site has been located at Tek Top by Cook (1973) 86–87. Barr. 56, C.

Chrysa (Χρύση) Plin. HN 5.132 mentions Chrysa as a civitas which had once existed in the area where the Sminthion still stood. A C2 (?) Hellenistic inscription set up in the Sminthion implies the presence of a garrison and mentions [του] ἐν Χρύσῃ πολείται (I.Alexandria Troas 4), but we should understand that these were citizens not of Chrysa as an independent polis, but of Alexandria Troas. No pre-Hellenistic remains have been noted at the site, and it may have succeeded Hamaxitos, which was occupied until the end of C4 (Cook (1988) 15). Barr. AC.

Kremaste (Κρεμαστή) According to Xen. Hell. 4.8.37, this place lay beside a plain in the territory of Abdios and was associated with gold mines. Cook (1973) 290 argues that it was located at Gavur Hisar, in the valley of the river Rhodios. Barr. 51, C.

Marpessos (Μάρπησσος) Paus. 10.12.3 mentions the former polis Μάρπησσος ἐν τῇ Σήνῃ τῇ Ῥωμικῇ, which has tentatively been located at Damkale (Zerdalılık) by Cook (1973) 281–82. In Pausanias’ time there were sixty inhabitants in its ruins. Lactantius (Div. inst. 1.6.12) says that it was a vicius of Gergis. It was the legendary home of the sibyl Herophile, whose cult was adopted by the city of Gergitha, to which Marpessos belonged (C. Robert (1887) 454ff). See Leaf (1923) 106; Cook (1973) 280–82. Barr. C.

Miletos Plin. HN 5.122 mentions Miletos as an extinct settlement in Mycia (see Ruge (1932)). It has been located in the neighbourhood of Adramyttion, possibly at the crossing of the river Euenos. It may therefore belong to Aiolis, not the Troad. Barr. 56, AC.

Palamedium, Polymedia (Πολυμέδειον) Plin. HN 5.132 names an oppidum Palamedium and a civitas called Polymedia as settlements in the Troad. They may be identical with one another, and Polymedia is certainly to be identified with Polymedeion, a chorion which Strabo situated between Lekton and Assos (13.1.51). On the basis of this information editors have restored the name Π(αλαμέδειον) in the
Athenian tribute assessment document of 424/3 (IG 1 71.113.136). Barr. 56, AC.

**Pedasos** (Πέδασος) Strabo 13.1.59 refers to a polis called Pedasos, which had once been inhabited by the Leleges in the region of Assos and Gargara, but which was now abandoned. This may, however, be an alternative or previous name for the settlement of Assos itself. Barr. unlocated, only H.

**Pityeia** (Πίτυεια) One of the toponyms listed in Ps.-Skylax 97 after the heading Αἰολίδες πόλεις...ἐπὶ θαλάσση, with Kebren, Neandra and Skepsis (MS πετίεια, conj. Voss). Strabo 13.1.44 refers to places called Zelea and Pityeia, apparently in the mountain country north-east of Skepsis. The place is not to be identified with Pitya, which Strabo 13.1.15 says was in the territory of Parion, between Parion and Priapos (Ruge (1939) 560). Not in Barr.

**Polion, Polisma** (Πόλιον, Πῶλομα) People of Astypalaia, from their new settlement of Rhoiteion on the Hellespontos, founded a further colony called Πόλιον, which was renamed Πῶλομα in Strabo’s day. This was destroyed soon after its foundation and the land assigned to Rhoiteion or Sigeion, but it was resettled in C6 under the Lydians and recovered its territory. It possessed a sanctuary. Whether these coins attributed to Polion in fact belong to Skamandra, which was destroyed soon after its foundation and the land assigned to Rhoiteion or Sigeion, but which was resettled in C6 under the Lydians and recovered its territory. It possessed a sanctuary, and the word Polion or Sigeion, but it was resettled in C6 under the Lydians and recovered its territory. It possessed a sanctuary, but Strabo denies that it was a city, although its population gradually increased thereafter (Strabo 13.1.42). Not in Barr.

**Skamandra** (Σκάµανδρα) Plin. HN 5.124 refers to a place called Skamandria, and an inscription from Ilion may refer to its inhabitants as οἱ ἐν Σκαµανδρῷ (I. Ilion 63.3, 5, 25 (C2–C1)). Steph. Byz. 573.12 has Σκαµάνδρος, ποσταμῶν Τροίας, ἀπό Σκαµάνδρου and provides the ethnics Σκαµανδρικός, Σκαµανδριανός, Σκαµανδρίνιος. Since the phrase ἀπό Σκαµάνδρου should refer to the famous river, the previously mentioned Σκαµάνδρος cannot itself be the river, and the word ποσταμῶν in this entry is surely a mistake for πόλις. This inference is also implied by the assortment of ethnics. In the Hellenistic period it may have been a polis, since its inhabitants were parties to a treaty with Ilion. Coins of Skamandra were identified by Imhoff-Blümer (1901) 42–44; cf. Head, HN 5 548. But it is uncertain whether these coins attributed to Skamandra in fact belong to Skepsis; see L. Robert (1966) 98–103. The bronze types which have been attributed to Skamandra are the following.


**Sminthion** (Σμίνθιον) The sanctuary of Apollo Smintheus, which lay close to the site of Chrysa on the territory of Hamaxitos (Strabo 13.1.48). The cult of Apollo Smintheus is mentioned by Homer (II.1.37–39) and is widely attested on coins of cities in the Troad. The great temple of Apollo Smintheus, whose foundations have been excavated, dates to the middle Hellenistic period (Rumscheid (1995)), but it doubtless stood above an earlier structure. A terracotta antefix of C5 is reported from the site (Mitchell (1999) 139). Barr. 56.

**Thymbra** (Θύμβρα) Hom. II. 10.430 refers to Θύμβρας; compare Θύμβρα πόλις Τρομάδος, Δαρδάνου κτίσμα in Steph. Byz. 319.17; Strabo 13.1.35 mentions τὸ πεδίον ἢ Θύμβρα and the ethnics Θύμβραῖος (applied to the cult of Apollo Thymbraios, Strabo 13.1.35) and Θύμβριος (applied to the river). No city site has been certainly located, but Strabo’s Thymbrian plain was south of Ilion, around the confluence of the Thymbrios and the Skamandros, which was the site of the sanctuary of Apollo Thymbraios. Cook (1973) 117–23 reports in detail on local finds around the now deserted village of Akça Köy. The presence of an important Archaic and Classical cemetery is consistent with the location of a polis here. Thymbra was supposedly assessed for tribute to the Delian League in 425/4 on the basis of a doubtful reading of the initial letter of the name (IG 1 71.113.134). Head, HN 2 550 attributed to Thymbra C4 bronze coins. Types: obv. head of Zeus Ammon, or Athena; rev. rays of star, or torch in olive wreath; legend: θΥ. Cook (1973) 117–23 suggested that these coins may have been issued by a community in southern Aiolis. Barr. AC.

All of these cities may have been poleis in the Archaic and Classical periods.

**II. The Poleis**

765. **Abydos** (Abydenos) Map 51. Lat. 40.10, long. 23.15.

Size of territory: 4. Type: Aca. The toponym is Ἀβυδος, ἦ (Hdt. 9.114.2; Thuc. 8.62.3; I.Knidos 603.12 (C4f)), the city-ethnic is Ἀβυδωνίς (IG 1 264.14.10), or Ἀβυδόν (Hdt. 7.44; I.Knidos 603.4; Head HN 2 538–39).

Abydos was founded in C7e from Miletos (Thuc. 8.61.1). It is called a polis in the urban sense by Hdt. 5.117.1 and Xen. Hell. 4.8.5, and in the political sense by Xen. Hell. 4.8.36. In Ps.-Skylax 94 Abydos is one of the toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις Ἑλληνίδες αἱδ. By implication Abydos is
called a polis in the territorial sense at Hdt. 7.43.2, and is called an asty by Xenophon at Hell. 4.8.39.

The earliest collective external use of the city-ethnic is in the Athenian tribute lists between 454/3 and 429/8 (infra) and the earliest collective internal use is on C5f coins (infra). The external individual use is found in Hdt. 4.138.1; IG 12 1340 (425–400); and IG 11 2 49 (C4e).

The name of territory was ἡ τῶν Αβυδονίων χώρα (Xen. Hell. 4.8.6; cf. Hdt. 7.95.2) or Αβυδονίη (Xen. Hell. 4.8.35). It included gold mines mentioned by Kallisthenes (FGfrHist 124 fr. 54.12); Xen. Hell. 4.8.37 implies that these were in the plain near Kremaste. Xerxes mustered his troops along πάσας τὰς ἀκτας καὶ τὰ τῶν Αβυδονίων πεδία (Hdt. 7.45). The territory extended to Dardanos on the south-west (Hdt. 7.43.2) and as far as Astyra, which by Strabo’s day was incorporated (Strabo 13.1.23). Abydos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is registered from 454/3 (IG 13 259.11.29, restored) to 418/7 (IG 13 287.11.25) a total of eighteen times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of sometimes 4 tal. (IG 13 271.11.29), sometimes 6 tal. (IG 13 279.11.17) and sometimes other amounts. It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG 13 71.11.62, restored). It defected from the Delian League in 421 (Thuc. 8.62.1), and Xenophon mentions the presence of a Spartan harmost at Abydos in Hell. 3.9.4, 4.8.3, 5 and 32. In Hell. 1.18 he refers to foot-soldiers of Abydos, and in 4.8.33 to 200 hoplites, 50 of whom were later killed (4.8.39).

Abydos was under the control of a pro-Persian tyrant, Daphnis, in the 520s (Hdt. 4.138.1), and it was one of the Hellespontine cities destroyed by fire by Dareios after his Skythian expedition (Strabo 13.1.22). Five men of Abydos are recorded as proxenoi of Athens in IG 11 2 49 (C4e); and Iphiades of Abydos was appointed proxenos by Knidos in C4f (I. Knidos 603).

Arist. Pol. 1305b33 classifies the constitution of Abydos as an oligarchy, in which the magistrates were still chosen by the hoplites and the people. As such it was unstable and liable to upheaval: ἀλλ’ αἱ μὲν ἄρχαι ἐκ τιµηµάτων µεγάλων εἶσαι ἡ ἑταιρία, αἱροῦνται δὲ οἱ ὀπλίται καὶ οἱ δήµοι, ὄπερ ἐν Αβυδό τὸ συνέβαινεν . . . κινοῦνται δ’ αἱ δηλαγραφία ἐξ αὐτῶν καὶ διὰ φιλονεικίας δηµαγογούντων. This oligarchy may be dated to the period after Abydos’ defection from Athens in 411. C.360, after a period of stasis, the oligarchy was replaced by a new tyranny under Iphiades (Arist. Pol. 1306b26–31; I. Knidos 603). The same stasis, or another period of stasis, is referred to at Arist. Oec. 1349b3–8: a stasismos led to the land being left uncultivated, and to resident foreigners (μέτοικοι) refusing to make loans until they had been paid for existing debts. A decree was passed (ἐδῆµεν ἵστανε) allowing anyone who wished to provide loans to the farmers, who were to repay their creditors from the first yield of their harvests.

There are few remains of the city. Arist. Mir. ausc. 832b–17 mentions a theatre, and the accounts of sieges in C3 and C4 imply that it was fortified (Thuc. 8.62.3; Xen. Hell. 4.8.4, 5.17).


An external communal dedication at Delphi is recorded in F.Delphes 1114.215 (C4f/C3e).

766. Achilles
Map 56. Lat. 39.55, long. 26.10. Size of territory: 1. Type: A: a. The toponym is Ἀχιλλιένων, τό (Hdt. 5.94.2) or Ἀχιλλείων (MS Αἰγιαλείων) (Ps.-Skylax 95). The city-ethics Ἀχιλλείωτης and Ἀχιλλείτης are recorded by Steph. Byz. 152.14–15, in general of places called Ἀχιλλείον.

Achilleion is called a polis in the urban sense by Hdt. 5.94.2, when it was used as a base by Mytilenians involved in conflict with the Athenians based in its northern neighbour, Sigeion. In Ps.-Skylax 95 Achilleion is one of the toponyms listed after the heading τόποις Ἐλληνικῶς . . . άιδε. The name has been restored in the assessment lists of the Delian League in 425/4 (IG 13 71.113.137) and 421 (IG 13 77.11.23), where it is found in lists of Ακταινία poleis that use polis in the political sense.

The city walls were reputedly built by the Mytilenians with stones from the ruins of Lison (Strabo 13.1.39). The site at Beşika Burnu was identified with Achilleion by Cook (1973) 186–88 (accepted by Barr.); at Beşika Burnu are remains of a fortification wall securely dated to C6f (Cook (1973) 186–88; Korffmann (1988) 394–95; Schulz (2000) 11–12).

Achilleion probably minted bronze coins c.350–300; for the attribution, see Imhoof-Blumer (1901) 33–34. However, L. Robert (1951) 8–9 n. 2 pointed out that these coins might also be attributed to Achaion. Obv. helmet, or helmeted
head of Athena; rev. the same in wreath; legend: AX, monogram (Head, HN² 540; SNG Cop. Trias 64).

767. Antandros (Antandrios) Map 56. Lat. 39.35, long. 26.50. Size of territory: 4; Type: A:B. The toponym is Ἀντανδρός, ἦ (Thuc. 4.52.3, 75.1; Xen. Hell. 1.1.25, IG i² 77.14.15). Ἀντανδρός ἦ ἐν Τριφυλίῳ γῆ (Hdt. 5.26), Ἀντανδρός ἦ Πελοπόννησος (Hdt. 7.42.1). The city-ethnic is Ἀντανδρίς (Thuc. 8.108.4; SEG 22 191 (C48)).

Alkaios calls it a polis in the political sense (PLFZ3), and it is listed, also in the political sense, as one of the Aktaiai poleis in IG i² 77.14.15. At Thuc. 4.52.3 Antandros is called a polis twice, first in the urban, then in the political sense; and it is called a polis in the urban sense by Thuc. 8.108.4. Xen. Hell. 1.1.26 has politeia. It is called παρίσ as Diod. 13.42.4 (141). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally by Thuc. 8.108.4, Xen. Hell. 1.1.26 and an inscription of C2 (Michel 542), and internally by C55 coins (infra). The external individual use of the city-ethnic is found in SEG 22 191 (C48).

Its territory was called ἡ Ἀντανδρία by Arist. Hist. an. 519/16 and later sources. It included shipyards at Aspaea and a sanctuary of Artemis at Astyra, which is called a polis in Ps.-Skylax 98, a kome in Strabo 13.1.51, and a poleinche in Strabo 13.16.5. It belonged to the Troad (Hdt. 5.26), and its tribal affiliation was Aiolic.

Antandros was founded by Aiolians (Thuc. 8.108.4), although later sources alleged a link with Andros, on a spurious etymological basis (Pomponius Mela 1.18; Servius on Verg. Aen. 3.6). There are also references to the indigenous population. Hdt. 7.42.1 calls it Ἀντανδρός ἦ Πελοπόννησος; Alkaios (D. L. Page, Lyrica Graeca Selecta fr. 156 ἀπὸ Strabo 13.1.51) refers to a community of Leleges; and Demetrios of Skepsis ἀπὸ Strabo 13.1.51 to a community of Kilikes. It is also said to have been previously occupied by Thramban Esonoi and Kimmerioi (Arist. fr. 483.1).

The city was captured by Otenes, the Persian satrap of the Hellespontine area, c. 512 (Hdt. 5.26). It became a member of the Delian League after the Mytilene Revolt from 427, but was betrayed by Mytilenean refugees, who occupied the city before it was recovered in summer 425 (Thuc. 4.52.3, 75.1–2). The toponym is recorded among the Aktaiai poleis in the tribute lists of 425/4 (IG i² 71.111.125, restored) and 421 (IG i³ 77.14.15), and Antandros was reckoned to be one of the Ἀκταιαι πόλεις (Thuc. 4.52.3). In 411/0 it ejected a Persian garrison (Thuc. 8.108.4–5). There is evidence for sympoliteia with the Syracusans, who were given politeia by the Antandrians in thanks for benefits received in 409 (Xen. Hell. 1.1.26). It was on the route of the Delphic theorodōkoi around 200 (Plassart (1921) 8; Cook (1988) 12). In C2 Antandros sent foreign judges to Peltai in Phrygia (Michel 668).

The acropolis is mentioned by Thuc. 8.108.5, and the walls were repaired with Syracusan help in 409 (Xen. Hell. 1.1.26). Cults of Antandros include Apollo, who appears as a contributor in a list of stepphephoroi of C1 (Michel 668), and Artemis Astyrene, who appears on the coinage.

Antandros struck coins of silver and bronze, c.440–400 and c.400–284. Denominations: triobol, trihemiobol, trite.

768. Arisbe (Arisbaia) Map 51. Lat. 40.10, long. 26.30, but the exact site has not been localised. Type: Ba: The toponym is Ἀρίσβα, ἦ (Hom. II. 2.836, 6.13, 21.43); Diod. 14.38.3 has Ἀρίσβα. The city-ethnic is Ἀρισβαῖος (IG i² 271.123). Arisbe is called a polis in the urban sense by Diod. 14.38.3 (1399). Plin. HN 5.125 calls Arisbe an oppidum, which was still inhabited in his day. By 216 it was part of the territory of Abydos (Polyb. 5.11.5). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i³ 281.111.38).

The founder of Arisbe was Miletos (Strabo 14.1.6). Steph. Byz. 119.9 reports a foundation story from Ephor. fr. 164 that Arisbe was a Mytilenean foundation, but this seems to be a false inference from the existence of the homonymous Arisba on Lesbos (Strabo 13.1.21; Hdt. 1.151.2). It is not mentioned by Herodotos, Thucydides or Xenophon, although their narratives concern the cities of this region (see Teng (1994) 147). Arisbe was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is registered from 453/2 (IG i² 260.14.16, restored) to 430/29 (IG i³ 281.111.38) a total of five times, paying a phoros of 2 tal. (IG i³ 271.123). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.111.63, restored).

769. Assos (Assios) Map 56. Lat. 39.30; long. 26.29. Size of territory: 4; Type: Ba: The toponym is Ἀσσίος, ἦ (Xen. Ages. 2.26; Ephor. fr. 47). The following forms of the city-ethnic are attested: Ἀσσίος (C5 coins, infra; OGIS 221.2 (274)), Ἀσσίοις (C5 coins), Ἀσσίος (Steph. Byz. 157.2); Ἐσσίος (IG i² 284.20), ἡ Ἐσσίος (IG i³ 283.111.16), Ἡσσίος (Krateros fr. 23, Kreech).

Assos is not called a polis by Archaic or Classical sources, but Steph. Byz. 156.7 retrospectively (and erroneously) calls
it a πόλις Αιδέας. This passage, which does not identify his source, refers to Assos as a polis in an urban sense, and in a political sense as the second city of Aiolis. That Assos was a polis at least in the Classical period is indicated by its membership of the Delian League and its coinage (infra).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally by the tribute lists of the Delian League (infra) and internally by C5s coins (infra). Individually, the external city-ethnic is attested in OGIS 221 (274), and it is used for the Stoic Kleanthes (born 331) in, e.g., Plut. De exil. 599A and Diog. Laert. 7.168.

The territory of Assos may have included the poleis of Gargara and Lamponeion (Leaf (1923) 253–57), the former having been founded by Assians (Strabo 13.1.58).

According to Hellan. fr. 160, Assos was founded from Lesbos by Aiolians, and according to Myrsilos (FGRhHist 477) fr. 17 by Methymna (both apud Strabo 13.1.58); Alexander Polyhistor. fr. 137 (FGHist 118, fr. 96), in a commentary on Alkman, referred to Assos as an ἀποικος Μετυληναίων (Steph. Byz. 136.12). It retained the character of an Aiolic city, as is shown by the survival of the cult in imperial times of Zeus Homoloios, which is common in Boiotia (IGRiv 256; see RE viii. 2263–64 and xa. 244). A prior Lelegian population is referred to in Hom. Il. 10.429, noted by Strabo 13.1.58.

Assos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionian district and is registered from 454/3 (IG i 259.1.9) to 427/6 or 426/5 (IG i 284,20) a total of eight times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 1 tal. (IG i 259.1.9). It was presumably assessed for tribute in 410/9 (Kratos fr. 23, Krech = IG i 100).

Assos was ruled by the tyrants Euboulos, c.360, and his eunuch/slave Hermias, who died in 344 and was based at Atarneus in Aiolis (Strabo 13.1.57; see Leaf (1923) 295–97). In C4m the tyrant Ἐρμίας with his associates was an equal partner in a treaty with Erythrai (L.Erythrai 9). Hermias was resident at Assos from 348 to 345 (see the sources in Leaf (1923) 299).

The Archaic city temple on the acropolis, rebuilt in C4, was probably dedicated to Athena Polias; see coin types and LAssos14.11: Αθηνᾶς ἱερεία (first century AD). It was Doric, with six by thirteen columns, pronaos in antis, and an enclosed cela. The architraves and metopes were decorated with scenes from the Herakles cycle (Westcoat (1987); Stüpperich (1996)).

Fortifications built from polygonal masonry of the Archaic (? ) period were succeeded by well-preserved ashlar walls of C4 (? ); Lang (1996) 223; Schulz (2000) 16. These contained two main gateways with square towers, seven smaller gates, one round and numerous square towers, and enclosed an area of a little more than 55 ha (PECS). The acropolis was separately fortified. The city was besieged by the Persian satraps Autophradates and Maussollos in 365 (Xen. Ages. 2.26).

A cemetery with burials dating between C6 and C4 has been excavated on either side of a paved street outside the west gate (Stüpperich (1994)). Domestic housing of C6–C5 is also recorded. Other public buildings, including an agora with stoas, a bouleuterion, a theatre (destroyed in the nineteenth century), as well as fountain houses and drainage systems date mostly to the Hellenistic period (PECS).

Three periods can be distinguished when Assos minted coins. (1) Silver, c.479–450: obv. griffin; rev. lion’s head. (2) Silver, c.450–400: obv. head of Athena, wearing helmet; rev. lion’s head, or Archaic statue of Athena with spear and fillets; legend: ΑΣΣΙΟϹΟΝ or ΑΣΣΙΟϹΟΝ (sic) or ΑΣΣΙΩ. (3) Silver and bronze, c.400–241: obv. head of Athena; rev. various types; legend: ΑΣΣΙΩ or ΑΣΣΙΟΝ (Head, ΗΝ2 542; SNG Cop. Troas 226–44).

770. Astyra (Astyrenos) Map 56. Lat. 39.35, long. 26.55. Size of territory: 1? Type: [A]:a. The toponym is Ἀστυρα Μύσια, ἀτά (IG i 273.1.25–26; Ps.-Skylax 98). The city-ethnic is Ἀστυρηνοὶ Μύσοι (IG i 272.11.9). Ps.-Skylax assigns it to Lydia, while the tribute lists of the Delian League and Strabo make it part of Mysia (13.1.65). It was probably situated at Kiliseteppe Kaphcalari. In Ps.-Skylax 98 Astyra is the first toponym listed after the heading πόλεις Ἑλληνιδῶν . . . Αἰσθίδων. Strabo describes it as a κώµη (13.1.51; cf. Steph. Byz. 140.16) but formerly a πολιτεία dependent on Antandros (13.1.65). The “city-ethnic” is applied to Artemis by Xen. Hell. 4.1.41, and collectively and externally it is used in the Athenian tribute lists.

Astyra was a member of the Delian League, usually recorded by city/city-ethnic but once by toponym (IG i 273.1.25–26). It belonged to the Ionian district and is registered from 454/3 (IG i 259.11.6) to 438/7 (IG i 274.11.3) a total of eight times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 500 dr. (IG i 272.11.9).

The community housed the sanctuary of Artemis Astyrene (Xen. Hell. 4.1.41; Ps.-Skylax 98), which was also reckoned to belong to Antandros.

Astyra struck coins of silver and bronze in C5–C4. (A) Bronze, c.400–395: obv. bearded head of Tissaphernes; legend: ΠΙΣΣΑ; rev. facing cult image of Artemis Astyrene;
legend: $\Sigma$ΤΥΡΗ. (B) Silver and bronze coins of C5–C4, previously ascribed to an Astyra in Karia (Steph. Byz. 140.17–18), are now believed to have been minted by Astyra in Mysia. (1) Silver, C5: obv. amphora, or oinochoe, or rose; rev. oinochoe, and/or square incuse; legend: $A$ or $\Sigma$ΤΥΡΗ. (2) Silver, C5: obv. head of Artemis?; rev. rose; legend: $\Sigma$ΤΥΡΗ. (3) Bronze, C4: obv. head of Helios; rev. amphora and various symbols, or bow; legend: $\Sigma$ΤΥΡΗ or $\Sigma$ΤΥΡΗ. (4) Bronze, C4: obv. head of Aphrodite; legend: $\Sigma$ΤΥΡΗ (Stäuber (1996) 11.252–60; SNG Cop. Caria 158; Suppl. 298).

771. Astyra Troika Map 51. Lat. 40.05, long. 26.40. Size of territory: ? Type: C? The toponym is Ἀστυρα Τροίκα, τά (IG i³ 71.111.86; Strabo 13.1.23). Strabo describes this Astyra as a πόλις κατεσκαµµένη, situated in Troas and now belonging to Abydos, but in earlier times independent and in possession of gold mines, now exhausted. The date of its destruction is unknown. It was claimed to be a member of the Delian League; attested by the name Ἀστυρα Τροίκα in the assessment of 425/4 (IG i³ 71.111.86). See Leaf (1923) 133; ATL i. 472; Stäuber (1996).

772. Azeia (Azieius) Unlocated. Not in Barr. Type: Cβ? The toponym may have been Ἀζεία (suggested by Steph. Byz. 32.4). The ethnic is Ἀζείης (Ἀζείης, IG i³ 279.1.106) or Ἀζεῖα (Ἀζεία, IG i³ 261.iv.28) or Ἀζεῖειότης (Hellan. fr. 58).

The Azieans were members of the Delian League. They belonged to the Hellespontine district (IG i³ 270.11.26) and are recorded from 452/1 (IG i³ 261.iv.28) to 415/4 (IG i³ 290.111.3, ethnic heavily restored) a total of seven times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of 400 dr. (IG i³ 261.iv.28). They were perhaps assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.111.67: [Ἀζέιος] [ἐίς ]). Since the Azieans are recorded in the tribute lists by ethnic only and never by toponym, and since we have no other source, we do not know whether they were settled in a polis town or were a people living dispersed or settled in small villages. Being recorded in the tribute lists, the Azieans must have been a political community, and possibly a polis, but we have no proof.

In the Athenian tribute lists the Ἀζεῖις belong to the Hellespontine district, whereas the Ἀζεῖοι are classified by Steph. Byz—quoting Hellanikos—as an ἐθνος τῆς Τρῳάδος. If the Azieans were the same as the Azieotans, they must have lived in northern Asia Minor, and presumably in Troas. In ATL i. 463–64 the Azieans are connected with Azeus, grandfather of the Minyan leaders at Troy (Hom. II. 2.513) and placed in the Troad.

773. Birytis (Berysios) Map 56. Lat. 39.55, long. 26.20, but this location, at Mersinoba (Cook (1973) 114, 357), is not beyond doubt. Type: B? The toponym is Βέρυτις, Τρῳακὴ πόλις (Steph. Byz. 165.8) or Βήριδος, πόλις Τρῳακὴ (Steph. Byz. 167.6). The city-ethnic Βερύτις (Steph. Byz. 165.8 records the city-ethnic Βέρυτις, but there is no other authority for this.

No Archaic or Classical source calls Birytis a polis, and the retrospective mentions in Steph. Byz. do not indicate a source. However, the community issued its own coinage in C4l (infra). The external collective city-ethnic is recorded in the Athenian tribute lists (infra), and the internal by coins of C4l/C3 (infra).

Birytis was a member of the Delian League. It presumably belonged to the Hellespontine district (IG i³ 71.111.91, restored) and is recorded from 454/3 (IG i³ 259.v.11–12) to 446/5 (IG i³ 266.1.25) a total of six times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of 1,000 dr. (IG i³ 259.v.11). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.111.91, restored). However, it is not completely certain that the Berysioi are to be identified as the inhabitants of the polis mentioned by Steph. Byz. 165.8–9; see ATL i. 464–47, 475.

Birytis struck coins of silver and bronze in C4l/C3e. (1) Silver: obv. head of Herakles; rev. head of beardless Kabeiroi wearing pilos between two stars. (2) Bronze: obv. head of beardless Kabeiroi wearing pilos; rev. club, or triskele; legend: BIPY (Head, HN² 542; see Fritze (1904); L. Robert (1951) 25–31, SNG Cop. Troas 247–53).

774. Dardanos (Dardaneus) Map 51. Lat. 40.05, long. 26.25. Size of territory: 2. Type: Aα. The toponym is Δάρδανος, ἡ (Hdt. 5.117.1; Thuc. 8.104.2). The city-ethnic is Δαρδανεῖς (IG i³ 267.1.24; Xen. Hell. 3.1.10, An. 3.1.47); Δαρδανίς is found at Xen. Hell. 3.1.10; Steph. Byz. 219.3 has Δαρδανίδης. The kletic form Δαρδανική is applied to the territory (Strabo 13.1.44).

Dardanos is called a polis in the urban sense by Herodotos 5.117.1 and 7.43.2, where the territorial sense is a connotation. In Ps.-Skylax 95 Dardanos is the first toponym listed after the heading πόλεις Ἐλληνίδες . . . αἰδε. It is called polis in the political sense by Xen. An. 5.6.21 and 23 and an early Hellenistic inscription (Taşlık hôglu (1971) 187 no. 2). Furthermore, polis is used retrospectively by Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 1.46.1, who draws his information from Hellan. fr. 31. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally by IG i³ 267.1.24 and 268.11.31, and internally in the genitive
plurality on coins of the Roman period (SNG Cop. Troas 307–11), in abbreviated forms on coins of the Classical period (infra). The external individual use of the city-ethnic is attested in Xen. Hell. 3.1.10 and An. 5.6.21. The city territory is referred to in Mnaseas ((FHG 111) 154 fr. 28 = Steph. Byz. 219.1–2) as ἡ Δαρδανία, ἡ Τευκρίς πρῶτερον ἐκαλεῖται. For the few archaeological remains of the settlement (mostly sherds), see Cook (1973) 57–60.

Referring to an uncertain period between C4 and C1, Strabo described Dardanos as an ancient foundation, whose inhabitants were often transferred to Abydos by Hellenistic kings, but then returned to the ancient foundation, κτίσμα ἀρχαίον, οὔτω δ’ εὐκαταφρόνητος, ὡστε πολλάκις οἱ βασιλεῖς οἱ μὲν µετ' ὑπεστηρίζον αὐτὴν εἰς Ἀβυδον, οἱ δὲ ἀνθρώπων πάλιν εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον κτίσμα (Strabo 13.1.28). This passage may imply that it was an early, perhaps C7 Greek colonial settlement, but the colonists are unknown.

Dardanos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded from 451/50 (IG i3 262.4.iv.10) to 429/8 (IG i3 282B.1.3) a total of fifteen times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 1 tal. (IG i3 270.11.3). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.11.11.72, restored). It may have been controlled by the satrap of Aiolis, Ζήνης Δαρδανεύς, in 399 (Xen. Hell. 3.1.10). An early Hellenistic city decree (psophisma) mentions a boule (Tašklıkoğlu (1971) 187 no. 2). IG ii² 78 (before 378) is possibly a honorary decree for citizens of Dardanos (1.8: Δα[ρδανεύς]).

Dardanos struck coins of electrum, silver and bronze from C6/C5 to C4. Almost all the coin types show fighting cocks. (1) (?)Electrum staters, minted in Lydia, of C6/C5: obv. cock; rev. quadripartite incuse square. (2) Silver issues on the Persian standard, C5: obv. horseman; rev. cock(s); legend: ΔAP ZIH (a possible reference to Ζήνης Δαρδανεύς, satrap of Aiolis in 399, Xen. Hell. 3.1.10). (3) Silver and bronze, C4: similar types. Legend: ΔAP or ΔΑΡΔΑΝ (Head, HN² 544; SNG Cop. Troas 282–304).

775. Gargara (Gargareus) Map 56. Lat. 39.35, long. 26.30. Size of territory: 2. Type: Α/Β. The toponym is Γάργαρος, η (Hom. Il. 8.48, 15.151; Alkman apud Steph. Byz. 198.22), or Γάργαρα, τά (Ephor. fr. 47; Strabo 13.1.5); according to Steph. Byz. 199, Hellan. fr. 158 used the form Γάργαρας, but Stephanos states: οὐδέµα δὲ σφάλμα εἶναι. The presumed forerunner of the coastal site is called Παλαιά Γάργαρας (Etym. Magn. 231.30), or Παλαιάγαρας (Steph. Byz. 128.21). The city-ethnic is Γαργαρεύς (IG i3 270.1.34; Michel 522.22).

Gargara is called a polis in the urban sense by Ephor. fr. 47 and is implied to be a polis in the political sense in the inscription for Malousios of Gargara of 306 (Il. Ilion 1.4–5, 17, 22, etc.). The collective city-ethnic is attested internally on C5s coins (infra) and externally on C5 and C4 inscriptions (IG i3 270.1.34; Michel 522.22). The external individual use of the city-ethnic is found in a Chian C4 list of proxenoi (PEP Chios 50.12) and in the inscription of Ilion for Malousios (Michel 522.3, etc.). The name became the butt of jokes in the later C5. Alkaios comicus fr. 19, Kock, refers to γάργαρ’ ἀνθρώπων, and Ar. Ach. 3 to ψαμµακοσιογάργαρα (Leaf (1923) 263).

The city territory was known as ἡ Γαργαρίς (Strabo 13.1.58) and was proverbial for its fertility (Verg. G. 1.103; Sen. Phoen. 608; Macrobr. Sat. v.20.15–16; cf. Tenger (1994) 150 n. 91).

Gargara was a πόλις Ἀιολική (Strabo 13.1.5; cf. Steph. Byz. 128.22, who also cites Hecat. fr. 224), founded from Assos (Strabo 13.1.58), although the indigenous population was Lelegian (Strabo 13.1.58, interpreting Hom. Il. 10.428). Gargara was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionian district and is recorded from 451/2 (IG i3 261.v.22) to 428/7 (IG i3 283.111.22) a total of eight times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of either 4,500 dr. (IG i3 261.v.22) or 4,660 dr. (IG i3 270.1.34). It was assessed for tribute in 410/9 (IG i3 100.11.6). In C4 it was a member of the confederation of Athena Ilias (Michel 522). The site was relocated from Palaigargara on a mountain peak to a coastal site at an unspecified period, either before C5 (so ATL i. 477) or in the Hellenistic period later than the composition of the epigram of Aratos (Anth. Pal. 9.437; so Leaf (1923) 262). Demetrios of Skepsis apud Strabo 13.1.58 reports that colonists were brought from Miletoupolis by the kings, so that the population became semi-barbarous rather than Aiolic. This was presumably in the Hellenistic period.

The mountain-top site was defended by fortification walls of the Archaic period (Stüpperich (1995); cf. Schulz (2000) 28), and included a walled acropolis area with foundations of a temple. Hom. Il. 8.48 reports a cult of Zeus at the summit. Architectural remains include an Aiolic capital and a mid-C6 relief of an armed warrior, which may have served as a column (Stüpperich (1995), correcting and adding to Cook (1973) 255–61). It was on the route of the Delphic theordokoi c.200 (Plissart (1921) 8; Cook (1988) 15). A citizen of Gargara is listed in a C4 list of proxenoi from Chios (RPh (1937) 325–32 no. 6A.12).

Gargara minted silver and bronze coins. (1) Silver, c.420–400: denominations: tetrobol, diobol, hemiobol,
tritartemorion: obv. male head (Apollo?); rev. bull grazing, or galloping horse, or ram's head, or spokes of wheel. (2) Silver and bronze, c.400–284; denominations: tetrobol and small fractions: obv. Apollo laureate; rev. same types as (1), no wheel. Legend: ΓΑΡΓΙΤΩΝ or ΓΑΡΓΙΤΩΝ expanded to ΓΑΡΓΙΤΩΝΕΩΝ on imperial coins (Head, HN² 545; SNG Cop. Troas 314–31).

776. Gentoins (Gentios) Map 56. Lat. 39.55, long. 26.15. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: B. The toponym is Ἐβραίως (Steph. Byz. 203,3); the city-ethnic is Ἐβραίως (IG¹ 261,1,8; Steph. Byz. 203,4).

Gentoins is called a polis only by Steph. Byz. 203,3, who cites no earlier source. Steph. Byz. 203,3 also reports that it was founded by one of the sons of Aineias. However, the collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally by C4 coins (infra) and externally by the Athenian tribute lists (infra). The city presumably controlled a small territory in the Skamandros basin between Iliion and Skamandra.

Gentoins was a member of the Delian League. It is recorded from 452/1 (IG¹ 261,1,8 to 444/3 (IG¹ 268,1,31) a total of seven times, paying a phoros of 500 dr. (IG¹ 261,1,8). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG¹ 71,111,64, restored in the Hellespontine district; cf. Tenger (1994) 155–56.

The acropolis of the site on Balti Dağ measures 190 × 100 m and has fortifications of rough masonry combined with more even work, including an arched entrance datable to C4 (Cook (1973) 134–40). An agora with stone seats and a small Archaic/Classical temple are reported, but occupation did not spread beyond the hill-top, and the site was small.

Gentoins minted bronze coins in C4: obv. female head (Artemis, nymph?); rev. bee; legend: ΤΕΝ or ΤΕΝΤΙ (Head, HN² 545; SNG Cop. Troas 335–36).

777. Gergis (Gergithios) Map 56. Lat. 39.55; long. 26.35. Size of territory: 4? Type: Αγ. The toponym is Γεργύς, Ἡ (Xen. Hell. 3,1,15; Steph. Byz. 203,21) or Γεργύδος, Ἡ (Steph. Byz. 203,21–22) or Γεργυδία (Welles (1934) no. 10 (275)); Strabo 13,1,19 reports the toponym in the plural feminine form ἡ Γεργυδία. Various forms of the city-ethnic are recorded: ἡ τῶν Γεργυδίων πόλεως (Xen. Hell. 3,1,22); Γεργυδία Θεουκρατος (Hdt. 5,12,2,2, 7,43,2); Γεργυδία (IG IV,1,2 13,27 (c.270)).

Xen. Hell. 3,1,15, 21 describes it as a polis in the urban sense; at 3,1,22 the political sense is probably a connotation. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally by Xen. Hell. 3,1,22 and internally by C4 coins (infra). The individual use of the ethnic is recorded c.270 on an inscription of the Aitolians (IG IV,1,2 13,27).

The name of the territory was τὸ Γεργύδηον, Ἡ Γεργυδία (sc. χώρα; Welles (1934) no. 10 (275): ἀπὸ τῆς ὀμορφοτής τῆς Γεργυδίας ἡ τῆς Σκηνήδαια). It was the inland region to the east of the route followed by Xerxes to Abydos in 481 (Hdt. 7,43,2), and included Marpessos, home of the sibyl Herophile, whose image is shown on coins of Gergis (Paus. 10,12,4; Head, HN² 543). The Gergithés, described by Hdt. 5,122,2 as οἱ ἡπολευθέντες τῶν ἀρχαίων Θεουκρατος were an indigenous non-Greek people occupying the interior of the Troad north of the river Skamandros; see Leaf (1923) 102–6. This passage and Hdt. 7,43,2 indicate that Gergis was effectively a barbarian polis, in contrast to its neighbours on the coast of the Troad. The polis was controlled by the pro-Persian “satrap” Zenis of Dardanos (or “the Dardanian”) and then by his widow, Mania, in 399, and eventually by her son-in-law, Meidias of Skepsis (Xen. Hell. 3,1,15–22; see Winter (1994)).

Some of its inhabitants were transplanted by metoecism to a new settlement called Gergitha near the springs of the river Kaikos by Attalos I (Strabo 13,1,70). After 188 its territory was attached by synoecism to Iliion (Livy 38,39). One of its citizens, Νικόσταρτος Αριστάρχος Γεργυθεύων, was honoured in an Aitolian proxeny decree of c.270 (IG IX,1,2 13,27).

Xen. Hell. 3,1,15–22 implies that it was a fortified site, and specifically mentions gates and towers at 3,1,22.

Gergis struck coins of silver and bronze c.400–350 and c.350–241: obv. head of sibyl Herophile; rev. seated sphinx; legend: ΤΕΠ. The coin type with sibyl and sphinx was mentioned by Phlegon of Tralles, cited in Steph. Byz. 204,1–2. (Head, HN² 545–46; SNG Cop. Troas 337–40; Sear (1979) no. 4097, silver hemiobol).

778. Hamaxitos (Hamaxiteus) Map 56. Lat. 39.05, long. 26.05. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: Αγ. The toponym is Ἑμαχιτός (IG I,7 77,18.18) or Ἑμαχιτός, Ἡ (Thuc. 8,101,3; Xen. Hell. 3,1,13,16; BCH 45 (1921) 8; Strabo 13,1,47). The city-ethnic is Ἑμαχιτεύς (Iscr. Cos 66 ED 71 3,8,6 (C41); Strabo 13,1,51; Steph. Byz. 83,11, without citing an authority), or Ἑμαχιτεύς (Apollodoros, FGrHist 244, fr. 10 apud Steph. Byz.).

It is called a polis in the political and urban senses combined by Xen. Hell. 3,1,13, 16 (cf. Hansen (2000) 175). In Ps.-Skylax 95 Hamaxitos is one of the toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις Ἑλληνιδες... ἀδει. The political sense is attested in a restored inscription from Kos dating between 321 and 306 (Iscr. Cos 63 ED 719,B,6), and its name has been restored ([Ἀμαχιτός]ιτός) at IG I,7 77,18.18 in a list of
Aktaiai poleis which uses polis in the political sense. The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is attested on C4 coins (infra); the external collective use in Iscr. Cos 63 ED 71g.B.6.

The name of the territory was ᾿Αμαξίταια (Strabo 10.3.21). It contained the temple of Apollo Sminthas at Gülpinar and two other places called Sminthia, also the salt pans at Tragasaki (Strabo 13.1.48). However, the salt pans are said by Ath. 2.43A to be on the territory of Larisa.

Hamaxitos was one of the Ἀκταίαι πόλεις in the Delian League and was assessed for tribute of 4 tal. in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.111.124, 129, toponym restored) and for an unknown amount in 422/1 (IG i³ 77.14.14, 18). Schwerthereim (1988) (SEG 38 1251) published an inscribed fragment purporting to be part of a treaty between Athens and Hamaxitos. Lewis (1993) (SEG 43 877) suggested that this was part of an Athenian imperial decree, and questioned the restoration which assigned the text to Hamaxitos. On Kos has been found a C4i decree of Hamaxitos, granting προξενία and πολιτεία to a citizen of Kos (Iscr. Cos 63 ED 71g.B.6.; cf. LGPN 1, Nikomedes no. 12). Kos was on the route of the Delphic theoreodokoi c.200 ( BCH 45 (1921) 8; Cook (1988) 15). Xen. Hell. 3.1.13 (Ἀμαξίταιον... τοῖς τείχεσι) suggests that the city possessed a circuit wall in C4e.

Hamaxitos was absorbed into the newly founded city of Alexandria in 310 (Strabo 13.1.47), and thereafter its territory was part of the χώρα of Alexandria Troas (Strabo 10.3.21). It participated in the cult of Apollo Sminthus (Strabo 13.1.48).

Hamaxitos struck bronze coins c.400–310: obv. head of Apollo; rev. lyre, or Apollo Sminthus; legend: ΑΜΑΞΕΙ (Head, HN² 546; SNG Cop. Troas 341–45).

779. Ilion (Ilieus) Map 56. Lat. 39.55, long. 26.15. Size of territory: 3 or 4. Type: Α. The toponym is Ἰλιον, τά (Xen. Hell. 1.1.5; Aen. Tact. 24.11). The city-ethnic is Ἰλεύς (Xen. Hell. 3.1.16; Tod 148 (359) = Michel 523 = I.L lion 23) or Ἰλιάς (Ἀθηναϊκή τύρον Ἰλίας, Hdt. 7.40). According to Hdt. 7.40, at Ilion Athena had the epiklesis Ἰλιάς, which same form is also used to denote Ilian territory at Hdt. 5.94.2 and 7.42.

Ilion is called a polis in the urban sense by Aen. Tact. 24.12, 14 (cf. Aen. Tact. 24.8 where it is called πόλισμα). In Ps.-Sklavx 95 Ilion is the third toponym listed after the heading πόλεις Ἐλληνιδες... αἰδε. Ilion is called a polis in the urban and political senses combined by Xen. Hell. 3.1.16 and in an early Hellenistic inscription (I.Llion 25; cf. also Hellan. fr. 25b). Its name has been restored (𝕋[λιον]) at IG i³ 71.111.132 in a list of Aktaiai poleis which uses polis in the political sense. Strabo 13.1.27, referring to the period before 189, calls it a κοινόπολις. The collective use of the ethnic is attested internally by a decree of Ilion of 359 (Tod 148 = I.Llion 23) and by C4i coins (Head, HN² 546), and externally by Xen. Hell. 3.1.16. The external individual use of the ethnic is found in IG i³ 505.8 (302/1).

Strabo refers to a period when Ilion was a κομητής, δή των Πελορίων πόλην τῶν νόμων τῶν μὲν κάμμων εἶναι φαυνόν, τὸ ἱερὸν ἔχουσαν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς μικρὸν καὶ ἐντέλες (Strabo 13.1.16). The name of the territory was ᾿Ιλιάς γῆ (Hdt. 7.42), ᾿Ιλίας χώρα (Hdt. 5.94.2), or simply ᾿Ιλιάς (Hdt. 5.122.2).

Ilion was one of the Aiolic settlements of the Troas (Xen. Hell. 3.1.16). If the toponym is correctly restored in IG i³ 71 and 77, it was one of the Ἀκταίαι πόλεις in the Delian League and was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.111.124, 132, Ἰ[λιον], 2 tal.) and in 422/1 (IG i³ 77.14.14, 21, amount not preserved, toponym completely restored). Ilion awarded προξενία to Menelaos, son of Arribiaios of Athens, in C4 (Tod 148 = I.Llion 23). A kind of συμπολιτεία with Lampsakos (no. 748) is probably attested by an unique silver tridrachm: obv. head of Athena with Corinthian helmet, r.; rev. winged horse, r., under the horse: ΑΑΜΕΥΣ(ΙΕΩΝ), above it: IA(ΙΕΩΝ) (Frisch (1975) XV, (1978) 129–30 (c.300)).

In the early Hellenistic period it was democratic, as is shown by a lengthy law which was devised against tyrants and oligarchies (Michel 524 = I.Llion 25). This text also implies that the chief magistrate was a strategos, an office that could only be held once; there was also a tamias, and the magistrates were collectively known as αρχαί. A citizenship decree of c.300 testifies to the organisation of the citizens into phyliai (I.Llion 24.13). The city buildings included a πρυτανείον (I.Llion 24.20, 25.25) and a δικαστήριον (I.Llion 25.27, perhaps a lawcourt rather than a court room).

Aen. Tact. 24.4–13 refers repeatedly to πιλαι, thus indicating that the city was fortified in C4f (cf. Xen. Hell. 3.1.16), but there are virtually no monumental traces of the pre-Hellenistic city, although the remains suggest that the settlement was more prosperous in C7–C6 than in C5–C4 (PECS). Recent excavations show almost continuous occupation of the site after the fall of Troy VII.2 in the late Bronze Age. Archaic finds include bronze fibulæ of c.700 and an Aiolic capital (Mitchell (1999) 138). Recent excavations have revealed a sanctuary of C8–C6, but no further building in the Classical period (Rose (2000) 284). The city wall, attributed by Strabo 13.1.26 to Lysimaschos, in fact appears to have been built c.275–250 (Rose (1997) 93–101). Ilion was refounded at the end of C4, probably by Lysimaschos (Strabo 13.1.26,
the interpretation of this passage is very controversial; see Leaf (1923) 142–43, who attributes the embellishment to Alexandria; but see L. Robert (1951) 7–8). A prytaneion is mentioned in the pro-democratic law against tyrants and oligarchies, probably of C3ε (Michel 524A.25–26 = I.ilion 25), and Michel 522.11 (c.306) refers to a theatre. The most important cult was that of Athena Ilias (Hdt. 7.43.1–2; Xen. Hell. 1.1.5). The most recent study of the sculpted reliefs from the temple argues that it was not early Hellenistic, but constructed in C2–C1 (Schmidt-Dounas (1991)).

Iliion issued a little silver and bronze coinage against tyrants C4l and c.240: obv. Athena; rev. sometimes vase, mostly Athena Ilias wearing kalathos and chiton with symbol (thunderbolt, owl); legend: IAI (Head, HN² 546; SNG Cop. Troas 346–61). For an issue struck in collaboration with Lampsakos (no. 748) see supra.

780. **Kebren** (Kebrenios) Map 56. Lat. 39.45, long. 26.35. Size of territory; 5. Type: Α/Β. The toponym is Κεβρήν (Xen. Hell. 3.1.17; Dem. 23.154; I.Assos 4 (C2)) or Κεβρήνη (Strabo 13.1.47) or Κεβρήνια (Diod. 14.38.3 (1399)). The city-ethnic is Κεβρένιος (IG 13 263.11.33), Κεβρήνιος (Xen. Hell. 3.1.18) or KEPBNE, probably for Κεβρενεύς (C6 coins, infra). The forms Κεβρένιος, Κεβρηνίος and Κεβρηνεύς are all found in Strabo (13.1.51, 33).

In Ps.-Skylax 96 Kebren is the first toponym listed after the heading Αἰολίδες δὲ πόλεις ... αἰθὲ and it is called a polis in the urban sense by Xen. Hell. 3.1.17, but a polisma by Strabo 13.1.47, referring to the period after it was incorporated into Alexandria. The collective use of the ethnic is attested internally on C6 coins (Head, HN² 543) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (infra) and Xen. Hell. 3.1.18. The external individual use of the ethnic is attested on a C5 inscription from Gergis (Cook (1973) 403 no. 18).

The name of the territory was Κεβρηνία (Strabo 13.1.33). Strabo observes that Kebrenia was parallel to and south of ancient Dardania, and that it was divided from the territory of Skepsis by the river Skamandros. It was regarded by Ephor. fr. 22, as προσ τῆς Τήνης. Steph. Byz. 371.3 calls Κεβρηνία α χώρα τῆς Τροάδος.

The city was founded from Kyme in Aiolis (Ephor. fr. 10; Homeri vita Herodotea c.20, Allen). Xen. Hell. 3.1.18 implies that the Ἑλληνες in the city were to be distinguished from a non-Greek element.

Kebren was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded from 454/3 (IG 13 259.IV.26) to 447/6 (IG 13 265.II.9) a total of five times, twice restored, paying a phoros of 3 tal. in 454/3 (IG 13 259.IV.26) and 8,700 dr. in 450/49 (IG 13 263.II.33). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG 17 II 113.99).

In 310 it was incorporated into the new city of Antigoneia, later Alexandria. In late C3 a decree probably of the Kebrenians was set up in Asos in honour of a troop of soldiers and their commander for coming to their assistance (I.Assos 4; cf. L. Robert (1951) 33).

Kebren had imposing fortifications sited in μάλα ἰσχυρό χωρίῳ (Xen. Hell. 3.1.17), with walls (ibid. 18) and gates (ibid. 19). The existing walls are dated to C5 or earlier (Cook (1973) 330). They measure 5 km in circumference and enclose an area of c.90 ha; they were reported to survive over 10 feet high and are 8–10 feet thick (Leaf (1923) 171–73, citing Calvert; Judeich (1898b) 539; Cook (1973) 328–31). On the citadel are a few remains of a separate acropolis wall (Cook (1973) 334). Numerous ancient building remains have been noted on the site.

Kebren minted in the Archaic and Classical periods. (1) Silver, C6: obv. head of ram; rev. incuse square. (2) Silver, C5: denominations: diobol, trihemiobol, obol, tritartemorion, tetartemorion: obv. head of ram; legend: ΚΕΒΡΕΝΕ or ΚΕΒΡΕΠ; rev. incuse square. (3) Silver, c.400–310: denomination: obv: obol: two rams' heads; legend: ΚΕΒΡΡΗΝΙ; rev. incuse square. (4) bronze, c.400–310: obv. male head in Persian head-dress, or Apollo; rev. monogram, or ram's head, or ram's head and eagle; legend: KE, K (Head, HN² 542–43).

L. Robert (1951) 17–36 argued that Kebren was refounded under the name Antiocheia in the early Hellenistic period and underwent synoecism with Birtytis between 280 and 270. This has been contested by Cook (1988) 17–19.

781. **Kokylion** (Kokylites) Map 56. Lat. 39.40, long. 26.25. Size of territory; 7. Type: Α/Α. The toponym is *Κοκύλλων*; cf. Cocylion at Plin. HNIV 122.2. The city-ethnic Κοκυλίτης is attested at Xen. Hell. 3.1.16, where the city and its inhabitants are described as one of three Aiolian poleis which were persuaded to join Derkylydas in 399. In this passage, our only source, pollis is used in the urban and political senses combined. Xen. Hell. 3.1.16 (εἰς τὰ τέκταν δέχεσθαι ... Κοκυλίται ἐπεθύνοντο) suggests that the city may have been fortified in C4e.

782. **Kolonai** (Kolonaeus) Map 56. Lat. 39.40, long. 26.10. Size of territory; 2. Type: Α/Α. The toponym is Κολωναί, αι (Thuc. 1.131.2; Xen. Hell. 3.1.13, 16; IG 17 71.113.15: Κ[ολωνεί]) and the city-ethnic is Κολωναεύς (C4 coins, infra; Strabo 13.1.62).

Kolonai is called a polis in the political and urban senses combined by Xen. Hell. 3.1.13, 16 (cf. Hansen (2000) 175). In
Ps.-Skylax 95 Kolonai is one of the toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις Ἐλληνίδες... αἱδέ. It is called a polis in the political sense by Xen. Hell. 3.1.13; its name has also been restored (Κ[ο]λονεύς) at IG i³ 71.11.135 in a list of Aktaiai poleis which uses polis in the political sense. It was one of the πολίσματα that were incorporated by synoecism into Alexandria in 310 (Strabo 13.1.47). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally by C4 coins (infra). The individual city-ethnic is used externally by Strabo 13.1.62 in reference to the local historian Daes, who should be dated not later than C4 (Schwartz, RE iv 1982).

It belonged to the region of the Troad and was called Κολοναί αἱ Τρωάδαι by Thuc. 1.131.1 (but this may be a reference to the homonymous place in the territory of Lampakos). The territory was formerly part of the Tenedian Peraia (Strabo 13.1.47).

The settlement was founded by Aiolians (Strabo 13.1.62) and was reputed to be the home of the Thrakian king Kyknos, killed by Achilles, in a story told in post-Homeric epic (Leaf 1923) 219.

If the toponym is correctly restored in IG i³ 71, Kolonai was one of the Ἀκταίαι πόλεις in the Delian League and was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.11.124 and 135 (K[ολονεύς], 1,000 dr.).

The Spartan regent Pausanias took refuge here and made contact with the Persian king after leaving Byzantion in 478 (Thuc. 1.131.1, unless this passage refers to the Kolonai in the interior of the territory of Lampakos).

The city possessed a sanctuary of Apollo Killaios introduced by Aiolians (Strabo 13.1.62). The site extends "720 by 230 paces" on a hill-top, with a possible acropolis area at the south end about 200 paces across (Leaf 1923) 223-224. Xen. Hell. 3.1.13 (Κολοναί... τοῖς τεῖχεσιν) suggests that the city possessed a circuit wall in C4.

The city minted bronce coins between c.400 and 310: obv. head of Athena; rev. ΚΟΛΩΝΑΩΝ in rays of star (Head, HN2 543; SNG Cop. Troas 276-81).

784. Larisa (Larisaiaos) Map 56. Lat. 39.35, long. 26.10. Size of territory: 2? Type: Aα. The toponym is Λάρισα, η (Xen. Hell. 3.1.13, 16), Λάρισα (Ps.-Skylax 95), Λ[αρισα] (IG i³ 71.11.130, 77.11.19). Steph. Byz. 413.5-6, referring to all the Larisas, indicates that the city-ethnic for persons was Λαρισαίος, and for divinities Λαρισεύς. It is Λαρισαίος in Strabo 13.1.48.

Hom. II. 2.840-41 says that Larisa was inhabited by φύλα Πελασγών. Larisa is called a polis in the political and urban senses combined by Xen. Hell. 3.1.13, 16 (cf. Hansen 2000) 175). In Ps.-Skylax 95 Larisa is one of the toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις Ἐλληνίδες... αἱδέ, and its name has been restored ([Λάρισα]α) at IG i³ 77.11.19 in a list of Aktaiai poleis which uses polis in the political sense. It was one of the πολίσματα that were incorporated by synoecism into Alexandria Troas in 310 (Strabo 13.1.47).

The name of the territory was η Λαρισαία (Strabo 13.1.48). It included the hot salt springs of Tragasia (Ath. 2.43A). Hom. II. 2.840-41 and 17.301 refers to the fertility of the land, Λάρισαν ἑρυθρόλακα.

If the toponym is correctly restored in IG i³ 71 and 77 (supra), it was one of the Ἀκταίαι πόλεις in the Delian League and was assessed for tribute of 3 tal. in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.11.124, 130) and in 422/1 for an unknown amount (IG i³ 77.11.19, 19).
It is located ἐν τῇ Περαίᾳ by Ath. 2.43A, and according to Strabo 13.1.47 was formerly a city of the Tenedian peraiā. Larisa was one of the places visited by the Delphic theoredoi c.200 (Plassart (1921) 8; Cook (1988) 12). It may have sent theoreoi to Samothrace (Cook (1962) 100, (1973) 221).

The site on a low hill measuring “320 x 350 paces”, extending north from the base of the hill to the harbour; with building foundations and BG pottery (Leaf (1923) 225); Archaic and Classical sherds are reported (Cook (1988) 14). See also Akalin (1991). Xen. Hell. 3.1.13 (Λάρισαν . . . τοῖς τείχεσιν) suggests that the city possessed a circuit wall in C4e.

785. Neandreia (Neandrius) Map 56. Lat. 39.45, long. 26.15. Size of territory: 4. Type: A–α. The toponym is attested in the forms Νέανδρεια (IG i3 259.iv.10 (454/3)) or Νεάνδρεια (IG i3 272.1.30 (440/39)) or Νεάνδρειον, τό (Theopomp. fr. 374 apud Steph. Byz. 471.5) or Νεανδρία, η (Strabo 13.1.47). The city-ethnics are Νεάνδρειοι (IG i3 280.11.12 (432/1)) or Νεανδριεύς (Xen. Hell. 3.1.18; Strabo 13.1.51; cf. Cook (1988) 14 n. 23).

Neandreia was one of the Aiolian cities of the Troas (Xen. Hell. 3.1.16). In Ps.-Skylax 96 Neandreia is the third toponym listed after the heading Αἰολίδες δὲ πόλεις . . . αἴδε. It is called a polis in the urban and political senses combined by Xen. Hell. 3.1.16. The collective city-ethnic is used internally on C5–C4 coins (infra) and externally on the Athenian tribute lists (infra). The name of the territory was η Νεανδρίς (Strabo 10.3.20, following Demetrios of Skepsis). It included the Samonian plain, which was probably to the east of the city in the Skamandros valley (Cook (1973) 315). It overlooked and presumably adjoined Hamaxitos on the west (Strabo 13.1.51).

A foundation story is recorded in Dictys Cretensis, which may originate with C5 or C4 sources, before the foundation of Alexandra Troas (Schwertheim (1994) 21–24). Neandreia was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded first by toponym (IG i3 263,11.34), later by city-ethnic (IG i3 280,11.12), from 454/3 (IG i3 259,IV.10) to 430/29 (IG i3 281.11.37) a total of twelve times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 2,000 dr. (IG i3 259,IV.10) in all years. It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.11.81) and in 410/9 (IG i3 100,11.4). It was one of the cities incorporated in Alexandra Troas in 310.

The origin of the civic centre (temple, agora, stoa) dates to the Archaic period, including a C6 temple, perhaps dedicated to Apollo (Wiegartz (1994)), an agora and stoa, possible remains of a theatre (Trunk (1994)), extensive housing and a complex internal drainage system. The western section of the housing area was built on a rectangular organised grid dating to C4 (Maischatz (1994)). There was a fortified area at the west end of the site, arguably protected by the earliest fortifications of C6. These were built from 2–2.5 m-thick rough polygonal masonry, not laid in horizontal or even courses; they had five entrances. New walls were built in late C5 or early C4. They were 3.2 km long and 2.9 m thick, made from granite ashlark blocks. There were eight gates and eleven rectangular towers, two with interior courtyards (Schulz (1994), (2000)). These walls may be indirectly referred to at Xen. Hell. 3.1.16 (εἰς τὰ τείχη δέχεσθαι . . . Νεανδρεῖσι . . . ἐπειδόθηντο).

The city minted silver and bronze issues from c.430–310: denominations: drachm, hemidrachm, obol, hemibol: obv. head of Apollo, or helmet; rev. altar and laurel tree, or ram, or horse, or triskeles, or ear of corn; legend: ΝΕΑ or NEΑ (Head, HN2 547; cf. Pohl (1994) 157–61; SNG Cop. Troas 446–54).

786. Ophryneion (Ophryneus) Map 56. Lat. 40.00, long. 26.20. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: [A]:α. The toponym is Ὄφρυνειον, τό (Hdt. 7.43.2; Dem. 33.20; note Ὄφρυνειον (dat.) in IG i3 430.11 (414/13)); restored at IG i3 71.111.131, 77.111.20; Ὄφρυνον, τό is recorded by Xen. Ant. 7.8.5. The city-ethnic is Ὄφρυνεύς (C45 coins, infra).

Ophryneion is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 7.43.2, and in the political sense retrospectively by Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 1.47.2, who draws on Hellan. fr. 31. Its name has been restored ("Ὄφρυν[ε]ιον") at IG i3 77.111.20 in a list of Aktaias poleis which uses polis in the political sense. The collective internal use of the city-ethnic is attested by C45 coins (infra).

If the toponym is correctly restored in IG i3 71 and 77, it was one of the Ἀκταιας πόλεις in the Delian League and was assessed for tribute of 5 tal. in 425/4 (IG i3 71.111.124, 131: Ὄ[φρυν]ε[ιον]) and for an unknown amount in 422/1 (IG i3 77.111.14, 20: Ὅ[φρυν]ο[ιον].)

An Athenian inscription listing confiscated goods being offered for public sale (IG i3 430.11 (414/13)) refers to ἐπικαρπία τής γῆς τῆς ἐν Ὄφρυνειο. This implies land-ownership by Athenian citizens. Dem. 33.20 mentions that Parmenon lived here in exile from Byzantion, losing his wife and children when their house was destroyed by an earthquake.

Ophryneion was the reputed burial place of Hektor (schol. Hom. Il. 13.1). Strabo 13.1.30 reports that the grove of Hektor occupied a conspicuous site, and Hektor appears on the coins.
The site occupies a prominent hill some 100 m high, forming a conspicuous headland with a steep brow, giving the site its name. Walls (undated) enclosed the whole acropolis and are reported as 2 m thick without mortar; the upper part of the acropolis is separated by a deep trench and embankment (Leaf (1923) 153–54, citing Calvert’s description). Many buildings are reported on the acropolis and the slopes to the west and north-west.

Ophryneion minted silver and bronze c.350–300: denominations: hemidrachm, trihemibol: rev. mounted naked youth, or Dionysos, or Hektor; legend: ὈΦΡΥΝΕΩΝ or ΟΦΡΥ (Head, ΗΝ² 547; SNG Cop. Troas 455–60).

787. *Palaiperkote (Palaiperkosios) Map 51. Lat. 40.15, long. 26.40. Size of territory: ? Type C.? The toponym is *Παλαιπερκόσιος, reconstructed from η πάλαι Περκόσιος (Strabo 13.1.20, infra) and the city-ethnic Παλαιπερκόσιος (IG i³ 272.1.28).

The Palaiperkosioi were members of the Delian League. They belonged to the Hellespontine district and are recorded from 451/50 (IG i³ 262.11.14) to 421/20 (IG i³ 285.11.80) a total of fourteen times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 500 dr. (IG i³ 265.11.39) in all years. They were linked with the Perkosioi in 433/2 (IG i³ 279.11.19–20, completely restored) and probably assessed in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.111.100, partly restored). In a passage that is certainly corrupt, Strabo (13.1.20) made some observation about a change of name (ἡ πάλαι Περκόσιος μετωνοµάσθη, ὃ τόπος). The change of name, however, seems to be that attested from Perkote to Perkope (see entry for Perkote), and it is not clear whether this passage refers to Palaiperkote at all. The site was probably located at Erdağ, where a large Archaic (?) fortification wall has been reported (Judeich (1898b) 546; cf. Schulz (2000) 23).

788. Perkote (Perekosios) Map 51. Lat. 40.15, long. 26.35. Size of territory: 1 or 2? Type: Α.α. The toponym is Περκόσιος, ἤ (Hom. II. 2.835, 11.229, 15.548; Hdt. 5.117; Xen. Hell. 5.1.25; Att. Anab. 1.12.6), rendered as Περκότε in the Athenian tribute lists (ATL i. 374). The form Περκόσιος occurs in lesser MSS of these authors and was current after the Hellenistic period; see Eust. II. 840.46 on II. 11.229; Ath. 1.29fl, discussion by Ruge (1938). The city-ethnic was Περκόσιος (Hom. II. 6.30) or Περκόσιος (IG i³ 272.1.33).

Perkote is called a polis in the urban sense by Hdt. 5.117.1. In Ps.-Skylax 94 Perkote is one of the toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις Ἑλληνιδές αἰδέ. The city-ethnic was used in its collective sense externally by the Athenian tribute lists (infra). Perkote was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded either by toponym (IG i³ 266.1.21) or by city-ethnic (IG i³ 272.1.33) from 454/3 (IG i³ 259.11.17, partly restored) to 430/29 (IG i³ 281.111.26) a total of thirteen times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 1,000 dr. (IG i³ 266.1.21) in all years. It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.111.88, partly restored). Perhaps the Perkosi were jointly listed with Palaiperkosioi in 433/2 (IG i³ 279.11.19–20, both ethnics completely restored). In 387/6 Antalkidas brought his fleet to anchor at Perkote (Xen. Hell. 5.1.25). According to later sources, Perkote provided Themistokles with his bed linen (Plut. Them. 29; schol. Ar. Eq. 84; Ath. 1.54).

789. Polichna (Polichnaios) Map 56. Unlocated. Type: C.? The toponym is Πολιχναία, ἤ (Strabo 13.1.45). The city-ethnic is probably Πολιχναίτης (IG i³ 71.111.76) or Πολιχναιος as reported by Steph. Byz. 532.4 and confirmed by the form Polichnaeii (Plin. HN 5.30). Its location is uncertain (Leaf (1923) 210).

At 13.1.45 Strabo refers to a fortified settlement (τείχησις χωρίον) called Πολιχνα or Πολιχνή on the territory of Skepsis. The toponym is possibly to be connected with the (restored) ethnic [Πολιχναῖος]χωρίσα, a community in the Hellespontine district assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.111.76), thus ATL i. 541. The common alternation Polichnaios/Polichnita is attested in the case of the Erythraian Polichnitaioi (no. 860). If the restoration and the identification are accepted, Polichna was presumably a polis and perhaps a dependency of Skepsis already in C5.

790. Rhoiteion (Rhoiteus) Map 56. Lat. 40.00, long. 26.20. Size of territory: 2. Type: Α.α. The toponym is Ροιτείον, τὸ (Hdt. 7.43; Thuc. 4.52.2; Xen. Hell. 1.1.3; IG i³ 77.11.16). The city-ethnic is Ροιτείειος (Strabo 13.1.30; Steph. Byz. 557.8) or Ροιτείος (IG x1.4 582; IG x1.2 163.B.g.18 (both C3f)).

Rhoiteion is called a polis in the urban sense by Hdt. 7.43.2, and in Ps.-Skylax 95 Rhoiteion is the second toponym listed after the heading πόλεις Ἑλληνιδές ... αἰδέ. It was one of the Aktaiai poleis mentioned by Thuc. 4.52.2 and IG i³ 77.11.16, where polis is used in the political sense. The collective city-ethnic is attested internally by C45 coins (infra); the individual city-ethnic is attested externally by C3f inscriptions (IG x1.4 582; IG x1.2 163.B.g.18), but SEG 12 88 (332/1) has been interpreted as a grant of proixeny to a Rhoiteius. The name of the territory was τὸ Ροιτείον (Leaf (1923) 157). It probably extended west and south to the river
Simoès, and east to Ophryneion. It included the burial tumulus of Ajax (whose statue was returned to the Rhoeitians by Augustus (Strabo 13.1.30), and an unlocated colony called Πόλιον, which was renamed Πόλισμα in Strabo's day (Strabo 13.1.42).

Rhoeitio was founded by Dorian from Astypalaea, who also founded the undefended colony of Polion, in C7/C6, which was demolished soon afterwards (Strabo 13.1.42).

Rhoeitio was one of the Ακταιαί πόλεις in the Delian League and was assessed for tribute of 8 tal. in 425/4 (IG 13 71.111.124, 126, toponym restored) and for an unknown amount in 422/1 (IG 13 77.14.14 and 16). In 424 it was briefly seized by refugees from Mytilene and other refugees from Lesbos, but returned on payment of 2,000 Phokaian staters (Thuc. 4.52.2). Μουρίας Αντιφάνου 'Ροιτεύς was honoured in a C3f proxeny decree of Delos (IG XI.4.582). It was absorbed by Ilion in a synoecism after 189 (Livy 38.37).

The acropolis is reported to be fortified on three sides with two towers (undated); the fourth side was precipitous. There were buildings within the acropolis, while the lower town extends to the south (Cook (1973) 77–90).

The city minted silver coins c.350–300: denomination: tetrobol: οβυ. head of Apollo; rev. triskeles; legend: POITEI (Head, ΗΝ2 548).

791. Sigeion (Sigeieus) Map 56. Lat. 40.00, long. 26.10. Size of territory: 2. Type Aπα. The toponym is Σίγειον, τό (IG 13 1144.A.11.1.32 (464); Hdt. 5.65.3; Thuc. 6.59.3; Arist. Hist. an. 547-5). Also Σίγη, ἦ (Hecat. fr. 221; Ps.-Skylax 95). For the identification of Σίγη with Σίγειον, see Bürchner (1923) 2276. The city-ethnic is Σίγειος (Syll. 3.2.A = LSAG2 pl. 71 43-44 (C6)) or Σίγειος (Syll. 3.2.B (C5)) or Σίγειος (Syll. 3.2.B (C5); IG 13 272.1.35) or Σίγειος (I.Kios 1.4 (C4)). Sigeion is described as a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 5.94.2 and in Ps.-Skylax 95 (Sigeion is one of the toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις Ἐλληνιδεῖς . . . αἰδῆ. Other references to Sigeion as a polis are late: Harp. Σι1 and Strabo 13.1.31 (κατασταμηνίμον πόλις). The collective city-ethnic is attested internally in C6 by Syll. 3.2, and externally in C5 by the Athenian tribute lists (infra) and IG 13 17 (C5m/s), which is a decree granting privileges to the city. Individually, the city-ethnic is applied externally in I.Kios 1 (C4) and by later sources to the C5 historian from the city, Damastes (= ForHist 5; cf. Test. 1, 2, 4).

Its territory is termed χώρην by Hdt. 5.94.2. Sigeion and Rhoeitio included the former territory of Ilion, until that city was refounded (Strabo 13.1.42). In the early C6 control of Sigeion was contested between Athenians and Mytilenians; the latter’s base was the neighbouring polis of Achilleion (Hdt. 5.94.2). The eccles may have been the Athenian, Phsyskon, in C7, when virtually the entire rest of the Troad was controlled by Lesbos (Strabo 13.1.8).

Sigeion was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded from 450/49 (IG 13 263.iv.25) to 418/17 (IG 13 287.11.9) a total of fifteen times, once completely restored, paying a ψηφος of 1,000 dr. (IG 13 263.iv.25) down to 418/17, when it paid 1 tal. (IG 13 287.11.9). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG 13 71.111.93). In C4, Tenedos claimed control over Sigeion (Arist. Rh. 1375b31; Anon. in Arist. Artem. Rhet. 81.12). Strabo 13.1.39 (cf. 13.1.31) says that the city was demolished (κατεσκασθαι) by the people of Ilion on account of its disobedience. The date must fall between c.334 and Strabo’s own time.

Sigeion was usually ruled by an autocrat or a tyrant: Phsyskon, Athenian Olympic victor, in late C7 (Strabo 13.1.38); Hegesistratos, son of Peisiistratos, in 520s, and perhaps Hippias in 510 (Hdt. 5.94.1); Chares son of Theochares between c.355 and 334 (Theopomp. fr. 105 apud Ath. 12.532B; Arr. 1.12.1; schol. Dem. 3.21). A public decree of C2 has been recorded (Daux (1956); cf. BE (1958) 410).

A prytaneion is mentioned in C6 (Syll. 3 2A). The city walls were reputed to have been built with stones from Ilion by Archianax of Mytilene in C6 (Strabo 13.1.38). There was a C6 dedication of crater, base and stand by Phanodikos of Prokonnesos (Syll. 2). A C4 decree of Kios gave proxeny status and minor privileges to Ἀδολός Ἀδόλου Σίγειος (I.Kios1). Silver and bronze coins were minted in C4, probably when Sigeion was controlled by Chares, c.355–334. Denomination: hemidrachm: οβυ. head of Athena, or head of Zeus; rev. owl, crescent behind; legend: ΣΙΓΕ (Head, ΗΝ2 549; Six (1894) 306–7).

792. Skepsis (Skapsios) Map 56. Lat. 39.50, long. 26.40. Size of territory: 5. Type Aπα. The toponym is Σκῆψις, ἦ (Xen. Hell. 3.1.15; F.Delphes III.1.288 (C2)); Παλαιακήψις (Strabo 13.1.51). The city-ethnic is Σκάψιος (C5 coins, infra), Σκάφθως (IG 13 261.iv.27), Σκῆ[ψις] (IG 13 100.111.3; IG 13 100.364 (C3); F.Delphes III.1.288 (C2)). Σκέψιος (coins, infra; Xen. Hell. 3.1.21), Σκέφθως (Krateros fr. 24, Krech (454/3)).

It is called a polis in the urban sense by Xen. Hell. 3.1.15. In Ps.-Skylax 96 Skepsis is the second toponym listed after the heading Ἀλοιδᾶς ἐδα πόλεις . . . αἰδῆ. In the political sense polis is used by Xen. Hell. 3.1.21. Skepsis is repeatedly referred to as a polis in the political sense in a decree of 311 (OGIS 6.2,
4, 11, 15). The acropolis is mentioned by Xen. Hell. 3.1.21 (ἐν τῇ τῶν Σκηφίων ἀκρόπολει). Xen. Hell. 3.1.21 also refers to its inhabitants as citizens in emphatic terms: παραδοὺς δὲ τοῖς πολῖταις τὴν πόλιν, καὶ παρακελευσάμενος ὦσπερ Ἑλλήνας καὶ ἑλευθέρους χρῆ, οὗτοι πολιτεύειν. This passage, however, also implies that the population was mixed. Xen. Hell. 3.1.28 also employs the term patris in relation to the city. The collective city-ethnic is used internally on coins (infra) and externally on the Athenian tribute lists (infra); the external individual use is attested in a C3 epitaph from Athens (Agora xvii 666).

The name of the territory was Ἡ Σκηφία (Strabo 13.1.33), and the city lay ἐν δὲ τῇ μεσαίᾳ τῆς Τροάδος (Strabo 14.1.6). Its extent must have been large, but the topography remains extremely obscure. According to Strabo 13.1.45, it included a walled settlement called Πολίχνα (possibly itself a small polis), and it was separated from the territory of Kebran by the river Skamandros (Strabo 13.1.33). The site of Palaikepsis was said to be above Kebran in the highest parts of Mt. Ida near Polichna (sic) (Strabo 13.1.52). Strabo 13.1.51 describes the early but undated metoikesi from Palaikepsis to Skepsis as follows: ὅσπερ οι κατοικοῦσαι σταδίως ἐξήκοντα μετοχικήσαντες ἐπὶ Σκαμάνδρου τοῦ Ἐκτόρος καὶ Ἀσκανίου τοῦ Αἰνείου παιδός. The figure of 60 stades was emended to 260 by Leaf (1923) 270–71, who was guided by Strabo’s indications that Skepsis lay in the river basin of the Skamandros, while Palaikepsis was in that of the Aisepou. Following this, Strabo 13.1.52 refers to the arrival of Milesian settlers to be joined in a sympoliteia at Skepsis, perhaps after the sack of Miletos in c. 454 (Strabo 13.1.52). The original oecists, according to Strabo 13.1.52–53, following Demetrios of Skepsis, were Skamandrios and Askanos.

Skepsis was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded in 453/2 (IG i3 260.viii.4, partly restored), in 452/1 (IG i3 261.iv.27) and in 441/0 (IG i3 271.11.31), paying a phoros of 1 tal. It was assessed for tribute possibly in 454/3 (Krateros fr. 24, Krech) and in 425/4 (IG i3 71.111.65, completely restored), probably in 410/9 (IG i3 100.iii.4, partly restored).

Strabo 13.1.52 records a progression in its constitution from kingship (descendants of Skamandrios and Askanos), through oligarchy, to democracy (after the sympoliteia of Milesian settlers). Imhoof-Blumer (1901) 45 suggests that a coin with the legend ΑΝΤΗΝΟΡΟΣ is evidence for a dynasty of that name in C2 or C1; but this may simply be an allusion to the legend of the Antenoridai, current at the city (Leaf (1923) 275–80). The magistrates included a βασιλεὺς (Strabo 13.1.52). The city received a letter from Antigonos in 311 (OGIS 5), and the demos responded by passing a decree in the king’s honour. The Skepsians resolved to set up a sanctuary and altar for Antigonos and to found an annual festival, which would feature a thysia, an agon, a stephanephoria and a panegyris. Among the city magistrates the text mentions a tamias, who was responsible for expenditure on the festival, and a grammateus, who was to supervise the erection of the stele inscribed with the decree in the sanctuary of Athena (OGIS 6). An early Hellenistic citizenship decree testifies to the organisation of the citizens into phylai (Judeich (1898a)). Xen. Hell. 3.1.15 implies that Skepsis was a fortified site.

Derkylias conducted a sacrifice to Athena on the acropolis in 399 (Xen. Hell. 3.1.21; cf. OGIS 6.40–41), perhaps suggesting a cult of Athena Polias. There was also a communal cult of Dionysos (coins, inscription of C4/C3; SEG 26 1337 (regulations for priesthood of Dionysos Bambouleios, probably dating to C2)). The city used the Ionic calendar, and the month Lenaion is attested (SEG 26 1337).

Skepsis minted silver and bronze coinage in C5 and C4. (1) Silver, 460–400: denominations: drachm, triobol, trihemibol, hemibol; obv. horse (Pegasos); legend: ΣΚΗΨΙΟΝ or ΣΚΗΨΙΟΝ NE(ON) which may refer to the refoundation of Skepsis at this time. After 310 Skepsis was synoecised with Alexandria by Antigonos, but restored to independence by Lysimachos (Strabo 13.1.52).

Skepsis was originally an Ionian city (implied by use of form ΣΚΗΨΙΟΝ on C5 coins, infra); but there was a secondary foundation by Milesians after 494 (Leaf (1923) 272–73). The original oecists, according to Strabo 13.1.52–53, following Demetrios of Skepsis, were Skamandrios and Askanos.

Skepsis was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Hellespontine district and is recorded in 453/2 (IG i3 260.viii.4, partly restored), in 452/1 (IG i3 261.iv.27) and in 441/0 (IG i3 271.11.31), paying a phoros of 1 tal. It was assessed for tribute possibly in 454/3 (Krateros fr. 24, Krech) and in 425/4 (IG i3 71.111.65, completely restored), probably in 410/9 (IG i3 100.iii.4, partly restored).

793. Tenedos (Tenedios) Map 56. Lat. 39.50, long. 26.05. Size of territory: 2. Type: A3a. The toponym is Τένεδος, Ἡ (IG i3 265.11.109; Hdt. 1.151.2; Thuc. 3.35.1). The city-ethnic is Τενεδιός (Hdt. 1.151.3; IG i3 261.1.6). Tenedos is called a polis in the urban sense by Hdt. 1.151.2 and implicitly in Ps.-Skylax 95 (Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 142). It is included among the poleis in the political sense mentioned at Hdt. 1.151.3 and is explicitly called polis in the political sense in IG
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LESBOS

MOGENS HERMAN HANSEN, NIGEL SPENCER, HECTOR WILLIAMS

I. The Island

The name of the island is Λέσβος, ἦ (Hom. Il. 9.129; Anac. fr. 13.6, PMC; Thuc. 1.116.1; Arist. Hist. an. 621b22; IG iα 18.18 (C5m)); F.Delphes 111.1 497-9 (C4l–C3e)). The ethnic is Λέσβος (Archil. fr. 98.11; Alc. fr. 129.1, Lobel and Page; Hdt. 1.24.8; IG i3 1352 bis, SEG 28 24.2 (428/7)). In Tod 196.16 Λέσβος is an unconvincing conjecture (Brun (1993) 188, followed by RO 96).

Lesbos covers 1,614 km² (Labarre (1996) 191). It was settled by the Aiolian Greeks, probably over an extended period from the later Bronze Age to the early Iron Age. However, the continuity of many traditions in the material culture across the Bronze Age/Iron Age divide, lasting in some cases until the Archaic period, makes it almost impossible to pin down precisely in the archaeological record when the “Aiolian” element in the population in Lesbos arrived (Spencer (1995b) 275–77, 293–303). The Aiolian dialect, related to Thessalian and Boiotian, is the principal clue to the question of the identity of the new population elements in Lesbos (Thumb and Scherer (1959) 84–85, Cook (1975) 776–79). The written sources are late and are infected with mythological speculations (Bérard (1959) 22–28).

According to Herodotos (1.151.2) there were in C5m five poleis on Lesbos, but there had once been six until the polis of Arisa was destroyed by an andrapodismos. A century later, Ps.-Skylax (97) reported that Lesbos had five poleis: Methymna, Antissa, Eresos, Pyrrha and Mytilene. This neat picture of the poleis of Lesbos is disturbed by Steph. Byz., who, in addition to the six poleis above, lists seven further poleis on Lesbos: Geren (205.3), Ira (337.2), Issa (339.14), Metaon (448.10), Nape (469.4), Xanthes (480.17) and Penthiel (516.18). These seven toponyms, or some of them, may have been names of Archaic poleis. Furthermore, some rare billon coins of C5f have with good reason (confirmed by T. Buttrey) been assigned to Lesbos because of the metal as well as the obv. type: two boars’ heads, face to face. The coins are inscribed KΙΘΙ or, perhaps, ΚΙΟΙ (see infra). They may testify to the existence of an otherwise unknown poleis. It is true that Herodotos’ account at 1.151.2 conveys the impression that there had never been more than six Lesbian poleis. But in the same part of book 1 he reports that there were eleven Aiolian and twelve Ionian poleis, whereas we know from other sources that, in C5m, there were more than thirty poleis in Aiolis and some thirty in Ionia. On the other hand, Stephanos does not in any of the seven cases cite a source for his site-classification, and we know from other regions that some doubtful and spurious settlements are recorded as poleis in Stephanos’ treatise. There are no other written sources or material remains to back up Stephanos’ site-classifications, and not all of the locations can even be securely located topographically. Furthermore, the inscribed letters on the coins do not readily fit with any otherwise attested toponym or ethnic. Future discoveries may show that the community that struck these coins and some of the poleis listed in Steph. Byz. were in fact Archaic poleis, but, as the evidence stands, it seems preferable to place them all in the list of non-polis settlements.

In addition to the six poleis, Barr. records seventeen sites as settlements of the Archaic and/or Classical periods, and the list of unlocated toponyms includes four which have been recorded below. However, as the evidence stands, only two of the seventeen deserve to be classified as settlements, viz. Issa and Petra, and even they can be classified as settlements of the Archaic and Classical periods only with some hesitation. Lesbos was dotted with a large number of towers and forts, many of them in Lesbian masonry and dating from the Archaic period (Spencer (1994), (1995a) 53–64, (1995c); Schaus and Spencer (1994)). There has been significant extensive survey work carried out on the island, but the lack of any intensive survey in any region of the island means that currently there is very little evidence of proper non-polis settlements. In short, at the time of writing, it is difficult to answer questions about the settlement pattern,
and to decide whether Lesbians who were not settled in the urban centres of the poleis lived either dispersed in the countryside or in second-order towns or villages. This will become clear only when further fieldwork is carried out in the hinterland of the known urban centres.

What we know about the history of Lesbos in the early Archaic period concerns the colonisation of Chersonesos, Troas and Aiolis (Strabo 13.2.1; Mason (1993) 226–29). Specific information is known for a few poleis only: in C7 Lesbians colonised Madytos (no. 669) and Sestos (no. 672). Tenedos (no. 793) was colonised at an unknown date. For colonies founded by Methymna and Mytilene, see infra.

At some point in C6s Lesbos came under Persian rule. A Lesbian fleet was defeated by Polykrates, and Lesbian prisoners worked on the fortifications of Samos (Hdt. 3.39.4). Mytilenaian ships served in Kambyses’ fleet when he invaded Egypt in 525 (Hdt. 3.13–14), and Lesbian ships in Otanes’ fleet when he conquered Lemnos and Imbros c.512 (Hdt. 5.26). The Lesbians joined the Ionian Revolt, and seventy Lesbian ships fought at Lade in 494 (Hdt. 6.8.1–2, 14.3). After the defeat, the entire island of Lesbos was systematically ravaged by the Persians (Hdt. 6.31.1), and all five poleis seem to have been exposed to andrapodismos. Lesbos joined the Greeks in 479 (Hdt. 9.106.4).

All five Lesbian poleis were members of the Delian League, but none is recorded in the tribute lists, not even after the Revolt of 428/7. The Lesbians were among the original members of the League (Plut. Arist. 23.4; cf. Thuc. 3.10.2–4); they continued to provide ships and did not shift to paying phoros (Thuc. 1.19; Arist. Ath. Pol. 24.2). They provided ships for the suppression of the revolt of Samos in 440/39 (Thuc. 1.116.2, 117.2) and for the Athenian naval expedition round the Peloponnese in 430 (Thuc. 2.56.2). The Lesbian poleis remained autonomoi and eleutheroi (Thuc. 3.10.5), but were nevertheless under pressure from Athens (Arist. Pol. 1284b38–40). In 428 the Lesbian poleis revolted, except Methymna (Thuc. 3.2.1; Quinn (1981) 33–38). After the Athenians had quenched the Revolt, these poleis were forced to accept Athenian kleisarchs, but did not have to pay phoros (Thuc. 3.50.2). Methymna, however, remained an autonomos member of the League and provided ships presumably against Melos in 416 (Thuc. 5.84.1) and certainly for the Sicilian campaign in 415–413 (Thuc. 6.85.2, 7.57.5). Methymna, Mytilene and Pyrrha revolted once again in 412, but were soon recovered (Thuc. 8.22.2–23.6, 100.2–3). In 405, after the Spartan victory at Aigos potamoi, Lysander put an end to the Athenian domination of Lesbos (Xen. Hell. 2.2.5).

In 390/89 the Lesbian poleis were allied with Lakedaimon, except Mytilene, and there was a Spartan harminost on Lesbos (Xen. Hell. 4.8.28). All five Lesbian poleis were members of the Second Athenian Naval League, and this time they are recorded individually, Mytilene and Methymna among the founding members (IG II² 43.80–81); Antissa and Eresos joined the League in, probably, 375 (B.20–21), Pyrrha is attested as a member in IG II² 107.29 (368/7).

At Messon (IG XI inv. 136.a.5 (Caf)) north of Pyrrha (Spencer (1995a) 103) was a shrine which in the Archaic period was shared by all Lesbians and consecrated to three divinities: Zeus, the Aiolian mother goddess (either Hera or Kybele) and Dionysos (Alc fr. 129; cf. Robert (1969) 816–31). In the Classical period the sanctuary was situated at the edge of the territory of Pyrrha (Labarre (1996) 197). For the C4–C3 pseudodipteral Ionic temple, see Pyrrha (no. 799) infra. From the temple at Messon Louis Robert inferred that there was a Lesbian federation from C71 onwards (Robert (1969) 818, 825). Further evidence of cooperation between the poleis is the “Lesbian” coinage (infra). But neither the coins nor the existence of a sanctuary shared by all poleis in a region or a multipole island is enough to support the inference that there was a federal organisation with common political institutions for all the poleis. There can be no doubt, however, that Antissa, Eresos and Pyrrha were controlled by Mytilene in the years before the Revolt of 428. They were dependent poleis and what triggered the Revolt in 428 was presumably the Mytilenaian’s attempt by a synoikismoi to transform Lesbos into one single polis (Thuc. 3.21.3–3.1 with schol.; cf. Moggi, Sin. 189–97). Thucydides conveys the impression that the synoecism was planned to include Methymna as well as the other three poleis.

There was no common Lesbian calendar. The names of some months are known for Eresos, Methymna and Mytilene, and most names differ from polis to polis apart from the month Apollonios (shared by Lesbos and Methymna) and Pantheios (shared by Methymna and Mytilene); see Trümper, Monat. 246–48. The evidence is Hellenistic or later, but if there were different calendars in the later periods we can infer a fortiori that each polis must have had its own calendar in the Archaic and Classical periods.

Several series of coins struck in billon or electrum are classified as a “Lesbian” coinage. The common view is that these coins were struck for general use in Lesbos, some of them in Mytilene, some perhaps in Methymna. (1) Billon coins struck on the Phoenician or Persic standard from before C6m to after C5m: denominations: stater, hekte and fractions. Types: obv. a great variety of types, some connected with Mytilene (e.g. two calves’ heads face to face), some
with Methymna (e.g., two boars’ heads face to face); rev. incuse square; legend: $\Lambda\varepsilon\Sigma$ or $\Omega$ (on a few); on one a monogram, interpreted as $A\Lambda$, standing for Antissa (Babelon, Traité ii.1, 349 no. 568). (2) Electrum coins struck on the Phokaic standard c.485–350 BC: denominations: stater and hekte. Types: obv. a great variety of types (head of animal, e.g., lion or ram; later, head of a god, e.g., Apollo or Hermes); rev. a great variety of types (e.g., panther or serpent or silenos in incuse square); legend: $\Lambda\varepsilon\Sigma$ or $\Omega$ (on a few), see 1029 infra (Head, $HN^2$ 557–59; Kraay (1976) 38–39, 266; SNG Cap. Lesbos 284–330).

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis

Aigeiros (Ἀϊγέρος) Strabo 13.2.2 (κόμη τής Μυθησαύνης). In Barr. identified with Kabakli, but both Mason (1993) 240–43 and Spencer (1995a) no. 243 dispute the identification. In Barr. classified as a settlement; but even if the identification is accepted, there is no evidence that Aigeiros (or Kabakli) was a settlement in the Archaic and Classical periods (Spencer (1995a) no. 243). For the erroneous attribution of an Archaic coin to Aigeiros (Head, $HN^2$ 559), see Mason (1993) 243. Barr. AC.


Hiera? (Ἱπά, Ηίρα) Alc. fr. 69.3-4, Lobel and Page: ἤρ [---] ἐστι πόλιν is sometimes restored as ἱπ [ας] ἐστι πόλιν. If correct, the restoration testifies to the existence of a seventh polis on Lesbos in the Archaic period; but it seems preferable to restore ἤρ [ας] ἐστι πόλιν or to leave the text unrestored. Steph. Byz. 337.2 (Ὑπα... ἐστι καὶ πόλις Λέσβου); Plin. $HN^5$ 139 (Hiera). Barr. Hiera is identified with a site near modern Perama (Spencer (1995a) no. 54), but remains in the area are all later than C1 (HW¹; Spencer (1995a) no. 54) and the identification with the historically attested Hiera cannot be proved from current finds in the area. Barr. C.

Issa (Ἰσσα) Steph. Byz. 339.14 (πόλις ἐν Λέσβω). In Barr. identified with a fortified hill-top settlement near modern Parakolia (Spencer (1995a) no. 123), where finds of an apparently substantial enclosure wall and a building complex were noted initially in the nineteenth century by Koldewey (1890) and more recently by Axioitis (1992). Both felt unable to date the structure from the associated ceramic scatter, although Kontes suggested that “pre-Hellenistic” ceramics had been found here. Near this site (lying to the north-east) is the Lesbian masonry enclosure at Xerokastrine (Spencer (1995a) no. 122), probably to be classified as a fort rather than a settlement in Antiquity. Barr. AC.

Kith[---] (Κιθ[---]) Some rare billon coins of C5f have with good reason been assigned to Lesbos because of the obv. type: two boars’ heads, face to face; legend: $K\vartheta\Omega$ or, perhaps, $ΚΙΘΙ$, rev. incuse square and, on one, boar’s head (Babelon, Traité ii.1, 347–49 nos. 559–61; NC (1905) 326 n.4; Head, $HN^2$ 560). Accepting the Lesbian origin of the coins, Bürchner (1924) 2127 included a Κιθος (?) among the towns on Lesbos. Barr. Unlocated, undated.

Maleia (Μαλέια) IG xii.2 74.b.16, a C3 register of landed property in the territory of Mytilene. According to Strabo 13.2.2, Μαλέια was the southernmost promontory on Lesbos. In Barr. identified with Akhlia. There are a number of archaeological remains reported in the area south of Mytilene on this promontory (Spencer (1995a) nos. 38–43), the most substantial of which were structural and architectural finds dating back to C5 in a rescue excavation near the modern airport. Intriguingly, more finds of a more votive nature, including Archaic ceramics, were reported by Koldewey in the nineteenth century near the tip of the promontory (Spencer (1995a) nos. 38–43). Barr. C.

Metaon (Μέταον) Steph. Byz. 448.10 (πόλις Λέσβου), citing Hellan. fr. 92. If this toponym is correctly identified with the remains near the village of Plagia (Spencer (1995a) no. 62), there are no remains antedating the Hellenistic period. Barr. AC.

*Myrsinia* No ancient source mentions a *Μυρσινία* on Lesbos. Barr. marks Myrsinia near/at Spencer (1995a) no. 60 (NS), but no ancient remains are reported apart from an altar of the Hellenistic or Roman periods (which could well have been removed from its original location). Barr. C.

Nape (Νάπη) Strabo 9.4.5; Steph. Byz. 469.4 (πόλις Λέσβου); by Hellan. fr. 35b called Λάση, erroneously according to Strabo 9.4.5. In Barr. identified with modern Klopedi, the location of the Aiolic-style temple (Spencer (1995a) no. 111); see infra. The remains do not warrant Barr.’s classification of the site as a settlement. Barr. AC.

Pentile (Πεντίλη) Steph. Byz. 516.18 (πόλις Λέσβου). The toponym is associated with the location 2 km south of Agiasos known as “Pitsilia”, but no ancient remains have
ever been located at the spot (Spencer (1995a) no. 71). Barr. Unlocated, undated.

**Petra** The only Πέτρα(a) on Lesbos mentioned in the sources (IG XII.2 76.9) is a Roman village south of Methymna (Spencer (1995a) nos. 207–8), and there is still a modern-day village bearing this name on the coast in this area. No ancient source mentions a Petra near Prophitis Elias (Spencer (1995a) no. 121) on the west side of the Arisha plain, where “traces of a substantial enclosure wall of polygonal masonry are visible” and “a scatter of amphora, pithos and other sherds lie on the slopes below the summit outside the enclosure wall, and on the peak or the hill are traces of foundations and a dense scatter of ceramics”. According to Kontes (1978) 291, a “fort”; but could also be a settlement of the Archaic period (Spencer (1995a) fig. 8). **Barr. AC.**

**Sigrion** (Σήριον) Steph. Byz. 565.1; cf. 101.1, 474.11 (λιμήν). Strabo 13.2.4. (Steph. Byz. 101.1). **Barr.** has Sigrion, but all the sources have Sigrion. In **Barr.** classified as a settlement, but the extensive settlement remains reported appear to date only from the Roman period. In terms of ancient remains nearby, there are towers in isodomic masonry (Spencer (1995a) nos. 149, 151). According to Spencer (1995a) no. 148, Sigrion as a site is dated Roman and later. **Barr.** indicates that it is both A and C.

**Therma** (Θέρμα) **IG XII.2 14.4 (C3e) (ἐχ Θέρμας).** In **Barr.** identified with modern Thermi (Kontes (1978) 234–35 = Spencer (1995a) no. 8). The most extensive ancient remains near the modern village are those of the long-lived cult of Artemis Thermia focused on the hot springs near the small harbour of Loutra Thermis. The cult dates from C5, but hardly warrant **Barr.’s** classification of the site as a settlement. **Barr. C.**

**Xanthos** (Σάνθος) Steph. Byz. 480.17 (πόλις ἐν Λέσβο). **Barr.** Unlocated, C. This date is probably based on the erroneous assumption that δο πολιτης Σάνθος ὃς Εὐρειπίδης (487.17–18 = Eur. fr. 1102, Nauck) belongs with Xanthos on Lesbos and not with Xanthos in Lykia.

2. **Unidentified Settlements**

**Ag. Georgios** According to Kontes (1978) 239 a “significant settlement”, but so far there is no corroboration of the extent or precise nature of the remains here, including those reported nearby by Koldewey in the nineteenth century (Spencer (1995a) nos. 41–42). **Barr. AC.**

**Ag. Nikolaos** A cave with rich deposits of a votive nature (Spencer (1995a) no. 25) dating back to the Archaic period. However, the other remains hardly warrant **Barr.’s** classification of the site as a settlement, at least in Antiquity. **Barr. C?**

**Damandri** According to Spencer (1995a) no. 89, all remains are Hellenistic or later. **Barr. C.**

**Garbias** See Spencer (1995a) no. 80, but the precise material remains at the site still require corroboration and as yet are insufficient to warrant **Barr.’s** classification of the site as a settlement. **Barr. C.**

**Laros** Kontes reported a site at the location, but this report remains to be corroborated. **Barr. C.**

**Parakoila** Classical–Hellenistic ceramics and some associated structural remains were located near the modern village of Parakoila by Axiotis (Spencer (1995a) nos. 124–26). However, there is no definite proof of settlement in the Archaic and Classical periods. **Barr. AC?**

**Trianta** The remains at the location of Classical date are only of tombs (Spencer (1995a) no. 120), and the classification of the site as a settlement appears unwarranted on current evidence. **Barr. C.**

II. The Poleis

794. **Antissa** (Antissaios) Map 56. Lat. 39.15, long. 26.00. Size of territory: 4. Type: A. The toponym is Αντισσα, Ἰ (Thuc. 13.18.1–2; Dem. 23.132). The city-ethnic is Αντισσαίοις (Thuc. 3.18.2; IG II2 43B.20). Antissa is called a polis both in the urban sense (Ps.-Skylax 97; cf. Hdt. 1.151.2) and in the political sense (Arist. Oec. 1347*25). At Thuc. 3.18.1 polis is found in both senses simultaneously. The collective and external use of the city-ethnic is attested in inscriptions (IG II2 107.29 (368/7)) and in literature (Arist. Pol. 1303κ34). For the individual and external use, see Σωτήρος Αντισσαίοις at Arist. Oec. 1347*25. Antissa is implicitly called patris in Xen. Hell. 4.8.28.

The territory of Antissa covered c.250 km². To the south its neighbouring polis was Eresos, and its frontier was probably in the high upland between the two poleis, with sites such as the polygonal masonry tower Kourouklis (Spencer (1995a) no. 178) representing the border area. To the north-east it bordered on Methymna, and the frontier was probably between the forts at Selles (ibid. no. 205) and Ametelle (ibid. no. 202), both belonging to Methymna, and the forts at
Koutlougouni (ibid. no. 190), Koja Dag (ibid. no. 193) and Skoteino (ibid. no. 201), all belonging to Antissa. According to Kontes (1978) 127–28, 312–13, Antissa possessed Issa and its territory reached the Gulf of Kalloni. However, the upland topography to the south and east of Antissa argues against the suggestion that their territory extended so far in this direction, and Kontes’ views have also been criticised by Labarre (1996) 199–200. Issa could have belonged to Methymna.

The Antissaians were members of the Delian League. They are unattested in the Athenian tribute lists which show that, like the other Lesbian poleis, the Antissaians provided ships instead of paying phoros (Thuc. 1.116.2, 117.2). In 428 they joined the Mytilenaians in defecting from Athens (Thuc. 3.21.1). They were involved in the Mytilenaian attempt to synoecise Lesbos, and before the Athenian siege of Mytilene began, the Mytilenaians secured their position in Antissa, Pyrhira and Eresos and reinforced the fortifications of the three cities (3.18.1). A Methymnaian attack on Antissa was repelled (3.18.2). After Mytilene’s surrender in 427, the Athenians sent a squadron against Antissa and conquered the city (3.28.3). The territory, or at least a part of it, was surrendered to Athenian klerouchs (3.50.2).

In 412 Antissa seems to have followed Chios and Mytilene and seceded from Athens once again (Thuc. 8.22.2). In any case, the juxtaposition at Thuc. 8.23.4 of Antissa and Methymna, which had revolted against Athens, indicates that Antissa had revolted too, and now sheltered some anti-Athenian exiles from Chios (Diod. 13.65.3; cf. Gehrke, Stasis 23, 45); but stasis between the two different ethnic groups led to civil war and the forceful expulsion of the exiles (Arist. Pol. 1303b25–28, 34–35).

In C4 Antissa was allied with Lakedaimon, but in 390/89 Thrasyboulos imposed a settlement by which the city joined the Athenians (Diod. 14.94.4). The settlement undoubtedly included the repatriation of some exiles to Mytilene (Xen. Hell. 4.8.28). Antissa was a member of the Second Athenian Naval League, but, by contrast with Mytilene, it was not among the founding members. It joined the alliance in, probably, 375 (IG 11.4 43B.20; Brun (1988) 377), and Antissaians representatives in the allied synedrion are attested for the year 368/7 (IG 11.2 107.29).

Antissa joined the Corinthian League, probably in 337, and was then ruled by a tyrant (Dem. 17.7; Bosworth (1980) 179). In 333 the city was taken by the Persian admiral Memnon, alongside the other Lesbian poleis (Diod. 17.29.2; Arr. Anab. 2.1.1), but the Macedonians reconquered Antissa in the following year (Arr. Anab. 3.2.6; Curt. 4.5.22) and deposed the tyrant (Dem. 17.7).

At the coastal site of Antissa, on the promontory of Ovriokastro, are few visible remains earlier than mediaeval, but in the 1930s limited excavations revealed Geometric/Archaic structures and graves on the landward side. The earlier of two superimposed apsidal buildings appears to be of Geometric date, the later successor building dating to the early Archaic period (Lamb (1931–32)). The end of a late Classical stoa was also uncovered, and an Archaic street; references for all finds are collected in Spencer (1995a) no. 161, (1995b) 285–87. In one of the cemeteries there is evidence of a small temenos and tomb cult (Spencer 1995d; for the link of the cult to the region of Antissa, see Haris & al. (2002a), (2002b). We know from Thuc. 3.18.1 that Antissa was walled in 428/7 and that the fortifications were reinforced in that year. There are stretches of a large-scale wall on the south side of the acropolis recorded by Lamb during fieldwork in the 1930s (Spencer (1995a) 62–63), but whether these were part of a circuit wall, and its precise dating, are still unclear. As reconstructed by Koldewey (1890) pl. 6, the walls enclosed an area of c.18 ha.

One of the so-called Lesbian coins (supra) has a monogram which has been interpreted as AN, standing for Antissa (Babelon, Traité ii.1.349–50 no. 568).

795. Arisba Map 56. Lat. 39.15, long. 26.15. Size of territory: probably 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is Ἀρίσβα, ἦ (Hdt. 1.151.2) or, in the Attic-Ionic dialect, ἄρισβη (Steph. Byz. 3, 8–9). Arisba is described by Herodotos as the sixth polis on Lesbos, where polis is used in the urban and the political senses simultaneously. Before Çsm and probably in C6, the city was conquered by Methymna; its population was exposed to andrapodosmos (Hdt. 1.151.2); and the territory was incorporated into that of Methymna (Strabo 13.1.21).

The site of Arisba is probably to be identified with the ancient remains on the low acropolis of “Palaiokastro” near the modern village of that name near Kalloni, and has been known since the nineteenth century. There are extensive traces of a polygonal masonry fortification wall around the acropolis, and along the northern side of the plateau. As reconstructed by Koldewey (1890) pl. 13, the walls may have enclosed an area of c.8 ha. There are remains of megaron-like houses on the hill, but the precise dating of both walls and houses is unclear and could not be clarified even through excavation by the local archaeological ephoria. (Koldewey (1890) pls. 13, 14; Kontes (1978) fig. 48; other references collected in Spencer (1995a) no. 116; see also Spencer (1995b) 287–88 and fig. 7).
796. **Eresos** (Eresios) Map 56. Lat. 39.10; long. 25.55. Size of territory: 4. Type: A. The toponym is Ἐρεσος, ἦ (Thuc. 8.100.3; Dem. 17.7; Arcoverdoros fr. 5.5, Olson and Sens; Arcadius 75.20) or Ἐρεσος (Ps.-Skyx 97; IG xii.2 533.1–2 (C3/C2)) or Ἐρεσος (Arist. fr. 655, Rose; Diod. 17.29.2). The city-ethnic is Ἐρέσος (IG i² 94.4 (C5); IG xii.2 526.C.31 (C4)); Thuc. 8.23.4). Eresos is called a polis in the urban sense (IG xii.2 526.A.8, 11, B.2, 11 (C4)); Thuc. 3.35.1; Ps.-Skyx 97; cf. Hdt. 1.151.2), in the territorial sense (IG xii.2 526.D.7, 28, 30, 37), and in the political sense (IG xii.2 526.A.27, B.30, C.3, D.21). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form on coins of C.4/C.3 (infra) and externally in inscriptions (IG i² 107.29; IG xii.2 137.11 (C4l)) and in literature (Thuc. 8.23.4). For the individual and external use, see Θεὸ φραστος ὁ Ἐρέσιος (Ath. 537B) and Μύς Πρωτέα Ἐρέσιος in a C.4l proxeny decree from Megara (IG vii 4.2). Eresos is implicitly called patris in Xen. Hell. 4.8.28.

The territory of Eresos probably covered c.225 km². Already in the Archaic period it was marked by a line of installations in Lesbian masonry (Schaus and Spencer 1994) 414–20), of which five have been identified: Spilios (Spencer 1995) no. 141), Megalos Lakos (ibid. no. 175), Biga tou Aetou (ibid. no. 187, some 8 km west of the Gulf of Kallon, but in Barr. placed near the coast), Apoteke (ibid. no. 130) and Makara (ibid. no. 131). To the north it may have included Sigrion (although there are no remains antedating the Roman period known at this site, supra). The frontier towards Antissa was probably the high upland area including Mount Ordynnos between the two poleis (see the description of the territory of Antissa, supra). Along the north coast of the Gulf of Kallon the frontier lay north of Apoteke (infra) but presumably south of what appears to be a fort at Issa (supra): Labarre (1996) 199.

The Eresians were members of the Delian League. They are unattested in the Athenian tribute lists, which shows that, like the other Lesbian poleis, the Eresians provided ships instead of paying phoros (Thuc. 1.116.2, 117.2). In 428 they joined the Mytilenaians in defecting from Athens (Thuc. 3.2.1). They were involved in the Mytilenian attempt to synoecise Lesbos, and before the Athenian siege of Mytilene began, the Mytilenaians secured their position in Antissa, Pyrrha and Eresos and reinforced the fortifications of the three cities (3.18.1). The Athenians gained possession of Pyrrha and Eresos only after Mytilene's surrender in 427 (3.35.1). The territory, or at least a part of it, was surrendered to Athenian klerouchs (3.50.2). Eresos revolted against Athens once again in 412 (8.23.4), but was soon recaptured by the Athenians (8.23.5). In 411, however, exiled Methymnian oligarchs provoked a new defection (8.100.3), and this time Eresos withstood the Athenians' attempt to take the city by siege (8.100.4–5, 101.1, 103.2).

In 414 Eresos was allied with Lakedaimon, but in 390/89 Thrasyboulos imposed a settlement by which the city joined the Athenians (Diod. 14.94.4). The settlement undoubtedly included the repatriation of some exiles to Mytilene (Xen. Hell. 4.8.28). Eresos was a member of the Second Athenian Naval League, but, by contrast with Mytilene, it was not among the founding members. It joined the alliance in, probably, 375 (IG i² 43B.21; Brun (1988) 377), and Eresian representatives in the allied synedraion are attested for the year 368/7 (IG i² 107.29).

Eresos joined the Corinthian League, probably in 337, and was then a tyranny (Dem. 17.7; Bosworth (1980) 179) ruled by Hermon, Heroaids and Apollodoros (IG xii.2 526D.18–21; Lott (1996)), but in 333 the city was taken by the Persian admiral Memnon (Diod. 17.29.2; Arr. Anab. 2.1.1), and other tyrants were installed; viz. Agonippos (IG xii.2 526A.1–32, D12) and Eury silicaos (IG xii.2 526B.1–33, D12). The Makedonians reconquered Lesbos in the following year (Arr. Anab. 3.2.6) and deposed the tyrants (Dem. 17.7). They were handed over to the Eresians, who had them sentenced to death and executed (IG xii.2 526, see infra). Almost all we know about the political organisation of Eresos stems from a dossier of documents, all related to trials against (1) the tyrants Agonippos and Eury silicaos, and (2) the descendants of the former tyrants (IG xii.2 526 = Rec. Inscr. Jur. Gr. 27 = Tod 191 = Heiserer (1980) 27–79; cf. the analysis in Koch (2001)). One decree reports the trial and conviction of Agonippos (A.1–32), another the trial and conviction of Eury silicaos (B.1–34), a third one the trial of the descendants of the former tyrants (A.33–41, C.1–20), followed by letters from Philip Arrhidaios and Antigonos (C.21–D.3) and, finally, a C.4l decree of the Eresian people confirming all former verdicts (D.4–39).

Eresos was probably a democracy when the trials of the tyrants were heard. A prytanis served as the eponymous official (πρῶτανις, C.29; cf. the list of πρωτανεις Ἐρεσίων drawn up by Phianis, the C.4s pupil of Aristotle (fr. 17–19, Wehrli)). Decrees (φαξήμαστα, D.33–34) were passed in a general assembly (ἐκκλησία, A.26) by the people (δάµος, A.33, 41) or by the council (βῆλα, C.31, D.4) and the people in accordance with a probouleumatic procedure ([πρ]εσβύλλευν ος), D.4). It was the people (δάµος) who in both cases decided to appoint a court (δικαστήριον, D.13–15, 24) to hear the trial of the tyrants, and speakers for the prose-
cution (συνήγοροι, C.28–34) were appointed by the polis (C.30). It is unknown whether the dikasterion was coextensive with the ekklesia. The trials were warranted by a law against tyrants and their descendants (A.24–26, D.16–17, 31–32). At the trial Agonippos was found guilty and sentenced to death by 876 votes to 7 (A.30–32); Eury silaos was sentenced to death too (D.14–15), and at the trial of the descendants of the former tyrants the Eresians confirmed the earlier sentence of exile (C.22–28). The number of votes cast, altogether 883, points to a total of at least 1,000 adult male citizens and a population of at least 4,000 citizens plus foreigners and slaves.

Eresos sent envoys to Alexander the Great c.332 (IG xiii.2 526A.33) and received envoys from Athens in 368/7 (IG ii.2 107.31–34).

Eresian citizens received pro Henia from Delphi (F.Delphes iii.4 395 (c.360–320)), Megara (IG viii.4 (C.41)) and Zeleia (Michel 531 (C.41)).

Only limited excavations and surveys have taken place on the site of Lesbos’ westernmost polis, and discoveries have been mainly Roman or early Christian in date (Koldewey (1890) pls. 8, 9; Kontes (1978) figs. 56, 57; Schaus and Spencer (1994)); references to finds at the site are collected in Spencer (1995a) no. 135, (1995b) 288 and fig. 8). Some remains of a fortification wall in Lesbian-style masonry, probably Archaic, survive on the acropolis (Koldewey (1890) pl. 9). As reconstructed by Koldewey (1890) pl. 6, the walls enclosed an area of c.5 ha. An Archaic Aiolic capital (probably either from a votive column or temple) was dredged up out of the harbour and is now in the museum at Mytilene (Spencer (1995a) no. 135 and n. 61 (p. 30); Archontidhou (1999) 28). An Archaic relief of a seated Kybele in naiskos from the site suggests a sanctuary (Spencer (1995a) no. 138; Archontidhou (1999) 93). At the site of Apotheke near the entrance to the Gulf of Kalloni stands the best-preserved structure in Lesbian-style masonry on the island, a large Late Archaic temple platform (Koldewey (1890) pl. 15; Schaus and Spencer (1994) 416–17 and fig. 3; Spencer (1995a) no. 130, (2000) 72). We know from Thucydides that Eresos was walled in 428/7, that the fortifications were reinforced in that year (3.18.1), and that the city was besieged in 412 (8.100.4–5).

Eresos struck bronze coins in C4/C3. The most frequent types are: obv. head of Hermes wearing petasos; rev. corn- ear, or caduceus; legend: EPEΩΣI or EPE (Head, HN2 560; SNG Cap. Lesbos 339–43; for the C4 date of the earliest coins, see IGCH no. 1227).

797. Methymna (Methymnaios) Map 56. Lat. 39.20; long. 26.10. Size of territory: probably 3, later 4. Type: A. The toponym is Μηθυμνα, ῶ (Thuc. 8.100.2; Xen. Hell. 1.6.38; Dem. 44.9). The epichoric form of the city-ethnic is Μαθυµναίοι (coins, infra), the Attic–Ionic form is Μηθυμναίοι (IG i.2 353.66 (420/19); Hdt. 1.23.1). Methymna is called a polis both in the urban sense (Xen. Hell. 1.6.13; Ps.-Skylax 97; cf. Hdt. 1.151.2) and in the political sense (IG ii.2 40.23 (378/7); Hdt. 1.151.2, 3; Xen. Hell. 4.8.28; Isoc. Ep. 7.9). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins (infra) and externally in inscriptions (IG i.2 353.66 (420/19)) and in literature (Hdt. 1.151.1; Thuc. 3.2.3). For the individual and external use, see Ἀρίων ὁ Μηθυμναῖος (Hdt. 1.23). Methymna is implicitly called patris in Xen. Hell. 4.8.28.

The territory was called ῶ Μηθυμναία (Ant. 5.21) and may originally have covered less than 200 km² (Mason (1993) 229), but after the conquest of Arisba probably measured more than 400 km². To the west it bordered on Antissa, and the frontier probably lay along the forts at Selles (Spencer (1995a) no. 205) and Ametelle (ibid. no. 202), both belonging to Methymna, and the forts at Koutlougouni (ibid. no. 190), Koja Dag (ibid. no. 193) and Skoteino (ibid. no. 201), all belonging to Antissa. On the east coast of Lesbos Methymna bordered on Mytilene, and its territory may have included Aigeiros (Labarre (1996) 194), although the location of the latter site is still unclear; see the list of non-polis sites supra. The frontier between Methymna and Mytilene may have been as far north as Cape Tsakmák (Mason (1993) 231–48), but this suggestion remains to be proved. Towards the Gulf of Kalloni, after the disappearance of Arisba, Methymna bordered on Pyrrha to the south-east, and the frontier was probably at Messon, the common shrine for all of Lesbos (Mason (1993) 231–32). Further to the west Methymna’s territory at the Gulf of Kalloni may have extended to the site of Issa and bordered on Eresos somewhere north of Apotheke (see supra).

The only historical event antedating the Classical period is Herodotos’ piece of information that Methymna conquered Arisba, the sixth polis on Lesbos, and exposed its population to andrapodismos (Hdt. 1.151.1, supra).

Methymna was a member of the Delian League. The Lesbians were among those who in 478 encouraged the Athenians to replace Sparta as the hegemon in the war against Persia (Plut. Arist. 23.4), and the Methymnians must have been among the original members of the League. In spite of Mytilenaian collaboration with an anti-Athenian faction in Methymna (Thuc. 3.18.1), the Methymnians remained loyal to Athens when the rest of Lesbos revolted in 428 (Thuc. 3.2.1, 5.1, 50.2), and they maintained their status
as *autonomoi* allies who, instead of paying *phoros*, took part in the campaigns with their armed forces (Thuc. 6.85.2, 7.57.5). Accordingly, they are not recorded in the Athenian tribute lists. In 412 Methymna was the first Lesbian *polis* that revolted from Athens (Thuc. 8.22.2, 23.4), but the city was soon recovered by the Athenians (8.23.6, 100.2). In 411 a group of oligarchic exiles made a vain attempt to win the city (Thuc. 8.100.3). Methymna remained in Athenian hands (Xen. *Hell.* 1.2.12) until 406, when the city was betrayed by a pro-Lakedaimonian faction to a Peloponnesian force under Kallikratides (Xen. *Hell.* 1.6.12–15, 38; Diod. 13.76.5). The Methymnaeans were still allied with Sparta in 390/89 (Xen. *Hell.* 4.8.28) when, supported by pro-Athenian exiles settled in Mytilene, Thrasyboulos launched an attack on Methymna. He won a battle and ravaged the territory but could not conquer the city (Xen. *Hell.* 4.8.28–30; Diod. 14.94.4).

A decade later Methymna had changed sides. It was one of the founding members of the Second Athenian Naval League. A separate treaty between Athens and Methymna was concluded in the autumn of 378 (*IG* ii² 42), and Mytilene is listed among the allies in the so-called Charter of the League (*IG* ii² 43.81 = *Staatsverträge* 257), and their representatives in the allied *synedrion* are attested for the year 368/7 (*IG* ii² 107.28). Methymna sent envoys to Athens in 378/7 (*IG* ii² 40.24–25), and Athens sent envoys to Methymna (*IG* ii² 107.31–34 (368/7)).

In 333 Methymna was taken by the Persian admiral Memon alongside the other Lesbian *poleis* (Diod. 17.29.2; Arr. *Anab.* 2.1.11), but by a peaceful agreement the Macedonians regained the small cities on Lesbos in the following year (Arr. *Anab.* 3.2.6).

The group of oligarchic exiles attested in 411 (Thuc. 8.100.3) may indicate that, at that point, Methymna was a democracy; but otherwise next to nothing is known about the type of constitution until C₄m, when it seems to have been an oligarchy (Theopomp. fr. 227; Gehrke, *Stasis* 113). From C₄m Methymna was ruled by a series of tyrants (Berve (1967) 337; Bosworth (1980) 179–80). The first was Kleomnissi, who restored law and order to Methymna (Theopomp. fr. 227, where he is called *Khleoménis*), recalled the exiles, and issued all citizens with hoplite weapons (*Iosoc. Ep.* 7.8–9). He was loyal to Athens and was awarded *proxenia* by the Athenians (*IG* ii² 284). He was succeeded by Aristonymos, a friend of Memon (Polyaen. *Strat.* 5.44.3). The next tyrant, Aristonikos, was deposed in 332 and, on Alexander’s orders, handed over to the Methymnians, who had him tortured and executed (Arr. *Anab.* 3.2.4–7; Curt. 4.5.19–21, 8.11).

Only surveys and salvage excavations have been carried out at Methymna, the second in size of the *poleis* of the island; but a comprehensive study including a presentation of the remains visible up to the 1970s has appeared (Buchholz (1975); cf. Koldewey (1890); Kontes (1978); Spencer (1995a) no. 217, (1995b) 283–85 and fig. 5).

The extent of the ancient city with its acropolis (occupied by a small Genoese castle) and harbour (undated ancient harbour works are visible beside and under modern constructions) is apparent, and scattered finds suggest stages of expansion from Archaic to Hellenistic. The earliest historical structural remains may be those south of the Kastro, where an Archaic street and housing complex is underlain by earlier structural remains of Geometric and possibly Protogeometric date (Spencer (1995b) 283 and n. 94. The no longer visible theatre (*TGR* ii. 253) under the village school may be C₄ in date (Buchholz (1975)); a second theatrical building nearby (*bouleuterion or odeion?*) is also said to have once been visible (Dr. Peter Green, pers. comm.). Graves of C₆ and C₅ have been uncovered to the west and north of the acropolis (Buchholz (1975) pl. 10d; Spencer (1995b); Archontidhou (1999)). The site of the largest Aiolic temple on the island (probably to Apollo) has been known near the village of Napi since the late nineteenth century, but no complete study has yet appeared; it probably dates to Cēl (Evanisidis (1926), (1927); Koldewey (1890) pl. 16; Betancourt (1977); Spencer (1995a) no. 111, (1995b) 299–300).

A smaller structure of similar date beside it has not been identified, but it is probably a second temple (the same refs. as above). Recent new excavations (1999) by the Archaeological Service may reveal more precise information once they have been published. There is also possible evidence for an Archaic silver mine in its south-eastern territory near the village of Argenna (Davies (1932) 985). At various places in the modern town are remains of a C₆(?) polygonal city wall (Koldewey (1890) pl. 16, table 4(a); Lang (1996) 247). As reconstructed by Koldewey, the area enclosed by the walls measured c.30 ha. Furthermore, it appears from Thuc. 3.18.1 that Methymna was walled in 428/7 and that the fortifications were reinforced in that year; a siege of the city in 406 is reported at Diod. 13.76.5.

Methymna struck coins of electrum and silver from c.550 until c.375. (1) Electrum, c.550–375: *hektai* on the Phokaic standard. Types usually connected with Methymna are: *obv.* boar or, perhaps, Gorgoneion; rev. lion’s head. (2) Silver, from before 500 to c.450: denominations: didrachm, tetralobol, diobol. Types: *obv.* mostly boar or Gorgoneion; rev. mostly head of Athena; legend: on some
MAΘYΜNΑΙΟΣ. (3) Silver, c.420–c.375. Denominations: didrachm, drachm, triobol, obol. Types: obv. head of Athena; rev. lion’s head, or lyre, or kantharos; legend: MAΘYΜNΑΙΟΝ, often abbreviated MA or MAΘ (Head, HN² 558, 560–61; Kraay (1976) 39; SNG Cap. Lesbos 345–51).

Methymna colonised Assos (no. 769) (Myrsilos (FGrHist 477) fr. 17 = Strabo 13.1.58).

798. Mytilene (Mytilenaioς) Map 56. Lat. 39.05, long. 26.35. Size of territory: 4. Type: A. The epichoric form of the toponym is Μυτιλήνας, ἸΣ (IG xii.2 1.7 (C5)). In the Attic–Ionic dialect it is Μυτιλήνη, Ἓ (Hdt. 1.160.1; At. Eq. 834; Ant. 5.20), later Μυτιλήνη (Syll.³ 344.30 (C4l)). The toponym usually denotes the town (Ant. 5.23; Thuc. 3.18.4; Ps.-Sklav. 97), but sometimes the town plus its hinterland (SEG 36 750.17 (C4s)) and sometimes the political community (Hdt. 5.11.2; Dem. 40.37). The city-ethnic is Μυτιληναίος (coins and IG xii.2 1.18, 123) or Μυτιληναίος (IG xii.2 3.2 (C4q); IG ii² 40.19 (378/7)).

Mytilene is called a polis in the urban sense (IG xii.2 4.7, 17 + suppl. p. 2 (C4m); Thuc. 3.3.3; Xen.Hell. 1.6.19), in the political sense (Alc. fr. 348; IG xii.2 95.3 (C4) = SEG 28 690; Ant. 5.77; Thuc. 3.13.7; Dem. 40.37) and in the territorial sense (Ant. 5.76; IG xii.2 6 passim; SEG 36 750.2–3, 15, 19 (C4s)). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins (infra) and in inscriptions (IG xii.2 4.5 (C4m); SEG 36 750.9 (C4s)) and externally in inscriptions (IG ii² 213.7 (347/6); E.Delphes 111.4 400.3 (C4d/C3e)) and in literary sources (Ant. 5.76; Thuc. 3.2.3; Arist. Pol. 1285.35). For the individual and external use, see Πιτακάκος ὁ Μυτιληναῖος at P.L. 343A and Ἡρακλής Μυτιληναῖος in a C4s healing inscription from Epidaurus (IG iv² 1.121.122). Patris is found in Antiph. 5.62 and 79.

The territory of Mytilene may have covered c.450–500 km² (Kontes (1978) figs. 19–22). To the north it bordered on Methymna, and the frontier may have been as far north as Cape Tsakmák (Mason (1993) 231–48). According to Labarre (1996) 194), it ran south of Ageiros, but see supra regarding the problems in identification of this site. To the west Mytilene bordered on Pyrrha and was separated from this polis by the “pine-covered Pyrrhaian mountain” (Theophr. Hist. pl. 3.9.5) on the slopes of Mt. Olympus. There is no evidence of ancient settlements in this large area, and the forest may have been a no man’s land separating Mytilene from Pyrrha (Spencer (1996)). The presumption is that the region east and south of the forest belonged to Mytilene.

By the Classical period, it appears that Mytilene’s territory was not fertile enough to feed its population, and imports from Bosporos are attested in 428 (Thuc. 3.2.2). In C4m Leukon of Bosporos granted Mytilene a reduction in export duty. As restored, the inscription implies that the Mytilenians’ annual import exceeded 100,000 medimnoi (IG xii suppl. 3 = Tod 163 (C4m)), enough to feed a population of c.20,000 persons.

Mytilene was the greatest of the Aiolian poleis, and in the Archaic period had significant involvement in events outside the island. In this respect it appears largely set apart from the other Lesbian poleis, and Mytilene’s focus beyond events in the island may well have exacerbated its infamous social stasis at this time (Spencer (2000) and infra). In the C7s Mytilene acquired a peraia in the Treos, with Sigeion and Achilleion as the two most prominent centres. C.620, however, Athenian settlers under Phrynon took Sigeion. In the following war between Mytilene and Athens, the Mytilenaians were defeated in a battle in which the poet Alkaios lost his shield, but they then regained Sigeion, allegedly after a duel that Pittakos won against Phrynon. The war ended with an arbitration by Periander, the tyrant of Corinth, whereby the Athenians were awarded Sigeion. They probably lost it again, since, in the end, it was Peisistratos who seized Sigeion from Mytilene (Strabo 13.2.38; Hdt. 5.94–95, where Hdt. has mixed up and misdated some of the events; cf. Schachermeyer (1950) 1867–68). In the same period the Mytilenaians, as the only Aiolians, were co-colonisers of Naukratis in the reign of Amasis (Hdt. 2.178.2; see Spencer (2000) 75–76).

At some point in C6s Mytilene came under Persian rule, and Mytilenaians ships served in Cambyses’ fleet when he invaded Egypt in 525 (Hdt. 3.13–14). Mytilene took part in the Ionian Revolt in 499 (Hdt. 6.5.2) and must have provided the majority of the seventy Lesbian ships which fought at Lade in 494 (Hdt. 6.8.2). After the defeat, the entire island of Lesbos was systematically ravaged by the Persians (Hdt. 6.31.1). The Mytilenaians must have fought on the Persian side in 480/79 (Hdt. 8.85), but Lesbos joined the Greeks in 479 (Hdt. 9.106.4).

The Mytilenaians were members of the Delian League. The Lesbians were among those who in 478 encouraged the Athenians to replace Sparta as the hegemon in the war against Persia, and the Mytilenaians were among the original members of the League (Thuc. 3.10.2–4; Plut. Arist. 23.4). They remained autonomoi and eleutheroi until their revolt in 428, and instead of paying phoros, they took part in the campaigns with their armed forces (Thuc. 3.10.5, 11.1, 3.39.2; Arist. Ath. Pol. 24.2). The Lesbians, including Mytilene, provided ships against Samos in 440/39 (Thuc. 1.116.2, 117.2; Diod. 12.27.4, 28.2) and against the Lakedaimonians and
their allies during the first years of the Peloponnesian War (Thuc. 2.9.5, 56.2.3.3.4). Accordingly, they are not recorded in the Athenian tribute lists.

In 428 Mytilene and the other Lesbian poleis except Methymna defected from Athens (Thuc. 3.2–18, 25, 27–50; Diod. 12.55, derived from Thuc.). Behind the revolt, planned already before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War (Thuc. 3.2.1–2), was the Mytilenaians’ attempt to go through with a synoecism of Lesbos, their success in winning the control of Antissa, Eresos and Pyrrha, and the Athenians’ opposition to the synoecism (Thuc. 2.3, 3.1, 5.1, 18.3; Moggi, Sin. 189–97). The Athenians sent a fleet to Mytilene (Thuc. 3.2.), and after an abortive armistice (4.4) the harbours of Mytilene were blockaded by the Athenian squadron (6.1). At a meeting held in Olympia Mytilenian envos obtained an alliance with the Peloponnesian League (3.8–15). Reinforced by 1,000 hoplites, the Athenians built a blockading wall and besieged Mytilene (18.3–4). A Peloponnesian army invaded Attika in 427, but the relieving squadron under a Spartan nauarch never reached Mytilene (3.26.1, 29–33). The Mytilenaians were starved into unconditional surrender (3.28.1); and the members of the oligarchic faction were sent to Athens (3.35.1). The Athenians decided first to expose Mytilene to an andrapodismos (3.36.2), but went back on this decision the following day (3.49.1) and concluded peace on the following terms: the oligarchs sent to Athens, over 1,000 men, were held responsible for the revolt and executed; the other Mytilenaians were forced to pull down their walls, to surrender their fleet, to cede their possessions in the peraia to Athens, and to have their hinterland divided into 3,000 kleroi, of which 300 were made sacred property and 2,700 were given to Athenian klérouches (3.50) (Figueira 1991 8–10, 251–53). Mytilene became a dependent polis deprived of its hinterland, but not of its urban centre. Thus, there is no basis for Hamp’s view (1939 1–2) that it became a polis without territory (Hansen 1998 55). Shortly afterwards, however, perhaps already in 427/6, the Mytilenaians recovered their autonomia (IG i³ 66.12) and the possession of their hinterland (IG i³ 66.11–12, 18, 67.3–4; Mattingly 1996 136–37); but see Hornblower (1991 440–41). In 412 Mytilene followed Chios and revolted against Athens once again (Thuc. 8.22.2), but was almost immediately recovered by the Athenians (23.2, 100.3), and it remained loyal to Athens (Diod. 13.73.5; Xen. Hell. 1.6.35, 38) until it was taken by Lysander in 405 (Xen. Hell. 2.2.5).

In 394 the Mytilenaians joined the coalition organised by Konon (Diod. 14.84.3), and with his help they succeeded in 389 in expelling the Lakedaimonians from Eresos and Antissa (Diod. 14.94.3–4; Xen. Hell. 4.8.28–29). Alongside Chios, Rhodes and Byzantion, Mytilene was a founding member of the Second Athenian Naval League. A separate treaty between Athens and Mytilene was concluded in the autumn of 378 (IG ii² 40), and Mytilene is listed among the allies in the so-called Charter of the League (IG ii² 43.80 = Staatsverträge 257). The Mytilenaians fought beside the Athenians in the war against the Peloponnesian League (IG ii² 107; Isoc. 14.28) and approved of an Athenian garrison placed in Mytilene in, probably, 375 (SEG 19 204; Dreher 1995 28). When Kephisodotos became tyrant of Mytilene in 347/6, the city seceded from the League (Dem. 40.37), but it was readmitted through a new alliance concluded in 347/6 (IG ii² 233; Cargill 1980 95). Mytilene was allied with Alexander the Great (Arr. Anab. 2.1.4; Curt. 4.8.13), but was not necessarily a member of the Corinthian League (Bosworth 1980 181). The city was besieged and conquered by the Persian fleet in 333 (Diod. 17.39.2; Arr. Anab. 2.1.2–4), but reconquered by the Macedonians in the following year (Arr. Anab. 3.2.6; Curt. 4.5.22).

The constitutional history of Mytilene bristles with revolutions caused by discord between factions (stasis) (Gehrke, Stasis 117–23; Spencer 2000). In C7 the city was ruled by the house of the Pentheleidai, described by Aristotle as a βασιλικὴ δυναστεία (Pol. 311b26), which may indicate that Mytilene originally was a hereditary kingdom (Carlier 1984 451; Schütrumpf and Gehrke 1996 561). Because of their tyrannical behaviour, they were overturned by a certain Megakles; but later in the century Mytilene was once again ruled by a member of the family, Penthiulos, who was murdered by Smerdes (Pol. 131b37–30; Alc. fr. 75). His son-in-law was Pittakos (Diog. Laert. 1.81; Alc. fr. 70), who at some point ruled Mytilene together with Myrsilos (Alc. fr. 70.7; Strabo 12.2.3). A faction led by Alkaios and his two brothers made an abortive attempt to overthrow Myrsilos, and Alkaios had to go into exile to Pyrrha (P Berol. 9569). Myrsilos died (Alc. fr. 332), and after a period of civil war (Alc. fr. 70.11) Pittakos was elected aisymentes by the Mytilenaians; according to Alkaios (fr. 348), however, he was elected tyrannos (Arist. Pol. 1285b35–b1). Pittakos was later remembered as having given the Mytilenaians new laws (nomoi), but not a new constitution (politeia) (Arist. Pol. 1274b18–23). Under his rule the basileis are attested as a board of officials (Theophr. fr. 650). According to Apollodoros (FGH Hist. 244 fr. 27), Pittakos was elected c.600 and held power for ten years and then resigned his post (Schachermeyer 1950 1865–67 (stasis), 1868–70 (aisymnetes), 1870–72 (chronology)). Thereafter Mytilene was
probably an oligarchy, but in c.512 a new tyrant, Koes, was installed by Dareios as tyrant of Mytilene (Hdt. 5.11). At the beginning of the Ionian Revolt he was handed over to the Mytilenaian people and stoned to death (Hdt. 5.37–38).

In 428 Mytilene was an oligarchy (Thuc. 3.39.6), apparently with a ruling class of more than 1,000 citizens (Thuc. 3.50.1). One of the factors behind the defection from Athens seems to have been a dispute about succession to property among some of the euporoi (Arist. Pol. 1304a4–10), and when the dynatoi issued the demos with hoplite equipment, the commoners opposed the government and forced the surrender (Thuc. 3.27.3; Gillis (1971)).

In the years after 405 Mytilene was probably ruled by a Spartan harmanost and a Board of Ten (Xen. Hell. 2.2.5; Paus. 8.32.4), but in 390/89, when they and their Mytilenaian supporters were expelled (Xen. Hell. 4.8.28–29), Mytilene seems to have become a democracy (IG xii.2 4.3 (C4m), see infra; IG ii 107; Gehrke, Stasis 121). By 352/1, however, the democracy had been abolished (Dem. 13.8) and replaced with an oligarchy (Dem. 15.19; Isoc. Ep. 8). Shortly afterwards Mytilene was ruled by a tyrant, Kammys (Dem. 40.37; Brun (1988) 381–82), but he was already deposed in 347/6 (IG ii 231). When the Persians conquered Mytilene in 333, one of the exiles, Diogenes, was set up as tyrant of Mytilene (Arr. Anab. 2.1.5), but in the following year democracy was restored and a group of exiles readmitted to Mytilene (SEG 36 750; διαμοκρατίας; SEG 36 752 = IG xii.2 6; cf. Heisserer (1980) 118–41; SEG 40 673).

Under democracy decrees (ἰσαφίαματα) were passed by the council (βόλλα) and the people (δάμος) in accordance with a probouleumatic procedure (IG xii.2.5 + suppl.; SEG 36 750, 752; cf. Rhodes, DGS 256–58). The eponymous official was a prytanas (SEG 36 750.18; Theophr. fr. 650), and a prytaneion is mentioned in a paraphrase of Sappho’s poems (Ath. 425A); cf. πρυτανείον at P Oxy. 3711 fr. 1. col. 1.4, a late commentary on Alkaios. Other magistrates were boards of kings (βασιλῆς), generals (στρόταγοι) and some called περίδρομοι and δικάσκοτοι (IG xii.2 6.6–14). A treasurer (ταµίας) is also attested (IG xii.2 5.17), and we know from Ant. 5.77 that some of the public expenditure was defrayed through liturgies. The Mytilenaian sent envoys to Olympia (Thuc. 3.9–14) and to Athens (IG ii 107.21–22) and received envoys from Athens (IG ii 107.31–34). Mytilene granted proxenia to citizens of Magnesia on the Maeander (SEG 26 909 (C4l)) and to a citizen of an unknown polis (IG xii.2 5.5 + suppl. (C4s)). Mytilenaian citizens received proxenia from Athens (Dem. 40.36; Arist. Pol. 1304a9–10) and Delphi (E.Delphes ii.1.4 400 (C4l/C3e)).

Apart from one Olympic victor in 476 (P Oxy. 222.1.7; Olympionikai 209), the only known Mytilenaian victor in Panhellenic games was a periodonike who was active c.300 and, thus, is too late for our investigation (IvO 173; Paus. 6.15.1).

The city occupied an offshore island and the adjacent mainland from C10, probably focused around what later became known as the city’s “North Harbour” at Epano Skala (Spencer (1995a) no. 27, (1995b) fig. 3a); settlement activity of the third millennium has been found on the Classical acropolis of Mytilene (Lambrianides and Spencer (1997) 86–87 and fig. 5), and another settlement of the same date has been found on the coast just south of the Classical city. Sporadic Mycenaean sherds have been reported in the area of the modern town, where there are also finds of the Protogeometric, Geometric and Archaic periods (Spencer (1995b) 279–81 and fig. 3, (2000) 74–75 fig. 4.5). However, most of the surviving ancient remains are Hellenistic and later. Unpublished excavations in the early 1980s have revealed at least one of the stone bridges over the intervening channel (silted up in mediaeval times) mentioned by Longus (Daphnis and Chloe)1; it is probably Roman in date. According to Vitruvius (1.6.1), the town was laid out on a grid plan, but poorly orientated to the prevailing winds; some evidence of the orthogonal plan survives in the alignment of various structures excavated throughout the city. Archaeological excavations began in a modest way in the late nineteenth century with the work of Robert Koldewey and his colleagues at Mytilene and elsewhere on the island (Koldewey (1890)), but apart from the theatre, whose date is uncertain, large-scale work did not begin until the 1960s, and even then involved mostly salvage excavations, rarely published in any detail and only occasionally touching on Archaic and Classical levels. Later Roman, mediaeval and Ottoman buildings destroyed or covered most earlier remains and only occasionally is a “window” possible back to the city’s early history. Several Greek publications summarise much of what was known about Mytilene up to the early 1970s (Kontes (1973), (1978)); for a complete collection of all relevant references, see Spencer (1995b) no. 27, and recent excavations by the Canadian Archaeological Institute at Athens and K’ Ephoria of the Greek Archaeological Service have added substantially to our knowledge of certain areas (H. Williams (1984); Williams and Williams (1985), (1986), (1987), (1988), (1989), (1990), (1991); Archontidhou (1986–95)).

Possibly Archaic, certainly Classical and Late Classical sections of fortifications have been uncovered in different
areas of the city, especially on the north-western side where they are still well preserved and seem to be of late Lesbian-style masonry (Koldewey (1890) pls. 1, 2, 5, 6; Kontes (1978) figs. 35, 39; Mason (2001)). It is probable that the city expanded from its original focus around the north harbour further west on to the mainland in C5, perhaps just before the revolt of 428 (Diod. 13.79; Thuc. 3.2.1). A relatively well-preserved stretch some 50 m long was uncovered near the north harbour and seems to date from C4m; it probably defended the island portion of the city (Williams and Williams (1991) 180 fig. 2). Some 100 m to the north-west, excavations in 1999–2000 uncovered an apparently matching wall defending the mainland side of the city east of the modern IKA building. A 33 m stretch of probably C4 fortification wall was uncovered in 1973 near the public swimming pool at the edge of the modern south harbour (Khatzi (1973) 509–10). Smaller sections of city walls have been found, mostly on the north and south sides of town, in various salvage excavations, and seem to be late Classical in date. According to Koldewey (1890) pls. 11–12 the walls enclosed an area of 140 ha. In connection with the revolt in 428 Thucydides reports that walls were being constructed (3.2.2, 5). The city was besieged by the Athenians in 428 (3.18.4–5), and the walls were demolished after the conquest in 427 (3.50.1); however, walls are attested in 406 by Xen. Hell. 1.6.17 (τεῖχος) and in 333 by Diod. 17.29.2.

Mytilene had two harbours (Thuc. 3.6.1; Ps.-Skylax 97; Strabo 13.2.2). Strabo says that the south harbour of the city housed Mytilene’s triremes, but the modern harbour works have obliterated any remains; the east and west moles of the commercial north harbour (supra), however, survive just below modern sea level. Probably Roman in their present form, they may well go back to at least the Classical period, and as noted above, this harbour appears to have been the focus of the earliest post-prehistoric settlement. Immediately adjacent to the south side of the north harbour are the remains of a long substantial stoa of C4 or C3, known since the 1920s but not completely excavated until 2000–1 (Coulton (1977)). A long stretch of a well-built C4 aqueduct has also been uncovered (Khatzi (1972), (1973)) on the south side of town. The theatre (TGR ii. 252) on the sloping hillsides to the west of the town has been excavated on several occasions, but only brief preliminary reports have appeared; it is probably late Classical or early Hellenistic in date (Evangelidis (1927); cf. Plut. Pomp. 42.9 (rC4m)).

Remains of at least three Archaic/Late Classical sanctuaries have been found in different areas of the city. A C7 sanctuary, possibly to Kybele (a crudely small statue of the goddess appeared in the excavations along with much Archaic bucchero), with an apsidal building in Lesbian-style masonry appeared during building operations behind the former insane asylum near the north harbour; it has been published only in a brief preliminary form (Khatzi (1973) 515–17 fig. 10; Spencer (1995b) 296–99 fig. 11). A Late Classical/Hellenistic sanctuary to Demeter and Kore and Kybele has been excavated on the acropolis inside the mediaeval castle; it consisted of a series of at least five altars in a row north–south with a rectangular two-room building behind and two semicircular ashpits for burned remains of piglets (Williams and Williams (1991)). A sanctuary to Aphrodite was uncovered during building operations on the south slopes of the acropolis (Archontidhou (1986–95)) and there is some evidence for a sanctuary of Asklepios near the west side of the south harbour (Khatzi). The sanctuary of Apollo Maloies near the north harbour is still elusive (Thuc. 3.3.3). For a general account of local cults based mostly on literary and epigraphic evidence, see Shields (1997). A cult of Zeus Homonoios and Homonoia was invoked in connection with the restoration of the democracy in 332 (SEG 36 750.7–8; cf. Thérault (1996) 19–29). Cults of the Twelve Gods, of Zeus Basileus and Zeus Heraios were also invoked.

At least some C6 graves seem to have been found in what became the expanded C5 city (Kontes (1978) 216; Spencer (1995b) 295). Extensive late Classical/early Hellenistic cemeteries have been found north and south of the city, although there have only been short preliminary publications of them to date. Graves varied from simple interments cut in the bedrock to tile-covered, to stone-lined cists, to limestone sarcophagi, some in funerary precincts surrounded by a wall (Khatzi (1972), (1973); Spencer (1995b); autopsy on highway north of Mytilene in 2001).

Mytilene struck coins of electrum, silver, billon and bronze from C5f on. (1) Electrum, C5f/C4s: hektai on the Phokaic standard, with a great variety of types: obv: ram’s head, or lion’s head, or Apollo laureate, or young Dionysos, etc.; rev: panther, or sphinx, or Persephone, etc., all in incuse square; legend: on one coin only: MYTI. In C5s Phokaia and Mytilene concluded a treaty that the two poleis should take turns and strike identical electrum coins in alternating years (IG xxi.2.1 = SEG 34 849). (2) Billon, c.480–450, on the Phoenician and Persic standard: denominations: fractions of stater down to a twenty-fourth, with a variety of types: obv: head of calf, or lion, or Negro, etc.; rev: incuse square, sometimes with eye, or amphora, etc.; legend: on a few AΣ or M or MY. (3) Silver, C5f/C4s: denominations: stater, drachm, hemidrachm, diobol, trihemiobol, obol; types: obv.
head of Apollo or of Nymph Mytilene; rev. various types: head of nymph Mytilene, or goat’s head, or lyre, etc.; legend: MYTI, once MYTTIΑΕΝΩΝ. (4) Bronze, C4: types: obv. Apollo laureate; rev. bull’s head; legend: MY or MYTTI (Head, HN² 558–59, 561–62; Bodenstedt (1973); SNG Cap. Lesbos 284–99 (billion), 300–30 (electrum), 364–69 (silver), 370–74 (bronze)).

Mytilene colonised Achilleion in Troas (no. 766) (Strabo 13.1.39), Sigeion in Troas (no. 791) (Hdt. 5.94.1), Ainos in Thrace (no. 641) (Ephor. fr. 39), and Hermonassa in the Pontic region (no. 697) (Arr. Bith. fr. 55 = (FGrHist156) fr. 71).

In addition to its hinterland, Mytilene possessed a sizeable peraia in Troas and northern Aiolis (Strabo 13.1.38; Livy 37.21.4), although at what date all parts of this peraia were acquired, and whether all were simultaneously held, is not clear. The terminus ante quem for Mytilene’s acquisition of at least part of its peraia is the dispute between Mytilene and Athens over Sigeion in C7–C6e (Hdt. 5.95.2; Strabo 13.1.38; Diog. Laert. 1.74). The precise extent of the peraia is unknown, but it included the so-called Aktaiai poleis (Thuc. 4.52.2–3): i.e. Achilleion (no. 766), Antandros (no. 767), Hamaxitos (no. 778), Larisa (no. 784), Ophryneion (no. 786), Ilion (no. 779), Pordoselene (no. 831), Rhoiteion (no. 790), plus some others (IG i³ 71.111.122–40, 77.14.14–27; see Hansen (1997) 32). Mytilene had to surrender its peraia to Athens in 427 (Thuc. 3.50.3). Some of the Aktaiai poleis were reconquered in 424 by exiled Mytilenaians (Thuc. 4.52.3), but at least Antandros was lost again soon after (Thuc. 4.75.1). By C4m Antandros had recovered part of its peraia in the Gulf of Adramyttion (Ps.-Skyax 98), and it had been extended by a gift from Alexander in 331 (Curt. 4.8.13). For the extent of the peraia, see Kontes (1978) figs. 18ff; Stauber (1996) 163–65.

799. Pyrrha (Pyrrhaios) Map 56. Lat. 39.10, long. 26.15. Size of territory: 3. Type: A. The toponym is Πύρρα, ἦ (Thuc. 3.35.1; Theophr. Hist. pl. 2.2.5). The city-ethnic is Πυρραῖοι (IG i² 107.29 (368/7); Arist. Hist. an. 548*10; Theophr. Hist. pl. 3.9.5). Pyrrha is called a polis in the urban sense at Ps.-Skyax 97 (cf. Hdt. 1.151.2), and at Thuc. 3.18.1 polis is used about Pyrrha in the urban and political senses simultaneously. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form on coins (infra) and externally in inscriptions (IG i² 107.29 (368/7)) and in literature (Arist. Hist. an. 548*10). The individual and external use is attested in a Delphic proxeny decree for Μενεδήμος Εὐνίκου Πυρραῖος (BCH 1940/1 94.4 (330/29)). Pyrrha is implicitly called patris in Xen. Hell. 4.8.28.

The territory of Pyrrha seems to have comprised the south coast of the Gulf of Kalloni, in the sources called ὁ Πυρραῖος εἰρήνης (Arist. Part. an. 680*36–37) as well as the region south of the Gulf. It may have covered c.250 km² (Kontes (1978) figs. 19–22). Pyrrha bordered on Methymna to the north, near Messon. To the east Pyrrha bordered on Mytilene and was separated from this polis by the “pine-covered Pyrrhanian mountain” (Theophr. Hist. pl. 3.9.5) on the slopes of Mt. Olympos (see no. 798 supra).

The only thing we learn about the history of Pyrrha in the Archaic period is that Alkaios found shelter in the city when he had been exiled from Mytilene (P Berol. 9569).

The Pyrrhaians were members of the Delian League. They are unattested in the Athenian tribute lists, which shows that, like the other Lesbian poleis, the Pyrrhaians provided ships instead of paying phoros (Thuc. 1.116.2, 117.2). In 428 they joined the Mytilenaians in defecting from Athens (Thuc. 3.2.1, 25.1). They were involved in the Mytilenaian attempt to synoecise Lesbos, and before the Athenian siege of Mytilene began, the Mytilenaian secured their position in Antissa, Pyrrha and Eresos and reinforced the fortifications of the three cities (3.18.1). The Athenians gained possession of Pyrrha and Eresos only after Mytilene’s surrender in 427 (3.35.1), and the territory, or at least a part of it, was surrendered to Athenian klerouchs (3.50.2). In 412 Pyrrha followed Chios and Mytilene and seceded from Athens once again (Thuc. 8.23.2). It was recovered by Athens soon after (8.23.6), but Pyrrha was allied with Sparta once again in 406 (Diod. 13.100.5).

In C4e Pyrrha was allied with Lakedaimon, but in 390/89 Thrasyboulos seems to have forced the city to join the Athenians (Diod. 14.94.3–4; Lys. fr. 119, Sauppe). The settlement undoubtedly included the repatriation of some exiles to Mytilene (Xen. Hell. 4.8.28). Pyrrha was a member of the Second Athenian Naval League. In the list of members appended to the so-called Charter of the League, Pyrrha is restored either in line 90: Π[υρπραίος] or in Bt: [Πυρ]παίον [δ]ήμος (Dreher (1995) 198 n. 105; cf. SEG 38 55). In any case, Pyrrha joined the League after Mytilene and Methymna (80–81), but before Antissa and Eresos (B.20–21). Pyrrhanian representatives in the allied synedrion are attested for the year 368/7 (IG i² 107.29).

In C4f Menedemos of Pyrrha, a member of Plato’s Academy (Philoch. fr. 224; Epikrates fr. 10, PCG), was sent back to his mother city to advise the Pyrrhaians about their constitution (Plut. Mor. 1126C). In 330/29 he became proktonos of Delphi (BCH 1940/1 94.4).

In 333 Pyrrha was taken by the Persian admiral Memnon alongside the other Lesbian poleis (Diod. 17.29.2; Arr. Anab.
2.1.1), but by a peaceful agreement the Macedonians regained the small cities on Lesbos in the following year (Arr. Anab. 3.2.6).

The acropolis and possibly the lower town exhibit traces of settlement, fortification walls and tombs dating from the end of C10 (Koldewey (1890) pl. 11; Kontes (1978) fig. 60; Paraskevaidis (1963); Spencer (1995a) no. 99, (1995b) 281–83, fig. 4). As reconstructed by Koldewey (1890) 7–28 and pl. 11, the walls enclosed an area of 9.5 ha. Small-scale excavations nearly a hundred years ago carried out by Bohlau at Pyrrha uncovered a C8 apsidal building, probably a sanctuary (Schiering (1989)), and salvage excavations have opened numerous late Classical/Hellenistic graves (Kontes (1973); Archontidhou (1999) 74–75 for finds); rising sea levels have covered some buildings by the shore, including several identified as ship sheds of unknown date. The date of the large pseudodipteral Ionic temple at the Hellenistic pan-Lesbian site of Messon near the head of the Gulf of Kalloni in a marsh is debated, but is probably late Classical/early Hellenistic (Koldewey (1890) pls. 18–20; Petrakos (1967); Plommer (1981) suggests C5–C4; Pfommer (1989) suggests first half of C3 on the basis of architectural decor). After Pyrrha’s destruction, probably by the earthquake of 231, the site became part of Mytilene’s territory. Recent work, including drilled cores by the Archaeological Service, is in the course of publication. A sanctuary at the south-west tip of Lesbos, Cape Phokas, perhaps of Archaic date, possibly to Dyonisos or to Hera, etc. (Quinn (1961)) is known from limited excavations (Spencer (1995a) no. 74). We know from Thuc. 3,18.1 that Pyrrha was walled in 428/7, and that the fortifications were reinforced in that year. The harbour is mentioned by Ps.-Skylax 97.

Pyrrha struck bronze coins in C4, perhaps starting c.370. Types: obv. head of nymph Pyrrha wearing sphendone; rev. goat; legend: ΠΥΡ or ΠΥΡΡ, on some also ΑΘΕ (Head, ΗΝ2 563; Paraskevaidis (1963) 1412; SNG Lesbos 428).
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I. The Region

The name of the region is Ἀἰολεύς, -ίδος, ἦ (Hdt. 5.123). There is no ethnic specifically associated with the region, however, for the designation Ἀἰολεύς indicated a wider ethnic identity (“Aiolian”) and was also applied to the inhabitants of Aiolian settlements in Troas and the Aegean Islands, most notably Lesbos (Hdt. 2.178.2, 6.8.1). In the Hellenistic period Ἀἰολεύς was used as a “regional ethnic” by the citizens of the Aiolian settlements in the Troad as well as by the inhabitants of the Aiolian poleis around the Elaitic Gulf.¹ The extent of Aiolis as a region was disputed already in Antiquity, and the area covered in this chapter does not correspond to any of the ancient definitions of Aiolis as a geographical entity. The area discussed here corresponds roughly to the area treated in the first half of Ps.-Skylax 98, stretching along the coast of Asia Minor from Adramyttion and the plain of Thebe in the north to the Gulf of Smyrna in the south, including some inland settlements, particularly in the plains of the rivers Kaikos, Titiaios and Hermos. Ps.-Skylax, who appears to follow the Persian administrative divisions, calls the entire area north of the river Maiandros “Lydia”, but points out that the northern part from Antandros in the north to Tethrania in the south-east was formerly Mysian.

The communities in this part of Asia Minor are relatively poorly documented in the extant Archaic and Classical authors and inscriptions, and archaeological evidence for the settlements in our period is sparse. Only a few sites have been excavated,² and most of the architectural remains observed by travellers and archaeologists in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries date from the Roman period. A large earthquake that hit part of the region in AD 17 led to extensive rebuilding, and this meant, for example, that the extensive remains of the pre-Roman settlement at the ancient city of Assos, which were still inhabited by the descendants of Egyptian mercenaries settled there by Kyros the Great.

² Excavations have taken place at Myrina, Larisa Phrikonis, Pergamon and Kyme.

³ This is the case for Astyra and Adramyttion (subsumed under a general heading of poleis Hellenides), and Aigai. For Astyra, see the Inventory of poleis in the Troad, supra.

⁴ See e.g. the entries Adramyttion, Atarneus and Leukai in the list of poleis below. In the case of Kyllene, however, the ethnic composition of the population is not known. Xenophon characterises the community as a polis still inhabited by the descendants of Egyptian mercenaries settled there by Kyros the Great.

⁵ The communities for which coins constitute the primary pre-Hellenistic evidence are, in alphabetical order, Autokane, Boione, Chalkis, Iolla, Jolla, Perperene, Thebe and Tisna.
When deciding which communities to include and which to exclude on ethnic criteria, I prefer to play safe by including some settlements that cannot be said with certainty to have been Greek or Hellenised. If a community has left inscriptions in Greek during the Classical period, it is treated as a whole as "Hellenised", although it may in reality have contained a considerable number of members who did not speak Greek or consider themselves as "Hellenes".6 Also included are communities that are known to have struck coins on a Greek model, provided that the community in question identifies itself by means of a Greek-style collective city-ethnic (sometimes in an abbreviated form). More doubtful are those inland communities of which we know only that contemporary Greek observers (primarily Xenophon) chose to characterise them as poleis.7 Here it has seemed safest to list such settlements in the Inventory, but to issue a general warning here that serious doubt must remain as to whether these poleis had undergone a process of Hellenisation at all by the end of the period with which we are concerned.

The earliest extant definition of the "region" called Aiolis is the one found in Herodotus’ account of the Aiolian dodekapolis (Hdt. 1.149–51), later reduced to a group of eleven poleis after the conquest of Smyrna by Kolophonian exiles who forced out the original Aiolian inhabitants. Not all the poleis on Herodotus’ list can be localised (Killa, Notion and Aigiroessa have not yet been securely connected with any known sites);8 but the area concerned seems to have stretched from Smyrna in the north to Pitane on the southern boundary of the Chian peraia as indicated by Ps.-Skylax 98.9 As for the Aiolian poleis in the north around Mt. Ida in the Troad, Herodotus appears to have regarded them as a separate group (1.151.1). His reason for excluding these northern mainland settlements from his list may be that he regards them as part of the Troad, in which he locates Antandros in 5.26; but it may also be due to the fact that the southern poleis were operating as a loose political entity in the Archaic and Classical periods (see infra), and not least that the two groups belonged to two different satrapies in Herodotus’ day.10

The broadest definition of Aiolis as a region is that provided by Ephoros fr. 163b, who claimed that Aiolis stretched from Abydos in the north to Kyne in the south. For Ephoros and others, the existence of ethnically Aiolian poleis in the north was probably one important reason for extending the concept of Aiolis as far as this.11 Although Strabo appears to be dismissive of Ephoros’ claim, Ephoros was in fact not the only Classical author to have employed a wider geographical definition than that proposed by Herodotus. Aeneas Tacticus 24.3 refers to Ilion as part of Aiolis when describing how Charidemos of Oreos captured the city in 360. For Xenophon “Aiolis” meant first and foremost the ethnically Aiolian poleis controlled by Pharnabazos in the north, i.e. the settlements on the coast south of Ilion (3.1.16–18, 2.1). This is paralleled also in Isoc. 4.144, where Isokrates recounts Derkylis’ success in “Aiolis”, which undoubtedly relates to Derkylis’ conquest of poleis in Pharnabazos’ satrapy. However, in Hell. 3.1.10 the expression “This Aiolis

9 A border dispute between Mytilene and Pitane was subjected to arbitration in 138 (IG xii suppl. 142C). It has been suggested, most recently by Stauber (1996a) 1.63–64, that the Chian peraia was added to the mainland territory of Mytilene as a result of a grant from Alexander the Great. It can in any case be inferred from this inscription that the boundary between Pitane as the northernmost poleis of Aiolis and the territory occupied by the islands was quite stable over time.

10 He ends his list by the statement αὐτὴ μὲν νῦν αἱ ἄφερωτιδες Αἰολιδὲς πόλεις, ἐξω τῶν ἐν τῇ θητί οἰκείων. κεκυρωθαίται γὰρ αὐταὶ (Hdt. 1.151.1). It is most likely that the γὰρ clause serves to explain why the northern Aiolian poleis have been excluded from his account of the mainland communities, rather than to explain the separate listing of Aiolian settlements on the islands off the Asian coast.

11 Already Herodotus recounts a dispute between the Athenians and the Mytileneans over the area around Ilion to which the Mytileneans laid claim (Hdt. 5.94.2). The Athenian response was that the Mytileneans had no better claim to dominance than all the other Greeks who had participated in the expedition against Troy. There is little doubt that it was the Aiolian identity of the settlements in the Troad (which were claimed as Lesbian apokthiai), that formed the basis of Mytilene’s claim.

6 An example is the community of the Melanpagitai, of which we know only that they marked their border with the neighbouring community of Herakleia with a Greek graffito (ὁρμ. Μελανπαγιτῶν, Syll. 3 934 (C5))).

7 See e.g. the entries Palaigambrión and Parthenion.

8 Killa is probably not identical with the Homeric Killa in the Troad (Stauber (1996a) 1.31), and it is uncertain if Notion is to be identified with the harbour town of Kolophon in Ionia (the identification has become conventional, however, and BAR contains no separate entry for the Aiolian Notion).
was the possession of Pharnabazos . . .” (ἡ δὲ Αἰολίς αὐτῆς ἄνυ μέν Φαρναβάζου) implies that Xenophon operated with more than one geographical entity of that name, one of which overlapped with the Troad and probably also comprised the settlements around Mt. Ida. The other Aiolis may then have been identical with the southern Aiolis of Herodotos’ account, although this region is never referred to explicitly as “Aiolis” by Xenophon.¹²

Thus Herodotos’ and Xenophon’s accounts both suggest that there were two separate regions on the mainland that could be referred to as “Aiolis”. As mentioned above, this may reflect the fact that the two main groups of Aiolian settlements in Asia Minor belonged to different administrative units within the Persian Empire, the southern area having been part of the kingdom of Lydia and later of the same satrapy as the Ionian poleis, with which the poleis of southern Aiolis had close political connections in the Classical period. The long history of joint Persian administration of the southern Aiolian and the Ionian poleis on the mainland may in turn have influenced the Athenian administration of the area for tribute purposes: the Aiolian cities on the coast from Pitane in the north to Kyne in the south are all listed as part of the Ionian district in the tribute lists,¹³ and the Aiolian poleis also seem to have been regarded as part of Ionia for other purposes (the type of partial atimia, for example, that consisted in a ban on travelling to “Ionia” undoubtedly included the poleis of southern Aiolis as well).¹⁴

The Persian administrative divisions may also account for the very narrow definition of Aiolis offered by Ps.-Skylax (98), who describes “Aiolis” exclusively as the poleis around Mt. Ida before proceeding to list the Greek settlements in Lydia along the entire coastline from Antandros in the north to the river Maiandros in the south. The only regional distinction made in this text is between the area from Antandros to Teuthrania, which Ps.-Skylax designates as “formerly Mysia, but now Lydia” and Lydia proper; but within the latter region there is no attempt by Ps.-Skylax to distinguish the southern region, Aiolis, from that of Ionia.

There is some evidence from the Archaic and Classical periods that suggests that the poleis of southern Aiolis co-operated politically and militarily on a regular basis. The existence of particular common political institutions on an inter-poleis level is not directly attested in our sources, but it is highly likely that there was some kind of Aiolian parallel to the joint political and religious institutions of the Ionian dodekapolis that were centred on the Panionion. Herodotos reports that after the capture of Smyrna by Kolophonians, the exiles of the other eleven Aiolian poleis jointly made terms with the Kolophonians, whereby the Smyrnaeans were allowed to leave with their movable possessions. The Smyrnaeans were subsequently distributed among the eleven poleis and given citizenship there (Hdt. 1.150.1–2). This account is very likely anachronistic, at least as far as the organised resettling of the original Smyrnaeans is concerned.

More plausible is the claim in Hdt. 1.151.3 that the Aiolian poleis on the mainland “made a joint decision to follow the Ionians wherever they led” when confronted with the threat posed by Kyros in 546. Herodotos’ wording strongly suggests a hegemonic, multilateral alliance between the eleven Aiolian poleis as a united group and the twelve Ionian ones, with the Ionians taking the lead. The creation of this alliance was allegedly followed by a joint Aiolian and Ionian embassy to Sparta (Hdt. 1.152.1–2). The Ionian–Aiolian joint venture may have been short-lived, however, for the Aiolian poleis on the mainland are not reported to have provided any military support for the Ionian Revolt in the 490s. On the other hand, a late C4 inscription, I.Erythrai 16, recording a joint decision made by the Ionians and Aiolians (l. 6), confirms not only that there was collaboration among the Aiolian poleis internally; it also indicates that the kind of

¹² This is further suggested by the previous paragraph (Hell. 3.1.10) in which Xenophon reports that Derkylladas “differed so much from Thibron in his leadership that he led the army through friendly territory to the Aiolis of Pharnabazos without harming the allies in any way” (ὡσεὶ παράγγειλε τὸ στράτευμα διὰ τῆς φιλίας χώρας µέχρι τῆς Φαρναβάζου Αἰολίδος ἀνθρακτος τούς συµµάχους). Note that in Λπ. 5.6.24 Timasion reassures his troops that he is familiar with “Aiolis, Phrygia, Troas and the entire flood of Pharnabazos”, thus implying a differentiation between Aiolis and the Troad; the context suggests, however, that Timasion is still referring to an Aiolis in the north rather than to the settlements around and south of the Elatic Gulf.

¹³ The only settlement on the coast north of Pitane that may have been included in the Ionian poleis is Karene (Krateros (FGrHist 342) fr. 2). The absence from the Athenian tribute lists of other settlements on the coast between Pitane and the Thesan plain is perhaps due to the fact that these poleis belonged to the Chian and Lesbian peraiai. The Chians (and presumably their dependent poleis) never paid tribute at all. As for the poleis in the so-called Lesbian peraia, their absence from the tribute assessment lists after the fall of Mytilene may indicate that, in C5, the Lesbian peraia south of Adramyttion did not belong to Mytilene alone. Methymna, which did not join in the Lesbian Revolt, remained autonomos, and any possessions that the Methymnaeans may have had were undoubtedly exempt from tribute as well. There is no firm evidence for the Lesbian peraia north of the Elatic Gulf as a specifically Mysian possession earlier than the reign of Alexander the Great. Theopompos’ report (FGrHist 115) fr. 291 that the Chians and the Mytileneans had asked Hermias to be prostates of their territories on the mainland may refer to the Mytilenean possessions in the north, the so-called Aktai poièis, which included Assos, Hermias’ residence in the period 348–345. Assos is explicitly mentioned in the Theopompos passage.

¹⁴ For the type of partial atimia that consisted in a ban on travelling to “Ionia”, see Andoc. 1.76.
Ionian–Aiolian alliance suggested by Herodotos may have been based on historical fact.

In the Classical period there was clearly a perception that most of the original Aiolian poleis had a common origin as cities founded from the Greek mainland; but there seems to have been more than one tradition. According to Pheredikes of Athens (FGrHist 3) fr. 155), the Aiolian cities were founded by Androklos, the son of King Kodros, after he had initiated the settlement of Greeks in Ionia. Hellan. fr. 32 appears to have represented a rival Lesbian tradition, according to which the settlement of Aiolis was initiated by Orestes and Peisandros of Sparta. These two rival traditions may well reflect a contemporary C Peisandros of Sparta. These two rival traditions may well have been more than one tradition. According to Pherekydes of Athens (FGrHist 3) fr. 155), the Aiolian cities were founded by Androklos, the son of King Kodros, after he had initiated the settlement of Greeks in Ionia. Hellan. fr. 32 appears to have represented a rival Lesbian tradition, according to which the settlement of Aiolis was initiated by Orestes and Peisandros of Sparta. These two rival traditions may well reflect a contemporary C Peisandros of Sparta. These two rival traditions may well

In addition to the thirty-six settlements that are listed in the Inventory of poleis there are sixteen locations attested in Archaic or Classical sources for which the evidence is not sufficient to warrant their inclusion in the Inventory. They are as follows.

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis

Achaion Limen (Ἀχαῖον Λήμερον) Ps.-Skylax (98) is the only Classical author to mention this harbour. According to Strabo 13.3.5, it was located between Myrina and Gryneion on the shore of the Elatic Gulf and contained an altar of the Twelve Gods. Barr. HR, but C also attested.

Apollonia (Ἀπόλλωνια) This settlement is mentioned in Xen. An. 7.8.15. It was located in the vicinity of Pergamon, close to the base of the Persian nobleman Asidas. Asidas received military assistance from Itamenes, who had recruited some of his troops from Apollonia and Parthenion (see no. 827). Strabo 13.4.4 describes Apollonia as situated on an elevated site on the plain to the east of Pergamon. Barr. C.

Ardynion (Ἀρδύνιον) The toponym Ardynion is attested in Xanthos of Lydia (FGrHist 324) fr. 17 in the second book of his Lydiaka (C5). Steph. Byz. 116 classifies the settlement as “a polis in the Theban Plain”. Nikolaos of Damascus (FGrHist 90) fr. 47, 6 (C1) also refers to Ardynion as a polis founded by the Mysian king Arnoossos (… ’ōstis πόλιν Ἀρδύνιον ἐκτίσεν ἐν Θῆβῃ πεδίῳ), whose daughter married the Lydian king Sadyates (= Kandaules?, RE s.v. Sadyates 1). It is possible, but far from certain, that Nikolaos based his account directly on Xanthos, in which case the site-classification must be regarded as a genuine Classical one. Barr. A, but C also attested.

Arginoussai (Ἀργινοῦσαι) The toponym is attested in Thuc. 8.101.2 (as Ἀργινοῦσαι τῆς Ἰταίας) and in Xen. Hell. 1.6.27. According to Strabo 13.2.2, these were three islands close to Mt. Kanai on the mainland, one of which was probably the Biga peninsula. as suggested by Stauber (1996a) i.285, while the other two may be identified with the islands Garip Adasî and Kalemadasî. Stauber and his team found no Classical remains during their exploration of the islands and the peninsula. However, Diod. 13.97.3 states that at the time of the famous sea battle in 406 the islands were inhabited and contained a small Aiolian polismation, claimed by schol. Ar. Ran. 33 to be a πόλις τῆς Ἀιολίδος. Barr. C.

Blakeia (Βλακεία) This settlement is mentioned only from references to Aristotle’s Kylea Politeia (fr. 90, 531, 1–2, Gigon). It was located in the territory of Kyme, and the stupidity of its inhabitants allegedly gave rise to the expressions βλαξ and βλακικά (“naive”, “stupid”, “useless”). Not in Barr.

Chryse (Χρύση) The settlement of Chryse close to Thebe mentioned by Strabo 13.1.63 is conventionally identified with the Homeric town of that name. Stauber (1996a) i.37–38 locates it tentatively at Magara Tepe, where some Aiolian grey ceramic has been found in the context of a prehistoric settlement (3–2 millennium BC). There is no literary or epigraphical evidence from the Archaic or Classical period pertaining to a contemporary Chryse in this location. Barr. AC (but location is queried).

Itone (Ἴτωνη) The toponym of this settlement in Lydia is known only from Steph. Byz. 342. It was tentatively located near Mt. Timolos by Robert (1962) 314. There is no contemporary Archaic or Classical evidence for this community. Barr. C?

Kertonon (Κέρτωνων) The toponym Κέρτωνων is attested in Xen. An. 7.8.8 in the account of his route across Mt. Ida to Pergamon through the Theban plain and through the territories of Adramyttion and Kertonon. Stauber (1996a) i.330–32 refers to earlier suggestions of Assar Tepe at Çamavlu as a possible location, but he also points out that there are only a few ancient remains at that site. It has been suggested that Kertonon was in fact identical with the settlement Kytonion mentioned by Theopomp. fr. 17. Barr. C.

Kytonion (Κυτώνων) The toponym is attested only in Theopomp. fr. 17, cited in Steph. Byz. 399. The site-
classification given here as πόλις μεταξὺ Μυσίας καὶ Λυδίας cannot be attributed to Theopompos with certainty. Barr. C (but regarded as identical with Kertonon).

**Lyrrnessos (Λύρνησσος)** The most important attestations of the toponym Λύρνησσος are Hom. Il. 19.295 (the home of Briseis) and Strabo 13.1.61. The location of the Homeric Lyrrnessos was disputed already in Antiquity (see Stauber (1996a) i.67–71); but schol. Eur. Andr. 1 reports that some authors located the settlement in the plain of Thebe. Stauber (1996a) argues for a location of Lyrrnessos on the south-eastern edge of the plain of Thebe at Ala Dag. Here there are impressive remains of a prehistoric settlement, including large fortification walls dating from the third millennium, and there were also ceramic finds from the Classical, Hellenistic and Roman periods (Stauber 1996a i.102–8). Barr. AC.

**Malene (Μαλήνη)** The toponym is attested in Hdt. 6.29 as a location in the territory of Atenaeus, in which Histiaios was captured by Harpagos in 493. Dörpfeld (1928) 131–36 suggested that it was identical with the location Μαλέα attested in Thuc. 3.4.5 and 3.6.2, arguing that Thucydides’ description points to a location on the mainland rather than on the island of Lesbos. See, however, Wilson (1981) 154–56 for a solution to the topographical problems posed by Thucydides in these passages in favour of the conventional location of Malea on Lesbos. Other scholars have suggested that Μαλήνη was identical with Καρήνη, but Stauber (1996a) i.242 rejects this on the grounds that Herodotos mentioned both of these locations, both in the same area. According to Stauber, this would hardly have escaped textual emendation already in Antiquity, unless Herodotos was in fact referring to two different settlements. Lambrianides (1996) 196 agrees with previous attempts to locate Malene near Makaronia, while this is disputed by Stauber (1996a) i.242 and 244, who prefers to locate the settlement of Attea here. He does not suggest any alternative location of Malene. Barr. C.

**Pendaion (Πηδαίον)** This is attested only as a Homeric community (Il. 13.172), governed by King Imbrios. Stauber (1996a) argues that it must be sought in the vicinity of Thebe, but does not attempt a more precise location. There is no evidence for a settlement by that name in Archaic or Classical times. Barr. A.

**Pioniai (Πιονίαι)** The earliest reference to the toponym is found in Paus. 9.18.4, who reports that it was located in Mysia beyond the Kaikos, and that, according to its inhabitants, it was founded by Pionis, a descendant of Herakles. Unless Pioniai was located at modern Gömeniç (as assumed in Barr.), where some pre-Hellenistic remains have been found (Stauber 1996a i.95–96), there is no further evidence for a settlement of that name in the Archaic or Classical periods. The identification of Pioniai with the settlement on Gömeniç is rejected by Stauber (1996a) i.91–97. Barr. C.

**Thyessos (Θεσσος)** The toponym has been suggested as an earlier name for the settlement Hermokapeleia on the basis of the account of Nikolaos of Damascus ((FGrHist) 90 fr. 44.9 (C1, rC6)). According to this account, it was a trading settlement founded by the merchant Thyessos, which was given freedom from taxation by the Lydian king Ardys. Steph. Byz. 319 classifies it as a polis Lydias and indicates the same origin of the settlement as Nikolaos. The identification made by Keil of Thyessos with the later Hermokapeleion has been accepted as plausible, but not certain, by Zgusta (1984) 187–88. Barr. C?

**Thymbrara (Θύμβραρα, Θύβαρα)** The toponym is mentioned in Xen. Cyr. 6.2.11, as a place in which the Persian king held assemblies of his non-Greek troops from the southern satrapies even in Xenophon’s own day (cf. Cyr. 7.1.45). The settlement is mentioned by Hanfmann and Waldbaurn (1975). It has been suggested that it was identical with the location Thybrarna mentioned by Diod. 14.80.2 quite close to Sardis, but see Zgusta (1984), s.v., who regards the identification as “possible but not necessary”. There is no evidence that the settlement underwent a process of Hellenisation during the period with which we are concerned. Barr. C.
2. Unidentified Settlements

Belkahve  See the site list in the introduction to the region of Ionia.

II. The Poleis

800. Adramyttion  (Adramytenos)  Map 56. Lat. 39.30, long. 26.55. Size of territory: ? Type Α/Β. The toponym is Ἀδραµύττιον, τό (Hdt. 7.42.17; Xen. An. 7.8.8; Kratinos fr. 508, PCG) or Ἀδραµύττιον, τό (Thuc. 5.1.1, 8.108.4). The city-ethnic is Ἀδραµυτηνός (IG 11² 7941 (C3)) or, once, Ἀδραµιου[τανόν] (IG vii 2860 (C4)); cf. Fossey (1994) 37. Adramyttion is called a polis in the urban sense by Herodotos 7.42.1, and Ps.-Skylax 98 mentions Adramyttion under the heading πόλεις … Ἑλληνίδες αἵδε. That it was a polis in the political sense too is indicated by Aristotle’s inclusion of Adramyttion in his collection of politeiai (Arist. fr. 473). The collective and internal use of the city-ethnic is attested on Hellenistic coins, in abbreviated forms on coins of the Classical period (infra). The external and individual use is attested in a federal proxenia decree of Boiotia, presumably passed in C4 (IG vii 2860).

Adramyttion probably was not a member of the Delian League: the restoration Α[τραµυτηνός] ναοίν IG1 192.111.13 has been rejected in IG1 260.11.16, where the editor now reads Α[τραµαβαίν]. According to Thucydides 5.1.1 and 8.108.4, Persia retained firm control of Adramyttion in C5: Pharmakes, the satrap of Hellespontine Phrygia, allowed refugees from Delos, who had been driven out by the Athenians in 422, to settle at Adramyttion, where they seem to have remained until they were allowed to return home in 421/0 (Thuc. 5.32.1). Perhaps some of them stayed on: if the massacre of the Delians in Adramyttion by Arsakes (Thuc. 8.108.4) is to be placed in 411, as proposed e.g. by Stauber (1996a) i.133, this might suggest Delian settlement of a more permanent nature. On the problems related to Arsakes’ murder of some of the Delians and Arsakes’ connections with Tissaphernes and Pharmakes, see Gomme et al. (1981) 356–57, who follow the conventional view that the massacre took place c.421, and Hornblower (1996) 423–24. Presumably the polis remained under Persian control during most of C4 as well, although in Ps.-Skylax 98 it is described as a polis Hellenis and the region as being under Lesbos, perhaps in the period 404–386. It is conceivable that one of the Lesbian poleis, which had control of significant territory on the mainland, may also have controlled Adramyttion as a dependent polis.

The first epigraphical attestation of Adramyttion’s relations with the rest of the Greek world is IG vii 2860 (C4), bestowing proxenia and other privileges on the Adramyttian honorand. However, a number of jugs from Adramyttion” are recorded in a Delian inventory of 364/3 (I.Delos 104.12).

Silver and bronze coins were struck in Adramyttion by Orontas c.357–352 or perhaps in 362/1 in connection with the satrap’s revolt (Troxell (1981); contra Moysey (1989)). For the “autonomous bronze coinage” struck in C4f with the legend of Adramyttion, see the catalogue in Stauber (1996a) ii.193–96 nos. 11–26. Types: οβρ. head of Zeus; rev. forepart of winged horse; legend: ΑΔΡΑΜΥΤΗΝΩΝ. The full form of the ethnic (ΑΔΡΑΜΥΤΗΝΩΝ) is attested on coins of C2 and later: ibid. nos. 27ff.

As for the ethnic composition of the population of Adramyttion, the polis must have been sufficiently Hellenised in C4f to merit inclusion in Aristotle’s collection of politeiai, but it may well have contained an ethnically mixed citizen body throughout the Classical period and even later. Later tradition largely agrees in regarding Adramyttion as a Lydian foundation. Aristotle (fr. 473, Gigon) claims that the polis was founded by Adramyton, the son of Alyattes and brother of Kroisos. Rival traditions are all later.

801. Aigai(α)  (Aigaeus)  Map 56. Lat. 38.50, long. 27.10. Size of territory: ? Type Α/Α. The toponym is Αἰγαία (Hdt. 1.149.1), Αἰγαί, αί (Ps.-Skylax 98; Strabo 13.3.5) or Αἰγαίαι (Xen. Hell. 4.8.5, probably corrupt). The city-ethnic is Αἰγαιεῖς (Michel 13.11 (C4); Head, ΗΠ 552 (C3)) or Αἰγαιείς (Head, ΗΠ 552 (C3); Polyb. 5.77.4). Suda Σ1898 notes the form Αἰγαιείς. As part of the original Aiolian dodekapolis Aigai is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 1.149.1, with the territorial sense as a possible connotation, and in the political sense at Hdt. 1.150.2 and in a C4 inscription (Malay (1994) no. 515B l. 2). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in Staatsverträge 456.12 (C4l–C3). The earliest external attestations are Hellenistic (collective use: Polyb. 5.77.4; individual use: SEG 32 1322 (C3), Cyprus; IG x1.4 1042 (C3), Delos).

Little is known about the extent of Aigai’s territory in the Archaic and Classical periods. However, a C4 treaty between Aigai and the community of the Olympenoi (Staatsverträge 456) was set up at a small ancient settlement near Yenicė Köy, located c.5 km north-west of the urban centre of Aigai. Reinach (1891) 272 inferred from the inscription that the village was dependent on Aigai; but more evidence is needed to corroborate Reinach’s interpretation.
Herodotos lists Aigai among the twelve original Aiolian poleis in I. 149.1, and Malay (1994) no. 515 is indeed written in the Aiolian dialect. The polis was not a member of the Delian League, and it may be assumed that the Persians maintained at least nominal control over the polis during C5 and C4. However, according to Xen. Hell. 4.8.5, in 394 Derkylidas claimed, presumably exaggerating, that even in Asia Minor itself there were poleis such as Temnos and Aigai where it would be possible to live without being subjected (ὑπήκοοι) to the Persian king.

Only one Aigaian treaty survives from the Classical period, viz. Staatsverträge 456, concluded between Aigai and the Olympenoi regulating the seasonal transhumance of flocks. Malay (1994) no. 515 is a public enactment (ψάφιμμα), which mentions officials (ἄρχης, Α.3) and a priest (ἱερεύς, Α.5).

Bohn and Schuchhardt (1889) describe the visible remains of the urban centre of Aigai, which had been completely rebuilt after an earthquake in AD 17. Of older remains, only the inner city wall may be pre-Hellenistic (ibid. 10), and a second, larger, city wall may be dated with reasonable certainty to the reign of Eumenes II. The pre-Hellenistic wall is constructed in rough polygonal masonry and had a circumference of no more than 1 km, enclosing an area of triangular shape (ibid. 8–9), and this points to an urban centre of a modest size. Radt (1991) discusses remains of monumental architecture and argues in favour of connecting a C6 Aiolian capital with the site of Aigai.

The earliest coinage of Aigai dates from C5 (Head, HN² 552), although Head (1875) 293 tentatively assigned a number of electrum coins from 600–550 to Aigai.

802. Aigiroessa Unlocated. Type: Α.4. The toponym is Αἴγιροέσσα (Hdt. 1.149.1). The polis is attested only in Herodotos, who lists it as one of the twelve original Aiolian poleis. It is called a polis in the urban sense at 1.149.1, with the territorial sense as a possible connotation, and in the political sense at 1.520.2. It has been suggested by Stein (1883) 173 n. 3 that Aigiroessa is an earlier name of Elaia, which is not mentioned by Herodotos in his listing of Aiolian poleis. However, coins from Elaia with the legend Ε.Λ.Ι. are attested as far back as C5m (Head, HN² 554). Cook (1958–59) 4, 17 attempts to locate Aigiroessa at the site of Belkhave in Smyrnaian territory.

803. Atarneus (Artaneites) Map 56. Lat. 39.05, long. 26.35. Size of territory: ? Type: Αβ. The toponym is Ἀταρνεῖς, ὁ (Hdt. 6.26.2, 8.106.1; Arist. Pol. 1267b32; Isoc. 4.144; Xen. Hell. 3.2.11; Theopomp. fr. 291; Tod 165,32 = I.Erythrai u. Kiazomenaìg (C4m)). The city-ethnic is Ἀταρνέως (Hdt. 6.4.1; IG xii suppl. 142.117 (C2m); Callim. Epigr. 1.1; Strabo 13.1.60; Paus. 7.2.11). Atarneus is called polis in the urban sense in Ps.-Skylax 98. That it was a polis in the political sense too may, up to a point, be inferred from the treaty between Hermias of Atarneus and Erythrai of C4m (infra). The legend ἈΤΑΡ on C4 coins is presumably the collective and internal use of the city-ethnic (infra). The external use of the city-ethnic is attested collectively in IG xii suppl. 142.117 (C2m) and individually in Hdt. 6.4.1 and Callim. Epigr. 1.1. The territory is called ΗΔΑΡΕΙΤΙΣ χώρη (Hdt. 6.29.1) and comprised the location Malene (for the problems related to the identification of Malene, see Stauber (1996a) i.241–42).

According to Hdt. 1.160.4, the Chians gained possession of Atarneus in return for handing over Paktyes to Kyros in 547/6; see also Hdt. 8.106.1, who refers to Atarneus as in “Mysian territory” and occupied by Chians. However, Xen. Hell. 3.2.11 describes Atarneus as occupied by refugees from Chios, which may indicate that at that time it had turned into some kind of splinter community over which the Chians had lost control (compare, e.g., the relationship between Anaia and Samos during the Peloponnesian War).

See also Diod. 13.65.4, mentioning how exiled Chian democrats used Atarneus as a base for their raids against the island in 409. Even during the tyranny of Hermias from c.355, it is clear that the Chians still maintained some interest in and had a claim to the site (Theopomp. fr. 291).

Tod 165 may be regarded as a treaty entered into by Atarneus with Erythrai in so far as the treaty concerned Atarneus as a community, if only indirectly, and was to be publicised in the sanctuary of Atarneus (Tod 165,32–33). On the other hand, the party to the treaty is Hermias rather than the polis as a whole, and it is significant that the delegates appointed to take the oath on behalf of Hermias and his associates are not referred to as representatives of the polis of Atarneus.

Atarneus is described as a city in Mysia (Hdt. 1.160.4; Isoc. 4.144). The site of Atarneus has been located on Kale Tepe, on which there are substantial remains of C4 buildings and a large preserved section of Atarneus’ city wall dating from C5 or C4 (Stauber (1996a) i.269–72). The city wall is also attested in Xen. Hell. 3.2.11 and Arist. Pol. 1267b32, both of which relate to sieges of Atarneus, in 398/7 and c.350 respectively. The site in Kale Tepe has yielded a considerable amount of surface finds from C4, pottery as well as tiles (Stauber (1996a) i.271), which suggests occupation of a relatively high density. A sanctuary (ἱερόν τοῦ Ἀταρνέως) is designated as a site in which the treaty between Hermias and Erythrai is to be displayed (Tod 165,32).
Atarneus struck coins in silver and bronze from c.400 onwards: obr. head of Apollo, or head of goddess; rev. coiled snake; legend: \textit{ATA} or \textit{ATAP} (Stauber (1996a) ii.270–79, cat. nos. 1–33; SNG Cap. Mysia 21–27).

The ethnic composition of the population cannot be determined with certainty. When the Chians “bought” Atarneus from Kyros in return for handing over the refugee Paktyes (Hdt. 1.160.4), there may have been a non-Greek population already dwelling there, and we do not know if they were expelled by the Chian settlers. But Himerius (\textit{Orat.} 40.6–7 = Arist. fr. 675, Rose) suggests, for what it is worth, that the process of Hellenisation may not have been complete even in Aristotle’s day. Himerius, who calls Atarneus a πόλις Μυσών, does not indicate the origin of this anecdote.

804. Autokane (Autokanaios?) Unlocated, unless identical with Kane. Map 56. Lat. 39.00, long. 26.50. Size of territory: ? Type: B? The toponym is \textit{Αυτοκάνη} (Hymn. Hom. Ap. 35). The legend \textit{Αυτοκάνα} on C₄ coins (infra) may be the toponym, but is perhaps better interpreted as an abbreviated form of the city-ethnic \textit{Αυτοκανα} (\textit{iov}). In the Homeric Hymn the toponym designates a mountain, but on the coins it must designate a homonymous settlement. The city-ethnic is unattested, unless the legend on the C₄ coins is an abbreviated form. Also, \textit{οί Καναιοί} mentioned in a Thessalian inscription of C₂ (IG ix.2 1105a) may perhaps be the citizens of Aiolian (Auto)kane. The status of Autokane is uncertain. Apart from the numismatic evidence we have no information about this settlement; but we know that the mountain Autokane (referred to as \textit{Κάνης} in Hdt. 7.42.1) was adjacent to the \textit{polis} of Kane/Kanai, which had two harbours (Schuchhardt (1887) 1209 and Tomaszewski (1891) 25). One of these may have been Autokane. Other scholars have suggested that Autokane and Kanai were identical (Barr.). This hypothesis may be supported by the fact that we have no numismatic evidence for Kanai, which is otherwise quite well attested: it is recorded, e.g., in a C₂ Delphian list of \textit{θεόροδοκοι} (BCH 45 (1921) 1 ID(a) 10). For a summary of this discussion, see Stauber (1996a) ii.274–77. If Autokane is to be identified with Kane, it must have contained a sanctuary of Artemis Orthia: \textit{IAdramytteion} 47 \textit{(C₄ or C₃ε)} found at Bademli (Kane) is either a \textit{horos} of her \textit{temenos} or an inscribed altar.

Autokane struck bronze coins from C₄m on: obr. laureate head of Zeus, or of Asklepios, or of Apollo; rev. head of Athena wearing Attic helmet, or head of Dionysos with wreath, or female head, or olive wreath; legend: \textit{AYTOKANA} or abbreviations down to \textit{AYT} (Stauber (1996a) ii.266–68, cat. nos. 1–18; SNG Cap. Aeolis 26–27).

805. *Boione Unlocated. Type: C? The toponym is unattested, but may be reconstructed tentatively from the legend \textit{ΒΟΙΩΝΙΤΙΚΟΝ} on late Classical/early Hellenistic coins. Most bronze coins have been found in the Hermos river valley (Imhoof-Blumer (1890) 631; Babelon, \textit{Traité} ii.2. 1177–78), and the coin types and craftsmanship resemble the coins struck in Larisa Phrikonis. A different location in Lydia was suggested by Leake (1856) 145. Although most coins are conventionally dated to C₃, bronze coinage dated to C₄ is described by Wroth in \textit{BMC Troad} 101. Types: obr. female head l., wearing ear-ring and necklace; rev. bull standing; legend: \textit{ΒΟΙΩΝΙΤΙΚΟΝ} or \textit{ΒΟΙΩΝΙΤΙΚΟΣ} (SNG Cap. Aeolis 28–29, giving 310 as the \textit{terminus post quem}).

806. Chalkis (Chalkideus) Map 56. Lat. 39.15, long. 26.35 (but note that the identification of Chalkis with modern Çiplakada is not entirely certain). Size of territory: 1. Type: C? The toponym \textit{Χαλκίς} and the city-ethnic \textit{Χαλκιδεύς} are known only from Steph. Byz. 685.1, who does not cite his source. The legend \textit{ΧΑ} on C₄ coins is presumably an abbreviated form of the city-ethnic (infra). If the identification of Chalkis with modern Çiplakada is correct, the territory of this community was c.2.5 km². Çiplakada belongs to a group of twenty-three islands known as \textit{Hekatonnesoi}, first mentioned by Herodotos (1.151.2), who reports on one Aiolian \textit{polis} there (no. 823). It is very unlikely that he has the settlement at Çiplakada in mind, however: the larger \textit{polis} Pordoselene/Nasos is a far more plausible candidate. The island has yet to be excavated, but Stauber and his team have reported substantial surface finds that point to a sizeable Hellenistic–Roman settlement. They also observed a fortification wall, the lower courses of which appear to be quite old (Stauber (1996a) i.228), and find it highly plausible that the island contained a settlement in the Classical period (C₅/C₄).

Stauber ((1996a) ii.280–82) ascribes C₄ bronze coinage to this community, but with caution. Types: obr. female head r. (Artemis’); rev. spearhead; legend: \textit{ΧΑ}. For a summary of the discussion, see Stauber (1996a) ii.282, who concurs with the majority of numismatists in regarding a Carian origin (Chalketor) for these coins as utterly implausible.

807. Elaia (Elaiites) Map 56. Lat. 38.55, long. 27.05. Size of territory: 2 or 3. Type: A?/a. The toponym is ‘\textit{Ελαία}, ῥ (IG i² 268.11.28; Ps.-Skylax 98; Polyb. 21.10.2) or ‘\textit{Ελαΐεα} (IG i² 266.1.17). The city-ethnic is ‘\textit{Ελαιίτης} (L.Délès 103.34 (C₄f)};
Elaia was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionian district and is recorded in the tribute lists sometimes by toponym (IG i² 266.1.17), while in other lists the entries are by the collective form of the city-ethnic (IG i² 261.111.4). It is recorded from 454/3 (IG i² 259.1.16, restored) to 242/20 (IG i² 285.11.8–9) a total of fifteen times, once completely restored, paying in all years a phoros of 1,000 dr. (IG i² 261.111.4).

In C4, Horismos Damasistratou of Elaia received προξενία and citizenship from Samos after the restoration of the Samians to their island (IG xii.6.23). The Elaians made a communal dedication of a beardless image of Zeus at Olympia (Paus. 5.24.6, who does not give a date).

The site was described by Bürchner (1905). The oldest city wall (probably C3) enclosed an area of c.6 ha. An acropolis was located on the hill Maltepe (Bean 1966) 112–14.

Elaia struck silver coins c.460–400 and bronze coins after c.340. (1) Silver: types: obv. head of Athena, wearing close-fitting crested helmet; rev. olive wreath, the whole in incuse square; legend: ΕΛΑΙΑI (r. to l.). (2) Bronze: types: obv. head of Athena l. wearing close-fitting or Corinthian crested helmet; rev. corn-grain between two olive branches or in olive wreath, or horseman in olive wreath; legend: ΕΛΑI, sometimes ΕΛΑΙΙ (Babelon, Traité ii.2.29; BMC Troas p.125; SNG Cop. Aiolis 164–76).

808. Gambrion (Gambreiotis) Map 56. Lat. 39.05, long. 27.20. Size of territory: ? Type: A? The toponym is Γάμβριον, τό (Xen. Hell. 3.1.6). The full form of the city-ethnic, Γαμβρειώτης, is not attested earlier than C3 (Syll.³ 1219.4 = Michel 520 = LSam 16), but the legend ΓΑΜ on the C4 coins is presumably an abbreviated form. Gambrion is called a polis in Xen. Hell. 3.1.6, where polis is used in the urban and political senses combined. It was a town captured by Thibron, but it is also described as a personal fief which had been given by the Persian king to Gongylos of Eretria in C5, whose descendants were still in control in early C4. Thus, polis is used in the political sense too, denoting Gambrion as well as its surrounding territory from which troops could be recruited and taxes levied. For a discussion of such fiefdoms, see e.g. Briant (1985). The community must have been under Persian control throughout the Classical period, presumably as part of the satrapy of Lydia. An inscription of 326/5, found in Gambrion, records a gift of land, house and garden by Krateus (presumably a Makedonian) to Aristomenes (Syll.³ 302 = Guarducci (1974) 310–11). In the preamble (4–5) it gives the name of Menander (Μενανδρός σωτηράρχης τό), who was given the Lydian satrapy by Alexander the Great. An eponymous official (πρότατος) is mentioned; but it is suggestive that there is no mention of any Gambrian decision-making body. The inscription suggests that the Makedonians may have controlled land-ownership directly. The extent to which Gambrion had undergone a process of Hellenisation during the Classical period is unknown.

Gambrion struck coins of silver and bronze throughout C4. (1) Silver: types: obv. laureate head of Apollo; rev. forpart of butting bull; legend: ΓΑΜ. (2) Bronze: obv. head of Apollo; rev. forpart of bull, or star, or tripod; legend: ΓΑΜ (BMC Mysia p.62; SNG von Aulock 1085–89 and SNG Cop. Mysia 144–63. See also Babelon, Traité ii.2.18–19.)

809. Gryneion/Gryneia (Gryneieus) Map 56. Lat. 38.55, long. 27.05. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: Αα. The toponym is Γρύνειον, η (Hecat. fr. 225; Hdt. 1.149.1) or Γρύνειον, τό (Ps.-Skylax 98; Xen. Hell. 3.1.6; Bean (1974–75) 85–87 no. 21 (C2)) or Γρύνειον (Diod. 17.7.9) or Γρύνεια, τά (Steph. Byz. 215.15). The city-ethnic is Γρύνειεύς (IG i³ 265.1.17) or Γρύνευς (Krateros (FGrHist 342) fr. 2; cf. IG i³ 266.1.3, restored) or Γρυνεύς (SNG Cop. Aiolis 202–7 (C3)). As part of the original Aiolian dodekapolis Gryneion is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 1.149.1, with the territorial sense as
a possible connotation, and in the political sense at Hdt. 1.150.2 and in a C4l inscription (Iscr. Cos ED 71 B.3). At Xen. Hell. 3.1.6 polis is used in the urban and political senses combined, denoting a dependent polis (infra). In Ps.-Skylax 98 Gryneion is one of the toponyms listed after the heading πόλεις . . . Ἑλληνίδες . . . αἰδε. In Iscr. Cos ED 71 B.5 politia is used in the sense of citizenship. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in Iscr. Cos ED 71 B.4 and on C3 coins (SNG Cop. Aiolis 202–7) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG 13 265.1.17).

Xenophon refers to Gryneion as one of the personal fiefs which had been given to Gongylos by the Persian king in C5, and which were still controlled by his descendants in C4e (Hell. 3.1.6; see also Briant (1985)). Yet Gryneion was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionia district and is recorded from 455/2 (IG 13 260.vii.16) to 428/7 (IG 13 283.iii.18) a total of thirteen times, three times completely restored, paying a phoros of first 1,000 dr. but from 433/2, 2,000 dr. (IG 13 279.1.59). This suggests that the Persian king (and probably also Gongylos and his family) did not exercise control over Gryneion at least during C5. In 335/4 Gryneion was captured by Parmenion, who subjected its population to andrapodismos (Diod. 17.7.9); but the attested C3 coinage (SNG Cop. Aeolis 202–7) along with Segre Iscr. Cos ED 71 B (C4l) shows that resettlement must have happened soon afterwards.

The earliest detailed information about the political institutions is found in Iscr. Cos ED 71 B (C4l). The decree, passed by boule (βολάλα) and assembly (δήμος), bestows citizenship, prooxenia, egktésis ges kai oikias, and privileged access to the courts on the Koan honorand. The grant of citizenship, egktésis, and dikai prodikoi is to be ratified by vote in the assembly (ll. 4–7). Diplomatic relations through embassies are also attested in this decree.

Gryneion contained a sanctuary and oracle of Apollo Gryneieus (I.Delos 104 8 B (C4m)), which was still operating as late as C1 (Bean (1974–75) 85–87 no. 21 and discussion of the oracle and sanctuary in Ragone (1990)). Recent excavations have uncovered a cemetery with graves of C7–C4 (Mitchell (1999) 143).

810. Halisarna  Map 56. Lat. 39.05, long. 27.05. Size of territory: ? Type: A: ? The toponym is Ἀλίσαρνα, Ἰολλα (Xen. Hell. 3.1.6; An. 7.8.17). Halisarna is called a polis in Xen. Hell. 3.1.6, where polis is used in the urban and political senses combined. It is a town captured by Thibron, but it is also reported that Halisarna was ruled, presumably as a tyranny (Ἰρχων), by Prokles and Eurythenes, descendants of Demaratos of Lakedaimon (see also An. 7.8.17, indicating that Halisarna was ruled by Prokles). For Demaratos, who was given “land and cities” (γῆν τε καὶ πόλεις) by the Persian king in 486, see Hdt. 6.70. See also Briant (1985). In Xen. Hell. 3.1.6, Halisarna is mentioned together with the polesi Pergamon and Teuthrania, all of which were given to Demaratos: Xenophon’s phrasing αὐτὴ ἡ χώρα suggests that the territories of the three cities were not far apart.

There is a possible solution to the conflict between Xenophon and Steph. Byz. 75.9–10, which places Halisarna in the Troad: the Stephanos entry has τὸ εὐθυκόν ὁ αὐτὸς Ἀλίσαρναῖος. This is a strong indication that the original entry may have referred to two or more sites of the same name, and that the epitomiser has left out references to the community mentioned by Xenophon. Nothing is known about the ethnic composition of Halisarna’s citizen body.

811. Herakleia(?) (Herkaleotas) Map 56. Lat. 38.45, long. 27.10. Size of territory: ? Type: B: ? The toponym may be attested in Steph. Byz. 303.17 (Ὑσδίας); see the discussion in Robert (1937) 115–16, who also dismisses the identification of this Herakleia with the κ’ πόλις πρὸς τὴν Κυμαιά τῆς Αἰολίδου in Steph. Byz. 304.1. The city-ethnic Ἡρακλεώτης is attested in Syll. 934 (C5), where the collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally. This inscription is a boundary stone marking the frontier between the territory of the Herakleotai and that of the Melampagitai. The collective and internal use is presumably attested in abbreviated form on C4 coins (infra). Ramsay (1881) 297 argued in favour of locating Herakleia at a site near the station at Emir Aalem where he observed “a grass-grown tumulus, and a little beyond it is a hill, with remains of a small fortified town. The walls could be traced all round the hill, sometimes appearing above the ground, sometimes showing only a slight elevation in the grassy hill. The style of building was not apparent, but was certainly not the finer kind of Greek work.” Keil (1913) 163–64 adopted a more cautious position, pointing out that there were remains of many ancient settlements in the area, none of which can be identified with Herakleia with any certainty.

Herakleia struck silver coins in C5: types: obv. head of eagle and traces of letters; rev. square incuse; legend: ἩΡΑΚ. The similarity between the Herakleian coins and the coins minted by C5 Kyne is noted by Mørkholm (1964) 77.

812. Iolla (Iolleus) Map 56. Unlocated, but probably near Adramyttion. Size of territory: ? Type: C: ? The toponym is ἸΩΛΛΑ, the city-ethnic is ἸΟΛΛΕΩΝ (of Ἰολλεύς), both attested only on coins (infra). The location of Iolla
remains conjectural: see most recently Stauber (1996b: 106, who suggests Fughla Tepe near Boirazli/Kizikli. Robert (1937) 167–68 suggested that the river Ollius mentioned by Pliney, HN 5.121–23 is a distortion of the name Iolla, and that the community may have adopted the name of the river.

Iolla struck bronze coins throughout C4. (1) C.400: obv. head of Hermes; rev. forpart of Pegasos; legend: IOΛΛA. (2) C.350: obv. head of Zeus; rev. forpart of Pegasos; legend: IOΛΛΕΩΝ or, sometimes, IOΛΛA (Stauber 1996a ii.248–49 nos. 1–8).

Nothing is known about the ethnic composition of Iolla’s citizen body.

813. Karene (Karenaios) Map 56. Lat. 39.10, long. 26.50. Size of territory: ? Type: A?: The toponym is Καρηναῖοι (Hdt. 7.42). The city-ethnic is Καρηναῖοι (Kraters fr. 2). The site cannot be located with precision: see Stauber (1996a) i.241–46, who suggests the hill Ag. Illias (Gökçeğıl) as a possibility. Karene is called a polis in Hdt. 7.42.1, principally in the territorial sense. That it was a polis in the political sense too is indicated by its membership of the Delian League (infra). The collective use of the city-ethnic is found externally in Kraters fr. 2, a direct quotation from his On Pseudismata book 3: Πτεραιός, Πτεραιός, Καρηναῖοι. This quotation may suggest that Karene was recorded as a member of the Delian League (infra). Their proposition that Karene belonged to the Lesbian or Chian phylai in the Classical period is plausible, but cannot be verified. According to Ephor. fr. 126, a contingent of citizens of Karene settled in Ephesos in connection with a stasis shortly after the foundation of Ephesos and gave their name to one of the five Ephesian phylai.

814. Killa Map 56. Unlocated. Type: A:a. The toponym is Κίλλα, ἦ (Hdt. 1.149.1; Strabo 13.1.62). The city-ethnic is not attested. As part of the original Aiolian dodekapolis Killa is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 1.149.1, with the territorial sense as a possible connotation, and in the political sense at Hdt. 1.150.2. This Killa, situated somewhere near Antandros (Strabo 13.1.62), is probably not identical with the “Homerick” Killa in the Troad (Hom. Il.1.38, 452; see Stauber (1996a) i.31–33).

815. Kisthene Map 56. Lat. 39.25, long. 26.50. Size of territory: ? Type: B:y. The toponym is Κισθήνη, ἦ (Isoc. 4.153). The full form of the city-ethnic is not attested, but the legend ΚΙΣΘΗΘ on C4 coins is presumably an abbreviated form (infra). Kisthene has been located (with some caution) at Gömeç by Stauber (1996a: 1.159–62. According to Isoc. 4.153, Kisthene was conquered by Agesilaos and his troops in 397, and the soldiers were rewarded with 100 tal. This piece of information must be taken with a grain of salt; but if this figure is anywhere near the truth, it is an important indication of the prosperity of Kisthene.

Kisthene struck coins in C4. (1) Silver and bronze issued by Orontas c.357–352 (or perhaps in 362/1: for this dispute, see Troxell (1981) contra Mosey (1989)). Types: obv. hoplite, or head of Orontas; legend: sometimes Κ; rev. forpart of winged boar, or horseman; legend: ΟΡΟΝΤΑ or ΚΙΣΘΗΘ. (2) Bronze coins, C4: obv. head of Demeter; rev. horseman with bee or dolphin; legend: ΚΙΣΘΗΘ (Stauber 1996a ii.261–64, cat. nos. 1–5 (1), nos. 6–7 (2); SNG Cap. lonia 26 (1)).

816. Kyllene Map 56. Lat. 38.45, long. 26.50. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A:C. The toponym is Κύλλην, ἦ (Xen. Cyr. 7.1.45). Kyllene is called a polis in Xen. Cyr. 7.1.45 in a retrospective C6 context, describing how Kyros gave Kyllene and Larisa to his Egyptian troops in 546. Presumably polis is used here in its territorial sense, denoting Kyllene’s urban centre and its hinterland. But the reference to the Egyptians’ unfailing loyalty indicates that the political sense is a connotation. Xenophon claims that in his day the polis is still inhabited by the descendants of the Egyptians. It is not known what proportion (if any) of its citizen body would be perceived as Greek.

817. Kyme (Kymaios) Map 56. Lat. 38.45, long. 26.55. Size of territory: 2 or 3. Type: A:a. The toponym is Κύμη, ἦ (Hes. Op. 636; Hdt. 1.149.1; Thuc. 3.31.1; Ps.-Skylax 98; SEG 23 189.11.18 (c.330)). The city-ethnic is Κυμαιός (Hdt. 1.138, 4.138; IG i1 71.1.124). According to Steph. Byz. 80.23–25, Hecat. fr. 226 provided an alternative toponym, Μαγαζόνων, and at 1.149.1 Herodotos has Κύμη ἡ Φρικωνὶς καλεομένη (according to Strabo 13.1.3, called Phrikonios after Mt. Phrikion in Lokris). As part of the original Aiolian dodekapolis Kyme is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 1.149.1 and 5.123.1, in both cases with the territorial sense as a possible connotation, and in the political sense at Hdt. 1.150.2. The urban sense is also attested at Thuc. 3.31.1 and Ps.-Skylax 98, and the political sense at Hdt. 4.137.2, 138.2 and 5.37.2–38.1, where Kyme is listed under the heading polis among a number of tyrannically governed communities. Aristotle included Kyme among his politiai: Κυμαιῶν πολιτεία = no. 90 frs. 530–531; Heracl. Lemb. 36–39. The
word astos is used about the citizens of Kyme in Hdt. 1.158.2. The collective and internal use of the city-ethnic is attested on Hellenistic coins (SGN Cap. Aiolis 103–15), in abbreviated forms on coins of the Classical period (infra); the external use is attested in literary sources (Hdt. 1.157.3) and in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 261.v.2). The individual use is attested externally in Hdt. 4.138.2, 5.37.1 and IG II1 9116 (C4).

The territory was called Κύμηα, ἦ (Thuc. 8.101.2), and it comprised a settlement called Blakeia (Arist. fr. 531.1–2). Idil (1989) 529 reported on the existence of two harbours, both of which were probably used for military purposes in C3 and C4. Ps.-Skylax 98 mentions only one (see map in Bean (1966) 104 fig 15).

Kyme was a dependent polis in the Persian Empire: Hdt. 7.194.1 mentions a Sandokes son of Thamasios, ἄπο τῆς Κύμης τῆς Αἰολίδος ὑπάρχος, who served as general in Xerxes’ fleet. We do not know if Kyme participated in the Ionian Revolt: the only Aiolians mentioned specifically by Herodotos are the Lesbians, and from his account it appears that there was no Kymaian naval contingent present at the battle of Lade. In C3 Kyme was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionian district and is recorded from 452/1 (IG i3 261.v.2) to 421/20 (IG i3 285.11.10) a total of thirteen times, twice completely restored. In the first years it paid 12 tal., from 448/7 reduced to 9 tal. (IG i3 264.1.13). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.1.124). In 411 Kyme supplied a contingent of fifty hoplites to help the Spartans and Methymnaian against the Athenians and the Mytilenaeans (Thuc. 8.100.3). In 408 the Kymaians sent an embassy to Athens to complain of Alkibiades’ conduct (Diod. 13.73.6). Kymaians appointed theodorokoi to host theoroi from Argos (SEG 23 189.11.18 (330–324)), and to host theoroi from Nemea (SEG 36 331.11.34–35 (331/30–313)).

Little is known about the constitutional history of Kyme. Herakleides (Polit. 10.16) reports that Pheidon and later Prometheus legislated in order to enfranchise more citizens (perhaps after 700). According to Pheidon’s law, the franchise was given to citizens who could breed at least one horse. Later Prometheus included another thousand citizens in the constitution. The constitution was replaced by a tyranny at the bidding of Kyros (Herakleides, Polit. 11.5: Κύρος δὲ καταλαύνας τιν χολίας μορφαρχείζας αὐτοῦς ἐποίησεν). According to Arist. fr. 530, 1–2, the official title of the tyrant was αἰσυµνήτης. C.512 the tyrant of Kyme was Aristagoras, son of Herakleides (Hdt. 4.138.2), who was deposed in 500/499, but not killed by the Kymaians (Hdt. 5.37–38). Later (perhaps much later) the polis had a democratic constitution which, again, was replaced by an oligarchy on the instigation of a certain Thrasy-machos, who is characterised as a "demagogos" (Arist. Pol. 1304a41–51, probably referring to Aiolian Kyme; cf. Aubonnet in the Budé edn. p. 171 n. 2). The stasis was triggered by the democrats using their power to soak the rich (h20–24). One of Plutarch’s Quaestiones Graecae—presumably derived from the Aristotelian collection of politeiai—concerns Kyme, probably Aiolian Kyme, and mentions a boule, a board of basileis and a magistrate in charge of the desmoterion (Plut. Mor. 291E–92A). So far, the only surviving public enactment antedating 306 is I.Kyme 1, a C4l honorary decree passed by the demos. Arist. Pol. 1268b–1269a refers to legislation (nemos) on homicide. Free non-citizens appear to have been resident in Kyme: a funerary inscription found at Kyme near the sanctuary of Isis and datable to C4 commemorates a citizen of Lampasakos (BCH 51 (1927) p. 386 no. 7). The inscription SEG 47 1663 (c.500) mentions two foreigners, one from Paros and one from Samos.

In 546 the Kymaians sent θεοτρόποι to the oracle in Branchidai (Hdt. 1.157–60). According to Diod. 15.18.2, Kyme and Kla zomenai consulted the oracle in Delphi in 383, shortly after the death of Tachos, in connection with their dispute over Leukai, which contained an Apollo sanctuary (Fontenrose (1978) H15).

Until now few remains of Archaic and Classical public architecture have been excavated. An Isis temple, excavated by Salac in 1925, may have dated back to C4, perhaps originally dedicated to a different goddess (Kybele/Artemis, later also Aphrodite, as suggested by Idil (1989) 527). Akurgal (1956) 12 reported on a C4 capital. Schäfer and Schläger (1962) 52 describe a pier, in part from C6. Recent deep soundings have revealed a late Archaic building on one of Kyme’s two acropolises (Gates (1997)). Kyme was probably fortified as early as C6 (Hdt. 1.160.1, who reports on the reluctance by the citizens of Kyme to incur the risk of a siege in 546). Recently, Archaic walls have been discovered beneath the Hellenistic fortifications (Gates (1994) 275). The city was besieged by Tissaphernes c.400 (Diod. 14.35.7).

Kyme struck coins of silver and bronze from C7l onwards. Denominations: stater, hemidrachm, hemiobol. (1) Silver, C7l: obv. forepart of horse, beneath, monogram (?); rev. incuse square containing ornamented star, beside it (as countermark) smaller incuse square containing a star of different design. (2) Silver, c.480–450: obv. eagle’s head; legend: KY; rev. incuse square of mill-sail pattern. (3) Silver, c.350–320: obv. forepart of horse, or eagle standing; legend: KY; rev. forepart of horse, or rosette; legend: KY or magistrate’s name. (4) Bronze, c.350–320: obv. eagle standing, or forepart
of horse; legend: magistrate’s name and/or KY; rev. vase with one handle; legend: KY. (Babelon, Traité ii.2. 1169–72 nos. 2058–63, (1930) 28; BMC Troas 104–5; SNG Cop. Aeolis 30–86.)

According to Ephor. fr. 114, Kyme was founded by Amazons. Kyme reportedly colonised (or participated in the colonisations of) (1) Kabren in the Troad (Ephor. fr. 10); (2) Ainos in Thrace, which was first founded by Alpeonnesios and later received epoikoi from Mytene and Kyme (Ephor. fr. 39); and (3) Side in Pamphylia (Ps.-Skylax 101; Att. Anab. 1.26; Strabo 14.4.2).

818. Larisa (Larisaioi) Map 56. Lat. 38.40, long. 27.00. Size of territory: ? Type: Ar. The toponym is Λήρισας, ας (Hdt. i.149.1) or Λάριςα, ή (Xen. Hell. 3.1.7), sometimes distinguished from other towns called Larisa by the epithets Φρίκωνις (Strabo 13.3.4, explained at 13.1.3; cf. supra 1043) or Λύγυρστα (Xen. Hell. 3.1.7). The city-ethnic is Λαρισαίος (Xen. Hell. 3.1.7) or Ληρισαίος (IG i3 71.1.152, but see infra). The legend ΛΑΡΙΣΑΙ on C4 coins is presumably an abbreviated form of the city-ethnic rather than the toponym (infra). As part of the original Aeolian dodekapolis Larisa is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 1.149.1, with the territorial sense as a possible connotation, and in the political sense at Hdt. 1.150.2. Larisa is called a polis in Xen. Cyr. 7.1.45 in a retrospective C6 context, describing how Kyros gave Kyllene and Larisa to his Egyptian troops in 546. Presumably polis is used here in its topographical sense, denoting Larisa’s urban centre and its hinterland. But the reference to the Egyptians’ unfailing loyalty indicates that the political sense is a connotation. The collective use of the city-ethnic is presumably attested internally on coins (infra). It is attested externally at Xen. Hell. 3.1.7 and possibly in the Athenian assessment decree of 425/4 (IG i3 71.1.152). The toponym is restored in the assessment decree of 422/1 (IG i3 77.14.19). Larisa was perhaps claimed by the Athenians as a member of the Delian League: the city-ethnic Λαρισαίοι in IG i3 71.1.152 is listed in the Ionian district immediately after Πυγεκές, which might indicate that the reference is to the other Larisa at Ephesos. However, it is impossible to draw any firm geographical conclusion on the basis of the sequence of poleis in the Athenian lists, and the city-ethnic of Ephesian Larisa attested in inscriptions of the Roman period (e.g. I.Ephesos 3272 and 3274) is Λαρισαγός, which indicates that the Larisa in the assessment decree is in fact the one in Aliolis.

There is no epigraphical attestation of Larisa’s diplomatic relations with the outside world before the early Hellenistic period (Fraser, Samothrace ii 11. no. 23 1–2 (C3l/C2e), which mentions theoroi).

Scheffold (1933) 145–48 reports on steats from the Archaic and Classical periods (C6f and C5). In his publication he also reported that on the acropolis, three-quarters of which had been excavated, he had found remains of a road, walls, towers, gates, an altar and temple, a palace and wells, all of which seemed to date from the Archaic period. The fortifications, however, have later been downgraded to C5 (Lang 1996) 228–29. Lang’s account ((1996) 224) mentions a pre-Greek cult site, on top of which a small C6 temple was built, followed by a much larger temple c.530. The palace, of the bit-hilani type, was constructed in three phases in C6, with later work of rebuilding c.400 (Boehlau and Scheffold 1940) 28–30. For a very useful summary of the remains of Archaic Larisa, see Lang (1996) 224–31. Water was supplied to the fortified city by pipes (Xen. Hell. 3.1.7). Scheffold (1933) 148 described two cisterns and a well of polygonal masonry next to a large building complex from C5. The building may have been used for public administration.

Larisa was walled in C4 (Xen. Hell. 3.1.7), and the remains of the C4 fortification of both the acropolis and the town are described in Boehlau and Scheffold (1940) 52–56.

The coinage of Larisa Phrikonis has generated a good deal of controversy. The coins in question are C4 issues of silver and bronze. (1) Silver: obv. female head wearing sphendone; rev. amphora; legend: ΛΑΡΙΣΑΙ. (2) Bronze: obv. bearded head; rev. amphora between corn-gain, r. and ΛΑΡΙΣΑΙ. (3) Bronze: obv. female head l.; rev. amphora; above, bunch of grapes; on l., caduceus; on r., ear of corn; legend: ΛΑΡΙΣΑΙ. (4) Bronze: obv. horned river-god three-quarters facing to. r.; rev. Apollo laureate; legend: ΛΑΡΙΣΑΙ. (5) Bronze: obv. head of river-god; rev. head of bull; legend: ΛΑΡΙΣΑΙ. All five issues are ascribed to Larisa Phrikonis by Head, HN2 555. SNG Cop. Aeolis 208–12 ascribe (3) and (4) to Larisa Phrikonis. In BMC Troas p. 134 (3) and (4) are ascribed to Larisa in Troas. On the problem relating to the attribution of coins to each of the three Asian poleis called Larisa, see Imhoof-Blumer (1901–2) 1171–76 nos. 2064–70 and Roberts (1951) 47–64, who wants the amphora types (1)–(4), with both male and female heads, to be ascribed to Larisa in the Troad, while the “bull-types” (5) should be assigned to Larisa Phrikonis on the grounds that a similar type was minted in Boione, which presumably was located nearby in the Hermos valley; cf. also Robert (1982).

In 346 Kyros gave Larisa to his Egyptian troops, whose descendants were still inhabiting the polis in Xenophon’s day (Xen. Cyr. 7.1.45). The presence of a non-Greek element may explain the existence of a palace. However, the presence of an Archaic Aeolian population is confirmed by C7 and C6
graffiti at the temple of Athena (Boehlau and Schefold (1943) 123 and 183). It is conceivable that they made up a considerable proportion of the citizen body of Larisa in the Classical period, and that the polis was considered Greek.

819. Leukai (Leokates) Map 56. Lat. 38.35, long. 26.50. Size of territory: ? Type: A. The toponym is Λεύκαια, α' (Ps.-Sky laxy 98; Strabo 14.1.38) or Λευκεία, η (Diod. 15.18.1–2). The city-ethnic is Λευκατής (Babelon, Traité ii.2. 2146) or Λευκαίεως (ibid. 2047, after Alexander the Great). Leukai is implicitly called a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Sky laxy. 98 (cf. Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 142) and retrospectively by Diodorus at 15.92.1 (r362/1) (urban sense) and 15.18.1–2 (rC4) (political sense). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins (infra).

The name and extent of its territory are not attested for the Classical period; but according to Ps.-Sky laxy, 98, it contained more than one harbour (Λεύκαια καὶ λιμνές). Leukai was situated on the coast (Diod. 15.18.1) between Smyrna and Phokaia (Strabo 14.1.38). In Barr. it is represented as an island c.10 km south of the coast of Asia Minor. The only authority for this is Plin. HN 5.119: oppidum Leucae in promontorio, quod insula fuit. If this piece of information carries any weight, it must relate to the Archaic period or periods. Leukai must have been a coastal city.

Leukai was founded by Tachos after the death of Glos. c.383/2 (Diod. 15.18.1; see Stylianou (1997) 208). Later, both Kyme and Klazomenai wanted to gain control of Leukai and consulted the oracle in Delphi, who responded that the polis that first managed to make a sacrifice at Leukai at a specified date should be the winner of the dispute (Diod. 15.18.2; see Fontenrose (1978) H15). Since it was stipulated that representatives from the two poleis should depart at dawn on the day specified for the sacrifice, the Klazomenians founded a polis close to Leukai and thus won the contest. This event was commemorated by a festival called Prophthaseia (Diod. 15.18.3–4, but without any indication of whether the festival was held at Klazomenai or Leukai). C.362. Leukai served as a naval base for the Egyptian fleet commanded by Reomithres (Diod. 15.92.1). Leukai possessed a sanctuary of Apollo (Diod. 15.18.1).

Leukai struck coins in silver and bronze in C.4s. Denominations: obol, hemiobol and small fractions in bronze. (1) Silver obol: types: obv. head of Aphrodite or Artemis, crescent; legend: Λ; rev. swan, crescent; legend: Λ. (2) Silver hemiobol: obv. head of Zeus; legend: ΛΕΥ; rev. forepart or head of boar; legend: ΛΕΥ. (3) Bronze: obv. head of Apollo; rev. swan; legend: ΛΕΟΚΑΤΩΝ or ΛΕΟ. (4) Bronze: obv. head of Athena; rev. lion standing; legend: ΛΕΥ. (5) Bronze: obv. head of Apollo; rev. swan or swan before tripod; legend: ΛΕΥΚΑΙΕΩΝ or ΛΕΥ and magistrate’s name (Babelon, Traité ii.2. 1159–62 nos. 2041–48; Head, HN2 570; SNG Cop. Ionia 799–801). According to Babelon (Traité ii.2. 1159–60), the striking similarity between the coins of Klazomenai and those of Leuke suggests that Leuke was a polis dependent on Klazomenai.

The ethnic composition of the population of Leukai is not known; but it may have contained a non-Greek element, given the history of its foundation, even after it became a Klazomenian dependency.

820. Magnesia (Magnes) Map 56. Lat. 38.35, long. 27.25. Size of territory: ? Type: C. The toponym is Μαγνησία, η (Hellan. fr. 191). The city-ethnic is Μάγνης (infra). The only pre-Hellenistic attestation of the city-ethnic is external, individual and admittedly uncertain: a C6 graffito from Abydos has been restored as [Μάγνης] ηδὸν ζεύγος Káikos (Ihnken (1978) 160 T13 = Jeffery (1990) 361 no. 2). Neither Ihnken nor Jeffery explains why this heavily restored ethnic is to be connected with Magnesia on Mt. Sipylus rather than with Magnesia on the Mianadros, or with Magnesia at all. Nothing further is known about Magnesia in the Archaic and Classical periods.

821. *Melanpagos? (Melanpagitas) Map 56. Lat. 38.35, long. 27.10. Size of territory: ? Type: B. There is no attestation of the toponym. The city-ethnic is Μελανπαγίτης (Syll. 3 934). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested in an internal context in C3: a graffito ὁρία Μελανπαγίτων Πρακλεοτών marked the common boundary between the territory of the Melanpagita and the neighbouring Herakleotai. The settlement was located near Gökkaya by Ramsay (1881) 296–97. Keil (1913) 166–68 reported on an intricate network of walls which can only be explained satisfactorily by a proper excavation. However, a wall of rough polygonal masonry on the eastern side of the hill-top was tentatively identified as a fortification wall enclosing the settlement. Keil also noted the similarity between the retaining walls of the settlement and those found at the acropolis of Neon Teichos.

822. Myrina (Myrinaiaos) Map 56. Lat. 38.50, long. 27.00. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: Α. The toponym is Μύρινα, η (Hdt. 1.114.3; Xen. Hell. 3.1.6). The city-ethnic is Μυριναῖος (IG1 Σ 71.1.179–80). As part of the original Aiolian dodekapolis Myrina is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt.
I. Adramytteion

34 (in the urban sense in Ps.-Skylax (Νασιώτας or Aiolic Δαµόθεος Μυριναῖος. Hellenistic coins (whose descendants were still in control in the early C dependent used in the urban and political senses combined, denoting a individual and external use is attested in Hellenistic inscriptions, e.g. Δαµόθεος Μυριναῖος, a metic living in Iasos (I. Iasos 192.7).

Myrina was allegedly founded by Amazons (Strabo 13.3.6), but a tradition recorded in Euseb. vii 1.69.12c and vii 2.18c claims that Myrina was founded in 1046 by Aiolians. Myrina was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionian district and is recorded in the Athenian tribute lists by toponym (IG i3 266.1.14) or by city-ethnic (IG i3 265.1.11). It is recorded from 453/2 (IG i3 260.viii.11) to 415/14 (IG i3 290.1.18) a total of eighteen times, three times completely restored, and in one case Myrina on Lemnos is an alternative, paying a phoros of 1 tal. (IG i3 266.1.14). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.1.179–80).

Pottier and Reinach, who excavated the cemetery of Myrina, noted a hill resembling an acropolis with remains of ancient fortifications, and a city wall of polygonal masonry of varying quality ((1882) 201; cf. Bean (1966) 106–10).

Myrina struck coins of silver in C4 and of bronze in C4–C3. (1) Silver hemidrachms: types: obv. head of Athena wearing Corinthian helmet; rev. bust of Artemis facing; legend: MY. (2) Bronze: obv. head of Athena wearing Attic helmet; rev. amphora; legend: MY or MYPI (Head, HN² 555 (C4); SNG von Aulock no. 1659 (C4–C3); SNG Cop. Aeolis 213–20).

823. Nasos (Nasiotas) Map 56. Lat. 39.20, long. 26.40. Size of territory: 1 (1.15 km²). Type: Δ. The toponym, Νῆσος, η or Aiolic Νάσος, is attested only in the entry Νάσος Πορδοσελένε in IG i3 77.1v.17. The city-ethnic is Νασιώτας (I. Adramytteion 34A.40 (C4)). The Aiolian polis (in the urban/topographical sense) in the Hekatonnesi mentioned in Hdt. 1.151.1 probably refers to this community. Nasos is called polis in the personal/political sense in I. Adramytteion 34A.9, 14, 19, 24–25, 33 (319–317); and in the same inscription the word polites is used in the plural of its citizens (34A.22). Nesos Pordoselene is recorded in the assessment decree IG i3 77.1v.17 under the heading Aktaioi poleis. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form on C4 coins (infra) and in a C41 inscription (I. Adramytteion 34A.40). Nasos was located on the island of Alibey Adası, and was probably identical with the community known as Pordoselene (see Stauber (1996a) i.198–209 and the entry Pordoselene).

The community was entered by toponym in the assessment decree IG i3 77.1v.17 as one of the Aktaioi poleis, but we cannot be sure that it was ever a paying member of the Delian League. The toponym is completely restored in the assessment decree of 425/4 (IG i3 71.111.127–28), and it does not appear in any of the surviving Athenian tribute lists. The fact that it was entered as one of the Aktaioi poleis may suggest that it was a polis dependent on Lesbos, presumably Mytilene (no. 798).

One psephisma passed by the assembly of the Nasiotai survives: I. Adramytteion 34 (319–317), which is referred to as a ψάφσμα on face A, lines 46 and 50. On face B,55–56 there is a reference to a nomos concerning the offence of overthrowing the democracy (πολιωτήτα των καλ[λυ]ντων τῶν δῖαι[μοι], 55–58). Fines and atimia are imposed in the entrenchment clause to this decree (B.55–56). The boule (βόλλα) is mentioned (B.15–16), and other magistrates mentioned in this inscription are the χοροστάτας (A.36), ταιμίας (A.45), ἔξεστασται (B.2–3, 60–61), and an ἐπιμήνυς (B.38). The assembly is referred to in several places in this decree, and there is specific reference to a κυρία ἐκκλησία (B.22–23). A prytaneion is attested (A.32–33); but so far monumental architecture from the Classical period has not been recorded (Stauber (1996a) i.208–12). Taxes were levied on the community by Antipatros, presumably in the 320s (A.9–14). I. Adramytteion 36 (C41) may also have been passed by Nasos/Pordoselene; but since it cannot be ascribed to this polis with certainty, it will not be used in the present context.

Nasos struck coins of silver (hemidrachm) and bronze in C4. Types: obv. head of Apollo; rev. panther with various symbols: head of ram or club, etc.; legend: ΝΑΣΩΙ or ΝΑΣΩΙΑ (Stauber (1996a) i.283–96; SNG Cop. Aeolis 429–31).

824. Neon Teichos Map 56. Lat. 38.40, long. 27.00. Size of territory: ? Type: Δ. The toponym is Νέων Τείχους, τό (Hdt. 1.149.1). As part of the original Aiolian dodekapolis Neon Teichos is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 1.149.1, with the territorial sense as a possible connotation, and in the political sense at Hdt. 1.150.2. Xen. An. 7.5.8 simply designates it τείχος.

According to Ps. Her. vit. Hom. 9, Neon Teichos was a foundation from Kyme, founded 8 years after that city. If the
identification of the ruins at Yanik Köy with ancient Neon Teichos is correct, then the settlement was walled (Ramsay (1881) 281); but the precise location of Neon Teichos is still controversial. According to a tradition recorded in Strabo 13.3.3, Neon Teichos was founded by Lokrians whose ultimate aim was to capture Larisa Phrikonis.

825. Notion Unlocated. Type A:α. The toponym is Νότιον, τό (Hdt. 1.149.1). As part of the original Aiolian dodekapolis Notion is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 1.149.1, with the territorial sense as a possible connotation, and in the political sense at Hdt. 1.150.2. Unless this Notion is in fact identical with Notion near Kolophon (a conventional but unwarranted equation, for which see most recently Hoepfner et al. (1999) 280 n. 247), nothing further is known about this community.

826. Palaigambrion Unlocated, not in Barr. Type: Α?: The toponym is Παλαιαγάμβριον, τό (Xen. Hell. 3.16). Palaigambrion is called a polis in Xen. Hell. 3.1.6, where polis is used in the urban and political senses combined. It was a town captured by Thibron, but it is also described as a personal fief which had been given by the Persian king to Gongylos of Eretria in C5, whose descendants were still in control in C4e. Thus, polis is used in the political sense too, denoting Palaigambrion as well as its surrounding territory as a place from which troops could be recruited and taxes levied.

827. Parthenion. Map 56. Lat. 39.15, long. 27.20. Size of territory: ? Type: B: The toponym is Παρθένιον, τό (Xen. An. 7.8.15, 23). There is no attestation of the city-ethnic. The settlement is referred to as a polis in Xen. An. 7.8.21. In Xen. An. 7.8.15 we hear about an unsuccessful Greek raid on the property of the Persian Asidates, who was defended by Itamenes and his troops, some of whom were recruited from Parthenion. The ethnic composition of this community is not known.

828. Pergamon (Pergemos) Map 56. Lat. 39.10, long. 27.10. Size of territory: ? Type: Α:β. The toponym is Πέργαμον, τό (Xen. Hell. 3.6; An. 7.8.8, 23). The city-ethnic is Πέργαμηνός (Staatsverträge 535 (C3e)). Pergamon is called a polis in Xen. Hell. 3.1.6, where polis is used in the urban and political senses combined. It was a town captured by Thibron, but it is also reported that Pergamon was ruled, presumably as a tyranny (ἡρχον), by Prokles and Eurysthenes, descendants of Demaratos of Lakedaimon (see also An. 7.8.17). For Demaratos, who was given “land and cities” (γῆν τε καὶ πόλιας) by the Persian king in 486, see Hdt. 6.70. See also Briant (1985). The collective use of the city-ethnic is presumably attested internally in abbreviated form on coins (infra). The individual and external use is found in an Epidaurian proxeny decree of C4/C3 (IAEpid 42 xiii).

The constitutional history in the Archaic and Classical periods is unknown: in C4 it may still have been controlled by the descendants of Gongylos, who may have received the city as a fief from the Persian king.

For a full description of the Archaic and Classical city walls, see Radt (1992). He discusses two walls, one of which (Wall I) may date from C7 or even earlier, while the other (Wall II) probably dates from C5 and covers an area of 18 ha (Radt (1994) 64). The article also contains extensive discussion of pottery found in the context of the walls; cf. also Radt (1999).

Pergamon struck coins of silver and bronze from C5m to C4e. (1) Silver: types: obv. laureate head of Apollo; rev. bearded male head (“Satrapenkopf”: SNG von Aulock no. 1347) in Persian head-dress, or head and neck of bull, all within incuse square; legend: ΠΕΡΓ or ΠΕΡΓΑ. (2) Bronze: obv. laureate head of Apollo; rev. two bulls’ heads; legend: ΠΕΡΓ or ΠΕΡΓΑ; or obv. female head; rev. boar’s head, or two boars’ heads; legend: ΠΕΡ or ΠΕΡΓ. Date: C5m–C4e: SNG Cop. Mysia 313–16. BMC Mysia p. 110 includes silver coinage from 420–400; see also Babelon, Traité i.2. 86–89 nos. 43–46. SNG von Aulock no. 1348 ascribes the bronze coins to C4f.

Despite Radt’s discovery of significant amounts of Aiolian grey ware, the ethnic composition of Pergamon’s population in the Archaic and Classical periods still remains uncertain. In Xen. An. 7.8.8 Xenophon is entertained by a woman called Ἐλλάδα, wife of Gongylos of Eretria and mother of Gorgion and Gongylos. Ironically, her name may bear witness to her non-Greek origins or, at the very least, to the ethnically mixed nature of the community in which she lived. The name is rare, and the entries in LPGN suggest that, in the Greek world in the Classical period, it was borne predominantly by slaves. Her two sons controlled four cities in Mysia and Aiolis (Gambrian, Palaigambrion, Myrina and Gryneion) which the Persian king had given as fiefs to their ancestor in return for his loyalty as a mediser (Xen. Hell. 3.1.6).

829. Perperene (Perperenios) Map 56. Lat. 39.15, long. 27.00. Size of territory: ? Type: C?: The toponym is Περπερήνα, ἦ (Galen, De Victu Attenuante 102; De Rebus Boni Malique Suci 6) or Παρπάρων (Apolodoros (FGrHist
244) fr. 7 apud Steph. Byz. 508.11–13). The city-ethnic is recorded as Παρπαρωνιώτης (Androttion (FGrHist 324) fr. 15 apud Steph. Byz. 508.15–16), but the three attested epigraphical (albeit Hell./Rom.) sources for the city-ethnic suggest that the normal version was Περπερήνου (I.Smyrna 447.4, 469.2–3, 689.11.23–24). This is confirmed by C4 coin legends ΠΕΡΠΕΙ (infra). Perperene is not called a polis by any extant Classical source; Galen, De Victu Attenuante 102 provides the earliest attestation. The collective use of the city-ethnic is presumably attested internally in abbreviated form on coins (infra) and is attested externally in Androttion (FGrHist 324) fr. 15.

Perperene was probably located 1 km north of the modern village of Asağibey, where substantial ruins may be identified as ancient Perperene, although according to Kaufmann and Stauber (1994) 41, there is no direct evidence to confirm this identification; see also Stauber (1996a) i.296. Although no Archaic or Classical remains have been found on this site, Stauber (1996a) i.303 points out that the visible buildings may have been erected on top of an older settlement. Only excavation may reveal the age of the original settlement.

Perperene struck bronze coins in C4. Types: obv. laureate head of Apollo; rev. bunch of grapes, branch and leaves in wreath; legend: ΠΕ or ΠΕΡ or ΠΕΡΠ or ΠΕΡΠΕ (Stauber (1996a) ii.309–25, cat. nos. i–11).

830. Pitane (Pitanaïos) Map 56. Lat. 38.55, long. 26.55. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: Αχα. The toponym is Πιτάνη, ἕ (Hdt. 1.149.1). The city-ethnic is Πιταναϊος (IG i³ 262.111.244; Krateros (FGrHist 342) fr. 2 apud Steph. Byz. 358.15–16; AJP 56 (1935) 358–79 1.147 (C4)). As part of the original Aiolian dodekapolis Pitane is called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 1.149.1, with the territorial sense as a possible connotation, and in the political sense at Hdt. 1.150.2. In C4, however, Ps.-Skylax 98 refers to Pitane as a limen only. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins (infra) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i³ 262.111.244). In C4 the individual use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in AJP 56 (1935) 358–79 1.147 (C4) and E.Delphes 111.1 410 (319), adding Αἰολευς as an indication of regional affiliation: Ἡρακλείτῳ Αἰοιστράτων Αἰολεὶ ἐκ Πιτανῆς.

Nothing is known explicitly about the extent of Pitane’s territory in the Archaic and Classical periods. But since it bordered on Mt. Kane to the west, Elea to the east, and Teuthrania to the north, it is unlikely to have exceeded 100 km². The information that may be gleaned from Hellenistic sources cannot be used retrospectively (on territorial changes and consolidations in this area in the Hellenistic period, see most recently Savalli-Lestrade (1992)).

In C5 Pitane was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionian district and is recorded from 453/2 (IG i³ 260.viii.17) to 433/2 (IG i³ 279.1.56–58, restored in 430/29 (IG i³ 281.1.41)) a total of fifteen times, but five times completely restored, and paid 1,000 dr. in all years. Pitane received proserenia from Delphi in 319 (E.Delphes 111.1 410), and another grant of proserenia given to a citizen of Pitane is recorded in an undated (C3?) decree passed by an unknown polis located in Aiolis, most likely Kyme (SEG 47 1659).

Pitane had city walls in C4, and probably also earlier. In 335/4 it was besieged by Parmenion, who was forced to lift the siege by Memon (Diod. 17.7.9). Remains of the ancient fortifications of the peninsula of Çandarlı were described by Schuchhardt in Conze et al. (1912–13) 99–100.

Pitane struck bronze coins in C4. Types: obv. head of Zeus Ammon; rev. pentagram; legend: ΠΙΤΑ or ΠΙΤΑΝΑ or ΠΙΤΑΝΑΙΩΝ; or obv. Silenus; rev. omphalos entwined by serpent; legend: ΠΙΤΑΝΑΙΩΝ (Fitz. Mus. Cat. III.72; BMC Mysia 171–72; SNG Cop. Mysia 530–35).

831. Pordoselene Map 56. Lat. 39.20, long. 26.40, but see infra. Size of territory: 1 Type: Α. The toponym is Πορδοσελήνη (Ps.-Skylax 97; Arist. Hist. an. 605b29–30). In C4 Pordoselene is called a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 97. If Nasos and Pordoselene were identical (see infra) then this community was probably the one referred to as an Aiolian polis in the political sense by Hdt. 1.151.1. The full form of the city-ethnic is unattested, but the collective and internal use is presumably attested in abbreviated form on coins: ΠΟΡΔΟΣΙΛ (infra).

Pordoselene was entered by the toponym Νέσος Πορδοσελένε on the tribute assessment list IG i³ 77.iv.17 (422/1), but it is not clear whether it was ever a paying member of the Delian League. It does not reappear in any surviving tribute list. The community is listed along with other Aktaioi poleis, suggesting that Nesos/Pordoselene was a Lesbian dependency in C5.

Pordoselene struck coins of silver and bronze from C3L to C4L. (1) Silver (drachmas): types: obv. head of Apollo; rev. lyre, or panther, or crab or other symbol in incuse square; legend: ΠΟΡ or ΠΟΡΔ or ΠΟΡΔΟΣΙΛ. (2) Bronze: obv. head of silenus; rev. dolphin; legend: ΠΟΡ (Stauber (1996a) ii.297–307). On the unfounded a priori assumption that only independent communities struck coins, Stauber (1996a) i.199 assumes that the earliest coins minted by
Pordoselene are evidence that it gained independence from Mytilene in 427.

Problems arise in connection with any attempt to locate the site of Pordoselene, the most vexing of which is the question whether Pordoselene was identical with the polis of the Nasiotai, an identification that may be suggested by the joint entry Nesos Pordoselene in IG I1 77.14.17. It may also be significant that Hdt. 1.135.1 mentions only one polis on the islands known as Hekatonnesoi (however, the present Inventory does in itself indicate that Herodotos’ enumerations of communities in various regions of the Greek world cannot be trusted to have been in any way comprehensive). The debate is summed up by Stauber (1996a) i.198–208: communis opinio has been that Nasos and Pordoselene were two different poleis. Nasos on the island now known as Alibey Adası and Pordoselene on the smaller island of Maden Adası. Stauber objects (ibid. 205–7) that Maden Adasi, being an infertile island of tuff, could not have supported a community in Antiquity: indeed, when surveying the island he found no evidence at all for an ancient settlement. Stauber is inclined to conclude that there was indeed only one community, which was located on Alibey Adası, and that Nasos/Nasiotai temporarily replaced the toponym and city-ethnic of Pordoselene because the name containing the word “fart” was perceived as an embarrassment. If Stauber’s view is correct, then the information set out s.v. Nasos in the present Inventory applies to Pordoselene as well.

832. Temnos (Temnites) Map 56. Lat. 38.40, long. 27.10. Size of territory: ? Type: Aα. The toponym is Τηµίντης (Hdt. 1.149.1), or (Suda E3024, conjectured at Strabo 13.3.70) or ἡ (Strabo 13.3.5). The city-ethnic is Τηµινήτης (Xen. An. 4.4.15). The Aiolic forms Ταµινος/Ταµιντας are attested on C4 coins (infra) and in Hellenistic inscriptions (I.Perg. 5 = Staatsverträge 555 (C3e)). As part of the original Aiolian dodekapolis Temnos was called a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 1.149.1, with the territorial sense as a possible connotation, and in the political sense at Hdt. 1.150.2. Xenophon refers to it as a polis in the urban sense, indicating that the community was small (Hell. 4.8.5: οὐ μεγάλη πόλις). The collective and internal use of the city-ethnic is presumably attested in abbreviated form on C4 coins (infra), the external use is found in a C3e decree (I.Perg. 5.2). For the individual and external use, see Xen. An. 4.4.15: Δηµοκράτις Τηµινήτης.

Although Temnos is attested as a flourishing community in the Hellenistic period (e.g. Herrmann (1979)), next to nothing is known about the political and constitutional history of Temnos in the Archaic and Classical periods. The community may have been dependent on the Persian king (it was never a member of the Delian League, at any rate); in 394, however, according to Xen. Hell. 4.8.5, Derkyldas mentioned Temnos as a polis where it would be possible to live without being subjected (ὑπηκοός) to the Persian king. On this remark, which perhaps should not be taken too seriously, see the entry for Aigai supra.

Temnos struck bronze coins in C4. Types: obv. head of Dionysos, bearded, wreathed with ivy; rev. bunch of grapes with vine leaves and tendrils, the whole in slight circular incuse; legend: TA (BMC Troas 142; SNG Cap. Mysia 246–49).

833. Teuthrania Map 56. Lat. 39.00, long. 27.05. Size of territory: ? Type: Α. The toponym is Τευθρανία (Hdt. 2.10.1) or Τευθρανία (Ps.-Skyx 98; Xen. Hell. 3.16; An. 2.1.3, 7.8.17). The full form of the city-ethnic is unattested, but the collective and internal use is presumably attested in abbreviated form on coins: TEY (infra). Teuthrania is called a polis in Xen. Hell. 3.1.6, where polis is used in the urban and political senses combined. It was a town captured by Thibron, but it is also reported that Teuthrania was ruled, presumably as a tyranny (ἕρχον), by Prokles and Eurysthenes, descendants of Demaratos of Lakedaimon. In An. 2.1.3 Prokles is referred to as ὁ Τευθρανίας ἀρχηγός. For Demaratos, who was given “land and cities” (γῆ καὶ πόλις) by the Persian king in 486, see Hdt. 6.70. See also Briant (1985).

Teuthrania struck coins of silver and bronze c.400. Types: obv. head of Apollo, with long hair; rev. bearded head of young dynast Prokles wearing Persian tiara; legend: TEY (Babelon, Traité ii.2 nos. 41–42; Head, HN 538; SNG Cap. Mysia 549).

Nothing is known about the ethnic composition of Teuthrania’s population.

834. Thebe Map 56. Lat. 39.35, long. 27.00, but location disputed; Stauber (1996a) i.45 and (1996b) suggests Kucuk Cal-Tepe. Type: B. The toponym is (Ὑποπλάκιος) Θῆβη (Dikaiarchos fr. 53a, Wehrli), Θῆβη (Hom. Il. 1.366), Θῆβαι (Hom. Il. 22.477) or Θήβα Πλακία (Sappho, fr. 44.1.6). The only Archaic/Classical attestations of Thebe as a polis are connected with the Homeric tradition (Hom. Il. 1.366, 6.414–45; Eur. Andr. 1). Curtius Rufus, however, refers to Thebe as an “urbs” in a retrospective C4 context (Hist. Alex. 3.4.10).

Thebe struck bronze coins in C4m. Types: obv. head of Demeter with wreath, hair in sakkos; rev. three crescents forming triskeles, or forepart of winged horse; legend: ΘΗΒ or ΘΗΒΑ (Stauber (1996a) ii.243 cat. nos. 1–3; SNG Cop. Mysia 580).
835. Tisna (Tisnaios) Map 56. Lat. 38.45, long. 27.05, but see infra. Type: C2. The toponym Tisna can be reconstructed from the city-ethnic attested by C4 coin legends (infra). Presumably the community took its name from the river Tisna, a personification of which was depicted on Tisna’s coins.

Tisna struck bronze coins in C4. Types: obv. beardless male head L, horned (river-god Tisnaios); rev. one-handled vase, or spearhead, or sword in sheath; legend: ΤΙΣΝΑΙ or ΤΙΣΝΑΙΟΣ or ΤΙΣΝΑΙΟΝ (Imhoof-Blumer 1883) 275 nos. 241–42; Head, HN2 557; Robert (1937) 169; BMC Troas 149; SNG Cop. Aeolis 283.
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I. The Region

The name of the region is Ἰωνίη, Ἰ (Hdt. 1.6.3) or Ἰωνία, Ἰ (Thuc. 1.2.6). There is no ethnic specifically associated with the region, for the designation Τῶνες (alternatively Τάωνες) indicated a wider ethnic identity (Hymn. Hom. Ap. 147, 152; Hdt. 1.143.2–3). The broad definition of Ionian ethnicity on the basis of criteria relating to common cult practice and common ancestry is found in e.g. Hdt. 1.147.2, where Herodotos offers a definition of “Ionians” as all people who traced their origins to Athens and who celebrated the Apatouria (cf. Thuc. 2.15.4, who claims that the Ionians who have kinship ties with the Athenians celebrate the more ancient Dionysia in the month Anthesterion). In Classical sources generally the ethnic sometimes, but not always, implied kinship ties with the Athenians (Thuc. 1.6.3, 12.4, 95.1; Eur. Ion 69–75; Isocr. Paneg. 122), who could themselves be referred to as Ionians (Hdt. 1.56.2; Bacchyl. Dithyramb 3.3; cf. Hall (1997) 52–53). It has been argued by some modern scholars (see e.g. the references to the debate in Alty (1982) 2 n. 9) that the definition that stressed the Ionian connection with Athens was a direct result of successful Athenian attempts to promote the Delian League as an essentially Ionian alliance, with an emphasis on Athens’ status as the mother city of the island poleis and of the Ionian poleis in Asia Minor. However, there is some evidence which suggests that some of the foundation myths of the Ionian poleis in Asia Minor incorporated an Athenian dimension quite early on, perhaps as early as C7 and certainly earlier than the foundation of the Delian League (e.g. Alty (1982) 13–14; Herda (1998)).

As has been pointed out e.g. by Alty (1982), the designation Τῶνες or Τάωνες could also be used more narrowly about the Greek population of Asia Minor (Aesch. Pers. 178; Hdt. 4.97; Thuc. 6.4.5, 77.1), and more specifically about the citizens of the Ionian dodekapolis as distinguished from the Asiatic Aioleans and Dorians (e.g. Hdt. 1.6.2, 26.3, 3.1.1, 4.89.1; Thuc. 3.104.3, referring to the Ionians who celebrated the Ephesia, a festival which, according to Hornblower (1991) 527–29, had temporarily replaced the Panonia). These two narrower applications of the ethnic are attested in literary and epigraphical sources from C5 onwards, but not at all in the extant sources from the Archaic period.

Unlike the ethnic of the neighbouring region Aiolis (Αἰολεῖς), which was sometimes used to identify the regional affiliation of individuals, Τῶνες is found only as a collective regional ethnic, never as an individual designation and never as a supplement to a city-ethnic proper. The closest parallel to a genuine regional ethnic is the prepositional phrase ἀπ’ Ἰωνίας, which could be used after an individual’s city-ethnic (e.g. IG II² 9973, a tombstone commemorating Λεοφρόνις Ἡροστράτου Μυησία ἀπ’ Ἰωνίας (c.300)). For the use of ἀπ’ Ἰωνίας as a supplement to a collective city-ethnic, see CID 11 6.2 (Ἀντίοχος ἀπ’ Ἰωνίας (359–357)). The examples of the regional designation are few, and most of them date from the Hellenistic period or later.

Herodotos is our earliest extant source for the regional toponym Ἰωνίη. In Solon fr. 44.2, West, Ἰωνίη refers to the land inhabited by Ionians, of which Attika is the most ancient part. In the Classical period, however, Ionia was clearly regarded as a geographical entity in Asia Minor (e.g. Hdt. 1.142.2; Xen. An. 3.5.15; Andoc. 1.76; Aen. Tact. 18.13), although its extent and definition were disputed to some degree.¹

¹ Some of our Athenian sources include the Aiolian settlements on the coast in “Ionía” (Thuc. 2.9.4; Xen.Hell. 2.1.17), probably reflecting the Athenian tribute arrangements which amalgamated Ionia and Aiolis into a single district (cf. Hornblower (1991) 248).
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The toponym was sometimes used to denote the sum of the twelve Ionian poleis in Asia Minor that made up the Ionian dodekapolis, and as such it could be used both in a topographical sense (Thuc. 3.33.2: ἀτείχιστοὺς γὰρ ὀσμής τῆς Ἰωνίας, which probably indicated that the urban centres in the region were unfortified) and in a political sense (Hdt. 5.65.5, 98.2: νῦν γὰρ Ἰωνὴ πᾶσα ἀπέστηκε ἀπὸ βασιλέως). This use of the toponym (which may have a parallel in [Lys.] 6.6) indicates that Ionia could be regarded as a political entity as well as a geographical area. This undoubtedly reflects the existence of common Ionian political institutions at a regional level in the Archaic and Classical periods, which will be further discussed below.

Hdt. 5.123 reports that Artaphernes and Otanes were ordered to attack "Ionia and neighbouring Aiolis", which presupposes a perceived northern boundary of the region. Indeed, it can be inferred from Hdt. 7.194 that c.480 Aiolis had its own governor (ὁ ἀπὸ Κύμης τῆς Αἰολίδος ὦπαρχος; cf. Debord (1999: 170). Even so, the boundary between Aiolis and Ionia was far from neatly defined: Phokaia (no. 859), the northernmost Ionian polis according to Herodotos' definition (1.142.3, 163.1), was in effect an Ionian enclave within Aiolis. Its nearest neighbour towards the south-east was the Aiolian polis of Neon Teichos (no. 824); to the north-east it may have shared a boundary with Kyllene (no. 816). Further south, Smyrna (no. 867) was originally an Aiolian settlement, which later became an Ionian polis when, according to Hdt. 1.149.1–50.2, its Aiolian inhabitants were driven out by a group of Kolophonians and distributed among the remaining eleven Aiolian poleis. Herodotos also reports (1.143.3) that the citizens of Ionian Smyrna applied for permission to participate in the festival celebrated at the Panionion; but it is not entirely clear if their application was successful. It is only in the Hellenistic period that we find firm evidence for Smyrnaian membership of the Ionian koinon.

The definition of the southern boundary of Ionia also presents some problems. In 1.170.3 Herodotos relates Thales' proposal that the Ionians should establish a single common bouleuterion at Teos (no. 868), because Teos was located "in the middle of Ionia", a statement that presupposes boundaries of the region to the south as well as to the north. However, unlike Xenophon (Hell. 3.2.14; Ages. 1.15, 29) Herodotos does not operate with the river Maiandros as the southern boundary of the region; nor does he recognise the river as the conventional boundary between Karia and Lydia (contrast Ps.-Skylax 99). In 1.142.3–4 he lists ten Ionian poleis on the Asian coast, starting from Miletos (no. 854) in the south and ending with Phokaia (no. 859) in the north, to which he adds the islands of Samos (no. 864) and Chios (no. 840) to the west. In his list he distinguishes between poleis located in Karia (Miletos, Myous and Priene, of which the latter two were located north of the river Maiandros) and those in Lydia (Ephesos, Kolophon, Lebedos, Teos, Erythrai, Klazomenai and Phokaia). Herodotos is unique among Archaic and Classical authors in locating Myous and Priene in Karia, but his location of Miletos in Karia has parallels elsewhere (Hecat. fr. 240; Ps.-Skylax 99). In other passages, however, Herodotos refers to Miletos as situated in Ionia (5.28, 37.2; 6.7, 28.1), and this is paralleled in other literary sources (Pherikydes (FGrHist 3) fr. 155; Thuc. 8.26.3). The Athenian tribute quota lists (e.g. IG ii 1 270.2.C, 271.2.D, 272.D.11.11) likewise list Miletos in the Ionian panel while including its neighbour Latmos (no. 910), directly to the east, in the Karian panel (e.g. IG ii 1 270.2.C, 271.2.D, 272.D.11.86). The Athenian decision to register Latmos separately undoubtedly rested on criteria of ethnicity, and it is clear that, to some extent, the definition of the region as a geographical entity was informed by these criteria. That may be one of the most important reasons for the fuzzy boundaries of Ionia to the north and south.

Although Herodotos draws attention to dialectal differences between individual Ionian poleis (1.142.3–4) and is aware of differences between the Ionian and Dorian dialects (1.139), the Ionian dialect plays only a marginal role in his definition both of regional ethnic identity and of the region itself. Herodotos' narrow definition of the Asiatic Ionians includes only the inhabitants of the Ionian dodekapolis (1.142.3–4, 145–46.1). Thus, he excludes not only the poleis of Magnesia on the Mauandros (no. 852) to the east, and Isasos (no. 891) and Halikarnassos (no. 886) to the south, all of which contained Ionian-speaking populations, but also

---

2 There are only two indications that Smyrna obtained membership earlier than the Hellenistic period. One is schol. Pl. Th. 153.C, according to which the expression κολοφῶν about a decisive vote is due to the privilege of Kolophon (no. 848) as a member of the Ionian Koinon to cast an extra vote on behalf of Smyrna whenever the votes were tied. If this is true, the privilege may have been established after the destruction of Smyrna in 585, Paus. 5.8.7 reports that when Onomastos of Smyrna won the boxing contest at Olympia in 688, Smyrna was already contributing to the Ionian organisation (ἀνατελείον ἡ διδυμομένον τηρικοῦτα ἐς Ἰωνας).

3 L. Smyrna 575.35–39 (C3m), 577 (292–288).

4 In Herodotos' list of Ionian poleis Erythrai (no. 845) is separated from the poleis on the mainland and grouped with Samos (no. 864) and Chios (no. 840) on the grounds that the Erythraian dialect resembles that of the Chians. The dialect spoken in these two poleis in fact contains some Aiolic features, which distinguish it from the Ionian spoken in other Asian poleis (Buck (1955: 143).
thirteen communities on the coast, all of which are included in the present Inventory as Greek poleis that are attested as types A or B in the Classical period. All of these were located within the geographical area that he identifies as Ionion elsewhere (e.g. 1.170.3).

There can be little doubt that Herodotos’ exclusion of the inhabitants of Magnesia, Isos and Halikarnassos rested on criteria of ethnicity, some of which may be reflected in the different foundation myths of the poleis. In Hdt. 3.90.1 the Magnesians in Asia (presumably the citizens of Magnesia on the Maiandros) are listed separately as an ethnic group, alongside the Aiolians and Ionians and others who belonged to the first Persian tax district. Halikarnassos had originally belonged to the Dorian hexapolis and claimed to have been founded from Troizen (no. 357) (Hdt. 7.99.1); while Isos, which is not mentioned at all by Herodotos, claimed originally to have been an Argive foundation (Polyb. 16.12.2). As for the Greek poleis that were located within Ionia, but not mentioned by Herodotos in his definition of the region, their exclusion may be ascribed to either of two possible causes. One explanation may be that all of them were dependencies of the twelve poleis listed by Herodotos. As such they may have been indirectly represented in the Ionian koinon, just as a number of poleis in Boiotia were only indirectly represented at the federal level (436–37). In that connection it is interesting to note that the Athenians in C5 appear in most cases to have preferred to deal directly with each of the dependencies in matters relating to tribute, rather than indirectly through negotiation with each of the local hegemonic powers. Another explanation for Herodotos’ exclusion of them from his list of Ionian poleis may be that his list was informed first and foremost by criteria related to a narrow definition of Ionian ethnicity which applied only to the Ionian dodekapolis, to the exclusion of other Greek communities in the area.

The case for regarding the dodekapolis as a narrowly defined ethnic group on the basis of the description offered by Herodotos is, in fact, a strong one. The definition of the group conforms to all of the six criteria of ethnicity applied to Arkadya by Nielsen (1999): viz. a collective name, a myth of common descent, a shared history, a distinctive shared culture, an association with a specific territory—that is, a “homeland”—and a sense of solidarity.

According to Herodotos, all of the twelve poleis claimed pure Ionian descent, a claim that is ridiculed at length in Hdt. 1.146.1–47.2. As for their collective name, Herodotos claims that the citizens of the dodekapolis were the only ones to acknowledge the designation “Ionians”, which in itself distinguishes them from other groups (1.143.3). All of the twelve poleis traced their origins to a single homeland, viz. Achaia, the twelve mere of which constituted the origin of the twelve Ionian poleis, and Herodotos believes that this is the reason why the Ionians refused to admit more members into the Panionion (1.145). The Ionians were driven out of their homeland, having been defeated by the Achaians (Hdt. 1.145, 7.94). They subsequently founded their own exclusive sanctuary of Poseidon Helikonios on Mt. Mykale and established the Panonia festival (Hdt. 1.143.3, 148.1). A sense of solidarity became apparent in the face of an external threat, although Herodotos is quick to point out the failure of the Ionian poleis to present a consistently united front (1.141.1–4, 6.6–17). On the other hand, Herodotos also reports the proposal by Bias of Priene that the Ionians should vacate Asia and found a polis of “all the Ionians” in Sardinia (1.170.1–2), as well as Thales’ suggestion that the Ionians should establish a common bouleuterion at Teos and reduce the political status of each of the poleis to that of a deme. Although neither proposal was carried, it is clear that Herodotos here concedes that there was a considerable cohesion of the region as a whole. To sum up, in spite of the fact that Herodotos pours scorn on the Ionian claim to exclusivity as an ethnic group, he has to accept the foundations on which that claim was made by the members of the dodekapolis.

That some of these features were indeed part of the self-definition of the dodekapolis is suggested e.g. by the account in Diod. 15.49.1–4, in which it is reported that in 373/2 representatives of the nine Ionian poleis that formed part of...
the koinon in C₄⁸ petitioned the Achaians to allow them to copy their ancestral altars at the Poseidon sanctuary at Helike (no. 235) in Achaia in connection with a reorganisation of the Panonia. Furthermore, the role played by the Kodridai in the foundation of the Ionian poleis after the expulsion of the Ionians from Achaia is attested in a number of Classical sources, viz. Pherekydes (FGrHist 3) fr. 155 (Ephesos)); Hdt. 9.97 (Miletos); Hellan. fr. 48 (Erythrai); and Ephor. fr. 25 (Klaizomenai). Only for one member of the dodekapolis, Chios, do we know that its foundation myth in the Classical period definitely did not link it with the Kodridai: Ion of Chios (FGrHist 392) fr. 1 explains that Chios, a Euboian foundation, successfully applied for membership of the Panionion at the behest of the Chian basileus Hektor.

As far as the other poleis on the Ionian coast are concerned, we know that at least one of them, Pygela (no. 865), operated with a foundation myth that set it apart from the dodekapolis already in the Classical period. According to Theopomp. fr. 59, it claimed to have been founded by some of Agamemnon’s troops who were prevented from travelling on because of disease. This myth is probably reflected in the name of one of its civic subdivisions, the phyle Agamemnonis (I.Ephesos 3111.8–9 (C₄)). There is no evidence for Pygela’s participation in its own right in the Panonia, not even in the period in C₄ when the community was not a dependency of any member of the dodekapolis. It is thus a distinct possibility that the narrow definition of an Ionian ethnic identity applying only to the dodekapolis, as propagated by the Ionians themselves, was one of the reasons why other Greek poleis on the Ionian coast were not represented in the Panonion, just as it may account for the exclusion of the poleis Magnesia and Iasos from Herodotos’ definition of the region.

The early history of the Panonion itself and of the political institutions that were connected with the association is obscure. The tradition that the twelve Ionian poleis united c.700 against a thirteenth polis, Melie, is not attested earlier than the Hellenistic period, and its historicity is dismissed, e.g. by Hommel in Kleiner et al. (1967) 91, who prefers instead to assume that the war was waged by a smaller coalition of Melie’s neighbours. The first reliable attestation of the Panonion as a centre for political and military activity at a regional level is provided by Hdt. 1.76.3 and 1.141.1–4, which relate to Kyros’ conquest of Lydia. According to Herodotos, envoys were sent from Kyros to the Ionians prior to his victory in order to persuade the Ionian poleis to back him against Kroisos. Later the Ionians and the Aiolians sent a joint delegation to Sardis in order to negotiate terms with the Persians after Kroisos’ defeat. There can be little doubt that these negotiations were conducted through the political institutions connected with the Panonion. After Kyros had turned down their request, the Ionians (with the exception of Miletos) assembled at the Panonion and decided to send a joint embassy to Sparta (Hdt. 1.141.4), in which representatives of the Aiolian poleis also took part. It appears from Hdt. 1.151.3–152.1 that a hegemonic alliance had been established between the poleis in Ionia and Aiolis, with the Ionians as the leading partner. The alliance may have been relatively short-lived, for there is no information to suggest that the Aiolians offered military assistance to the Ionians in the latter’s last stand against the Persians in 494. However, we know from I.Erythrai 16 (C₄), a joint decision by the Aiolians and Ionians, that the collaboration reported by Herodotos between the two groups is entirely plausible.

The Panonion was also the centre of joint Ionian opposition to the Persians in connection with the Ionian Revolt. In 497 the Ionians had made a joint decision to send military aid to Onesilos of Cyprus (Hdt. 5.108.2–109.3); according to Herodotos, the decision was made by τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἰωνῶν. Finally, when faced by an attack by the Persians in 494, the Ionians sent delegates (πρὸ Βοιωλοῖς) to the Panonion (Hdt. 6.7), who decided to counter the Persian threat by assembling a joint navy at Lade.

After the Ionian defeat at Lade, the Persians may have used the existing Ionian organisation as a means of controlling the region. They imposed obligations on the Ionians to resolve their internal disputes by legal means rather than by war (Hdt. 6.42.1), and the political institutions connected with the Panonion may well have provided the framework for these dispute resolutions (e.g. Debord (1999) 176–77).

In C₅ our sources for the common Ionian political institutions dry up. It is assumed by some scholars (e.g. Hornblower (1982a) 58 with n. 48) that the koinon was not functioning under the Athenian Empire, except for its purely religious activities celebrated under the name of τὰ Ἐφέσια, presumably because the Athenians would have

---

* The reduction of the number to nine members in Diodorus’ account may be due to the effects of the King’s Peace, the terms of which may have separated the islands of Chios and Samos from the poleis on the mainland, and possibly also to the temporary disappearance of Priene. Tod 113 (391–388) mentions five poleis as participants in the arbitration between Myous and Miletos (Erythrai, Chios, Klaizomenai, Lebedos and Ephesos), and Tod assumes that the inscription originally recorded delegates from the rest of the Ionian poleis (including Priene). Other scholars (e.g. Debord (1999) 254 n. 167) note that it seems impossible to fit all the remaining members into the lacuna in ll. 11–15.
regarded a continued Ionian alliance as a potential threat. However, as early as 391–388 the Persians seem again to have used some Panonian political structures for exercising control over the region and ensuring internal peace, as indicated by Tod 113. This inscription records an arbitration process between Miletos (no. 854) and Myous (no. 856), conducted by representatives of the Ionian poleis at the request of Strouses, who is designated in the inscription (l. 42) as satrap of Ionia.

The Panonia festival and with it presumably also the political institutions connected with the Panionion were moved from Ephesos back to Mykale during C4f (see most recently Debord (1999) 177). There is archaeological evidence for a bouleuterion on Mt. Mykale dating to C4m (Müller-Wiener in Kleiner et al. (1967) 35–37). I.Priene 139 (365–335) confirms the existence of an Ionian boule, while another inscription (PEP Priene 11 (350–323)) regulates sacrifices to Zeus Boulois at the Panionion. The inscription mentions a prytaion (l. 21, presumably presiding over the Panonian boule, so Hommel in Kleiner et al. (1967) 61) as well as sceptre-carrying basileis (l. 17), who presumably acted as representatives of each of the poleis members of the koinon (Hommel in Kleiner et al. (1967) 59–61). The basileus of Ephesos is singled out for special mention in l. 22, perhaps reflecting Ephesos’ claim to the “kingship of the Ionians”, as attested in Pheraykes (FGrHist 3) fr. 155, on the grounds that Androklos, a son of Kodros and the ktistes of Ephesos, was the leader of the colonisation of Ionia.

As will become clear from the individual poleis entries in the Inventory, a considerable number of the communities in Ionia were dependent poleis under the control of their larger neighbours. But even the latter poleis were themselves dependencies, for, as a region, Ionia experienced more than two centuries of almost uninterrupted dependency on external powers. At least as early as C6m, all the Greek poleis in Ionia were part of the kingdom of Lydia. When Kroisos came to the Lydian throne c.560, he completed the subjugation of the Greeks that had been started by Gyges (680–645) and carried on by his successors (Hdt. 1.26.1–28). According to Hdt. 1.6.1–3, Kroisos was the first to levy tribute on the Greeks, and he regards Kroisos’ conquests as marking the end of Greek freedom. After the conquest of Lydia by Kyros the Great (546), the Ionian poleis were brought under the control of the Persians (Hdt. 1.169.1–2). Herodotos claims that no fixed tribute was imposed by either Kyros or Kambyes (3.89.1–3); when Dareios created his twenty nomoi (“tax districts”), the Ionians, together with the Magnesians, Aliolians, Karians, Lykians, Milyans and Pamphylians, but separately from the Mysians and Lydians, formed part of the first nomos. After the Ionian Revolt, the Persians reasserted their control over the poleis, and the tribute assessments carried out by Artaphernes, hyparchos of Sardis, in the aftermath of the Revolt were, according to Hdt. 6.42.1, still in force in Herodotos’ own day. This passage may be taken to indicate, with Thuc. 8.5.5, that the Persians kept maintaining their claim to tribute from the region throughout C5, although the Athenians effectively prevented the satraps from collecting it. From 479 to 412 the poleis were dependent on Athens, which is attested as interfering in a very heavy-handed way in the internal affairs of several of the poleis at least as early as C5m.

After 412 many of the poleis in the region went over to Sparta, and from 412 to the King’s Peace in 386, which reaffirmed the Persian king’s claim to the poleis in the region, the Ionians could to some degree play off rival external powers (Sparta, various Persian potentates and, from 394, Athens) against each other, although for the most part the cities appear to have been little more than pawns in a much larger power struggle. In this period, the status of the Ionian poleis as autonomoi communities appears to have been a bone of contention, which to some extent affected especially the relationship between the Spartans and the Persians in the first half of the 390s.

The history of Ionia as a part of the Persian Empire is complex, and it is outside the scope of this chapter to engage with the question of the status of Ionia as an administrative area within the Empire. One of the most important modern controversies, which has still not been settled decisively, focuses on the question whether Ionia was a satrapy separate from Lydia in C5 and C4 (see Debord (1999) 116–30 for a

---

9 Some of these are listed in n. 6, which includes only communities of type A and type B.

10 See e.g. Lewis (1977) 87; Hommel in Kleiner et al. (1967) 35–37.
11 See e.g. Erythrai (no. 845), Miletos (no. 854) and Samos (no. 865).
12 In 401 the Ionian poleis (with the exception of Miletos) decided to back Kyros against Tissaphernes (Xen. Hell. 3.1.3; An. 1.1.6–8); after Kyros’ death the poleis seem to have had some influence on the direction of Spartan foreign policy in relation to the Persians (see e.g. Lewis (1977) 136–47). In the early 380s there is evidence of considerable Athenian involvement with Klaizomenai (I.Erythrai 502) and Erythrai (SEG 26.1282), the latter having sided with Konon and Pharnabazos against the Spartans (Diod. 14.84.3) after the battle of Knidos in 394. Other Ionian poleis that had sided with Konon were, according to Diodorus, Teos, Ephesos and Chios. It is widely agreed that the Athenian decrees mark a return to some of the methods by which the Athenians had kept their allies under control in C5 (e.g. Debord (1999) 261–65 and Badian (1995) 85–86).
discussion and references to the debate\textsuperscript{14}). Perhaps the most important conclusion drawn by Debord (1999) 199–200 in this respect is that the internal organisation of the Persian Empire kept evolving throughout the Classical period, and that the satrapies should not be seen as static, rigidly defined administrative units. What should be noted here is that, whatever the status of the region within the Persian administrative system at any one time, the poleis on the mainland never seem to have been formally split up and distributed between several different districts, although we have attestations of gifts of the revenue from individual poleis to favoured subjects of the king, gifts that have parallels also in Aiolis and elsewhere.\textsuperscript{15} It should also be noted that, from at least as early as the 350s, some of the Ionian poleis came under the influence of the Hekatomnids (see generally Hornblower (1982a) esp. 107–12), who extended their control as far north as the island of Chios and the polis of Erythrai.

The King’s Peace in 386 had at least one important consequence for the region as a geographical entity: viz. the separation of Samos and Chios from the rest of the dodekapolis. It is uncertain to what extent the treaty meant the complete severance of ties between these islands and their periaitai (see Debord (1999) 264 for references to the modern controversy); but there can be little doubt that the King’s Peace marks a change in the formal relations between the poleis on the mainland and the island communities of Samos and Chios, to which the Persian king did not lay claim. Chios entered into an alliance with Athens in 384/3 (Tod 118), and it was a member of the Second Athenian Naval League (Tod 123,24) until its defection in 357 (Dem. 15,3; Diod. 16,7,3). Samos, on the other hand, appears to have held aloof from the alliance, but when the Persians had introduced garrisons on the island, the Athenians responded in 365 by setting up a klerouchy that effectively eliminated the Samian polis for more than four decades (see no. 865).

The present Inventory comprises the poleis attested both in Ionia proper and in the south-western part of Lydia. Although the majority of the poleis in the Inventory are referred to as “Hellenic”, it must be noted here, as a general caveat, that the population of each of them is likely to have contained a significant non-Greek element (see e.g. Priene (no. 861)), and that non-Greek cultural influences on the poleis, including those situated on the coast, were probably strong throughout our period.

In addition to the thirty-four settlements that are described in the Inventory of poleis below, there are fifty-eight locations attested in Archaic or Classical sources for which the evidence is not sufficient to warrant their inclusion in the Inventory or about which we know that they were second-order settlements; in addition, there are seventeen unidentified settlements.\textsuperscript{16}

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements
not Attested as Poleis

Akele (Ἀκέλη) Attested in Hellan. fr. 112 (\textit{apud} Steph. Byz. 58.12–14), who referred to the city as a polis founded by Akelos, son of Malis and Herakles. There is no other Archaic or Classical evidence for this community, and it is not clear whether it was considered Greek. The location of it is uncertain: the designation of it as a polis in Lydia is due to an emendation of Steph. Byz. 58.12, where it is referred to as a polis in Lykia by the MSS. Not in Barr.

Assosos (Ἀσσησός) Hdt. 1.19,3 (χώρης τής Μηλαίας εν Ασσησώ); Theopomp. fr. 123 (\textit{apud} Steph. Byz. 136.4–5: πόλις Μηλαίας γῆς). It was a settlement with an Athenian sanctuary in the territory of Miletos. Not in Barr., but A is attested, see s.v. Miletos (no. 854).

Athymbra (Ἀθυμβρα) The earlier name of the Hellenistic polis Nysa according to Steph. Byz. 35.18–20 (without source

\textsuperscript{14} Debord (1999) 118 argues that, between the death of Oroites, the satrap of Sardis, who controlled the provinces of Phrygia, Lydia and Ionia, and the Athenian victory at Salamis, Ionia was probably a distinct administrative unit within the Persian Empire, although it was sometimes under military control from Sardis. He further argues (ibid. 128) that the satrapy of Ionia was recreated as part of a major reorganisation of the Persian Empire in 392/1, but perhaps brought back under the control of Sardis under Tiribazos. The (probably short-lived) existence of an Ionian satrapy under Strouthas in C4 may be confirmed by Tod 113. Note, however, Lewis’ suggestion (1197) 118–19 n. 75) that Strouthas had more extensive powers, but that Ionia alone is mentioned in the inscription, because “only his position as satrap of Ionia is relevant to this arbitration”.

\textsuperscript{15} The most famous example of a Greek beneficiary is Themistokes, who received revenue from Magnesia and Myous, as well as from Lampsakos (Thuc. 1.138,5).

\textsuperscript{16} The following settlements have not been included in the site list, because the evidence currently available is late and because there is currently no archaeological or epigraphical material suggesting Greek occupation of the sites earlier than the Hellenistic or Roman periods: Almoura (SEG 31,949) or Almyra (SEG 29,1151); Apateira (SEG 29,1155); Boukolion (SEG 29,1151); Ches ion (Apollodorus, Chron. fr. 49); Erythras Limen (Strabo 14,1,32); Gallesion (Parthenios fr. 629); Ioniapolis (Poschlow-Bindokat (1977) 100, (1977–78)); Kar nia (Nikolaos (FGrHist 90) fr. 27); the harbour Kasytès (Strabo 14,1,32); Kotheira (SEG 29,1155–89); Kyrbissos (Robert, OMS c. 304–8); Metropolis and Panormos in Ephesian territory (Strabo 14,1,20); Pet akoma (SEG 29,1153); Pyrrha (Strabo 14,1,9–10); Sillyos (Steph. Byz. 569 and Radet (1893) 323; Barr. classifies it as a late settlement); Stena (SEG 39,1244,23 (after 120/19); Thyeira (Meric et al. (1979)).
Drymoussa (Δρυμοῦσσα) Thuc. 8.31.3 (νήσος). In C5 the island Drymoussa belonged to Klazomenai (no. 847), when, according to Thuc. 8.31.3, the Klazomenians deposited property there for safe keeping. Barr. 56, C.

Drys (Δρύς) Arist. Σαμίων πολιτεία (= no. 129) (fr. 583.1). I.Priene 37+38.105–6 (C2). Drys was located in the territory of Priene (no. 861), close to the Samian peraia. It was the site of a famous battle between Priene and Miletus (no. 854) in the Archaic period. Kleiner et al. (1967) 82 n. 234 suggest that Drys may have been situated in the vicinity of the fortress Karion in territory that was repeatedly disputed by Priene and Samos (no. 864) in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Barr. 61, C.

Embaton, Embata (Ἐμβατον, Ἐμβατα) Thuc. 3.29.2 (Ἐμβατον τῆς Ἑρυθραίας); Theopomp. fr.14 apud Steph. Byz. 270.8–9 (τόπος τῆς Ἑρυθραίας); Polyaeon. 3.9.29. It has not been located (pace Barr.) with certainty but was somewhere on the coast in the territory of Erythrai (no. 845). The name simply means “landing place”, and we have no firm evidence for a settlement there. On the basis of a restoration of I.Erythrai 2016.61 (C3), it has been assumed that Embaton contained an Aphrodite sanctuary, but that restoration is now universally rejected. Barr. 56, C (Agriya).

Glaue (Γλαύκη) Thuc. 8.79.2. Glaue was located on Mt. Mykale, and it appears to have contained a sizeable harbour: according to Thuc. 8.79.2, eighty-two Athenian ships were anchored there in 410. Glaue presumably belonged to the Samian peraia at that time. Barr. 61, C.

Helos (Helos) Barr. includes this as a possible Classical site in Erythraian territory; however, the only evidence for the toponym is found in Plin. HN 5.31.117, a passage mentioning three oppida (Pteleon, Helos and Dorion) and widely regarded as suspicious (e.g. Keil (1910) 22). RE s.v. Polichne (9) accepts the Pliny passage and regards the location of Denizgeren as probable simply on the grounds that the area used to contain a swamp. It is this location that has been accepted by Barr. It appears to have been a sizeable harbour in C5 (Keil (1910) 16). Barr. 56, C?

Hermonossa (Ἐρμώνωσσα) PEP Chios 76.c2–3 (475–450). Located on the island of Chios (no. 840). Not in Barr.

Kalamoi (Κάλαμοι) Hdt. 9.96.1. Located on the coast of Samos (no. 864), but it is not certain if Kalamoi contained an actual settlement. Shipley (1987) 280. Barr. 61, C.

Kardamyle (Καρδαμύλη) Thuc. 8.24.3. Located on the island of Chios (no. 840), directly on the sea, perhaps at modern Marmaron. Barr. 56, AC (Marmaron).
Karides (Κάριδες) Attested in Ephor. fr. 11, who designates Karides as a polis founded by the survivors of the flood in the time of Deukalion, and claimed that there was still a location of that name in his day on Chios (no. 840). Barr. 56, AC.

Karion (Κάριον) I.Priene 37+38a.1.9–10 (φρούριον (C2)). It was located on Mt. Mykale in territory disputed between Samos (no. 864) and Priene (no. 861) throughout the Hellenistic period. Kleiner et al. (1967) 94–95 and 126–27 argue that the fortress was built on top of the remains of Melie (Barr. equates it with Melie), the fortifications of which were strengthened and extended towards the end of C7. There is archaeological attestation of continuous activity on the mountain throughout the Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic periods, but according to Kleiner et al. (1967) 126–27 the site was occupied only intermittently for garrison use. Barr. 61, A for Melie and H for Karion, but see supra for C.

Karteriois, Limen en (ὁ ἐν Καρτερίοις λιμήν) Thuc. 8.101.2; the harbour belonged to Phokaia (no. 859); according to Plin. HN 5.138, Karteria was an island, but it cannot be located with certainty. Not in Barr.

Kaukasa (Καύκασα) Hdt. 5.33.1. Located on Chios (no. 840), perhaps at modern Volissos. Barr. 56, C.

Kencreus (Κέγχρευς) I.Erythrai 151.7, 11 (c.340). Located in the territory of Erythrai (no. 845) and possibly a settlement. Not in Barr.

Klamadai (Κλαμάδαι) Attested in IG i3 96.5 (412/11) as the site of the estate of Kleomedes. It is uncertain whether Klamadai was a settlement or a region on Samos (no. 864). Shipley (1987) 280. Barr. 61, C.

Kleai (Κλεάι) I.Erythrai 151.2 (c.340). Located in the territory of Erythrai (no. 845) and possibly a settlement. Not in Barr.


Koloura (Κόλουρα) Attested in Hecat. fr. 234, who refers to it as a place ὡν Προtoplηγησε ἕξωντο. According to Steph. Byz. 37.18–19, it was located περὶ Προτηγης, but nothing further is known about it. Not in Barr.

Koressos (Κορής(ο)ς) Hdt. 5.100 (Κορής(ο)ς τῆς Ἑφεσίας); Xen. Hell. 1.2.7–10; Hell. Oxy. 1.1 (Λυκήν (Chambers)). Located in the territory of Ephesos (no. 844). Not in Barr.

Kybeleia (Κυβέλη(λ)εια) Hecat. fr. 230 apud Steph. Byz. 389.9–12 (πόλις Ύπωνίας); I.Erythrai 151 + EA 9 (1987) 138 no. 4 II.1 (c.340), a list of public roads in the territory of Erythrai (no. 845). According to Strabo 14.1.33, Kybeleia was situated on Mt. Mimas, just south of the promontory called Melaina, and was in his day a kome. Barr. 56, AC.

Lade (Λάδη) Hdt. 6.7; Thuc. 8.17.3 (νῆσος). Lade was a small island off the coast close to the urban centre of Miletos (no. 854); it was the scene of a major naval battle in 496 during the Ionian Revolt (Hdt. 6.7ff); it provided an anchoring place for nineteen Athenian ships in 412 (Thuc. 8.17.3) and for 160 ships under the command of Nikanor in 334 (Arr. Anab. 1.18.4–5). There are no archaeological remains on the island that might point to habitation in the Archaic or Classical periods (Greaves (2002) 3). Barr. 61, AC.

Lampsos (Λάμψος) Ephor. fr. 25 apud Steph. Byz. According to Steph. Byz. 410.25–411.1, paraphrasing Ephoros, Lampsos was a part of the territory of Klazomenai (μοίρα τῆς Κλαζομενίων χώρας) and named after Lampsos, a descendant of Kodros. There is no firm evidence for an actual settlement there. Not in Barr.

Leros (Λέρος) This island belonged to Miletos (no. 854) throughout the Classical period and possibly also for most of the Archaic period. The main settlement on the island is most likely to have been located at Ag. Marina, where there is evidence for habitation from C7 to the Byzantine period (Bean and Cook (1957) 134–35). Cf. Leros (no. 504) and infra s.v. Miletos (no. 854). Barr. 61, AC.

Leukonia (Λευκώνια) Attested only in Plut. Mor. 244F–245A as a place settled by the Chians after the murder of their king, Hippoklos. The anecdote (repeated by Polyain. 8.66) relates how the Erythrianians later appropriated the settlement; this suggests that Leukonia was located on the Asiatic mainland, perhaps on the Mimas peninsula. Barr. 56, A (“mainland (not on Khios)”).

Leukonion (Λευκώνιον) Thuc. 8.24.3 mentions Leukonion as a place where the Athenians fought and defeated the Chians in 412. Leukonion was presumably located on the east coast of Chios (no. 840), but the site has not been identified. Barr. 56, unlocated.

Mαιάνδριοι (Μαιάνδριοι) No toponym is known for this community, which is known from the Athenian tribute quota lists (IG i1 71.1.133, 259.111.29, 267.v.39). Barr. 61, C.
Malyeia (Μαλυείη) I.Erythrai 151.1 (c.340). Located in the territory of Erythrai (no. 845) and possibly a settlement. Not in Barr.

Marathon epi thalassan (Μαραθών επὶ θάλασσ[αν]) I.Erythrai 151.26 (c.340). Located in the territory of Erythrai (no. 845) and possibly a settlement. Not in Barr.

Marathousa (Μαραθούσσα) Thuc. 8.31.3 (νήσος). In C5 the island of Marathousa belonged to Klazomenai (no. 847), when, according to Thuc. 8.31.3, the Klazomenians deposited property there for safe keeping. Barr. 56, C.

Melie See Karion supra.

Myrsinoussa (Μυρσινούσσα) Attested in I.Priene 1.9 (c.334), from which it appears that it was a kome in the territory of Priene (no. 861). Not in Barr.

Nais (Ναίς) IGR IV 713 (Imperial); an ethnic (Ναιός) is attested in Ícten and Engelmann (1995) 90 no. 3, a C4 communal dedication by the Naës. It is uncertain if the Naës were a Greek community or a barbarian one. It cannot be ruled out that Naës was in fact a Greek polis. Not in Barr.

Oie (Οἴη) I.Erythrai 151.27 (c.340). Located in the territory of Erythrai (no. 845) and possibly a settlement. Not in Barr.

Oion (Οἰόν or Οἶος) The toponym is attested in PEP Chios 76.111–12 (475–450). Located on Chios (no. 840) and possibly a settlement. Not in Barr.

Oroanna (Ορόαννα) Attested in a list of theodorodokai published by Robert, BCH 70 (1946) = OMS I.342–44 (C2); the ethnic is Οροαννευς (I.Smyrna 128). The community is not attested in any Archaic or Classical sources, but ceramic finds on the modern site of Karatepe between Teos (no. 868) and Kolophon (no. 848), identified as Oroanna by R. Merić, date from the period C5 to the first century AD (see Mitchell (1990) 98). It is highly doubtful if Oroanna had undergone Hellenisation earlier than the Hellenistic period. Barr. 56, H (N Kolophon), but see supra.

Panormos (Πάνορμος) Attested in Hdt. 1.157.3, where the site is designated as a λιμήν in the territory of Miletos (no. 854), and in Thuc. 8.24.1. Barr. 61, C (Kovela Liman).

Pele (Πήλη) Thuc. 8.31.3 (νήσος). In C5 the island of Pele belonged to Klazomenai (no. 847), when, according to Thuc. 8.31.3, the Klazomenians deposited property there for safe keeping. Barr. 56, C.

Phanai (Φάναι) Thuc. 8.24.3. Located on Chios (no. 840) at the modern site of Kato Phana. Barr. 56, AC.

Phoikou (Φοίκικος) Thuc. 8.34 (λιμὴν). Keil (1910) 20 tentatively accepts the identification made by H. and R. Kiepert of this harbour with the modern site E˘ gri Liman, while it is queried in RE s.v. Polichne 9. Here the Gulf of Çesme or the Gulf of Agrilia are suggested as potential alternative locations. Barr. 56, C (E˘ gri Liman).

Phokaia on Mt. Mykale (Φόκαία) Ps.-Skylax 98 provides the only Classical evidence for a Phokaia located on Mt. Mykale. His statement is supported by Steph. Byz. 675.23–24. Nothing further is known about this site. Not in Barr.

Polichna (Πολίχνα) Thuc. 8.14.3, 23.6. Polichna was controlled by Klazomenai (no. 847) and was fortified by it in 412 after its decision to revolt against Athens (Thuc. 8.14.3). The Klazomenian Polichna has not been located with certainty. Barr. suggests Bahklikova?, dated C.

Polichne (Πολίχνη) Hdt. 6.26.2 (Πολίχνη ἡ Χῖον). Polichne belonged to Chios (no. 840) and was used as a base for military operations by Histiaios during his attack on the island in 494. Polichne has not been identified with any modern site; it is generally assumed that Polichne was located on the island of Chios itself, and that it was not identical with the Polichne on the mainland that contributed to the Erythraian synty (no. 860) in C5. Barr. 56, unlocated (“on Khios”), A.

Prineus (Πρινεύς) I.Erythrai 151.20 (c.340). Located in the territory of Erythrai (no. 845) and possibly a settlement. Not in Barr.

Sidle (Σιδήλη) The toponym is attested in Hecat. fr. 236 apud Steph. Byz. 565.18–19 (πόλις Ἱωνίας). There are no other attestations of this site. Not in Barr.

Skolopoeis (Σκολόπεις) Hdt. 9.97. The site was located on the coast south of Mt. Mykale and contained a Demeter sanctuary (Hdt. 9.97). A possible location was suggested by Wiegand and Schrader (1904) 17. Barr. 61, C.

Skyphia (Σκυφία) Attested in Ephor. fr. 26 apud Steph. Byz. 580.5–6 (πολιχανιον), and it is clear from the verbatim quotation of Ephoros in Steph. Byz. 580.6 (“ἐν Σκυφίᾳ κατέχει”) that Skyphia was a settlement. According to Steph. Byz., Skyphia belonged to Klazomenai (no. 847). Nothing further is known about this community. Not in Barr.
Skyppion (Σκύππιον or Σκύππιος) Attested in Paus. 7.3.8 (referring to the time of the Ionian immigration) as a place in the territory of Kolophon (no. 848), founded from Kolophon by a group of Ionian invaders who later went on to found Klaazonai. There is no other evidence for a community of that name. Not in Barr.

Smyrna in Ephesos (Σµύρνα) Hipponax fr. 50.1, West; it was probably a suburb of Ephesos (no. 844). Not in Barr.

Teichioussa (Τείχιούσσα) I. Didyma 6.3; Thuc. 8.26.3, 28.1. Located in the territory of Miletos (no. 854). Barr. 61, C.

2. Unidentified Settlements

Anades Identified as a possible Classical settlement on Chios (no. 840) by Yalouris (1986) 156 on the basis of house terraces, ceramic evidence and tiles. Barr. 56, C.

Armolia Identified as a possible Classical settlement on Chios (no. 840) by Yalouris (1986) 150 on the basis of architectural fragments and ceramic finds. Not in Barr.

Avgonema Identified as a Classical settlement on Chios (no. 840) by Yalouris (1986) 151 on the basis of foundations and ceramic evidence. Barr. 56, C.

Belkahve Settlement in the territory of Smyrna (no. 867) with an Archaic wall and ceramic evidence from C4 and later. Bean (1955). Barr. 56, AC.

Çatalkaya Fortified Archaic site in the territory of Smyrna (no. 867), with what appear to be housing terraces surrounded by a fortification wall. The ceramics found on the site are predominantly Archaic and Hellenistic. Tuna (1984) and Meriç and Nollé (1988) 225–26. Not in Barr.

Çobanpınar Settlement in the territory of Smyrna (no. 867) which has yielded ceramic finds from the Classical period. Bean (1955). Not in Barr.

Elinga Identified as a Classical settlement on Chios (no. 840) by Yalouris (1986) 151 on the basis of ceramic evidence, tiles and building stones. Barr. 56, C.

Emporio Archaic settlement on Chios (no. 840) containing a walled acropolis dating from C7 (Boardman (1967) 4–5), a harbour, at least two sanctuaries, and a residential area on the hill of Prophitis Elias. Barr. 56, A.

Erina Early Bronze Age settlement on Chios (no. 840) which has also produced Archaic and Classical sherds in abundance (Yalouris (1986) 150). Not in Barr.

Kastri tou Psellou Identified by Yalouris (1986) 146 as a possible settlement on Chios (no. 840), with ceramic evidence from the Classical period as well as a possibly Classical defensive wall. Not in Barr.

Kontari Identified as a possible Archaic settlement on Chios (no. 840) by Yalouris (1986) 144, but there is no firm evidence for occupation prior to the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Barr. 56, HR.

Lithi Identified as a possible Archaic settlement on Chios (no. 840) by Yalouris (1986) 151 on the basis of alleged Archaic tombs on the site. Barr. 56, A?

Managros Identified as a possible Archaic and Classical settlement on Chios (no. 840) by Yalouris (1986) 146 on the basis of architectural and ceramic finds on the site. Barr. 56, C.

Milingos Identified as a Classical settlement on Chios (no. 840) by Yalouris (1986) 157–58 on the basis of possible house and cultivation terraces, building stones, early walls, tiles and ceramic evidence. Barr. 56, C.

Neo Karlovasi Identified as a settlement on Samos (no. 864) by Shipley (1987) 255–56, who records a stretch of a late Classical wall, possibly a circuit wall. Barr. 61, C.

Neokhorion Identified as a small Archaic and Classical settlement on Samos (no. 864) by Shipley (1987) 259 on the basis of tiles and ceramic finds. Barr. 61, AC.

II. The Poleis

836. Achilleion Map 61. Not in Barr. Unlocated. Type: A. The toponym is Ἀχιλλεία, τό (Xen. Hell. 3.2.17, 4.8.17). In C4 Achilleion is called a polis in the urban sense by a single source: Xen. Hell. 4.8.17, where it is reported that Thibron used Achilleion as a base for his raids against the territory of the Persian king. Achilleion was situated in the Maiandros valley (Xen. Hell. 4.8.17), and thus it cannot be identical with the phourion near Smyrna referred to in Steph. Byz. 158.12 (pace Hirschfeld (1894)). According to Xen. Hell. 3.2.17, in 398 Achilleion was in a position to supply contingents of armed forces. Nothing further is known about this community.
837. Airai (Airaios) Map 56. Lat. 38.10, long. 26.40. Size of territory: unknown but probably 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is Ἀιράι, αί (Thuc. 8.20.2). Note that at Thuc. 8.19.4 Ἀιράι in OCT is an emendation of MSS 'Εράι (without any indication of the MSS reading in the app. crit.). At Ps.-Skylax 98 Ἀιράι is a possible conjecture of MSS Ἀυράι, but the text is too corrupt to allow firm conclusions. The city-ethnic is Ἀιραιεύς (PEP Teos 235 = BCH 4 (1880) 175–76 no. 35 (undated); IG i3 270.1.13 (442/1)) or ἡραιεύς (IG i3 282.1.44–45 (429/8)) or ἡραιεύς (IG i3 260.1.x.2 (453/2)) or Αἱραιεύς (IG i3 259.111.25 (454/3); Imhoof-Blumer (1902) 512). Airai is called a polis both in the urban sense (Thuc. 8.20.2) and in the political sense (PEP Teos 268.7 = BPW (1892) 739 no. 11 (C4)). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in a Teian inscription (PEP Teos 235 = BCH 4 (1880) 175–76 no. 35 (undated)), and on C4 coins (infra) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists and assessment decrees (infra).

Airai was undoubtedly a community that was predominantly Greek. We possess no information relating to its foundation; but Wilamowitz-Möllendorff (1908) 617 inferred from the Greek name of the settlement (presumably from the weed ἀιρα, ζιζάνιον) that Airai was a relatively recent foundation.

Airai was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionian district and is recorded from 454/3 (IG i3 259.111.25) to 427/6 or 426/5 (IG i3 284.5) a total of fifteen times, paying a phoros of 3 tal. down to 447/6 (IG i3 265.11.52) and thereafter 1 tal. (IG i3 266.1.12). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.1.116). It revolted in 411 (Thuc. 8.19.4), and an Athenian attempt to reconquer the city failed (Thuc. 8.20.2). Although Airai was a Teian dependency in Strabo’s day (14.1.32), there is no information relating to its status in the Classical period.

Two surviving public enactments were passed by Airai: PEP Teos 28 = Ὅηβειβλ 15 (1912) 75–76 no. 15 may be a fragment of a C3 honorific decree, while PEP Teos 268 is an honorific decree passed in C4 and our most important source for the political institutions of Airai in C4: the honorand is granted privileged access to the courts (ἐν δίκαιας προδικίων) and access (ἐφοδου) to the ekkleisía (ll. 2–3), and he and his descendants are given dining rights in the prytaneeion on public festival days (ll. 9–12). The inscription may also provide evidence that there were free non-citizens resident in Airai in C4 (ll. 4–5), and that ownership of real property was restricted to the citizens of Airai (7–9).

Meric (1987) 303 with plan 2, p. 306 reports on a survey at the site (Urla). The surface pottery is said to date from late Geometric to C4e, and there was a fortification wall around the peninsular site.


838. Anaia (Anaietes) Map 61. Lat. 37.50, long. 27.15. Size of territory: unknown but probably 1 or 2. Type: C. The toponym is Ἀναία, η (Thuc. 4.75.1; Ps.-Skylax 98; IG XI.6 43.11 (C4)), Ἀναία, η (Paus. 7.4.3). The city-ethnic (?) is Ἀναιίτης (Thuc. 3.19). For possible polis status, see infra.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in Thuc. 3.19.2 (428/7) and allegedly in CID ii 6.2 ([Ἀ]ναίται ἐπὶ Ἰωνικοῦς] (358); see infra).

According to Maiandros of Miletos (FGrHist 491) fr. 1, Samos (no. 864) received Anaia as a dependency from Kolophon (no. 848) in the wake of the Meliac War (c.700), and it remained a part of the Samian peraia in the Classical and Hellenistic periods (Ps.-Skylax 98). It is hard to decide if Anaia was a dependent polis whose citizens had a communal identity distinct from that of the Samians. At 3.19.2 Thucydides uses the collective city-ethnic in a reference to a military action by the Anaiaites (ἐπιθεµένων τῶν Καρών καὶ Ἀναιίτων). Conventionally the Anaiaites of Thuc. 3.19.2 are identified with the exiled Samian oligarchs who supported the Peloponnesians from their base at Anaia (e.g. Robert (1959) 21; Shipley (1987) 35; Hornblower (1991) 405). There can be little doubt that this splinter community would still perceive itself as Samian (Thuc. 3.32.2, 4.75.1). The same probably applies to Thucydides’ mention of an Anaian warship in 8.61.2 (μιὰ Ἀναιίτης), which assisted Leon of Sparta at the battle of Chios in 411. The ship was presumably provided by the Samian exiles, and Thucydides may have used the adjective in order to avoid the possible misunderstanding that the ship was provided by the Samians on the island. Barron identifies two Samian silver coin types that were probably struck at Anaia during this period. One type carries the legend Ἕλ, which, as Barron suggests (1966) 93, may be the initial of ΑΝΑΙΤΩΝ, while the other has the legend ΕΠΙ ΒΑΤΙΟΣ. According to Barron (1966) 92, Batis may have been either the leader of the oligarchic faction or an overseer appointed by Pissouthnes.

By the terms of the Peace of Antalkidas in 386, Samos was outside the sphere of influence of the Persian king, while her peraia was defined as part of Persian territory. The implications for the political relationship between Samos and the settlements on the mainland cannot be ascertained. If the
Persians insisted on control of the former peraia of Samos for taxation purposes only, this may not have prevented Samos from maintaining political ties with its former possessions. A continuation of Samian involvement on the mainland may explain how the Samians could settle at Anaia after their expulsion from their island by the Athenians in 365 (see most recently Hallof and Habicht (1995)).

It has been suggested by Fantasia (1986), primarily on the basis of CID ii 6A.1: [Ἀνα]ίαι ἄποικοι ἀπὸ Ἴων ἀσιᾶτακαὶ τοῦ παθοῦ τοῦ Ἴων ἀσιᾶτακαὶ τοῦ παθοῦ τοῦ Ἴων ἀσιᾶτακαὶ τοῦ παθοῦ τοῦ Ἴων ἀσιᾶτακαὶ τοῦ παθοῦ τοῦ Ἴων ἀσιᾶτακαὶ τοῦ παθοῦ τοῦ Ἴων ἀσιᾶτακαὶ τοῦ παθοῦ τοῦ Ἴων ἀσιᾶτακαὶ τοῦ παθοῦ τοῦ Ἴων ἀσιᾶτακαὶ τοῦ παθοῦ τοῦ Ἴων ἀσιᾶτακαὶ τοῦ παθοῦ τοῦ Ἴων ἀσιᾶτακαὶ τοῦ παθοῦ τοῦ Ἴων ἀσιᾶτακαὶ τοῦ παθοῦ τοῦ Ἴων ἀσιᾶτακαὶ τοῦ παθοῦ τοῦ Ἴων ἀσιᾶτακαὶ τοῦ παθοῦ τοῦ Ἴων ἀσιᾶτακαὶ τοῦ παθοῦ τοῦ Ἴων ἀσιᾶτακαὶ τοῦ παθοῦ τοῦ Ἴων ἀσιᾶτακαὶ τοῦ παθοῦ τοῦ Ἴων ἀσιᾶτακαὶ τοῦ παθοῦ τοῦ Ἴων ἀσιᾶτακαὶ τοῦ παθοῦ τοῦ Ἴων ἀσιά

839. Boutheia (Boutheieus) Map 56. Lat. 38.28, long. 26.20. Size of territory: 5 (the island itself is 826.5 km², to which the Chian peraia and the Oinoussai islands should be added). Type: A. The toponym is Xios, Χῖος (Hdt. i.98.4; Aen. Tact. ii.3). The city-ethnic is Χῖος (Hdt. 1.18.3; IG ii 63 A.24 (378/7);). Chios is called a polis in the urban sense (Hecat. fr. 141; Hdt. 6.27.2; Xen. Hell. 2.1.3; PEP Chios 76 = Koerner (1993) 62.B.10–12 (C5), as opposed to chora; Aen. Tact. ii.4) and in the political sense (Hdt. 6.27.1; Thuc. 8.6.4; At. Pau.171, Aeschin. 3.42; Aen. Tact. ii.4; SEG 35 923.2, b.16 (C5); PEP Chios 76 = Koerner (1993) 62.A.13, C.3 (C5); PEP Chios 78.11 (C5); Tod 118.36 (384/3), 192.11 (332/1)). Polis in the territorial sense is attested in Kritias fr. 2.7, DK, and Tod 192.16 (332/1). Polites is applied to the citizens in Isoc. 8.98. Politeuma is used in the sense of citizenship in PEP Chios 12.27 (c.320), and in the sense of constitution in Ath. Pol. 24.2 (C3). The word politeuma in the sense of constitution is used in Tod 192.3 (322/1), in which Alexander the Great prescribes that the Chian constitution is to be democratic. The asy of Chios is referred to in I.Délos 9.3 = SEG 19 510, 33.633 (C6) and PEP Chios 78.2 (C4); and in Hdt. 6.15.1 the citizens are called astoi. In IG ii 63 10510.7 (cf. CEG ii 606 (C4)) Chios is the patris of Symmachos, son of Simon. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in PEP Chios 12.23 (c.320) and externally in literature (Thuc. 7.5.4; Arist. Pol. 130343) and in inscriptions (Tod 118.16–17 (384); IG ii 63 A.24 (378/7)). The individual use is found externally in IG ii 63 683 (C6); Hipponax fr. 30.2, West (C6–C5); Simon. fr. 19.1, West; SEG 36 50.2 (490–480); and IG iv 2.1 123.117 (C4). There is also one internal attestation of the individual use of the city-ethnic (PEP Chios 266.2 (C3/C2e)).

The territory of Chios is referred to as Χῖος, Χῖος in Hdt. 6.26.1. The names of several locations, some of which may have been second-order settlements in C5, are known from epigraphical and literary sources: Koila, which according to Hdt. 6.26.1 contained a Chian garrison in 494; Kardamyle (Thuc. 8.24.3); Boliskos (Thuc. 8.24.3; Ephor. fr. 103); Phanai (Thuc. 8.24.3); and Leukonion (Thuc. 8.24.3). Delphinion, a site with more than one harbour on the coast

840. Chios (Chios) Map 56. Lat. 38.25, long. 26.10. Size of territory: 5 (the island itself is 826.5 km², to which the Chian peraia and the Oinoussai islands should be added). Type: A. The toponym is Xios, Χῖος (Hdt. i.98.4; Aen. Tact. ii.3). The city-ethnic is Χῖος (Hdt. 1.18.3; IG ii 63 A.24 (378/7);). Chios is called a polis in the urban sense (Hecat. fr. 141; Hdt. 6.27.2; Xen. Hell. 2.1.3; PEP Chios 76 = Koerner (1993) 62.B.10–12 (C5), as opposed to chora; Aen. Tact. ii.4) and in the political sense (Hdt. 6.27.1; Thuc. 8.6.4; At. Pau.171, Aeschin. 3.42; Aen. Tact. ii.4; SEG 35 923.2, b.16 (C5); PEP Chios 76 = Koerner (1993) 62.A.13, C.3 (C5); PEP Chios 78.11 (C5); Tod 118.36 (384/3), 192.11 (332/1)). Polis in the territorial sense is attested in Kritias fr. 2.7, DK, and Tod 192.16 (332/1). Polites is applied to the citizens in Isoc. 8.98. Politeuma is used in the sense of citizenship in PEP Chios 12.27 (c.320), and in the sense of constitution in Ath. Pol. 24.2 (C3). The word politeuma in the sense of constitution is used in Tod 192.3 (322/1), in which Alexander the Great prescribes that the Chian constitution is to be democratic. The asy of Chios is referred to in I.Délos 9.3 = SEG 19 510, 33.633 (C6) and PEP Chios 78.2 (C4); and in Hdt. 6.15.1 the citizens are called astoi. In IG ii 63 10510.7 (cf. CEG ii 606 (C4)) Chios is the patris of Symmachos, son of Simon. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in PEP Chios 12.23 (c.320) and externally in literature (Thuc. 7.5.4; Arist. Pol. 130343) and in inscriptions (Tod 118.16–17 (384); IG ii 63 A.24 (378/7)). The individual use is found externally in IG ii 63 683 (C6); Hipponax fr. 30.2, West (C6–C5); Simon. fr. 19.1, West; SEG 36 50.2 (490–480); and IG iv 2.1 123.117 (C4). There is also one internal attestation of the individual use of the city-ethnic (PEP Chios 266.2 (C3/C2e)).

The territory of Chios is referred to as Χῖος, Χῖος in Hdt. 6.26.1. The names of several locations, some of which may have been second-order settlements in C5, are known from epigraphical and literary sources: Koila, which according to Hdt. 6.26.1 contained a Chian garrison in 494; Kardamyle (Thuc. 8.24.3); Boliskos (Thuc. 8.24.3; Ephor. fr. 103); Phanai (Thuc. 8.24.3); and Leukonion (Thuc. 8.24.3). Delphinion, a site with more than one harbour on the coast
just north of the urban centre of Chios, was fortified by the Athenians in 412/11 (Thuc. 8.38.2), and traces of the C5 fortification on the top of a small acropolis were reported by Boardman (1956) 41–49. The site is also mentioned in PEP Chios 75 = BCH 3 (1879) 242–55 a8 (C5–C4). PEP Chios 76 = BCH 3 (1879) 230–41 (475–540) mentions Ἐρμιώνοσσα (c.2, 4), Δήλιον (c.6), Δοφῖτις (c.9), [Ε]νάδαι (d.17–18), Καμινή (sic!) (d.20), Μελαινα Ἀκτή (d.22–23) and Οἶον (a.11–12). Section c of the inscription is concerned with the definition and preservation of official boundaries of the area Δοφῖτις. It is clear from c.9–15 that the polis took an active interest in the preservation of these boundaries, but the nature of Δοφῖτις as a locality is not quite clear. PEP Chios 75 = BCH 3 (1879) 242–55 of C5–C4 provides some more names: Ἀκταί (a.22, 32, a sanctuary is located here), and Πάρβας (a.34, 36–37: an area that contained a swamp and a lake). For a more comprehensive overview of second-order settlements on the island, see further the gazetteer in Yalouris (1986) 143–59. The community at modern Emporio (which cannot be securely associated with any ancient toponym; see Boardman (1967) 254–56) was a sizeable one. The Archaic settlement contained a walled acropolis dating from C7 (ibid. 4–5), a harbour, at least two sanctuaries, and a residential area on the hill of Prophitis Elias of considerable density, estimated by Boardman to number more than fifty houses in an area of less than 0.04 km². The houses appear to have been abandoned in C7, but there is evidence of Classical and Hellenistic occupation on the hill to the west of the Archaic settlement (ibid. 35).

In addition to their territory on Chios itself, the Chians also controlled the islands of Oinoussai (Hecat. fr. 142; Hdt. 1.165.1; Thuc. 8.24.2). After Harpagos’ attack on Phokaia (no. 859) c.546, the Phokaians approached the Chians with a view to purchasing and resettling in these islands; but according to Hdt. 1.165.1, the Chians refused to sell because they feared the establishment of a rival emporion that might cut off their own island from trade. In 412, the Athenians used the islands as a naval base for raids against Chios after the latter’s secession from the Delian League. In Hdt. 6.26.2 a πολιχνὴ Χίων is mentioned, but it is not clear from the context if this site was located on Chios itself or if it was identical with Polichne on the Mimas peninsula, a settlement that had become an Erythraian dependency by C5m. In C6 Chios gained control of Atarneus (no. 803) in Aiolis in exchange for handing over the refugee Paktyes to the Persian king (Hdt. 1.160.3–5). Chios still possessed Atarneus as part of its peraia as late as 398/7 (Xen. Hell. 3.2.11); however, at that time the site was used as a base by Chian exiles. It is probable, though far from certain, that Chios lost its Asian peraia as a result of the King’s Peace (Debord (1999) 264–72). Chios appears to have lost control completely by the 360s at the latest, when Atarneus had been taken over by Euboulos (Arist. Pol. 1267a31–37), who was succeeded by Hermias as ruler of the place (note, however, Theopomp. fr. 291, which may indicate that Hermias was originally installed by the Chians and the Mytilenaians (no. 798) as episkopos of the Chian and Lesbian peraiai, probably including Atarneus and its surroundings).

All calculations of the size of the Chian citizen population are based on the size of the Chian fleet (infra) combined with very varying assumptions about the number of Chian citizens on board each ship (Roebuck (1986) 81; Walter (1993) 97 n. 37). See Thuc. 8.15.2 for evidence that the Chian slaves formed part of the crews in 412 (cf. Hunt (1998) 46, 86). Chios is referred to by Thuc. 8.15.1 as being the largest of all the poleis that remained in the Athenian alliance in 412, and in Thuc. 8.45.4 Alkibiades claims that the Chians were the wealthiest of all the Greeks.

Chios appears to have been a strong naval power from very early on. Its contribution of 100 ships to the combined Ionian fleet in 494 was larger than that of any other polis involved, and there were forty picked citizen troops on board each ship (Hdt. 6.15.1). In 440/39 Chios and Lesbos together provided twenty-five ships for the Athenian war against Samos (no. 864) (Thuc. 1.116.2), while in 430 there were fifty Chian and Lesbian ships involved in the raids on the Peloponnese (Thuc. 2.56.2). Chian ships participated in the Pylos campaign in 425 (Thuc. 4.13.2), in the attack on Melos (no. 505) in 416/15 (Thuc. 5.84.1), and in the Sicilian expedition in 415–413 (Thuc. 6.43.7.20.2). It may be inferred, e.g. from Thuc. 8.15.2, that normally the Chians would themselves supply the crews for the ships participating in Athenian campaigns: after Chios’ open revolt in 412, the seven ships previously provided to Athens as a token of good faith (Thuc. 8.9.2) were no longer held to be trustworthy, and the free men on board (presumably Chians) were imprisoned, while the slave members of the crews were set free. When the Chians made their approach to the Spartans in 412, they claimed to have at least sixty ships to contribute to their new alliance. The calculation of ship numbers in Gomme et al. (1981) 27–32 suggests that the Chians may not have exaggerated.

In C6/C4e the organisation of the Chian armed forces comprised units called dekades: two inscriptions (PEP Chios 61 and 62) record slaves enrolled in these units, and, in PEP
Chios 62, slaves who had been granted their freedom by the polis. Three Chian military commanders who had assisted the Spartans at Aigos Potami were honoured with statues at Delphi (Paus. 10.9).

Chios was part of the Ionian dodekapolis (Hdt. 1.142.2), and Chian citizens participated in the Ionian arbitration between Myos (no. 856) and Miletos (no. 854) arranged by Strouses ( Tod 113.17 (391–388)). In Thuc. 8.40.1 the Chians are made to characterise themselves as the “largest of the allied poleis in Ionia”. Yet, perhaps because the Chians themselves regarded their city as a Euboian foundation quite separate from the other Ionian foundations on the Asiatic mainland, Chios’ regional affiliation does not seem to have been self-explanatory in Antiquity. In his work Χίου Κτίσις Ion of Chios (FGrHist 392) fr. 1 relates how the Chian basileus Hektor, the great-grandson of Amphiklos of Histiaia, took the initiative to persuade the Chians to participate in the Panonia. Paus. 7.4.8, having cited the passage, adds that Ion failed to explain why Chios was counted among the Ionian poleis (cf. Thuc. 8.6.2: ες την ’Ιωνίαν και Χίον).

Ion of Chios (FGrHist 392) fr. 1 is our earliest source for the Chian version of its foundation by Oinopion, Melas and others, with a second wave of settlers under the leadership of Amphiklos of Histiaia in Euboa. That the foundation myth had an early origin is indicated by the designation of Chios as Μέλαινας Πατρώιον ἄστυ in I.Delos 9.3 (550–500).

In the Archaic period, Chios and Miletos supported each other as allies in at least two wars: Miletos backed Chios in its war against Erythrai (no. 845) (terminus ante quem: c.600), while the Chians returned the favour by aiding the Milesians against Alyattes of Lydia (Hdt. 1.18.3 (c.600)). Chios appears to have escaped conquest by the Lydians and later the Persians right up until the aftermath of the Ionian Revolt in 493, when the Persians attacked the island. An andrapodismos may be indicated in the account of how the Chians were “netted” by the Persians (Hdt. 6.31.1–2). According to Herodotos, the Chians had previously established a treaty of xenie with Kroisos (Hdt. 1.27.5), perhaps implying that Chios was not a dependent polis as such, although it probably operated under considerable political constraint from Lydia. After the Persian conquest of Lydia, the islands off the Ionian coast “gave themselves up” to Kyros without a fight (Hdt.1.169.2), and Chios probably continued as a dependent polis within the Persian Empire from this point. It is not known, however, if Chios was subject to the same Persian demands for tribute and troops as the Ionian poleis on the mainland (see e.g. Roebuck (1986) 86). From at least as early as 513 to 480/79, Chios was ruled by the pro-Persian tyrant Strattis (Hdt. 4.138.2, 8.132.2).

Chios was one of the first poleis to join the Delian League after the battle of Mykale (Hdt. 9.106.4). As a contributor of ships rather than money, Chios remained autonomos (Thuc. 3.10.5, 6.85.2, 7.57.4), de jure at any rate, although Arist. Pol. 1284a39–41 suggests that the de facto relationship was heavily dominated by Athens, to the extent that the terms of their alliance were actually broken by the Athenians. A bilateral treaty concerning access to judicial procedures in Athens between Chios and Athens, presumably with Chios as a subordinate party, may have been in force in C5m (IG12 10.10–11, but the restoration is very uncertain). Chios went over to the Peloponnesian side in 412, and the Spartans established a military presence on the island as early as 412/11, led by the Spartan nauarch Pedaritos (Thuc. 8.17.1, 38.3–4). Thuc. 8.38.3–4, along with the very fragmentary Hell. Oxy. 5, Chambers, suggests that Pedaritos was heavy-handed in his interference in internal Chian affairs. That the Spartan involvement in Chios continued to compromise Chian autonomy is indicated by the report in Diod. 13.65.3–4 that the Spartan commander Kratesippidas restored Chian oligarchic exiles to the island and occupied the acropolis in 409/8. Sparta’s direct involvement in Chios continued for nearly a decade after the end of the Peloponnesian War, until the Chians expelled the Spartan garrison after the Athenian victory in the battle of Knidos in 394 (Diod. 14.84.3).

Chios entered into alliance with Athens in 384/3 (Tod 118). The treaty appears to have been on equal terms, and Chian eleutheria and autonomia are guaranteed (ll. 19–24). Although Diod. 15.26.3 may suggest that the Spartans managed to re-establish temporary control over the island after that point, this cannot be substantiated by any other evidence. In any case, Chios was a founding member of the Second Athenian Naval League from 378/7 (IG12 43.24 and 79 = Tod 123). In 363 Epameinondas succeeded in winning over the Chians; but, according to Diod. 15.79.1, his death shortly afterwards prevented the Thebans (no. 221) from consolidating their influence. Chios seceded from Athens again in 357 (Dem. 15.3; Diod. 16.7.3), when it formed an anti-Athenian alliance with Kos (no. 497), Byzantion (no. 674) and Rhodos (no. 1000), with further backing from Maussolos. From at least as early as 346 Chios fell within the Hekatomnian sphere of power. It is likely that a permanent Karian garrison was established by Idrieus, if not even earlier by Maussolos (Dem. 5.25; for a recent discussion of the numismatic evidence, on the basis of which it has been argued that the Karian presence was established already in
the reign of Maussolos, see Debord (1999) 382–83). A Makedonian garrison, maintained from Chian funds, was imposed by Alexander the Great (PEP Chios 32 = SEG 35 925 (334–330)), along with a demand for twenty manned triremes paid for by the Chians.

As noted above, there were numerous second-order settlements on Chios, and some of them were of considerable size. It has been argued that the formation of a centralised Chian polis with Chios town as its urban centre happened relatively late. ML 8 = PEP Chios 23 (600–550) forms an important part of the argument. On the assumption that the text is indeed Chian, one interpretation of the boule demosie in ll. C.5–6, manned by fifty representatives from each phyle (the number of which is unknown), is that the council served the purpose of uniting the different local communities in a single administrative and political structure (see recently Walter (1993) 94 and Nomina 1 264–66 with references to previous discussions). It cannot be ruled out that the peaceful abandonment of the settlement at Emporio c.600 (Boardman (1967) 37–38) was directly related to a process of centralisation, of which ML 8 may then represent a later stage. We may thus be dealing with an early form of synoecism. However, Valouris’ gazetteer (1986) contains at least eight second-order settlements with continued occupation during the Archaic and Classical periods (III.8–9, 20, IV.5–6, V.1, 4, VI.1), so it is likely that a considerable part of the Chian population continued to reside outside the urban centre. Continuous occupation of the Chian urban centre up to modern times has prevented systematic excavation, which means that the process and level of Archaic/Classical urbanisation cannot be assessed on the basis of archaeological evidence.

The modern reconstruction of early Chian political institutions is based on the inscription PEP Chios 23 = ML 8 (600–550); but doubts concerning the origins of the inscription have been raised, and it cannot be ruled out that the inscription pertains to Erythrai (no. 845) (for a parallel example, see Lerythrai 15 = PEP Chios 25 (C4m)). The text itself points to a constitution in which the assembly had a function as a legislative body (A.1–2), and it may also have had some judicial capacity (A.7). The council (boule demosie, C.5–6) appears to have had a probouleutic function in addition to a judicial one (C.9–14). There were ways of calling senior officials (demarchoi and basileis) to account (A.3–6), although the procedural details are not clear.

The constitutional arrangements of Archaic Chios were probably disrupted by the ascent of the tyrant Strattis (before 513 to 480/79). In C5 until 412, Chios appears to have had a moderate constitution which is not easily labelled as either a democracy or an oligarchy (O’Neill (1978–79)). There is no direct evidence for a Chian assembly in C5, although Thuc. 8.9.3 may indicate that it did exist. PEP Chios 76 (475–450) attests a board of officials called “the Fifteen” who report to the boule (B.1–5). The Fifteen have the authority to impose fines on other officials (here the horophylakes, B.15–19). There is mention of a dicastic panel consisting of 300 unribred men (B.21–25). The official designated basileis has as part of his task the pronouncing of public curses (D.7–9). It is not known if eligibility to serve as bouleutes, as an official, or as a judge was restricted by a property census or by other criteria in this period. Thucydides’ account of the Chian revolt from Athens in 412 suggests that the boule had considerable scope for independent action: negotiations with the Peloponnesians had evidently been conducted without the consent of the broader population (8.9.3), and the citizens who were involved in planning the revolt were in a position to arrange that a meeting of the Chian boule would be in progress when the Spartans made their surprise arrival on the island (8.14.1–2).

The moderate Chian constitution was then replaced by a much narrower oligarchic one (Thuc. 8.38.4). Opposition to the new regime was crushed (Thuc. 8.24.6, 38.3), and this constitution probably continued until 394, except perhaps for a brief period between 410 and 409/8 (Piérart (1995) 268–69). PEP Chios 2 (C4I/C4e) is a public enactment with the heading boules gnome (l. 2), while SEG 35 923.B.13–26 (C5–C4) is a law passed by the boule presided over by the basileis. There is no mention of an assembly in either inscription.

There are no Chian public enactments that can be securely dated to the period between 394 and 355, and we know very little about its political institutions (Tod 118.33–34 (384) probably referred to Chios’ boule in addition to unspecified archai). There is no decisive evidence to prove that the Chians reintroduced democracy in connection with their alliance with Athens (pace Gehrke, Stasis 46). By 355 the Chian constitution was definitely oligarchic (Dem. 15.19), but it is not clear whether this was the result of a recent stasis. The abolition of an extreme oligarchic government in Chios, mentioned in Arist. Pol. 1306b3–5, may refer to the period around 394 or to constitutional upheavals in C4m, as argued by Gehrke, Stasis 46. However, constitutional continuity may be suggested by the fact that the eponymous official is the prytanis throughout the Classical period (PEP Chios 2.1 (C5–C4), 75.A.20 (C4m), 80.23–24 (C48), 32.1 (334–330)); whereas the single prytanis had been replaced by
a board of prytaneis by c.320, perhaps on an Athenian model (PEP Chios 12.A.30). The restoration of the heading ‘πρυτάνεων γνώμη’ in SEG 35 923.A.1 (c.400) is disputed (Rhodes, DGS 230).

When Alexander the Great decreed in 334–330 that the Chian constitution was to be democratic, a fundamental revision of Chian legislation (nomoi, PEP Chios 32.5) was deemed necessary (PEP Chios 32.4–6). The institutions attested in PEP Chios 12 (c.320) were undoubtedly the result of these reforms. The psephisma (A.43) was passed by a popular assembly (A.1: ἐδοξεῖ τῶι δήµωι), and the magistrates mentioned in the decree, with the exception of the agontothetes (A.29), were serving as members of boards (prytaneis, A.30; tanai, A.33; exetastai, A.37).

The best evidence for the judicial system in C5 is provided by PEP Chios 76 (475–450). Impending court cases (perhaps concerning disputed property) were to be announced by kerykes in the countryside as well as the urban centre (B.5–20), and the penalties of fines and atimia are also attested here (C.14–15). The polis appears to have assumed responsibility for conducting cases on behalf of individuals who have been evicted from their property (D.1–5). Dikai prodikoi are granted to two teams of foreign judges in PEP Chios 12 A.16–17 (c.320).

Taxes payable to the polis and to a local settlement (Οἱ ὑµῶν) are attested in PEP Chios 75 B.45–46 (C4m). Total ateleia is granted to a priestess in PEP Chios 6.11–12 (C4), while limited ateleia from import and export taxes is granted in PEP Chios 12 A.17–18 (c.320). Free foreigners are subject to special charges in connection with the sacrifices regulated in PEP Chios 78.12–13 (C4). For a list of free foreigners attested epigraphically, see Saridakis (1986) 130–31.

Chian envoys were sent to Lakedaimon (no. 345) in 413/12 (Thuc. 8.4–6.1), to Astyochos in 412/11 (Thuc. 8.40.1) and to Athens (no. 361) in 384/3 (Tod iv.18.13). Chian citizens received proxenia from Athens (IG ii2 23 (388/7)) and Anaphe (no. 474) (Michel 662.17–18 (C4)). Chios bestowed proxenia and citizenship on a group of foreign judges from Naxos (no. 507) and Andros (no. 475) (PEP Chios 12.17–19, 27). PEP Chios 50 is conventionally interpreted as a C4m list of Chios’ proxenoi in different communities (at least fifteen); cf. PEP Chios 12 = SEG 12 390–32–32: τὴν στήλην τὴν προξενικῆν. Chian theorodokoi hosted theoroi from Argos (no. 347) c.330–324 (SEG 23 189.11.4) and theoroi announcing the Nemean Games (SEG 36 331.11.46–49 (323/2)). The Chians were given promanteia in Delphi (F.Delphes 111.3 213 (C4–C3)); and in C5e they sent a chorus of 100 young men (Hdt. 6.27.2). For the altar of Apollo dedicated by the Chians, see Hdt. 2.135.4 and F.Delphes 111.3 212 (after 480). Xenopeithes of Chios was victorious at Olympia in 480 (Moretti (1970) 296).

The system of civic subdivisions underwent more than one radical reform during the Classical period. There was a phyle structure attested perhaps as early as C6f (assuming that PEP Chios 23.C.8–9 = ML 8 relates to Chios); but there is as yet no attestation of the traditional six Ionian phylai (Piéart (1985) 182). Jones, POAG 191–93 argues for a three-tier structure in C5–C4e, tentatively identifying the groups as phylai, phratries (PEP Chios 80.28 (C4m)) and gene (PEP Chios 7.12 (C4m)). It was assumed by Forrest (1960), followed by Jones, POAG 194 and Piéart (1985) 181–82, that the three-tier structure was replaced by a more complex system with four tiers in C4s. In this system the phylai consisted of numbered subdivisions (πρωτοι, δευτεροι, τριτοι). These subdivisions were in turn further subdivided into units designated by numbers (A, B, I, etc.), each of which were subdivided into groups designated by a “patronymic”. While the groups designated by numbers and “patronymic” are well attested in C4 (PEP Chios 71.72, 73 (c.315)) and occupy an uncontroversial place in the hierarchy of subdivisions, it is more problematic to identify the named subdivisions in C5 and C4f as either phylai, phratries or gene. Some groups, such as the Kaukaseis (PEP Chios 8 (450–425)) and the Klytidai (PEP Chios 75 (C4m)), had complex administrative and political structures; but it is still uncertain if these groups belonged in the uppermost tier as phylai or at a lower level as phratries. The mention of Zeus Patroios in a decree passed by the Klytidai (PEP Chios 80.35 (C4s)) has led some to suggest that the group was indeed a phratri (for a summary of the debate, see Graf (1985) 36–37); but nothing can be concluded with certainty. It may be suggested on the basis of PEP Chios 75.11–12 and 29 that the Klytidai had originally been a territorially based unit, perhaps centred on a second-order settlement (45–46: Οἱ ὑµῶν), not unlike the Kleisthenic demes. The same may be true of the Kaukaseis (Hdt. 5.33.1 mentions Καύκασα, a location on the coast). For this interpretation, see Graf (1985) 35 pace Forrest (1960) 188, who believed that the Kaukaseis derived their name from Kaukasos, the companion of Chios’ mythical founder Oinopion. PEP Chios 9 (C4–C3) allows the interpretation that admission of the next generation of Chians to the citizen body was controlled locally in the civic subdivisions. The text is a list of members of the Tottedai (perhaps a phratri) who have been admitted to the agogia.

Chios was exposed to numerous outbreaks of stasis and, consequently, exiles are frequently mentioned in the
sources. Arist. Pol. 1303a34–35 refers to Chian exiles in Antissa (no. 794) in Lesbos, who were later expelled by the Antissaians because of the threat that they posed. Unfortunately the event cannot be dated. Hdt. 8.132.2 relates how six conspirators against the tyrant Strattis fled the island in 480/79 after their assassination plans had been revealed. The defection of Chios from Athens in 412 was the result of rivalry between οἱ πολλοί and οἱ ὀλίγοι (Thuc. 8.9.3, 14.2), and we hear of Chian exiles once again after the Chians had sided with the Peloponnesians. A party of pro-Spartan oligarchic exiles was restored to the island by the Spartan commander Kratesippidas in 409/8 (Diod. 13.65.3–4). If Piérart’s (1995) interpretation and dating of SEG 39 370 are correct, the exiles mentioned in the inscription as “friends of Sparta” are identical with the exiles in Diod. 13.65.3–4. According to Piérart, the members of the extreme oligarchic regime set up by Pedaritos were expelled by the Chians, who were taking advantage of the reversal of Spartan fortunes after the Athenian victory at Kyzikos in 410. When Kratesippidas had succeeded in bringing the pro-Spartan exiles back to the island, they in turn exiled 600 of their opponents, and the latter set up base at Atarneus. According to Xen. Hell. 3.2.11, the second group of exiles still occupied the Chian peraia in 398. The letter of Alexander the Great to the Chians (PEP Chios 32 = SEG 35 925 (334–330)) stipulated that Chian exiles were to be allowed to return (I. 2): these exiles were undoubtedly of democratic or anti-Persian orientation (or both), and may have been forced out in the wake of constitutional upheavals in C4m (see Dem. 15.19). In the same letter Alexander instructed the Chians to impose exile on Medising citizens (II. 11–12).

Although excavations of individual plots in Chios town have uncovered parts of the ancient agora, we depend almost exclusively on literary evidence for the identification of major civic structures in the urban centre. Ps.-Skylax 99 mentions the harbour. Aen. Tact. 11.3–5 provides evidence for dockyards, a stoa and a tower near the harbour, but the date of the event related in this passage is uncertain. A sanctuary of Athena Poliouchos is attested in Hdt. 1.160.3 (rC6). Aen. Tact. 17.5 refers to the Chian agora (C4). A festival of Dionysos is attested in Aen. Tact. 17.5 and PEP Chios 12 A22 (c.320), which involved a procession to his altar, perhaps located in the agora. For a comprehensive discussion of cults and cult sites on the island, see Graf (1985) 22–146.

The Chian calendar included some Attic months, e.g. Posideon (PEP Chios 80.23 (C4)), but also the month Leukatheon (PEP Chios 75 A25 (C5–C4)), which is peculiar to the Ionian cities in Asia Minor (Graf (1985) 18–21; Trümpy, Monat. 102–5).

In 425/4 the Athenians ordered the Chians to tear down their new wall in order to deter them from revolting (Thuc. 4.51); it is not clear whether this wall was just an addition to existing fortifications or whether Chios had been unfortified before this time. In 412/11 the Athenians besieged its urban centre in vain, and it is highly likely that it was protected by walls (Thuc. 8.38.3, 40.1, 56.1, 61.3). Aen. Tact. 11.6 provides further evidence for city walls, but the date cannot be ascertained.

Chios struck coins on the Chian standard (15.6 g) from c.550. The earliest attested issue is an electrum hekte. Types: obv. sphinx; rev. four-part incuse square (anepigraphic). There was simultaneous minting of silver and electrum staters 525–510. Hardwick (1993) 213 suggests that the silver staters were issued c.525–493, and that the series may have been discontinued after the Persian attack on the island in 499. A second series of silver staters was issued c.490–435: obv. sphinx and amphora; rev. four-part incuse square (anepigraphic). From 435–425: obv. sphinx, amphora and grapes; rev. four-part incuse square (anepigraphic). Hardwick (1993) 216 argues for a break in the minting of silver staters 425–412. A unique electrum stater is dated by Hardwick to the period immediately after the revolt of 412: obv. sphinx, amphora and wreath; rev. four-part incuse square (anepigraphic). There is a corresponding silver tetradrachm to which Hardwick assigns the same date. From the last decade of C5 to c.330 silver tetradrachms and fractions were issued continuously: obv. sphinx and amphora; rev. four-part incuse square; legend: sometimes magistrate’s name or anepigraphic. Chios also struck bronze coins in C4: obv. sphinx and grapes; rev. amphora; legend: XIΟΣ and magistrate’s name (Hardwick (1993); SNG Cop. Ionia 1539–55).

The Chians are named as the founders of Maroneia (no. 646) in Thrace by Ps.-Skymnos 676. They also participated in the foundation of the Hellenion at Naukratis (no. 1023) (Hdt. 2.17.2).

841. Chytion Map 56. Lat. 38.20, long. 26.45. Unlocated. Size of territory: unknown but probably 1 or 2. Type: C. The toponym is Χυτόν, τό (I.Erythrai 502.9–10 = Tod 114 (3876); Ephor. fr. 78). Chytion is probably identical with the Chytroon mentioned by Arist. Pol. 1303b9, and Χυτόν is an almost universally accepted conjecture for MSS χυτόν. The reason for recording Chytion in this Inventory is Aristotle’s information that Chytion and Klaizomenai (no. 847) tended
to break up into two political communities like Kolophon (no. 848) and Notion (no. 858), which in some periods were split up into two poleis.

According to Strabo 14.1.36, Chytos was located on the site of Old Klazomenai, which was later moved to an island connected with the mainland by a causeway. It is perfectly conceivable that habitation may have continued on the site of Klazomenai's former urban centre. Recent excavations conducted by G. Bakir and his team show that the C6 mainland site was indeed abandoned after 494, but that habitation resumed around 400 (Mellink (1984)). The results of later excavations placed the date of abandonment of the Archaic settlement further back, in the 550s and 540s (Mellink (1992) 142). Excavation of C4 houses on the mainland site revealed two phases: the first from c.400 to 380–370, when these houses were ruined; the second phase from c.370–330 (Mellink (1987) 23). The chronology of the mainland settlement corresponds quite well to the little that can be gleaned from literary and epigraphical sources for the history of Chytos in C4; and Strabo's identification of this settlement with Old Klazomenai thus seems to be confirmed.

Chytos presents problems akin to those relating to Anaxa (no. 838). Although part of Klazomenian territory, it constituted a considerable “nuisance factor” like other perai (Hornblower (1991) 405) in that it provided a haven for citizens dissatisfied with the constitutional set-up of their city (Gehrke, Stasis 78–79). The decree I.Erythrai 502 = Tod 114, passed by Athens in 387, promised Athenian non-intervention in a conflict between the Klazomenians and tovs επί Χυτών (l. 9). The Klazomenians were given full authority in matters regarding a peace settlement with the people at Chytos (ll. 8–9), some of whom were held as hostages by the Klazomenians (ll. 9–10). It is perhaps significant that no city-ethnic derived from the name of the locality Chytos is used in this document: the conflict is viewed as an internal conflict within the community of Klazomenai rather than a war between two poleis. We do not know how the people of Chytos would have preferred to represent themselves; but it should be noted that Arist. Pol. 1303b9 uses the same expression as the decree (οἱ επὶ Χυτών).

842. Dios Hieron (Diosirites) Map 61. Lat. 38.00, long. 27.05. Size of territory: probably 1 or 2. Type: B. The toponym is Διός Ἐρέων, τό (Thuc. 8.19.2; IG 14 65.12 (427/6)). The city-ethnic is Διοσερίτης (IG 14 37.27 (C5)) or Διοσερίτης (IG 14 289.1.42). Dios Hieron is not attested as a polis in any Archaic or Classical source, but the collective use of the city-ethnic is attested in an external context in IG 14 37.27 (C5) and in the Athenian tribute lists (infra).

Dios Hieron was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionian district and is recorded from 454/3 (IG 14 259.111.23) to 416/5 (IG 14 289.1.42) a total of fourteen times, paying a phoros first of 1,000 dr. (IG 14 259.111.23) from 442/1 of 500 dr. (IG 14 270.1.4). It is often listed together with Kolophon (no. 848) (five times) and/or Notion (no. 858) (six times) (IG 14 259.111.21–23, 289.1.40–42; Piéart (1984) 171 n. 49). An Athenian decree of 427/6 honouring a citizen of Kolophon indicates that at this point Dios Hieron (called a chorion) was dependent on Kolophon (IG 14 65.11–14).

However, as dated and restored, another decree of C5 mentions the citizens of Dios Hieron on a par with the citizens of Kolophon and Lebedos (no. 850), and all three cities are to cover the travelling costs and daily expenses of five elected oikistai to be sent out from Athens (IG 14 37.27). So far, we have no evidence for Dios Hieron in C4; but its reappearance as a community in its own right in the Hellenistic period (SEG 39 1244.1.22; Head, HN 650) may serve as an indication in favour of its continued existence as a polis in C4.

843. (Elaiousioi) Map 56. Unlocated. Type: B. The toponym is not attested in the Classical period; but it was probably Ἑλαίοσια, derived from the city-ethnic Ἑλαίοσιός, attested in the Athenian tribute lists. Engelmann and Merkelbach (1972) 37, followed by Barr, reject the identification with the island Ἑλεούσα mentioned by Strabo 13.1.67 and note that many Greek communities derived their name from their olive trees.

The Elaiousioi were members of the Delian League. They belonged to the Ionian district and are recorded from 448/7 (IG 14 264.111.30) to 427/6 or 426/5 (IG 14 284.2–3) a total of eleven times, five times completely but plausibly restored. Elaious is explicitly recorded as a dependency of Erythrai (Ἐλαίοσιοι Ἑρυθραίοι) in two lists (IG 14 281.1.22, 284.2) and in the assessment of 425/4 (IG 14 71.11.151–52). In 448/7 and 447/6 they paid alongside the other dependencies of Erythrai (no. 845); they all formed a syntely, but the Elaiousioi paid on their own behalf (IG 14 264.111.30, 265.1.63). In later years their payment is recorded separately from that of the other Erythraian dependencies. They paid 100 dr. (IG 14 268.1.28) and were assessed at a phoros of 100 dr. in 425/4 (IG 14 71.11.151–52).

844. Ephesos (Epheios) Map 61. Lat. 37.55, long. 27.15. Size of territory: 5. Type: A. The toponym is Ἑφεσος, Ἕ (Hdt. 1.142.3; Thuc. 1.137.2; Xen. Hell. 3.4.16; Ps.-Skylax 98).
The city-ethnic is 'Εφεσος (Hdt. 1.147.2; I.Ephesos 2.9 (C4)). In C6 Ephesos is called a polis as citadel (akropolis) in I.Ephesos 1A.1, and in the urban sense in C6–C5 (Hipponax fr. 50.1, West). In C5 it is called a polis in the urban sense (Hdt. 1.26.2 (rC6)) and in the political sense (Hdt. 1.141.4, 142.3–4, 143.3; Herakleitos fr. 121, DK). In C4 it is called polis in the urban sense (Hell. Oxy. 1.2, Chambers; Xen. Hell. 1.2.7–8) and in the territorial sense in I.Ephesos 1420.4 (C4), in which citizenship is granted on the condition that the honorands remain εν τῇ τῆς πόλεως. For polis in the political sense, see IG ii² 8523.4; I.Ephesos 2.4 (C4); SEG 39 1151.2. The urban centre is called polisma by Kreophyllos of Ephesos (FGrHist 417) fr. 1 (c.400?). The polis cognate polites is applied to the citizens of Ephesos in I.Ephesos 1419.3 and 1420.4 (both C4). The word politeia is used in the sense of citizenship in Xen. Hell. 1.2.10; I.Ephesos 1421.3 (C4). Ephesos was the patris of Pythokles, who was brought up and lived in Athens, and who was commemorated by a funerary epigram (IG ii² 8523.4 (C4e); cf. CEG 11 485). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in Hdt. 1.147.2; IG ii² 1.48 = Tod 97.8 (403/2); IG ii² 1485.11.9 (C4l), and internally in I.Ephesos 2.9 and 1427.2 (both C4). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in Hdt. 9.84.2; ML 95e (405); SEG 17 111 (C4).

The name of the territory is 'Εφεσια (Hdt. 5.100, 6.16.2; L.Priene 3.13 (probably C3)) or 'Εφεσια (Xen. Hell. 3.2.14). It included the location Koressos on the coast (Hdt. 5.100); cf. INFRA. There was a suburb called Smyrna “behind the polis” (πανίσαθε τῇ τῆς πόλεως), as mentioned by Hipponax fr. 50.1, West, cf. INFRA. Priene (no. 861) had a common border with Ephesos, presumably to the north-west (L.Priene 3.12–14). In Xen. Hell. 1.5.12, 15 there are references to an unspecified λιμὴν τῶν 'Εφεσιων (presumably the city harbour is meant). The location of the harbour Panormos mentioned in Strabo 14.1.20 cannot be determined with certainty (Merig 1985).

Ephesian Smyrna has been located beneath the agora of the Lysimachean city by Langmann (1993), whose identification has been accepted e.g. by Engelmann (1990) 281–82. The houses excavated on this site date from C8 and C7 (Kawiese et al. 1996 12). Langmann (1993) suggests that the site was inhabited by Smyrnaean merchants.

Koressos is mentioned in Hdt. 5.100 and Xen. Hell. 1.2.7–10; and it is referred to as a λιμὴτιν in Hell. Oxy. 1.1, Chambers. Xen. Hell. 1.2.7 reports that Thrasyllos landed his hoplite forces πρὸς τὸν Κορησσόν and that it was located on the opposite side of Ephesos’ urban centre from the swamp. Robert (1960) 139–44 argued, partly e silentio, that Koressos was an integral part of Ephesos rather than a polis in its own right. He dismissed the identification of this Koressos with the community that passed the C3 honorary decree published in ibid. 132–34. For the problems related to the precise location of Koressos, see Knibbe (1998) 76.

According to Ephor. fr. 126, Ephesos was founded by Proklos. Shortly after its foundation it became involved in a war against Priene in which most of the Ephesian citizens were killed. In connection with a rebellion against the descendants of Androklos, the remaining Ephesians invited citizens from Karyne (no. 813) and Teos (no. 868) to settle at Ephesos, and the newcomers gave their names to two of the Ephesian phylai. C.555–550 Ephesos entered into a treaty with Kroisos, presumably as a subordinate party (Polyaen. 6.50; Ael. VH 3.26; Staatsverträge 107). Ephesos belonged to the Ionian dodekapolis (Hdt. 1.14.23) and its citizens participated as judges in the arbitration between Miletos (no. 854) and Myous (no. 856) in 391–388 (Tod 113.29).

Ephesos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionian district and is recorded from 454/3 (IG i² 259.1.22, restored) to 415/14 (IG i² 290.1.26) a total of sixteen times, paying a phoros of 7½ tal. (IG i² 260.11.13), from 445/4 reduced to 6 tal. (IG i² 267.v.17), but in 433/2 raised to 7½ tal. once again (IG i² 279.1.65). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i² 71.1.125). Ephesos revolted against the Athenians during the Ionian War or, at any rate, not earlier than 414 (Piéart 1995) 258, after which the Ephesians supported the Peloponnesian War effort (SEG 39 370.23). After the Peloponnesian War Samian exiles were given asylum at Ephesos (Tod 97.8 (403/2)). In 395 Agesilaos trained his army in the urban centre of Ephesos (Xen. Hell. 3.4.16); but it subsequently joined Konon after the battle of Knidos in 394 (Diod. 14.84.3). In 336 Ephesos sided with Parmenion and Attalos, but changed course again in 334 when citizens with oligarchic leanings joined forces with Memnon (Gehrke, Stasis 59–60).

For a survey of the history of the Ephesian constitution, see Gehrke, Stasis 57–60. The Aristotelian collection of constitutions included one of the Ephesians (Heracl. Lemb. 66; Arist. no. 49). Suda A 83894 relates how Aristarchos of Athens was called to Ephesos to serve as ruler, and Gehrke, Stasis 57 suggests tentatively that he may have introduced a constitution resembling that of Solon’s constitution at Athens. After a succession of pro-Persian tyrants, a democratic constitution was introduced in 492 (Herakleitos fr. 121, DK), perhaps a radicalisation of a constitutional arrangement introduced by Mardonios in 494. Hermodoro, a friend of Herakleitos,
was exiled after the introduction of the constitutional change in 492 (Gehrke, *Stasis* 57–58). Gehrke notes (*Stasis* 58) that there is no evidence for any constitutional changes during the rest of C5 and most of C4: the Ephesian revolt against the Athenians in C5 (SEG 39 370.23) does not necessarily imply that the Ephesians had replaced their democracy with an oligarchic constitution (Piéart 1995) 258 thinks it unlikely that the Ephesians revolted any earlier than 414/13). Gehrke, *Stasis* 39 suggests that the regime following the King’s Peace was of an oligarchic leaning, and that the Ephesian support of the Macedonians in 336 was driven primarily by democratic forces within the city. An oligarchic countermove occurred in 334, when Memnon managed to gain control of Ephesos, replacing the democratic constitution with an oligarchy that lasted only until Alexander’s victory at Granikos later in the same year (Arr. Anab. 1.17.10). The reintroduction of democracy was accompanied by a massacre of the oligarchs (Arr. Anab. 1.17.11–12).

Public enactments passed by the *boule* and the assembly are, e.g., SEG 39 1151 (326/5–324/3); *I.Ephesos* 1419 and 1420 (both C4). A sacred law (νόμος ὁ πάρηγμος) is mentioned in *I.Ephesos* 2.5–6 (C4). In *I.Ephesos* 1420.1–3 there is reference to αὐτοκρατορικός, which appears to be the budget of the city, designating sums to be spent on public works. *I.Ephesos* 2 records death sentences passed on between forty-four and forty-six persons who had molested a board of Ephesian theoroi sent to the sanctuary of Artemis at Sardis. The case was conducted by προγάλασμα of the goddess Artemis (2.1). It is not clear from the text who had actually judged the case, and it has even been suggested that it was heard at Sardis (e.g., Masson 1987) 228–29). The indictment which formed the basis of the trial is cited in the decree.

In C4 the eponymous official was the πρύτανης (*I.Ephesos* 1421.3–4, 1425.2, 1426.2 (all C4)). The *boule* is attested in a probouleutic capacity in the enambles to numerous C4 decrees (e.g., *I.Ephesos* 1419.2 (C4)), and was in charge of certain public works (*I.Ephesos* 1420.5 (C4)). The πρώδρομοι (*I.Ephesos* 1438.3 (C4)) were responsible for assigning new citizens to *phyle* and chiliai by lot. Other officials are the board of ἐσσῆς (*I.Ephesos* 1443 (C4)), the ἀγωνοβέμιος (*I.Ephesos* 1440.11 (C4)) and the board of νικηφόροι (*I.Ephesos* 1440.7 (C4)). For the *neokoros* of the Ephesian Artemis, see Xen. *An*. 5.3.6. The Ephesian assembly is attested in *I.Ephesos* 1389.1, 1419.2, 1420.3, etc. (all C4). For Ephesian commanders and troops (hoplites), see *Hell. Oxy*. 2.1, Chambers.

Ephesian citizenship grants are attested in Xen. *Hell*. 1.2.10 (a block grant of citizenship given to the Selinuntians (no. 44) after successful defence of Ephesos against an Athenian attack in 409); and for C4 in *I.Ephesos* 1389, 1408–45 (mostly C4, some C3), and SEG 39 1151.4 (326/5–324/3).

The civic subdivisions of Ephesos are known primarily from citizenship decrees, in which it is stipulated that the hono- orand be assigned to a *phyle* and a chiliai (*I.Ephesos* 1421.6 (C4)): ἔσσεσσι φυλήν Ὁριος, χλαδατων Ἐχεπτολέῳς. According to Ephor. fr. 126, there were five phylai at Ephesos: Bennaioi, Teioi, Karenaioi, Euonymoi and Ephesioi. Bennaioi is undoubtedly a false rendering of Bembineis. The *phyle Eὐόνυμεῖς* is attested in *I.Ephesos* 1419.4, Βεµβιεῖς in *I.Ephesos* 1427.4, Ἐφεσεῖς in *I.Ephesos* 1420.5, Ὁριοι in *I.Ephesos* 1421.6, and Καρηναῖοι in *I.Ephesos* 1415.17 (all C4, 1415 as late as c.300 (Rhodes, DGS 358)). The epigraphical record provides the names and *phyle* affiliation of some fifty chiliaystes; see Jones, *POAG* 312.

Ephesian embassies are attested epigraphically in *I.Ephesos* 1436.1 (C4) and *I.Ephesos* 1437.2 (before 321). In C4 the city granted *proxenia* to a citizen of Kyrene (no. 1028) (*I.Ephesos* 1389 (C4)) and to a Macedonian (*I.Ephesos* 1433.2–3). Between 325 and 275, Monounios, son of Sophokles of Ephesos, was appointed *proxenos* by Delphi (no. 177). For a grant of *enktosis*, see *I.Ephesos* 1389 (C4). Ephesian theoroi are attested in *I.Ephesos* 2.3–4, 10 = SEG 36 1011 (c.350–300); for theorodokoi to host theoroi from Argos (no. 347), see SEG 23 189.11.8 (330–324).

Although Hdt. 1.26.2 may suggest that the urban centre of Ephesos was moved at some point during C6 or C5, this is not at all certain (see Ozyigit (1988) 94–96). Herodotos need not imply any more than that the urban centre had expanded considerably since C6 and that the Artemision thus was no longer situated 7 stades outside the city walls.

So far, very little of the monumental architecture of Archaic and Classical Ephesos has been excavated. In addition to a temple of *Meter Theon* and a structure which was probably an Apollo sanctuary, the Artemision, perhaps the most important monument in the whole of Ephesos, has been uncovered and described (Bammer and Muss (1996)). According to Hdt. 1.26.2 (rC6), the Artemis temple was situated 7 stades from the walls of the old urban centre. The foundation of the earliest temple has been dated to C8. On the fire of the Archaic Artemision in C4m, see Knibbe (1998) 89. He rejects the tradition of the mad pyromaniac Herastratos and offers a more plausible explanation: viz. that the foundations of the temple had been causing problems since the days of Kroisos and they were slowly sinking. In addition the ground level was constantly rising because of alluvial deposits from the river Kaystros. The fire con-
veniently made it possible to construct the late Classical Artemision on higher ground than its predecessor. For an account of C7–C6 finds in the Artemision, see Wiplinger and Wlach (1995) 107–8. τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς Ἁρτέμιδος is mentioned in I.Ephesos 1438.4 (C4), from which it appears that citizenship grants were displayed in the temple.

Other temples or cult sites are attested epigraphically: I.Ephesos 101 (C5) mentions a hieron of Zeus Patroios and a hieron of Apollo Patroios, as does I.Ephesos 102 (c.300). The hieron of Zeus Patroios is also attested in I.Ephesos 104 (C5). I.Ephesos 107 is a C4 private dedication to Μητὴρ Ὄρειν.

The preserved theatre (TGR iii. 494–96) dates from the Hellenistic period, but an inscription of C4 (I.Ephesos 1440.10) stipulates that the honours bestowed on Sostratos are to be proclaimed in the theatre at the festival of Dionysos. According to Xen. Hell. 3.4.18 and Ages. 1.25, Ephesos had several gymnasias in C4. That Ephesos was fortified in C6 is apparent from Herodotos' account of a siege by Kroisos (1.26.2; cf. 1.141.4). So far, a C6 city wall has not been confirmed archaeologically, but a stretch of polygonal wall on the north slope of the Panayirdağ hill is dated by ceramic evidence to c.500 and is probably part of a city wall (Scherrer (2001) 60 figs. 3 no. 4 and 3 no. 9).

Of Ephesian festivals, the Thesmophoria are mentioned in Hdt. 6.16.2, and the Dionysia in I.Ephesos 1440.10 (C4). For the Artemisia and the Ephesia and the question as to whether these two names refer to one festival or two, see Hornblower (1991) 527–29 with references to the general discussion. A communal dedication by the Ephesians to Athena is recorded in IG II² 1486.6–6 (C4).

For the Ephesian calendar, see Trümper, Monat. 96–99 §84. At least six months were identical with the Athenian months.

Ephesian citizens are attested as victors in the Olympic Games (Olympionikai 398 (380), 431 (356) and 438 (352)), in the Isthmian Games (I.Ephesos 1416.20 (C4)) and in the Nemean Games (I.Ephesos 1415.6, 1416.20–21 (c.300)).


845. Erythrai (Erythraios) Map 56. Lat. 38.25, long. 26.30. Size of territory: 5, including several dependent poleis, for which see infra. Type: A. The toponym is Ἑρυθραῖος, αἱ (Hdt. 1.142.4; SEG 23 189.11.3 (c.330)). The city-ethnic is Ἑρυθραῖοι (Hdt. 1.142.4; IG III 14.4 (C5)). According to Steph. Byz. 280.8–9, an alternative toponym was Κύκωτοπόλεις, for which his authority may have been Hecat. fr. 228. In C5 the urban centre of Erythrai is called a polis by Hdt. 1.142.4 and in C4 in SEG 26 1282.5–6. Polis in the political sense is used about Erythrai in Hdt. 1.141.4, 142.4, 143.3. I.Erythrai 8.4–6 = Tod 155 (c.352–353); I.Erythrai 9.23 = Tod 165 (C4); SEG 31 969.8 (351–344). The polis cognate polites is used in SEG 31 969.15–16 (351–344) and SEG 36 1039.12 (c.400). Politia is applied to the Constitution of Erythrai in Arist. Pol. 1305b20–22. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in SEG 36 1039.5 (c.400); I.Erythrai 6.3 (394); and externally in Hipponax fr. 12, West (C6–C5); Hdt. 1.18.3; Dem. 8.24; IG III 14.4, 8, 22; and SEG 26 1282.11 (c.387). For the individual and external use, see PEP Phokaia 20 (undated).

The name of the territory is Ἑρυθραία, ἥ (Thuc. 3.29.2, 8.24.2, 33.2). Its size is likely to have varied considerably over time. In the Athenian tribute lists five communities are entered as part of the Erythraian synteleia, some or all of which may have been fully integrated into the Erythraian polis in C4 when our sources for them dry up. But it is highly likely that they had been dependent poleis in their own right in the Archaic period and C5; see infra. The settlement pattern on the Mimas peninsula is very complex, and the communities mentioned in the tribute quota lists have not even been securely located. In C5 Erythrai comprised Καρυκος, probably a settlement as well as a mountain (Thuc. 8.33.2) and the harbour Ἐμβατον (Thuc. 3.29.2). The borders of Erythrai with the poleis on the isthmus and perhaps with Chios (no. 840)—whose peraia may have included territory on the Mimas peninsula—cannot be established for the Archaic and Classical periods. The most important evidence concerning the territory of Erythrai in C4 is I.Erythrai 151 (c.340), which contains a list of roads linking a number of locations in the territory of the city. The following toponyms—all unlocated—are listed in the text:
According to Hellan. fr. 48, Erythrai was one of the poleis founded by Neleus, son of Kodros. Erythrai belonged to the Ionian dodekapolis (Hdt. 1.142.4) and contributed eight ships for the battle of Lade (Hdt. 6.8.2). In 391–388 Erythrai sent representatives who participated as judges in the arbitration between Miletos (no. 854) and Myous (no. 856) (Tod 113.5).

In C5 Erythrai was a member of the Delian League, from which it defected, perhaps in the 450s, but see Gehrke, Stasis 66 n. 4. Athens managed to win back Erythrai shortly afterwards (the conventional date is 452: the most important evidence for Athens’ imposing her will is IG I 14 = ML 40 and IG I 15, both mentioning a garrison and Athenian episkopos). Erythrai belonged to the Ionian district and is recorded as a paying member from 450/49 (IG I 263.11, 13.1) to 415/14 (IG I 290.1.29) a total of sixteen times, paying a phoros of often 7 tal. (IG I 268.11.27) but sometimes higher amounts, e.g. 9 tal. (IG I 264.11.28) or 12 tal. (IG I 283.11.28). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG I 71.1.126).

In 412 Erythrai joined forces with the Peloponnesians (Thuc. 8.14.2), and Erythraian infantry assisted the Lakedaimonians (Thuc. 8.16.1).

Five communities are recorded in the Athenian tribute lists together with Erythrai as Athenian dependencies: viz. the Boutheis, the Θελαίασιοι, the Πολικναίοι (ιται), the Πτελέσιοι and the Συντελεία. With one possible exception (IG I 5.11.11, completely restored), the Erythraioi are recorded as the first of the six communities, and the presumption is that the five others were dependencies dominated by Erythrai. In the years 450/49 to 447/6 the six communities formed a synteleia (IG I 13.1–18, 264.11.28–30, 265.15.58–64, 268.12.27–28, 268.11.27); from 443/2 to 438/7 they paid individually (269.1–12–25, 270.1–22–27, 271.1–18–20, 272.11–6–21, 273.1–12–11.6, 274.11.6–11). In 433/2 the tribute was paid by the Ερυθραίσιοι καὶ Χ αυτόκελες (IG I 279.1.48–49); and in 430/29 the five small communities are recorded after Erythrai but as communities belonging to Erythrai: Ευρipheryιοι, Βουθεισιοι, Ευρήπαρναίοι, etc. (IG I 281A.19–24), but later in the same inscription (61–66) they are recorded with their own ethnic without any mention of their dependent status. In later tribute lists and in the assessment decree of 425/4 we meet the Βουθεισιοι (IG I 282.1v.38, 283.11.29, 284.11.1), the Ελλαίοιοι (IG I 284.11.2–3, 71.1.151), the Πολικναίοι (IG I 283.11.30, 71.1.145) and the Πτελέσιοι (IG I 71.1.93), sometimes recorded as belonging to Erythrai; yet—and no doubt accidentally—there is no further reference to the Συντελεία. Syntelies were usually formed by grouping poleis together and not by severing civic subdivisions from a polis to which they formerly belonged (Schuller (1974) 58–60). Thus, the presumption is that the five small communities listed after the Erythraioi in the tribute lists were small poleis dependent on Erythrai (see the individual entries).

After the battle of Knidos in 394, Erythrai entered into an alliance with Athens (Diod. 14.83.3). Diplomatic relations, perhaps in the form of a treaty, are attested in IG II 108 (366/5). I Erythrai 9 = Tod 165 (after 350) concerns an alliance with promise of mutual military assistance between Erythrai and the tyrant Hermias at Atarneus (II. 15–30).

The earliest attested constitution seems to have been a narrow oligarchy controlled by the Basilidai (Arist. Pol. 1305b18–22), followed by a moderate democracy or a moderate oligarchy in which eligibility for being a dikastes was restricted by a census of thirty staters. Cases are initiated by a volunteer prosecutor (ho boulonomenos), introduced by the prytaneis, and heard by a dikasterion composed of nine men from each phyle (I. Erythrai 2A): i.e. twenty-seven dikastai altogether if there were three phylai (infra). No explicit qualifications are prescribed for active participation as a prosecutor in public actions. The decree may have permitted even those who were not full citizens but children of freedmen or foreigners to act as prosecutors (B.14–24 as interpreted by Engelmann and Merkelbach (1972) 28–29), and certain magistrates were presumably selected by lot (28.25–32; Engelmann and Merkelbach (1972) 29). In, probably, 453/2 a democratic constitution was enforced by Athens by a decree (IG I 14) which stipulates that the 120 members of the boule are to be selected by lot (II. 8–9).

Immediately before the Athenians passed their regulations for Erythrai, in response to the defection of that city from the Delian League, the city must have been ruled by a pro-Persian, oligarchic faction, perhaps for as limited a period as that which separates the two inscriptions I. Erythrai 2 and IG I 14. This may be inferred from the Athenian regulations for Erythrai (IG I 14), in which the previous regime in Erythrai is referred to as tyrannoi (I. 33). It is not known to what extent the regulations of IG I 14 were implemented. In the beginning of C4 there was a
democracy in place in Erythrai (Todd 106 = I.Erythrai 6); but an Athenian decree of 337 B.C. testifies to a stasis, probably between oligarchs who control the city and democrats in control of the territory. The decree anticipates the democrats' conquest of the town (SEG 26 1282; see Gehrke, Stasis 68). An oligarchic constitution can be assumed for C4L: no assembly is attested in a C4M citizenship decree (I.Erythrai 8 = Tod 155), and a decree is passed by the boule on the proposal of strategoi, prytaneis and epimenioi (SEG 31 969 (351–344)). An undated decree (I.Erythrai 10) providing for amnesty between Erythrainians in the city and exiles (presumably democrats) is normally placed in the context of the reintroduction of democracy by Alexander the Great (Gehrke, Stasis 69).

The eponymous official in C5 Erythrai was the ἐπισηματεύς (I.Erythrai 1.16–17; IG 13.14.5; SEG 36 1039.29 (c. 400)). The assembly is attested in SEG 36 1039.7 (c. 400); I.Erythrai 6.2 = Tod 106 (394) and I.Erythrai 21.1 (334–332). IG 13 14.13–14 suggests that the Erythrainians already had a boule when the Athenian decree was passed; cf. I.Erythrai 2 Α20. For the boule in C4, see SEG 36 1039.6 (c. 400); I.Erythrai 6.1 (394); Tod 155 = I.Erythrai 8.1 (350); I.Erythrai 21.1, 10 (334–332). Among other officials we find the γραµµατεύς (I.Erythrai 1.2, 3–5, 9, 19 (C5–C4)); a board of ἐξετασταί (I.Erythrai 1.14 (C5–C4)); I.Erythrai 21.2–3 (334–332); a ταµάιας (I.Erythrai 2.7 (C5–C4)); πρωτάνεις (I.Erythrai 2.29 (C5)); ἐπισηματεύς (SEG 31 969.3); στρατηγοὶ (I.Erythrai 9.19–21, 21.2 (334–332)); an ἀγωνοθέτης (I.Erythrai 21.16 (334–332)); and a ἱεροποιός (SEG 36 1039.9–10 (c. 400)). The epigraphic evidence includes several C5–C4 lists recording sales of real estate (I.Erythrai 153–54; SEG 37 917–19). It is uncertain whether the decree on trade, I.Erythrai 15 (C4), was passed by Chios (no. 840) or by Erythrai.

Erythrai granted προξενία and citizenship to Konon of Athens and his descendants in 394 (I.Erythrai 6.10–13 = Tod 106) and to Maussolos of Mysia (no. 913) and his descendants in the 350s (I.Erythrai 8.6). In C4 προξενία was received from Kolophon (no. 848) (AJP 56 (1935) 358–79 IV.6). Erythrian theorodokoi to host theoroi from Argos (no. 347) are attested in SEG 23 189.11.3 (330–324).

The civic subdivisions of Erythrai were phyliai (I.Erythrai 2.14 (C5), 14.2 (C4)), gene (SEG 31 969.16) and presumably also chiliastyes (I.Erythrai 17 from C5 is interpreted as a decree concerning the local affairs of the chiliastys of the Peponioi; the earliest designation of this local group as a chiliastys is I.Erythrai 81.14 (C1)). There may have been three phyliai (Jones, POAG 304). For free non-citizens, see I.Erythrai 2B.23–24 (C5), with a distinction between emancipated slaves and “foreigners” and SEG 36 1039.12 (c. 400).

Athena Polias is mentioned in I.Erythrai 208.8–9 (C4e) and 210.1 (C5–C4e). Other communal cults are those of Zeus Agoraios (I.Erythrai 2B.8–10), and Apollo and Asklepios (I.Erythrai 205 (380–360)). In I.Erythrai 21.14 (334–332) the Dionysia are mentioned as an occasion where public honours are to be proclaimed. A festival for Apollo and Asklepios is mentioned in I.Erythrai 205.28 (380–360). SEG 36 1039.3–4 (c. 400) contains evidence for theopropoi. IG 13 14.3–5 suggests a significant Erythraian presence at the festival of the Panathenaia.

Some of Erythrai’s public architecture is attested epigraphically: the pytaneion (I.Erythrai 21.17 (334–332)), the agora (I.Erythrai 8.12–13, 10.16 (C4), 151.2, 3, 6, 8, 14 (c. 340)) and a stoa (I.Erythrai 10.12–13). The earliest phase of the monumental temple of Athena dates back to C8, with rebuilding work in C6 and destruction in C5. The temple was rebuilt soon after, in the 530s (Mitchell (1985) 83). It is attested epigraphically (I.Erythrai 8.14 (350s), 21.20 (334–332)), as are the Herakleion (I.Erythrai 21.20–21) and a number of other cult sites mentioned in I.Erythrai 151 (c. 340), including sanctuaries of Athena (12), Apollo (25), Artemis (34) and Achilles (36). SEG 36 1039 (c. 400) concerns the construction of a new temple for Aphrodite Pandemos. A theatre is attested from C4L (TGR iii. 451, which was apparently still under construction in C3 (I.Erythrai 24.32 (277–275)). As for the involvement of the Erythraian government in matters relating to infrastructure, see I.Erythrai 151 (c. 340): water reservoirs, [ὕδατα] [διόχεια], may be referred to in l. 1, and an extensive network of public roads through Erythraian territory is attested in this inscription. There are two categories of road: ὁδὸς δηµοσίης and ὁδὸς ἀνδροβασµός (Engelman and Merkelbach (1972) 247). The acropolis is mentioned in IG 13 15.44 (c. 450); and I.Erythrai 21 (C4) mentions demolition of the acropolis, to which the honorand Phanes Mnesitheou has contributed. In 1966 there were excavations of Tempelschutt on the acropolis dating from c.670–545 (Mellink (1967) 169). The city walls of Erythrai enclose an area of 135 ha and are dated to C4L and I.Erythrai 22 relates to their construction (Migeotte (1992) 211–13 no. 68; McNicoll (1986) 310 with fig. 156); cf. Diod. 19.60.4 for a siege of the city in 315.

Erythrai struck silver and bronze coins in C6–C4.

(1) Silver on the Milesian standard, before 480: denominations: didrachm, trihemi-drachm, tetrobol, diobol. Types:
obv. naked horseman; rev. incuse square containing rosette. (2) Silver, c.480–400: denominations: drachm, trihemiobol, obol, tetartemorion: obv. naked man holding horse, or Pegasos, or bull’s head; rev. incuse square containing rosette; legend: \textit{EPY\Theta}. (3) Bronze, C; obv. head of Herakles in lion’s skin; rev. various types; legend: \textit{EPY}. (4) Silver and bronze, C4: denominations: tetradrachm, drachm, fractions in bronze: obv. head of Herakles in lion’s skin; rev. various types; legend: \textit{EPY} and magistrate’s name. (Babelon, \textit{Traité} ii.1. 302–6, ii.2. 1135–42; BMC \textit{Ionia} pp. 116–27; SNG \textit{Cap. Ionia} 554–617). According to Babelon, Erythrai stopped minting coins, as did Chios (no. 840), in 356 and resumed only in the Hellenistic period.

\textbf{846. Isinda (Isindios) Map 61. Unlocated.} Not in \textit{Barr.} Type: C. The toponym, known only from Steph. Byz. 338.14–16, is \textit{Σευδος} or \textit{Σευδα}. However, the name of the site \textit{Σευδα} close to Ephesos captured by Thibron in 391/90 as reported by Diod. 14.99.1 may be due to corruption of the text and may in fact have read \textit{Σευδα} originally (\textit{ATL} i. 493; cf. French (1994) 85–86). The city-ethnic is \textit{Ἰσίνιδος}, the collective use of which is attested externally in the Athenian tribute quota lists (IG i\textsuperscript{3} 269.1.30). Isinda was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionian district and is recorded from 445/4 (IG i\textsuperscript{3} 267.7.16, almost completely restored) to 416/5 (IG i\textsuperscript{3} 289.1.44) a total of nine times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of 1,000 dr. (IG i\textsuperscript{3} 280.1.44).

\textbf{847. Klazomenai (Klazomenios) Map 56. Lat. 38.20, long. 26.45.} Size of territory: ? Type: A. The toponym is \textit{Κλαζομενις}, αἱ (Hdt. i.142.3; IG xi.5 444 no. 27 (C3)). The city-ethnic is \textit{Κλαζομενις} (SEG 28 697.8 = Ager (1996) no. 15 (C4); IG i\textsuperscript{3} 9038 (C4)). In C5 Klazomenai is called a polis in the urban sense in Hdt. 1.142.3 and Thuc. 8.23.6, and in the political sense in Hdt. i.141.4, 142.3, 143.3. In C4 it is called a polis in the urban sense in Aen. Tact. 28.5, and in the political sense in Tod 113.21 and 38 (391–388) and SEG 28 696.3 (C4). The \textit{polis} cognate \textit{polites} is used in Aen. Tact. 28.5. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on C4 coins (\textit{infra}) and externally in Hipponax fr. 1, West (C6–C5); Hdt. 1.51.2; IG i\textsuperscript{3} 261.1.11, 262.11.17, etc.; Thuc. 8.14.3; Tod 114 = I.Erythrai 502.4 (387). For the individual and external use, see Pl. Ap. 26 D: \textit{Ἀναταγότων τοῦ Κλαζομενίος}; Isoc. 4.335 (rC5); I.Erythrai 16.10 (C4); IG i\textsuperscript{3} 9038 (C4).

The name of the territory was \textit{Κλαζομενία} in \textit{SEG} 28 697.10 = Ager (1996) no. 15; this inscription is an arbitration concerning the territory of Klazomenai and its neigh-bour(s) carried out by judges from Kos (no. 497) towards the end of C4. It has been suggested by Ager (1991) that Teos (no. 868) is one of the cities which was involved in the dispute. She suggests that, in the inscription, the entire territories of Teos and Klazomenai are defined, starting from the border of Kolophonia (l.11) in the east and moving westwards on to the isthmus of the Mimas peninsula.

It may be inferred from Ephor. fr. 25 that a location called \textit{Ἄμφυς} was part of Klazomenian territory; and another settlement, \textit{Σκυφία}, is mentioned in Ephor. fr. 26 = Steph. Byz. 580.5–6. Steph. Byz. calls Skyphia a ποληγίνου \textit{Κλαζομενίων}, but it is uncertain whether this site-classification stems from Ephoros. In Thuc. 8.14.3 and 8.23.6 we are informed that the Klazomenians fortified \textit{Πολιχρα} on the mainland. We do not know if this Polichne was identical with the Erythraian dependency known as Polichne (see \textit{infra} and Gomme et al. (1981) 35). At 8.23.6 Thucydides reports that those Klazomenians who had been responsible for the rebellion against Athens retired to \textit{Δαφνίος} after the Athenian conquest of Polichne (see also Thuc. 8.31.2; IG i\textsuperscript{3} 119.5 (407), and \textit{infra}). From Thuc. 8.31.3–4 it appears that the Klazomenians also controlled three neighbouring islands: Drymoussa, Pele and Marathoussa. These islands were used for safe keeping of property.

According to Paus. 7.3.9, the Klazomenians moved their urban centre from the mainland to the adjacent island because of their vulnerability to attacks in the Archaic period (see also Strabo 14.1.36). This is now confirmed by the finds at the site of Chyton (no. 841), identified as the Archaic urban centre of Klazomenai, which show that the settlement was abandoned in C6m.

Klazomenai belonged to the Ionian dodekapolis (Hdt. 1.142.3), and Klazomenian representatives acted as judges in the arbitration between Myous (no. 856) and Miletos (no. 854) in 391–388 (Tod 113.21–25). Klazomenai was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionian district and is recorded from 454/3 (IG i\textsuperscript{3} 259.iv.21) to 416/5 (IG i\textsuperscript{3} 289.1.39) a total of eighteen times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of first 1\frac{1}{2} tal. (IG i\textsuperscript{3} 261.1.11), raised to 5 tal., 2,000 dr. in 427/6 or 426/5 (IG i\textsuperscript{3} 284.6) and to 15 tal. in 416/5 (IG i\textsuperscript{3} 289.1.39). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i\textsuperscript{3} 71.1.47) and possibly also in 410/9 (IG i\textsuperscript{3} 100.7: \{\textit{Κλαζομηνίων \o\}). Klazomenai defected from the League in 412 and moved the urban centre from the island to Polichna on the mainland (Thuc. 8.14.3); but it was won back by Athens later in the same year. The bulk of the population was moved back to the island, while the anti-Athenian faction fled to Daphnous (Thuc. 8.23.6). A Spartan attempt to
conquer the island failed (Thuc. 8.31.2–3), and the Klazomenians were still allied to Athens in 410 (Xen. Hell. 1.110–11). A protracted *stasis* between the pro-Spartan and probably oligarchic faction in Daphnous and the pro-Athenian and probably democratic faction in the urban centre on the island (Thuc. 8.31.2–3) was provisionally ended in 407 by a treaty between the Athenians and the faction in Daphnous (*IG* 13 119.5 = *I. Erythrai* 501), but the *stasis* continued (Diod. 13.79.1); see Gehrke, *Stasis* 78.

In 387/6 there seems to have been a democratic government in place in Klazomenai, and a treaty with Athens was concluded in 387/6 (Tod 114 = *I. Erythrai* 502) with Klazomenai as a subordinate party. But it is also clear that a *stasis* of some kind had preceded this decree. *Stasis* appears to have been endemic in Klazomenai in C4 (Arist. Pol. 1303a9 and, perhaps, Aen. Tact. 28.5–6). In the King’s Peace of 386 Klazomenai is explicitly mentioned as an island belonging to Persia (Xen. Hell. 5.1.31), but, pace Gehrke, *Stasis* 79, there is no compelling evidence that a tyranny or a narrow oligarchy was set up by Python when he conquered Klazomenai in C4m (Aen. Tact. 28.5–6). The only unquestionably attested public enactment is a *pephisma* of C4 in SEG 28 696.6, moved by a board of *timouchoi* (l. 1) and implying that the Klazomenians levied taxes on imports and exports (l. 5).

Hierokleides of Klazomenai received *proxenia* from Athens (no. 361) in 424/3 (IG 13 227). Klazomenian *theorodokoi* to host perception from Argos (no. 347) are attested in SEG 23 189.11.1 (330–324). A cult of Athena Polias may be attested for Klazomenai: Oikonomos (221) 74 reported on an inscription which he found in a sanctuary on the island. He did not give a transcript of the text, but his description suggests that the goddess worshipped on the small acropolis on the island may have been Athena Polias.

There was a Klazomenian treasury in Delphi (Hdt. 1.51.2). According to Diod. 15.18.2, Kyme (no. 817) and Klazomenai consulted the oracle at Delphi in 383, shortly after the death of Tachos, in connection with their dispute over Leukai (no. 819), which contained an Apollo sanctuary. An Olympian victor, Herodotos of Klazomenai, is attested in Paus. 6.17.2 (C4 according to *RE* s.v. Herodotos 1, but not in *Olympionikai*). For a Klazomenian victor in the Pythia, see SEG 18 214 (C4–C3). SEG 18 214 is a communal dedication by the Klazomenians at Delphi (C4–C3).

Like other Ionian cities, Klazomenai may have been walled in the Archaic period (Hdt. 1.162.2). On the mainland site that housed the urban centre of Archaic Klazomenai there are C6 walls around the acropolis (Mellink 1983) 440). The island settlement was unfortified in 411 (Thuc. 8.31.3). Aen. Tact. 28.5–6 describes a stratagem by which Python of Klazomenai gained control over the city by making wagons stop in the gates, thereby allowing his forces to enter. The episode may belong in C4 after the King’s Peace (Gehrke, *Stasis* 79; Whitehead 1990) 179). Cook (1953–54) 151 described the walls of the island settlement as of massive square masonry with backing containing plenty of black glazed pottery of the early and middle C4. Both the mainland site and the island settlement have been under excavation during the 1980s and 1990s, but so far most finds await publication.

Klazomenai minted coins of electrum, silver and bronze from C6 to C4. A silver drachm was found in the Asyut hoard, dating from 499–494 (Price and Waggoner 1975) 85). (1) Electrum and silver on the Phoenician standard, C6–C5: denominations: didrachm, drachm, diobol. Types: *obv.* forepart of winged boar; *rev.* quadripartite incuse square. (2) Silver on the Attic standard, C4: denominations: hemidrachm, diobol: *obv.* forepart of winged boar, or head of Athena; *rev.* incuse square with Gorgoneion, or ram’s head; legend: *ΚΛΑΖΟ* or *ΚΛΑΖΟΣ* and magistrate’s name. (4) Bronze, C4: *obv.* head of Apollo slightly facing; *rev.* swan; legend: *ΚΛΑΔΑ* or *ΚΛΑΖΟ* or *ΚΛΑΖΟΜΕΝΗΩΝ*. (5) The satrap Orontas, c.362: *obv.* bearded head in satrapal tiara; legend: *K*; *rev.* forepart of winged boar; legend: *ΟΡΟΝΤΑ* (Head, *HN* 567–68; *BMC Ionia* 17–26; *SNG Cop. Ionia* 1–91. For the controversy surrounding the coin hoard of electrum staters at Klazomenai in a sealed jar in a 580s context, see Le Rider (1994)).

The Klazomenians were the original colonisers of Abdera (no. 640), according to Hdt. 1.168; they were also co-colonisers of Naukratis (no. 1023) in the reign of Amasis (Hdt. 2.178).

848. *Kolophon* (Kolophonios) Map 61. Lat. 38.05, long. 27.10. Size of territory: unknown but, including Notion (no. 858), at least 4. Type: A. The toponym is *Kolofon* (*IG* 13 37.9 (c.425) (cf. *infra*); *PEP Kolophon* 5.35 (311–306) either η (Minnermos fr. 9, West) or δ (Strabo 14.11.28). The city-ethnic is *Kolofonious* (*IG* 13 266.1.10; *Xen. Hell. 1.2.3) or *Kolofoninitês* (*IG* 13 261.v.10). The mercenary’s signature from Abu Simbel has *θολοφόνος* (ML. τι (591)). In C5 Kolophon is called a *polis* in the urban sense in Thuc. 3.34.1,
2, and in the political sense in Hdt. 1.141.4, 142.3–4, 143.3. In C4 it is called a polis in the urban sense in PEP Kolophon 6.1.9, 19 (311–306)), and in the political sense in PEP Kolophon 4.29, 82, 86 (311–306). The polis cognate politéis is used in PEP Kolophon 1.5, 6.28 (311–306). Κολοφωνίων πολιτεία was included among the 158 Aristotelian constitutions (fr. 520.1–2). The verb πολιτεύεσθαι is found in Thuc. 3.34.2. Hdt. 1.14.4 applies the word asty to the urban centre of Kolophon. The word patris is used of Kolophon in Hdt. 3.51 1125 (no. 334). The word patris is used of Kolophon in Hdt. 3.51 1125 (no. 334). The verb πολιτεύεσθαι is found in Thuc. 3.34.2; see Notion (no. 306). The northern and eastern boundaries of Kolophonian territory in the Archaic and Classical periods are unknown. In PEP Kolophon 6.9 (311–306) and on C5 coins (infra) and externally in Hdt 1.147.2; Thuc. 3.34.1; Xen. Hell. 1.2.3; PEP Kolophon 16 (a C4 inscription found in Byzantium, perhaps commemorating a public slave of Kolophon). The individual and external use of the city-ethnic is attested in ML 7f (591); Pind. fr. 188, Bergk; IG i3 65.9 (427/6) and 1347 (C5 tombstone set up at Athens).

The name of the territory is Κολοφωνία (SEG 28 697.10 = Iscr.Cos ED 174). This text may relate to an arbitration between Teos (no. 868) and Klazomenai (Ager (1991)); and if Ager’s interpretation is accepted, this inscription shows that Kolophonian territory bordered on the territories of Teos and Klazomenai (no. 847) in the west (see also Ager (1996) 67–69 no. 15). The northern and eastern boundaries of Kolophonian territory in the Archaic and Classical periods are unknown. In PEP Kolophon 6 (C4) the territory (chora) and urban centre (polis) are mentioned. The territory of Kolophon contained Klaros with its Apollo sanctuary and the harbour town Notion (Thuc. 3.34.1: Νότιον το Κολοφωνίων); see Notion (no. 858).

The history of Kolophon begins c. 700 with a stasis between two factions. One of the factions emigrated to Smyrna, then an Aiolian city, but subsequently the Kolophonians expelled the Smyrnaeans and had Smyrna turned into an Ionian city (Hdt. 1.16.2, 150.1–2; see Smyrna (no. 867)). C.660 Kolophon was conquered by Gyges of Lydia (Hdt. 11.14.4). According to Arist. fr. 601 and Timaios (FGrHist 556) fr. 56, Siris (no. 69) in southern Italy was founded by colonists from Kolophon, and a combination of the sources has led to the view that these colonists left Kolophon because of Gyges’ conquest (Demand (1990) 31–33; supra 293). Theognideae 1103, West, suggests that Kolophon was destroyed in a way similar to Smyrna (no. 867) and Magnesia (no. 852). It is uncertain whether the destruction of Kolophon was connected with Gyges’ conquest or should rather be connected, e.g., with the story that Alyattes of Lydia had all the Kolophonian knights killed (Polyaen. 7.2.2). Kolophon belonged to the Ionian dodekapolis (Hdt. 1.142.3) and must have been under Persian rule from the 540s.

In C5 Kolophon was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionian district and is recorded from 454/3 (IG i3 259.111.21) to 416/5 (IG i3 289.1.40) a total of sixteen times, four times completely restored, paying a phoros of first 3 tal. (IG i3 259.111.21), reduced to 1½ tal. in 446/5 (IG i3 266.1.10), raised to 3 tal. in 432/1 (IG i3 280.1.38) and reduced to 500 dr. in 428/7 (IG i3 283.111.24). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.1.135).

In 430 Kolophon was conquered by the Persians in consequence of a stasis between the citizens. The Kolophonians living in the city fled and settled in Notion (no. 858). The stasis flared up again, and the city of Notion was divided into two sections separated by a wall. One part, described as a teichos, was inhabited by Medising Kolophonians and Notieis who now united and formed a political community. The other part of the city was inhabited by the opposite faction of Kolophonian immigrants (and, undoubtedly, some Notieis). In 427 they invited an Athenian squadron under Paches. The Athenians conquered the teichos, expelled the Medising Kolophonians, gave Notion to the other Kolophonians, and later sent a contingent of Athenian colonists supplemented with Kolophonians from all poleis (Thuc. 3.34.1–4). This incident is reflected in the Athenian tribute lists, where the phoros paid by Kolophon is reduced from 3 tal. in 432/1 to 500 dr. paid in 428/7 and the following years down to 416/15 (supra). For corresponding variations in Notion’s payments, see infra 1089. An undated C5 treaty between Athens and Kolophon with Kolophon as a subordinate party (IG i3 37, cf. 42–43) must belong in this context too, since it regulates the relations between the Kolophonians and the Athenian colonists (ll. 20, 23, 42). In the following period Notion and Kolophon are both listed side by side as members of the Delian League, viz. in 428/7 (IG i3 283.111.23–24), 421/0 (IG i3 285.1.40–41) and 416/5 (IG i3 289.1.40–41). Thus, both persisted as separate political communities, but inland Kolophon was still in Persian hands and was not reconquered by the Athenians until 409 (Xen. Hell. 1.2.4). It is unknown whether, from 427 to 409, the communities of the Kolophonians and Notieis were both centred on Notion, or whether a New Kolophon-at-Sea was founded, a community that remained distinct from the community of the Notieis who occupied the harbour of Notion; see Piéart (1984) 168–71, pointing out that the Kolophon mentioned in IG i3 37.9 is probably the New Kolophon, inhabited by the Kolophonians and the Athenian colonists. Following Mattingly (1966) 210–12 (= (1996)
174–78, 372–74, Piérart prefers a low dating of IG i3 37, 42–43, contra IG i3 pp. 40–41 followed by Gehrke, Stasis 80.

According to Arist. Pol. 1290¹/14–17, Kolophon had been an oligarchy before their war against the Lydians; but the oligarchy was of a peculiar kind, in so far as those citizens who met the property qualifications outnumbered those who did not. It is normally assumed that Kolophon continued as an oligarchy well into C5m (Gehrke, Stasis 80). The “New Kolophon” founded by Athenian colonists and Kolophonians in the 420s was democratic (IG i3 37.47–49; Thuc. 3.34.4). Very little is known about Kolophon’s history in C4. Gehrke, Stasis 81–82 assumes that it had an oligarchic constitution, introduced after the King’s Peace and replaced with a democracy by Alexander (PEP Kolophon 6 (311–306)).

Civic subdivisions of Kolophon in the Archaic and Classical periods are unattested apart from gene, for which see Robert (1936) 163–64, who discusses the use of gene designations in PEP Kolophon 6 (311–306).

A νόμος Κολοφονίων is referred to in the heavily restored inscription IG i3 37.43 (447/6). In C4 the eponymous official of Kolophon was the πρόεδροι (PEP Kolophon 6). Evidence of the assembly is found in PEP Kolophon 1 (a C4l probouleumate decree) and 6, with mention of an ἐκκλησία κυρία (l. 32). The Kolophonian boule is attested in PEP Kolophon 1 and 6. Officials connected with council and assembly are the ἐπωμήνιοι (PEP Kolophon 4 (311–306)) and the πρόεδροι (PEP Kolophon 8 (C4–C3)); see Rhodes, DGS 357. Other officials attested epigraphically are the καρπολόγοι (PEP Kolophon 6) and the board of πωλῆται (PEP Kolophon 4). For a Kolophonian embassy, see IG ii² 456.22–28 (307/6).

In C4l the Kolophonians bestowed πρύτανις and citizenship on two citizens of Erythrai (no. 456). In C4 (probably between 366 and 338) in IG vii.414.16. IG ii² 456 b.4–8 records a dedication of a wreath to Athena by the demos of Kolophon (307/6).

The remains of Kolophon excavated by Holland and published in 1944 are not easy to interpret; see Hoepfner and Osthues in Hoepfner et al. (1999) 280–91. C.311–306 the “old” Kolophon was merged with a new and larger urban centre (PEP Kolophon 6). It appears that, in connection with the joining together of the two urban centres, the buildings in the old centre were to be either privatised or demolished along with the old agora (l. 26). It may be inferred from the participle καταβάντας (l. 14) that the old city was located at a lower level than the C4 settlement; but its precise location cannot be determined. Holland found evidence for C7 structures close to a C4 stoa and another structure, also C4, which he interpreted as the Metroon. The Metroon is also attested epigraphically (PEP Kolophon 5). Miller (1978) 109–12, 127–28 classifies the building as a pytaneion annex. Hoepfner and Osthues (in Hoepfner et al. (1999)) conclude that the Archaic city must have been located on the slope of the acropolis, pace e.g. Migeotte (1992) 217, who follows Holland’s (1944) suggestion that the old city was located in the plain to the north-east of the acropolis. In PEP Kolophon 6 temples in the old city are referred to generally, and in 16–18 there is specific reference to altars for Zeus Soter, Poseidon Asphaleios, Apollo Klarios, Meter Antaie, Athena Polias and “the other gods and heroes”.

PEP Kolophon 6 concerns a great project of fortification which served in part to reunite the site of current habitation with the old (and apparently abandoned) urban centre of Kolophon (Migeotte (1992) 214–23 no. 69). Some fortificationary structures were clearly already in existence (22–23); but it is not clear if these fortifications enclosed the old or the new settlement; see de la Genière (1994). The circuit of “New” Kolophon encloses an area of 80+ ha (Hoepfner et al. (1999) 284).
Urbanisation may have taken place quite early at Kolophon; Hdt. 1.15.1 refers to Gyges’ conquest of the asty of Kolophon in C7. Remains of an early Archaic settlement (C7) have been found on the slope of the acropolis (Holland (1944)).

Kolophon struck coins of silver and bronze from C6 until throughout C5 and C4. The earliest silver types: (1) c. 525–490 on the Persian standard: denominations: hemiobol, trihemitetartemorion, tetartemorion; obv. head of Apollo facing; rev. incuse square; legend: HM, TPI, TE indicating denomination. (2) C5 on the Persian standard: denominations: drachm, trihemiot, quarterobol; obv. Artemis laureate, or Apollo laureate; legend: KO or KOLPΩNION or KOLOPHΩNION; rev. lyre within incuse square; legend sometimes on rev. Silver and bronze, c.389–330 on the Rhodian standard: denominations: tetradrachm, drachm, hemidrachm, diobol and fractions in bronze: obv. head of Apollo laureate; rev. lyre, or tripod; legend: KOLE or KOLΦΩ or KOLOΦΩNION and magistrate’s name (Head, HN 569–70; BMC Ionia 36–40; SNG Cap. Ionia 133–48).

For the Kolophonian foundation of Siris (no. 69) in southern Italy, see supra 1078.

849. Korykos (Korykaioi) Map 56. Lat. 38.10, long. 26.35. Size of territory: unknown but probably 1 or 2. Type: C. The toponym Kόρυκος, δ’ (Thuc. 8.14.1, 33.2, 34) designates primarily the mountain in the southern part of the territory of Erythrai (no. 845) (Thuc. 8.33.2; Hecat. fr. 231) but also a homonymous community, described by Ephor. fr. 27 as a polismation (Barr. records the mountain but not the settlement). The city-ethnic is Κόρυκαίος (Ephor. fr. 27; Strabo 14.1.32). Korykos was located in Erythrai territory (Thuc. 8.33.2), and it had another small community, Myonnesos (no. 855), as its neighbour (Ephor. fr. 27). On the coast along the foot of the mountain there was a row of small harbours, which were all nests of pirates (Ephor. fr. 27; Strabo 14.1.32). Korykos seems to have been one of them. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested in an external context in Ephor. fr. 27 and in a proverb quoted by Strabo 14.1.32. A controversy surrounds some Imperial coins which may or may not have been minted by this community (see Imhoof-Blumer (1902) 463 versus von Aulock (1968) versus Robert (1981) 352 n. 42).

850. Lebedos (Lebedios) Map 61. Lat. 38.05, long. 27.00. Size of territory: probably 2 or 3. Type: A. The toponym is Λεβέδος, ἡ (Thuc. 8.19.4; Strabo 14.1.29). The city-ethnic is Λέβεδος (Michel 484.2–3 (C4l)). Lebedos is attested as a polis both in the urban sense (Hdt. 1.142.3) and in the political sense (Hdt. 1.141.4, 142.3, 143; Tod 113.26, 39 (391–388); Syll. 3 344.19 (c.303)). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on C2 coins (Head, HN 580) and externally in IG i3 71.1.138, 263.11.6, 266.1.13; Tod 113.26 (391–388); Syll. 3 344.6 (c.303). Lebedos belonged to the Ionian dodekapolis (Hdt. 1.142.3), and its representatives participated in the C4 arbitration between Miletos (no. 854) and Myous (no. 856) (Tod 113.26). It is also clear from Michel 484 that in C4 the Lebedians were part of the Ionian association, presumably with representatives in the common Ionian boule.

Lebedos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionian district and is recorded from 451/50 (IG i3 262.11.32) to 430/29 (IG i3 281.1.42, mostly restored) a total of eleven times, four times completely restored, paying a phoros of 3 tal. down to, probably, 447/6 (IG i3 265.1.33) and thereafter 1 tal. (IG i3 266.1.13). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.1.138). It revolted in 411 (Thuc. 8.19.4).

The most important evidence for Lebedos is Syll. 3 344, which contains Antigonos I’s instructions concerning the synecism of Lebedos (c.303). The decree is difficult to use retrospectively, but it can be inferred from I. 21 that Lebedos had issued grants of proxenia. Theorodokoi of Lebedos to host theoreoi from Argos (no. 347) are attested in SEG 23 189.11.6 (330–324).

Michel 484.1–9 refers to a lawsuit concerning the priesthood of Zeus Boulaios and Hera, in which the Lebedians were involved. It is possibly an inter-polis dispute over a common Ionian priesthood.

In Antigonos I’s instructions on the proposed synecism of Teos and Lebedos, Syll. 3 344.24–26 (c.303), it is assumed that symbolaia exist between the two cities, and that each of them has its own laws.

The eponymous office of πρύτανις mentioned in Michel 484.1 and 10 may have pertained to Lebedos, as argued by Magnetto (1997) 63, rather than to Priene (no. 861), as has normally been assumed.

The walls of Lebedos were described by G. Weber (1904) 229, who did not attempt to date the fortification. It is presumably Hellenistic.

851. Leukophrys Map 61. Lat. 37.50, long. 27.30, but see infra. Size of territory: ? Type: A. The toponym is Λέυκοφρυς (Xen. Hell. 3.2.19). This community, which, in Classical sources, is attested only in two passages in Xen. Hell., is called a polis in the urban sense at 4.8.17. It was located in the Maiandros valley, and contained a
famous sanctuary of Artemis (3.2.19). It may have been situated at the site of the refounded Magnesia on the Maiandros (thus Barr.), but this cannot be determined with certainty.

852. Magnesia (Magnes) Map 61. Location before 399 unknown, after 399: lat. 37.50, long. 27.30. Size of territory: ?

Type: A. The toponym is Ἀγνησία, Ἡ (Hdt. 1.161, 3.122.1, 125.2) or Μαγνησία Ἡ Ασιανή (Thuc. 1.138.5, 8.50.3). The city-ethnic is Μάγνης (IG xi.6 35.3 (C4)); cf. Shipley (1987: 163), to which Hdt. 3.90.1 adds ὥς ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ. In C4 Magnesia is called a πόλις both in the urban sense (Ps.-Skylax 98: πόλις Ἐλληνίς; cf. also Diod. 14.36.3 (1400)) and in the political sense (SEG 14 459.7 (C4/C3e)). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested both externally (Archil. fr. 20, West; Theognidea 603, 1103, West) and internally on C4m coins (infra) and in inscriptions (I.Magnesia 2.13 (C4l)). The individual and external use of the city-ethnic is attested in IG xi.6 35.3 (C4l) and CEG 11 855 (C4l/C3e), which also uses patris about the community.

In Hdt. 3.90.1, the Magnesians of Asia are mentioned alongside the Ionians and Aiolians, and they seem to have been regarded as a group apart. According to SEG 14 459.7–9 (= CEG II 855 (C4l/C3e)), Magnesia was founded from Thessaly. Presumably in C7, Magnesia waged war against Ephesos (no. 844) (Kallinos fr. 3, West). A physical destruction of Magnesia by the Kimmerians in C7 is related by Strabo 14.1.39–40, who cites Archilochos (fr. 20, West) as corroboration. He also claims that Miletos (no. 854) annexed the site, but it is not known for how long the Milesians were in control. Hdt. 1.161 shows that the city had been rebuilt by 547/6, when it was plundered by Mazares and subjected to Persia.

The city remained under Persian control even after the establishment of the Delian League: the Persian king granted tax-levying rights at Magnesia to Themistokles during the latter's exile (Thuc. 1.138.5). When Astyochos approached Tissaphernes in connection with Alkibiades' intrigues in 411, Tissaphernes was apparently based in Magnesia (Thuc. 8.50.3). The city was under the control of Tissaphernes in 400 when it was captured by Thibron. When Thibron failed to take Talleis, he returned to Magnesia, and because the city was unfortified, he decided to relocate it to a mountain nearby called Thorax (Diod. 14.36.2–4).

Very little is known about the constitution of Magnesia. The Aristotelian collection of constitutions included a Μάγνητον πολιτεία (Heracl. Lemb. 50; Arist. no. 106), and at Pol. 1289b38–40 Aristotle mentions the importance of the cavalry of Archaic Magnesia as an illustration of his claim that communities dependent on such forces tended to have an oligarchic constitution. But Magnesia was evidently a democracy in late C4 (I.Magnesia 1 and 2).

I.Magnesia 1 (C4) and 2 (C4l) are both public enactments passed by the Magnesian assembly (2.8–9: ἐδὸξε τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ). The eponymous official of Magnesia in C4l was the πρῶτανις (2.2–3). The Magnesian boule is attested in I.Magnesia 2.8 (cited supra) in a probouleucic capacity. A grammateus (of the boule) is attested in 2.7. A Magnesian theorodokos to host theoroi from Argos (no. 347) is attested in SEG 23 189.11.11 (330–324). The months Ἀγγεῖον (I.Magnesia 1.3) and Παλλεῖον (I.Magnesia 2.3) are attested for C4. Both are untypical of Ionian calendars (Trümper, Monat. 110–11 §94). A Magnesian victor in the Olympic Games is attested in C51 (Olympionikai 329), another in 344 (Olympionikai 449), and one in the Pythian Games is attested in C4–C3 (SEG 14 459).

The citizen body of Magnesia was subdivided into phylai in C4 (I.Magnesia 2.4). The names of five phylai are attested in inscriptions of C3f (I.Magnesia 2.5, 6, 9, 11), and all five are named after the Olympian gods (Ares, Aphrodite, Hermes, Hestia and Zeus). Thus, Magnesia may already in the Classical period have had all twelve phylai named after the twelve Olympian gods (Jones, POAG 315–17). Proxenia and probably also citizenship were given to the Macedonian Apollonophanes (I.Magnesia 2 (C4l)). A grant of enktesis is given in I.Magnesia 2.15, and Magnesian tax-levying powers may be inferred from the grant of ateleia in I.Magnesia 2.15–16. Resident free non-citizens are attested in the C4 funerary monuments I.Magnesia 258 (Ἄρκατος) and 259 (Σμηνίτης).

The agora of C5 Magnesia is attested in Thuc. 1.138.5. The sanctuary of Artemis Leukophryene (Xen. Hell. 3.2.19) presumably lay within the urban centre of the relocated Magnesia (supra). Foundations dating back to 600 have been discovered beneath the Hellenistic Artemision.

The earliest attested coinage is a C5m silver didrachm on the Attic standard bearing the name Themistokles (BMC Ionia 158). Types: obv. Apollo standing, holding olive branch; legend: ΘΕΜΙΣΤ[ΟΚ]ΛΕΟΣ; rev. eagle with spread wings, border square of dots; legend: MA. From C4m Magnesia struck coins of silver and bronze. (1) Silver: denominations: tetradrachm, didrachm, drachm and fractions down to obol: obv. horseman holding spear; rev. humped bull; legend: magistrate's name and ΜΑΓΝ or,
sometimes, ΜΑΓΝΗΤΩΝ, all in maenader pattern. (2) Bronze: obv. Apollo laureate; rev. maedander pattern; legend: magistrate’s name and ΜΑΓ. (Head, HN2 381–82; Babelon (1930) 45; SNG Cop. Ionia 802–43.)

853. Marathesion (Marathesios) Map 56. Lat. 37.50, long. 27.15. Size of territory: probably 1. Type: C. The toponym is Μαραθήσιος, τῆς (Ps.-Skylax 98). The city-ethnic is Μαραθήσιος (IG i 3 270.1.6 (442/1)). In the Archaic and Classical periods this community is attested only in the Athenian tribute lists and in Ps.-Skylax 98, who unfortunately offers no site-classification.

From I.Priene 37.57–58 (C2) it appears that Samos (no. 864) claimed to have received Marathesion from Miletos (no. 854) after the Meliac War (c.700), and according to Strabo 14.1.20 Ephesos (no. 844) later received Marathesion from the Samians in return for Anaiia (no. 838). The date of this transfer cannot be determined. Thus, Marathesion seems to have been a dependent polis first under Miletos, then under Samos, and finally under Ephesos.

Marathesion was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionian district and is recorded from 443/2 (IG i 3 269.1.5, completely restored) to 415/4 (IG i 3 290.1.28) a total of seven times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of first 3,000 dr. (IG i 3 270.1.6) but 2,000 dr. from 433/2 on (IG i 3 279.1.16).

854. Miletos (Mileisios) Map 61. Lat. 37.35, long. 27.15. Size of territory: 5. Type: A. The toponym is Μίλητος, ἡ (Hecat. fr. 240; Thuc. 8.27.6; Syll. 3 273.8 (C48)). The city-ethnic is Μιλῆτιος (Hdt. 2.179.1; Syll. 3 273.5 (C48)). The earliest reference to Miletos as a polis is in Hymn. Hom. Ap. 180 (Μίλητον ἐχεις ἄναλον πόλιν (C8–C9?!)), where polis is used in the urban sense. In C5 Miletos is called a polis both in the urban sense (Hdt. 6.20; Thuc. 8.25.4) and in the political sense (Hdt. 5.29.2; Milet. v1.1 187.7 = ML 43). In C4 again, both the urban sense (OGIS 231.10 (c.300)) and the political sense (Xen. An. 1.1.6; Syll. 3 1002.5 = LSAM 44 (c.400)) are attested. Polisma is found at Hdt. 6.6; for the idiom used, see Hansen (1995) 61 n. 154. The polis cognate politeia (citizenship) is used in SEG 38 1193.8 (330–320), in which there may also be an attestation of the word polites (pl.) in l. 5. The Aristotelian collection of constitutions may have included a Miliotion politeia (Arist. no. 116), but the evidence adduced by Gigon is rather slim. The word asty is used about the urban centre of Miletos in Hdt. 5.29.2 and 5.92.12; and Hdt. 5.99.2 uses astos about the citizens. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in Milet. 1.3 135.5 = Syll. 3 273 (C4) and externally in Demodokos fr. 1.1, West (C6?); Hdt. 4.137.2; Xen. An. 1.11.11; IG i 3 21.67; and Tod 195.1 (c.330). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in Hdt. 4.137.1; Xen. Hell. 2.1.30; IG i 3 1356 (C5); and SEG 35 942 (Chios (C4)).

The name of the territory is Ἡ Μιλησίη (–a) (Hdt. 1.17.2; Thuc. 8.26.3). It was large and diverse and may have been as much as 2,000 km² (Burford (1993) 19; Lohmann (1995), (1997), (1999); cf. Mitchell (1999) 154 for a summary). There were four distinct parts: Milies itself (the limestone peninsula on which the city was situated on the northern side); Mt. Grion (the upland area to the east of Milesia); the lower Mianandros valley (then on the opposite shore of the Gulf of Latmos, controlled by Miletos perhaps as far as Magnesia); and the Miliesan islands (Leros, Patmos, Lade, Pharmakoussa and probably also Lepsia). The physical distinction between different parts of Miliesan territory may be reflected in Hdt. 6.20 (τῆς δὲ Μιλησίων χώρας . . . τὰ περὶ τῆς πόλεως, δὴ ἐν υπεράκρισι). The territory comprised a number of named locations: Assesos (Hdt. 1.19.1), Didyma/Branchidai (Hdt. 1.46.2, 157.3) and the harbour Panormos (Hdt. 1.157.3). The city also controlled some areas in the Mianandros valley (Hdt. 1.18.1). As for Miliesan state control of Didyma, see Hdt. 5.36.3: the scholar Hekataios reportedly suggested fund raising for the revolt against the Persian king by appropriating the temple treasures donated by Kroisos. Discussing the Archaic period, Tuchelt (1988) 433 n. 55 distinguishes—somewhat anachronistically—between zones of Miliesan influence, directly controlled areas, and communities that belonged to a Milesian “federation” (Staatsverband).

Assesos (modern Mengerevtepe: Lohmann (1995) 311) is known from Herodotos’ account of the destruction of the sanctuary of Athena Assesia by Alyattes (1.10–21). The location of the sanctuary is epigraphically attested by a C6 dedication (Herrmann (1995) 288–92; cf. Wachter (1998)). Lohmann (1995) 313–4 reports that sondages in the temple carried out by von Graeve in 1993 confirm the report of Hdt. 1.19.1 of the destruction of the temple in the twelfth year of Alyattes’ reign (608 or 598 or 594), and a further sondage revealed layers pointing to a second destruction by the Persians in 494. The sanctuary seems to have lost its significance after the second destruction. Assesos was surrounded by a C5s wall (2 m wide) with three towers and a gate protecting not only the settlement itself, but also the coastal part of the Miliesan chor(a) as a whole (Lohmann (1995) 314–21).

Τειχιώσα: the toponym is Τειχιώσα (1 Didyma 6.1) or Τειχιώσα (Thuc. 8.26.3, 28.1; IG i 3 71.1.122). The only pos-
itive indication pointing to Teichionissa as a proper (dependent?) polis is LDidyma 6.1, in which a Τειχιώσης ἄρχος is attested. However, he may have been a Milesian official who was in charge of the settlement. The polis status of Teichionissa in the Archaic period cannot be ascertained (see Gehrke (1980) 30 n. 78, who leaves open the possibility that Teichionissa became fully integrated into Milesian territory only after the return of the democrats who had formed a splinter community there in C5). It is clear that if Teichionissa had ever been a polis in its own right in the Archaic period, it certainly was not a member of the Delian League in its own right: in 454/3 Teichionissa provided a temporary home to Milesian democrats loyal to Athens (IG 17 259.vi.21–22: Μιλήσιοι ἐχς Λέρος Ἐκ Τειχιώσας τῆς Μιλήσιας). Voigtländer (1986) 627 describes remains of fortifications and housing complexes dating from between 750 and 550. He also reports on the remains of an Archaic city wall, and he concludes on the basis of finds of Attic ceramic that the site was inhabited in C5m (ibid. 629–30). In a C4 source Teichionissa is explicitly classified as a kome (Archestratos fr. 42).

Leros: the toponym is Λέρος, ἦ (Hdt. 5.125; Thuc. 8.26.1, 27.1; IG1 284.16). There is also an attestation of the collective and individual use of what may have been a city-ethnic, Λέρος (Demodokos frr. 1–2, West (C67). In 454/3, like Teichionissa, Leros provided a temporary home to Milesian democrats loyal to Athens and paid a phoros of 3 tal. (IG 17 259.vi.21–22: Μιλήσιοι ἐχς Λέρο). In later years Leros and Teichionissa were recorded by toponym after the Milesians, and the payment recorded for all three amounts to 10 tal. (IG 17 284.15–17 (427/6 or 426/5), 285.1.88–90 (421/0) and 489.1.36–38 (416/15)). In 411 Teichionissa was definitely part of Milesian territory (Thuc. 8.26.3: Τειχιώσας τῆς Μιλήσιας). There is also an attestation of the collective and individual use of what may have been a city-ethnic, Λέρος (Demodokos fr. 39, Archestratos fr. 42). In later years Leros and Teichionissa were recorded by toponym after the Milesians, and the phoros recorded for all three amounts to 10 tal. (IG 17 284.15–17 (427/6 or 426/5), 285.1.88–90 (421/0) and 489.1.36–38 (416/15)). According to Hdt. 5.125, Hekataios reportedly advised the Milesian epitropos to construct a fortress (τείχος) on the island, apparently under Milesian control, and wait there for an opportunity to return safely to Miletos. In a C4s honorific decree (Manganaro (1963–64) no. 1), the inhabitants of the island refer to themselves as τοὺς ἐν τῇ νήσῳ κατοικοῦντας τῶν πολιτῶν (4, 9–10) or as τῶν οἰκτήρων τῶν ἐλ Λέρος (6), and it is clear that by that time the inhabitants of the island represented themselves as Milesian citizens. Their assembly, ἐκκλησία (5), may have been roughly similar to the assembly of an Athenian deme. See further no. 504.

Ionia Polis (modern Mersinet Iseklesi). There is no evidence pertaining to the Archaic or Classical periods, and Peschlow-Bindokat’s assumption that the place existed as a quarry and harbour already in the Archaic period rests entirely on evidence from the Apollo temple at Didyma ((1977) 100, (1977–78)).

Didyma, alternatively Branchidai (Hdt. 1.46.2, 92.2, 157.3, with Ehrhardt (1998)), was located in Milesian territory already in the Archaic period (Hdt. 1.46.2). However, its status in the Archaic and early Classical periods is problematic: Tuchelt (1988) 430–31 suggests that Didyma was in fact an independent unit rather than just an extra-urban Milesian sanctuary (see esp. 433), but Ehrhardt (1998) counters that all evidence, including the Sacred Way along with an Archaic sacred law, points to an early connection between the cult site and the polis of Miletos. In C4m the sanctuary minted its own bronze coins. Types: obv. head of Apollo Didymeus, laureate, facing three-quarters l.; rev. lion standing l., looking back at star; legend: ΕΓ ΔΙΔΥΜΩΝ ΙΕΡΗ (Head, HN2 585; BMC Ionia 189).

As far as the territory of Classical Miletos is concerned, Lohmann (1997) 310 concludes that the minimum size of Miletis proper must have been at least 400 km². He reckons that the mountain range south of the Gulf of Akbük provided a natural boundary to the south, but notes that there are still problems connected with fixing the eastern boundary of the territory (ibid. 290). Apart from the marble quarries on the eastern Gulf of Latmos, the region lacks any important mineral resources. Good soils exist only on the northern side of Miletis, on a plain between Miletis and Assesos, and around the coasts. The islands, Mt. Grion and most of Miletis are hilly and have poor soils, unsuitable for arable cultivation. However, the deep rich lacustrine soil of the Maiandros valley is extremely fertile and retains moisture well, making it ideal for cereal production (Braun (1995) 32–33), and it was replenished annually by the flooding of the river Maiandros. This, in addition to probably quite extensive wool production on the uplands, made the territory of Miletos agriculturally productive; and Milesian possessions in the Maiandros valley were the object of several disputes; cf. the C4e arbitration between Miletis and Myous (no. 856) concerning territory in the Maiandros valley (Tod 113).

The size of the Milesian population was undoubtedly considerable already in the Archaic period, although it cannot be calculated with precision. It has been estimated that the early Archaic town may have had about 4,000 houses (Gates (1995) 238), undoubtedly an exaggerated figure.
(Hansen (2000) 179 n. 208). But the eighty Milesian ships at Lade in 494 (Hdt. 6.8.1) and the 2,000 hoplites in 424 (Thuc. 4.5.4.1) testify to a large population.

According to a tradition that may go back as early as C7, Miletos was founded by Neileus (Hdt. 9.97), whose hero may have been located just outside the Holy Gate (Herd (1998)). Archaeological evidence points to the existence of a (probably) Ionian Greek settlement from c.1050, and there are architectural remains of the Archaic urban centre dating from c.700 (Greaves (2002) 75–79). Relatively little is known about the history of Miletos in the early Archaic period, and most of our literary and epigraphical sources are late and unreliable. It is widely assumed that Miletos was ruled by an oligarchy in the period prior to the ascent of the tyrant Thrasyboulos in the last quarter of C7 (e.g. Gorman (2001) 101–21), but the accounts of the rivalries between different aristocratic families during C8 and C7 all date from the late Hellenistic and Roman periods.

According to Hdt. 1.142.3, Miletos belonged to the Ionian dodekapolis. During the Archaic period Miletos’ relationships with other Greek poleis in the region appear to have been determined to some extent by its enduring hostility towards Samos (no. 864), its most significant commercial rival. Hdt. 5.99.1 implies that Miletos offered military assistance to Eretria (no. 370) in Euboea in its war against Chalkis (no. 365), mainly on the grounds that Samos was aiding the latter in the so-called Lelantine War (on which see, e.g., Tausend (1992) 137–45). Miletos formed an alliance with Mytilene (no. 798) and perhaps other poleis on Lesbos (Hdt. 3.39.4), from which it received assistance against Samos during the reign of Polykrates, probably c.530 (see e.g. Tausend (1992) 86–87). There is also evidence of Milesian engagement in other regional conflicts. In its attempts to resist the invasions of Alyattes in C7, it was assisted by Chios (no. 840), allegedly in return for the help that Miletos had given to Chios in its war against its main rival Erythrai (no. 845) (Hdt. 1.18.3). Tausend (1992) 74–78, 83–85 discusses the evidence for two further Milesian alliances in the Archaic period: one with Erythrai against Naxos (no. 507), perhaps in the first half of C7, and the other with Samos against Priene (no. 861) in the first half of C6. During C7 Miletos suffered repeated attacks by the Lydians during the successive reigns of Gyges, Ardys, Sadyattes and Alyattes (Hdt. 1.14.4–22.4). According to Hdt. 1.18.1–22.4, the troops of Alyattes invaded Milesian territory for twelve consecutive years, until a treaty of xenia and symmachia was eventually concluded between Alyattes and the Milesian tyrant Thrasyboulos in the twelfth year of Alyattes’ reign (608 or 598 or 594). Herodotos’ account of the accidental destruction by fire of the temple of Athena in Assos (modern Mengeretep), which ultimately led Alyattes to end the war on terms favourable to the Milesians, is confirmed by archaeological evidence from the temple site (Lohmann (1995) 313–14). The treaty may have been upheld by Alyattes’ successor Kroisos, but this has been disputed (cf. e.g. Tausend (1992) 95–96; Gorman (2001) 123–24). After the Persian conquest of Lydia, Kyros is reported (Hdt. 1.141.4) to have granted the Milesians the same terms as they had previously had with the Lydians, and Herodotos seems to assume that the treaty originally contracted between Alyattes and Thrasyboulos had still been in force during Kroisos’ reign. The granting of favourable terms to Miletos by the Lydians and subsequently by the Persians presumably served the purpose of driving a wedge between Miletos with its considerable military strength and the other Ionian poleis. If this was indeed the Lydian and, later, the Persian strategy, it seems to have worked (Hdt. 1.141.4): Miletos held aloof from the Ionian attempt to form a united front against the Persians after 546.

It is widely assumed that Thrasyboulos’ reign was followed first by the rule of two further tyrants, Thoas and Damasenor (Plut. Mor. 298C–D), or by a narrow oligarchy and then by a period of stasis between two factions called “the Aeinautai” and “the Cheiromachai” respectively. The stasis referred to by Plutarch is normally identified with the stasis reported in Hdt. 5.28–29, which was ultimately resolved by an arbitration process conducted by a panel from Paros (no. 509). The Parians set up an oligarchy (Hdt. 5.28–29). According to Hdt. 5.28, the stasis lasted for two generations, but he gives no precise date for its resolution. It has been suggested that archaeological evidence indicating a decline in Milesian exports in the period 600–590 may have been directly linked to civil unrest (Greaves (2002) 96). It is normally held that the introduction of the new constitution after the arbitration coincided with the first recorded aisymnetes as a Milesian eponymous official (Milet. 1.3 122; see Gorman (2001) 112–13 for a summary of the traditional scholarly position). However, Gorman (2001) 113–15 advocates c.540 rather than the traditional date of 525 as the starting point of the aisymnetes list. She rightly points out that there may well be a gap in the list, reflecting the 15 years separating the Persian sack of Miletos in 494 and the reconstruction of the polis in 479. However, her argument that the Parian arbitration must be separated from the creation of the office of aisymnetes and instead be
moved back to C7 or even C8 rests primarily on the assumptions (1) that the Persians would not have permitted the resolution of the stasis by the intervention of another Greek polis, and (2) that a period of a maximum of 25 years between the introduction of the new constitution and the ascent of the tyrant Histiaios before 513 would not have been sufficient to restore Milesian prosperity (ibid. 115–21). Her first premise, at least, must be regarded as debatable: (i) the Milesians may have had more room for regulating their own internal affairs than other Ionian poleis thanks to their favourable treaty with Kyros; (ii) the Persians are later known to have allowed internal conflicts in the Ionian region to be resolved by a process of arbitration conducted by other Greek states (Tod 113).

From Hdt. 4.117–39 it is clear that the Milesian oligarchy must have been replaced with the Persian-backed tyranny of Histiaios by 513, when Milesian troops under Histiaios’ command assisted the Persians in their Skythian campaign. In return for his services during this campaign Histiaios was granted control of Myrkinos (no. 673) by Dareios (Hdt. 5.11.1–2), and it appears from Herodotos’ account that he first settled there. Later he was called to Susa as adviser to the Great King (5.24.2–25.2), leaving his cousin and brother-in-law Aristagoras to rule Miletos in his absence (Hdt. 5.30.2). Aristagoras (in secret collaboration with Histiaios, who was detained at Susa) was an important instigator of the Ionian Revolt in 499, according to Herodotos because he had fallen foul of the Persians as a result of the failed expedition against Naxos (no. 507) in 500 and was fearing for his position within Miletos (5.35–36.1). He subsequently stepped down (at least nominally, λαγων) as ruler of Miletos and introduced isonomy (Hdt. 5.37.2). This may have amounted to some kind of democracy (but see Gorman (2001) 136). Shortly before the Ionian Revolt was quashed by the Persians in 494, Aristagoras went into exile, and Histiaios, who attempted to re-establish his position in Miletos, was refused access to the polis (Hdt. 6.5.1–2).

After the Ionian defeat at the battle of Lade, to which the Milesians had contributed eighty ships (Hdt. 6.8), the Persians subjected the polis to anadrapodismos and physical destruction of its urban centre (Hdt. 6.18–20). According to Herodotos, most men were killed, and women and children enslaved. The people who were spared were resettled in Ampe on the Red Sea. The territory around the city and the plain were occupied by Persians, while the rest was settled by Karians. However, Herodotos’ claim that Miletos “was emptied of Milesians” may either be exaggerated or may refer more narrowly to Miletos’ urban centre (contra Gorman (2001) 145–47). In any case, Milesian troops were present among the Persian forces just before the battle of Mycale (Hdt. 9.99.3,104). The physical destruction of Miletos city in 494, on the other hand, appears to have been almost total (but see Voigtländer (1984) 156–58). Archaeologically, continuity of occupation at the site in C5f cannot be proved or disproved.

After the defeat of the Persians at Mycale, Miletos became a member of the Delian League in 478. It is recorded in the list from 454/3 (IG I² 259 111.19; Piërart (1974)), where Milesioi from Leros and from Teichioussa are also recorded as payers (IG I² 259.v1.19–22). Then the Milesioi are recorded from 452/1 (IG I² 261.11.28) to 430/29 (IG I² 281.1.14) paying first 10 tal. (IG I² 263.v.18) and from 443/2 5 tal. (IG I² 269.1.33). From 427/6 (IG I² 284.15–17) to 416/15 (IG I² 289.1.36–38) the Milesians are recorded with Leros and Teichioussa paying 10 tal., and in 415/4 the Milesians are recorded alone paying 10 tal. (IG I² 290.1.9). The Milesians were assessed for tribute in 425/4 alongside Leros and Teichioussa (IG I² 71.1.125). As a member of the Delian League Miletos provided an army contingent for the Athenian expedition against Corinth (no. 227) in 425/4 (Thuc. 4.42), and the Athenians had at their disposal more than 2,000 Milesian hoplites in 424 (Thuc. 4.54.1). Milesian troops also participated in the Sicilian expedition (Thuc. 7.57.4).

There is no secure evidence for the constitution of Miletos in the period between 479 and c.450, but it is normally held that the form of constitution was an oligarchy (perhaps moderate, so Gehrkke, Stasis 114). The Milesian banishment decree (Milet. 1.6 187 = ML 43), traditionally dated 470–440, banishes a number of prominent Milesians and contains provisions for rewarding anyone who kills them. Although it cannot be ruled out completely that the decree was passed after a stasis that may have brought Milesian democrats to power, and that it was directed against leading oligarchic figures, the board of officials referred to as the epimenioi is normally taken to be a feature of Milesian oligarchy (e.g. ML 43; Koerner (1993) 311; Gorman (2001) 332–34). It is possible that the provisions of the decree were directed by an established oligarchy against Medising members of the Milesian elite.

It is clear, however, that Miletos experienced a period of civil unrest in the middle of C5, and that the Athenians intervened on at least one occasion. [Xen]. Ath. Pol. 3.11 refers to a situation in which the Athenians chose to back the Milesian oligarchy against the demos; the oligarchs subsequently revolted and massacred the demos. It is
impossible to date the incident from [Xen.]’s text alone, but it may be connected with the passing of IG ρ 21 (conventionally dated to 450/49), which contains Athenian regulations for Miletos. An Athenian garrison was imposed on Miletos, but it cannot be determined if democracy was also imposed (Gorman (2001) 227–30, contra, e.g., Hornblower (1991) 188–89). IG ρ 21 is normally interpreted as an Athenian attempt to prop up an existing oligarchy, which may later have revolted and instigated the massacre that led to further Athenian intervention and the imposition of democracy.

A terminus ante quem for the introduction of democracy at Miletos is provided by Klio 52 (1970) 165–73 (dated to the 430s), which contains regulations for the sanctuary of Poseidon Helikonios, and which carries a preamble indicating the existence of political institutions on an Athenian model (see e.g. Rhodes, DGS 379). Gorman (2001) 236 argues for the likelihood that a democracy was already in place when the Athenians chose to back Miletos in its conflict with Samos “over Priene” in 441/0 (Thuc. 1.115.2).

In 412 the Milesians revolted against Athens (Thuc. 8.17.1–4), but the democratic constitution remained in place until 405, when it was replaced by an oligarchy (Diod. 13.104.5; Plut. Lys. 8). In 411 the Milesians countered an Athenian attack on their city with a force consisting of 800 hoplites (Thuc. 8.25.2), and further assisted the Peloponnesians with ships (Thuc. 8.61.2) and infantry (Thuc. 8.79.4). In 405 the Spartans helped the Milesian oligarchs to overthrow the democracy, and more than 1,000 democrats fled from Miletos and were resettled in Blaundos in Lydia by the Persian satrap Pharabazos (Diod. 13.104.6: Βλαῦδα). Xen. An. 1.1.7 reports that Tissaphernes attacked the pro-Spartan party in the city because he feared that they might support Kyros, killing and exiling most of them. From LSAM 45 (= SGDI 5496 (380/79)) it may be inferred that the rule of the pro-Spartan oligarchs was replaced by a democracy possibly as a result of Tissaphernes’ interference. The preamble of the law shows that by 380/79 the Milesian political institutions were set up on an Athenian model (Rhodes, DGS 379).

In C4m Miletos was probably ruled by the Karian dynasts, as is indicated by Milesian coins with the legends ΕΚΑ (Hekatomnmos) and ΜΑ (Mausolos) (Gehrke, Stasis 116 n. 12), and by statues of the Hekatomnids Ada and Idrius set up at Delphi by the Milesians (Tod 161B). Many of these changes of constitution took place as a consequence of stasis between opposing factions, thus in 452, 405 and 402 (Gehrke, Stasis 113–17).

Depending on the restorations proposed for the preambles of the decrees Klio 52 (1970) 165–73 (C5) and LSAM 45 = SGDI 5496 (380/79), the boule at Miletos seems to have resembled that of Athens in its designations of phylai presiding in each ptyany. In LSAM 45, the boule seems to have a probouleumatic function. Hdt. 5.29 refers to a ἄληψ (C6), and a Milesian assembly was convened by the Spartan general Kalikratidas in 406 (Xen. Hell. 1.6.8). The assembly is also attested in a number of C5 and C4 enactments: Klio 52 (1970) 165–73 is a C5 decree (psephisma) passed by the city of Miletos concerning the cult of Poseidon Helikonios. LSAM 45 = SGDI 5496 (380/79), a psephisma containing regulations for the cult of Artemis, has in the preamble: Κεκροπις ἐπετάνευεν, Φιλίνης ἐπεστάτει, ἐδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῶι ἄληψι. ΗΡάκλεστος ἐπεν (1–5). Both decrees show very strong Athenian influence (Rhodes, DGS 379). There is evidence for homicide legislation in Milet. vii.1.187.2–3 = M 43 (C5m).

Milet. i.3 122 lists officials under the heading οἱ ἀσυμνηται, also called stephanophori were clearly eponymous, and the list went back to 525 (Sherk (1992) 229–32; supra). Other officials are στρατηγοὶ (Milet. i.3 135.36–37 = Syll.3 273 (C4); τειχοποιοὶ (Milet. i.3 135.30–31 (C4)); ταµίαι (Milet. i.3 135.31); ἐπιµήνιοι (Milet. vii.1.187.5 = M 43 (C5m)); and πράκτορες (LSAM 45.11 = SGDI 5496 (380/79)); and a γραμματεύς, perhaps of the boule (Klio 52 (1970) 165–73 (435/4)).

The Milesian citizen population was subdivided into two different sets of phylai. Of the six old Attic-Ionic phylai, four are attested in C5 sources: the Oinopes, the Hoplethes, the Boreis and the Argadeis (Syll.3 57.1–3; PEP Miletos 419, 420), and the existence of the Geleontes and Aigikoreis can be presumed (Jones, POAG 321). A different system of at least nine and possibly twelve phylai is attested in sources, some of which date from C4 and one even from 437/6 (Herrmann (1970)). At least seven phylai duplicate the Kleisthenic ones: Aiantis, Akamantis, Erechtheis, Kekrops, Leontis, Oineis and Pandionis. The two other known phylai are Asopis and Theseis (Jones, POAG 322–23). Inscriptions of C3–C1 testify to at least five and perhaps seven demes, of which three are the Argaseis, the Leriou and the Teichisseis (supra 1083; Jones, POAG 323–25).

Miletian embassies are attested in Thuc. 1.115.2 (to Athens, 441/0) and Thuc. 8.85.4 (to Sparta, 411). Proxenia was received from Knidos (no. 903) (IKnidos 1.1–3 (400–350)) and from Tanagra (no. 220) (IG vii 524 (C4/C3e)). Citizenship was given to an individual from
Mylasa (no. 913) (SEG 38 1193 (330–320)), and in C4 Miletos also entered into mutual arrangements of isopoliteia with other states: Olbia (no. 690) (Gawantka (1975) no. 18 = Tod 195 (before 323)); Kyzikos (no. 747) (Gawantka (1975) no. 19 (before 323)) and Pygela (no. 863) (Gawantka (1975) no. 21). Milesian theorodokoi to host theoroi from Argos (no. 347) are attested in SEG 23 189.11.12 (330–324).

Since the Geometric period, Kalabaktepe, a 57 m-high hill to the south of Miletos, was defended and acted as an acropolis for the city (Milet. 1.8; von Graeve (1986), (1987), (1990), (1991), (1992), (1995), (1997), (1999)). Kaletepe (the Theatre Hill) has also been suggested as a possible acropolis for the ancient city, but here the archaeological evidence has been obscured by a Byzantine castle. Following the destruction of the city in 494 there was significant rebuilding on Kalabaktepe, but it was later abandoned as the city never grew to regain its former size, and the focus of settlement shifted towards the harbours.

In connection with his report of Alyattes’ attack on Miletos (C7), Hdt. 1.17 comments that, because of Miletos’ control of the sea, a proper siege could not be undertaken by an army. The Persian siege of Miletos after the battle of Lade was from land and sea (Hdt. 6.18). The city walls are mentioned in Hdt. 6.7 and 6.18. Their extent in the Archaic period is much debated (Milet. 1.8, 11.3; and Cobet (1997)); but Kalabaktepe appears to have been encircled with walls, and on its summit a second, inner wall has recently been found (Senff et al. (1997)). Whether the Archaic walls extended on to the plain below Kalabaktepe to enclose the whole peninsula is not yet clear (Cobet (1997)). Excavation of the area between Kalabaktepe and the Sacred Gate area is hampered by the great depth of deposits that overlie the ancient remains. Some or all of the lower city may have been enclosed within the city walls to defend the harbour area and secure its sea power (Lang (1996) 199–201); the city was besieged and taken by Alexander the Great in 334 (Diod. 17.22.1–4).

In Hdt. 1.17 and 1.21 the asty is referred to explicitly. According to Hdt. 1.17.2, there was also significant settlement outside the Archaic urban centre. Archaic Miletos appears to have covered a very large area, perhaps as much as 110 ha (Müller-Wiener (1986) 98), but this area cannot have been covered by contiguous urban settlement. Trial trenching on the plains between Kalabaktepe and the temple of Athena found limited evidence for Archaic settlement here (Milet. 1.8 39ff), and the archaeology in other parts of the city is obscured by later buildings. Thus, the estimate of about 4,000 houses in the early Archaic town (Gates (1995) 238) must be an exaggeration (Hansen (2000) 179 n. 208). The period 494 to 479 is virtually unattested in the archaeological record; but when the town was rebuilt, the walls were probably planned on the same scale and in the same location as the original Archaic city to enclose the city peninsula and Kalabaktepe. The new city was grid-planned and is presumed to have covered most of the area between Kalabaktepe and Humitepe (Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994) 17–19).

A Milesian agora is attested in Hdt. 1.21 (rC7–C6) and Diod. 13.104.5 (rA5). Milet. 1.3 135.29–30 mentions a sanctuary of Apollo. In a decree passed by the city of Miletos concerning the cult of Poseidon Helikionios, there is mention of the temenos (Klio 52 (1970) 165–73, Il. 31–32). The Athena temple in the western part of the peninsula dates back to C7, with rebuilding work in C6, and there is evidence that Delphinion near the Lion Bay had been situated there since the Archaic period. A C4 Dionysos temple had a C6 predecessor. A summary of the finds relating to the public architecture of Archaic Miletos is provided by Lang (1996) 198–99.

There is no Archaic or Classical evidence for a cult of Athena Polias, but Herrmann (1971) 293–94 infers from an inscription of the second or third century AD mentioning Athena Polias that she was identical with the goddess worshipped in the Athena temple, attested without epithet already in the Archaic period. In a decree of C5 the assembly regulates the cult of Poseidon Helikionios (Klio 52 (1970) 165–73). An oracular response of c. 500 very likely records a communal Milesian consultation at the oracle at Didyma (Milet. 1.3 178; Somolinos (1991); Herrmann (1992) 116–17). The oracle of Apollo at Didyma was presumably involved in the Milesian foundation of Olbia (no. 690); cf. the bone tablet of c. 525–500 found at Bereza (SEG 36 694), face B of which contains the inscription: Απόλλωνι Διδυμοῖ(μαίοι) Μυλησίω (Rusyayeva (1986)).

For the Milesian calendar, see Trumpy, Monat. 89–93. Five months are identical with the Athenian. Two of the Milesian months are attested in Classical sources: Taureon (Klio 52 (1970) 165–73, Il. 31 (C5)) and Artemision (LSAM 45 = SDGI 5494 (380/79)).

Milesian victors in the Olympic Games are Olympionikai 79 (596), 225 (472) and 385: Antipater (388), according to Paus. 6.2.6, was the first of the Ionians to have dedicated a statue at Olympia.

Miletos struck coins in C6–C4 of electrum, silver and bronze. (1) Electrum, C6: types: obv. mostly (head of) lion; rev. incuse(s). (2) Silver, C6–C5: obv. forepart of lion; rev.
floral pattern within incuse square. (3) Silver, C5: obv. lion; rev. floral ornament. (4) Silver, C4: obv. Apollo laureate; rev. lion; legend: MI monogram and magistrate’s name. (5) Bronze, C4: obv. lion walking, monogram; rev. star; legend: magistrate’s name; or obv. Apollo laureate; rev. lion and star; legend: MI as monogram or ΜΙΛΗΣΙΩΝ. (6) Silver, C4: obv. Athena; legend: magistrate’s name or refoundation of the following colonies: Leros (no. 510–494) were found in the Asyut hoard (Price and Waggoner (1975) 86; Jenkins (1990) 16). In BMC Ionia 183–91 and Babelon, Traité ii.2. 1047 it is assumed that there is a gap in the minting of silver and electrum coinage between 494 and 478, but this seems to rest entirely on the assumption that no coins were minted in the first decade and a half after the destruction of the city (Babelon, Traité ii.1, 11–54, 266–71, ii.2. 1047–55; Head, HP 584–86; SNG Cop. Ionia 943–77). Miletos was exceptionally active as a coloniser, and is reported or assumed to have been involved in the foundation or refoundation of the following colonies: Leros (no. 594) in C6; Ikaros at an unknown date (see p. 740); Therma (no. 481) at an unknown date; Myrkinos (no. 633) in 497; Kardia (no. 665) in collaboration with Klaizomenai (no. 847) at an unknown date; Limnai (no. 668) at an unknown date; Apollonia (no. 682) c.610; Bizone (no. 683) in C6; Dionysopolis (no. 684) in C6–C5; Istris (no. 685) in 657; Odessos (no. 689) in 585–575; Olbia (no. 690) in 647/6; Tomoi (no. 693) in C6; Tyris (no. 694) in C6; Kepoi (no. 699) in 580–570; Nymphaion (no. 704) in 560; Pantikapaion (no. 705) in 575; Theodosia (no. 707) c.570; Dioskourias (no. 709) in C6; Phasis (no. 711) in C6–C5; Amisos (no. 712) c.560 (possibly with Phokaia (no. 859)); Kromna (no. 723) at an unknown date; Kytoros (no. 724) at an unknown date; Sesamos (no. 728) at an unknown date; Sinope (no. 729) in C7; Tiegion (no. 733) at an unknown date; Artake (no. 736) in C7; Daskyleion (no. 740) at an unknown date; Kios (no. 736) in 626/5; Kyzikos (no. 747) in 679; Miletopolis (no. 750) in C7l/C6e; Paision (no. 755) in C7; Priapos (no. 758) in C7e; Prokonnesos (no. 759) in C7e; Abydos (no. 765) in C7e; Ariste (no. 768) without a date; Lampsakos (no. 792) in C7e. See also Ehrhardt (1983) and Gorman (2001) 243–58. In C4 the citizens of Olbia were granted ateleia in Miletos by mutual arrangement (Tod 195.21–22; cf. Graham (1964) 99–103). 855. Myonnesos (Mylon(ν)esios) Map 56. Lat. 37.35, long. 27.25. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Μύοννησος, ἡ (Hecat. fr. 232; Thuc. 3.32.1) or Μυόνης (Ephor. fr. 27). The city-ethnic is Μυόνησιος (Ephor. fr. 27; IG vii 556 (undated)). Myonnesos was reported to have been a polis in the urban sense in Hekataios’ work (fr. 232), quoted by Steph. Byz. 462.11–13: πόλις μεταξόν Τέεω και Λεβέδου. Ἑκαταίοι Αἰαί. Αρτεμιδώρος δὲ χωρίν αὐτήν φησι. The quotation indicates that Hekataios did actually offer a site-classification that was later contradicted by Artemidoros. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested in an external context in Ephor. fr. 27 (verbatim quotation).

Myonnesos was located between Teos (no. 868) and Lebedos (no. 850) (Strabo 14.1.29), and was, according to Thuc. 3.32.1, a Teian possession. The island is very small (c.1 km²), but Myonnesos may have controlled some of the periaia. The island—or peninsula—settlement of Myonnesos was too small to support a town (Bean (1966) 146–49). It must have been the equivalent of an acropolis, with the main settlement on the mainland. Like Korykos (no. 849), it was a nest of pirates (Ephor. fr. 27). The settlement on the small island that formed part of Myonnesos, and which was joined to the mainland by a causeway, contains remains of an early cyclopean wall.

856. Myous (Myes(s)ios) Map 61. Lat. 37.35, long. 27.25. Size of territory: unknown but probably 2 or 3. Type: A. The toponym is Μῦος (Hecat. fr. 235) or Μυοῦς, -ντος, ὁ (Hdt. 1.142.3, 5.34.4; schol. Thuc. 1.138); the city-ethnic is Μυήσιος (Hdt. 6.8.11; Tod 113.33) or Μυήσιος (IG 137.1.153 (425/4)). At IG I 11. 1046, v. 20, Μυῆσιος “is clearly a cutter’s error” (ATL i. 522). On the (unhistorical) variant Μυόνιος, see Robert (1946) 71. Myous is called a polis both in the urban sense (Hdt. 1.142.3) and in the political sense (Hdt. 1.141.4, 143.3; SEG 45 1619.4, 12–13 (C4l/C3e)), in which the use of the polis cognate politis is also found (12). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form on C4 coins (infra) and in SEG 45 1619.3 (C4l/C3e), and externally in literary sources (Hdt. 6.8.11) and in inscriptions (IG 137.1.153; Tod 113.33 (391–388)). The individual and external use is attested on a late Classical funerary monument set up at Athens (IG i2 9973).

Not much is known about the extent of Myesian territory in the Classical period. The only piece of evidence is Tod 113 (391–388), recording an arbitration concerning land in the Maiandros valley to which Miletos (no. 854) and Myous had both laid claim. The Myesians lost the case by default.

In 494 Myous provided three ships for the battle of Lade (Hdt. 6.8.11), and it seems to have been under Persian control even after the establishment of the Delian League; the Persian king granted tax-levying rights at Myous to Themistokles during the latter’s exile (Thuc. 1.138.5).
Myous was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionian district and is recorded from 452/1 (IG i² 261.11.30) to 430/29 (IG i² 281.1.15, mostly restored) a total of eleven times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 1 tal. (IG i³ 272.11.12, restored in all other lists) but ½ tal. in 452/1 (IG i³ 261.11.30, conj.) and in 432/1 (IG i³ 280.1.62). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.1.138).

A C44/C3e grant of proxenia and of citizenship is attested in SEG 45 1619, the sole surviving public enactment (φήμις, ll.16–17) passed by the boule and demos of Myous (ll. 10–11). This decree also contains a grant of ateleia (ll. 5–6).

Because of the absorption of Myous into Miletos (no. 854) in the Hellenistic period, very little remains on the site, the ruins of which may have been used as a quarry after the polis had ceased to exist (Bean (1966) 246). The site was surveyed by H. Weber in 1964 and 1966. Weber (1965) reports on two temples, an “upper” and a “lower”, of which he assumed that the upper temple was the older one, dating from C.5.

A sanctuary of Apollo is attested in SEG 45 1619.18.

Myous struck coins of silver and bronze in C4. (1) Silver hemiobol on the Attic standard: types: obv. head of Apollo laureate, facing i.; rev. lion with raised paw; legend: ΜΥΛΟΣ. (2) Bronze: obv. Poseidon laureate; rev. goose, or bow and arrow, or dolphin and trident; legend: ΜΥΣ or ΜΥΘ (Babelon, Traité ii.2. 1057–60, no. 1773; Head, HN² 587; SNG von Aulock nos. 2114–15; SNG Cop. Ionia 1022).

857. Naulochon

Map 61. Lat. 37.40, long. 27.15. Size of territory: unknown but probably 1 or 2. Type: probably Α (infra). The toponym is Ναυλοχον, τό (I.Priene 1 = Tod 185.2 (334); SEG 23 189.11.10 (330–324)). A city-ethnic may be attested in abbreviated form on the C4 coins (NAY, infra). Naulochon is probably called a polis in the urban sense in I.Priene 1.6 (van Berchem (1970) 200–1; Hornblower (1982a) 327); but the interpretation of this inscription is open to debate (Heisserer (1980) 162). Likewise, the dedication to the hero Naulochos as “protector of the polis” (πόλεως φύλακας) in CEG i² 854.5 = I.Priene 196 (C4m) may be an attestation of Naulochon (and not Priene (no. 861)) as a polis in the political sense.

Naulochon was the port of Priene and seems to have existed as a separate community during part of C4. However, the edict of Alexander the Great seems to equate the Greek inhabitants of Naulochon with the Πριενικεῖς, suggesting that there was no separate Naulochean communal identity. Depending on how the text is restored, the decree may also be interpreted to the effect that some of the inhabitants were not Greek at all (Heisserer (1980) 156; Botermann (1994)). If it is accepted that Priene had ceased to exist at some point after 391/0, to be revived as a community only after the refoundation of the city, then Naulochon may have served as a temporary urban and political centre of the Prienians (van Berchem (1970) 200–1; Hornblower (1982a) 327). However, the numismatic evidence points to Prienian coins having been minted simultaneously with coins minted by Naulochon, a problem not solved satisfactorily by van Berchem’s argument. Theorodokoi to host theoroi from Argos (no. 347) are attested for Naulochon in SEG 23 189.11.10 (330–324).

Naulochon struck bronze coins in C4m. Types: obv. head of Athena r.; rev. dolphin r., surrounded by maeander pattern; legend: ΝΑΥ (Babelon, Traité ii.2. 1059–60 no. 1776; Head, HN² 587; for one contemporary silver coin with the same types but inscribed ΠΠ, see Regling (1927) 47).

858. Notion

(Map 56. Lat. 38.00, long. 27.10. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is Νότιον, τό (Hecat. fr. 233; Thuc. 3.3.4.1; Xen. Hell. 1.5.12–14; Hell. Oxy. 8.4, Chambers; Ps.-Skylax 98). The city-ethnic is Νοτιεύς (IG i³ 261.v.11 (452/1)). Notion is called a polis in the urban sense, explicitly at Hell. Oxy. 8.4, unless the reference is to Kolophon (no. 848) (see Bruce (1967) 44), and implicitly at Ps.-Skylax 98: Νότιον καὶ λιμήν (see Flensfeld-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 142). At Arist. Pol. 1303β7–10 Notion is listed as an example of a community which was sometimes a separate polis. The collective and external use of the city-ethnic is attested in Attic inscriptions (the tribute lists and IG ii² 1.48 = Tod 97 (403/2)).

Although it cannot be ruled out completely that Notion in Ionia was in fact identical with the Aeolic Notion (“Southern”) mentioned in Hdt. 1.114.1, its history was inextricably bound up with that of Kolophon (no. 848), for which it served as a harbour town. Thus, the preferable view is that Aeolic and Ionian Notion were different communities.

Notion was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionian district and is recorded from 454/3 (IG i³ 259.11.22) to 416/5 (IG i³ 289.1.41) a total of eighteen times, four times completely restored, paying a phoros of 2,000 dr. in all years, except in 428/7 when it paid only 100 dr. (IG i³ 283.11.23). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.11.107, toponym mostly restored). It is recorded once by toponym (IG i³ 285.1.95), and otherwise by city-ethnic. In some years Notion and Kolophon are listed side by side (454/3–452/1 and 433/2–416/15), but in the period 451/0–440/39 the two
communities are separated by two entries (IG i ² 270.1.8 and 11) or four entries (IG i ² 262.16.4 and 12) or five entries (IG i ² 266.1.4 and 10) or even more.

Thuc. 3.3.4.1 refers to Notion in unambiguous terms as a Kolophonian dependency in 428/7 (eis Nótion to Kolofoniov). But in the Athenian decree for the Samians of 403/2, the Notieis are honoured by Athens along with the people of Ephesos (no. 844) for having given asylum to Samian refugees (IG i ² 1.48). This points to Notion as a state in its own right (in that case a dependent polis), at least at the turn of the century. Status as a separate community is also indicated by the much later attestation of theorodokoi in Notion, one to host theoroi announcing the Nemean Games (SEG 23 189.11.7 (330–324)) and one to host theoroi announcing the Nemean Games (SEG 36 33.11.44–45 (323/2)). Finally, at Pol. 173(6–7)–10 Aristotle notes that problems with the nature of the territory resulted in stasis between the Kolophonians and the Notieis and made it difficult to keep the polis united. Aristotle’s use of ethnics indicates that Kolophon and Notion were sometimes united, sometimes separate communities. For the problem relating to the Athenian foundation of a New Kolophon at Notion, see 1078 supra. Even if New Kolophon was founded on the actual site of Notion, the community of Notieis must have retained a communal identity distinct from that of the Kolophonian settlers, as pointed out by Piérart (1984) 168–71. During their excavation of Notion, Demangel and Laumonier (1923) recorded some C4 architectural fragments which may have belonged to the Athena sanctuary. A fortificatory wall (diateichisma) is mentioned in Thuc. 3.34.2; but this may have been only of a temporary nature. There is so far no evidence for Classical city walls. Recent Turkish excavations, reported by Mitchell (1999) 148, produced no further evidence for the pre-Hellenistic settlement.

859. Phokaia (Phokaeus) Map 56. Lat. 38.40, long. 26.45. Size of territory: probably 3. Type: A. The toponym is Phówkaia, Ἡ (Hdt. 1.142.3, 2.178.2; Xen. Hell. 1.3.1) or Ἡ πώκαι (Hdt. 1.80.1) or, in the Attic dialect, Phṓka (Tod 112.9–10 = SEG 34 849 (C5–C4)). The city-ethnic is Phókaiēs (Hdt. 4.138.2; Thuc. 1.13.6; IG i ³ 261.4) or Phókaiēs (C4 bronze coins, infra). Phokaia is called a polis both in the urban sense (Hdt. 1.162.2–163.1; Ps.-Skylax 98) and in the political sense (Hdt. 2.172.2; Tod 112.6, 17; Arist. Oec. 13.488β). Phókaiōn πολιτεία was included among the 158 Aristotelian constitutions (fr. 616). The word astos is used about the citizens of Phokaia in Hdt. 1.165, and patris is used in Hdt. 1.169. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on C4 coins (infra) and externally in Hdt. 6.8.2; Thuc. 1.13.6; Isoc. 6.8.4; IG i ³ 261.4. For the individual and external use, see Hdt. 6.11.1; CID 11 4.111.13 (C4m) and IG i ³ 2.421.2 (C4).

The name of the territory was Phōkaiēs (Thuc. 8.101.2). It included an island with a harbour called ὁ ἐν Καρτερίοις λιμήν (Thuc. 8.101.2) (a harbour is mentioned also at Ps.-Skylax 98). Karteria was most likely (a group of) island(s), and it is interesting to note that even islands could be described as part of Phokaia. At Hdt. 1.165,3 the term χώρη is used about Phokaia’s territory as a whole.

The colonisation of Massalia (no. 3) by Phokaians in c.600 is the first thing we know about Phokaia (supra 162, 165), and according to Thuc. 1.13.6, Phokaia then possessed a strong naval force. After the Persian conquest of the Lydian kingdom, the Phokaians decided to relocate their city and, according to Hdt. 1.164, the majority of the citizens left c.546. He also relates that many of them became homescick soon after and returned to Phokaia in spite of their solemn oath never to come back. The abandonment and destruction of Phokaia in 546 now seems to be confirmed archaeologically (Mitchell (1999) 143).

Phokaia belonged to the Ionian dodekapolis (Hdt. 1.142.3) and provided three ships for the battle of Lade (Hdt. 6.8.2) as well as the general of the whole fleet, Dionysios (Hdt. 6.11.1). Andrapodismos of Phokaia as a consequence of the defeat at Lade may be implied in Hdt. 6.17 in his account of the general Dionysios’ decision not to return home.

Phokaia was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionian district and is recorded from 453/2 (IG i ³ 260.viii.7–8, 9) to 430/29 (IG i ³ 281.4.49, mostly restored) a total of twelve times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 3 tal. down to, probably, 447/6 (IG i ³ 265.11.38), then 1 tal., 5,250 dr. (IG i ³ 266.11.11) and from, perhaps, 443/2 (IG i ³ 269.1.14) 2 tal. (IG i ³ 270.1.12). It was assessed for tribute in 453/2 (IG i ³ 71.1.139). In 453/2 these payments are split up into one payment of 3,000 dr. and one of 2 tal., 3,000 dr.

The only public enactment attested earlier than C3 is Tod 112 (C5/C4). Lines 6–18 of this decree also provide evidence for dikasterion, death penalty and fines. The eponymous official is recorded as πρύτανις (Tod 112.10–21), and other officials are referred to as ἀρχαῖ that generally in ll. 9–10. A Phokaian grant of aleteia may be attested in Iscr. Cos ED 71.B.15–17 (C4). Proxenia was received from Chios (no. 840) (RPhil (1937) 325–32 no. 6A.2 = PEP Chios 50 (C4)). On the C5s coinage treaty (Tod 112) with Mytilene (no. 798), see infra.
Hdt. 1.162–64 (1546) recounts how the Phokaiai fortified their settlement with financial assistance from Arganthonios, king of Tartessos, and describes the city wall as several stades long and constructed from large blocks of stone. In 1990, part of the city wall was found near the new city hall of Foça (Mellink (1993) 131). For the results of excavations of the Archaic city wall, see Özyigit (1994). They seem to have enclosed an area of c.50 ha. The archaeological evidence in general appears to confirm Herodotos’ account, including a burnt city gate and C6 drainage which suggest an attack c.540. In Xen. Hell. 1.5.11 the text suggests that the Athenians attempted to fortify Phokaia in 406, and the text need not be emended (Krentz (1989) 139).

Old Phokaia is currently under excavation, and remains of public architecture have been discovered. An Archaic temple of Athena is thought to have been located on a rock platform at the tip of the peninsula (Mellink (1953) 236, (1956) 382; E. Akurgal (1956) 6–8). It is assumed that this temple was destroyed by Harpagos and perhaps repaired shortly afterwards. The ceramic record runs from late Geometric throughout the Classical period. In Xen. Hell. 1.3.1 it is reported that the temple of Athena burned in 409/8. The temple appears to have been rebuilt in the Hellenistic period. Archaic walls of a Cybele sanctuary were discovered by Özyigit (Gates (1996) 325). A C4e–m theatre is currently under excavation (Mitchell (1999) 143).

Phokaia struck coins of electrum, silver and bronze. (1) Electrum, C6–C4; denominations: stater, hekte. Types: obv. a variety of types with seal above or below; rev. quadrupartite incuse square. (2) Silver on the Phoenician standard, C6–C4; denominations: tetradrachm, didrachm, drachm and fractions down to hemiolbol: obv. variety of types with seal above or below; rev. mostly quadrupartite incuse square; legend: sometimes ΦΩΚΑΕΩΝ. (3) Bronze: obv. female head; rev. griffin; only a few C4 bronze coins carry the legend ΦΩΚΑΕΩΝ. In, probably, C55, Phokaia and Mytilene (no. 798) concluded a treaty that the two poleis should take turns and strike identical electrum coins in alternating years (IG xii.2.1). In C4 the staters and hectaikoi struck in consequence of this treaty became the principal local currency of the poleis of western Asia Minor (Tod 112 = SEG 34 849; Head, HNP 587–89; Jenkins (1990) 18–19; Bodenstedt (1977–78a), (1977–78b) with Kraay (1982); BMC Ionia 203–16; SNG Cop. Ionia 1023–33).

Phokaia was an active coloniser, founding Lampsakos (no. 748) in 654/5, Massalia (no. 3) in Ç6f, Alalai (no. 1) in Ç6m, and Hygle (no. 54) c.540 after the failure at Alalai. It may also have founded Emporion (no. 2) c.600, possibly in collaboration with Massalia, and Amisos (no. 712), possibly in collaboration with Miletos (no. 854).

860. (Polichnitai) Map 56. Lat. 38.25, long. 26.35, but cf. infra. Size of territory: ? Type: B. No toponym is recorded. The city-ethnic is either Πολίχνιται (IG i3 264.111.29, 265.1.60) or Πολίχνιτης (IG i3 283.111.30), to be distinguished from the Πολίχνιται of Chalkidike (no. 596) and the Πολίχνιται (no. 789) in the Hellasponitik district (i.e. Troas).

The location of *Polichne is uncertain, but the community was undoubtedly situated on the Mimas peninsula. Wilamowitz-Möllendorff’s attempt (1908) 614 to identify this Polichne with that of Thuc. 8.14.3 was disputed by Kirsten (1952); Cook (1953–54) 157 with n. 3; and Gomme et al. (1981) 34–35.

The Polichnitai were members of the Delian League. They belonged to the Ionia district and are recorded from 450/49 (IG i3 265.11.14) to 428/7 (IG i3 283.111.30) a total of twelve times, once completely but plausibly restored. In 448/7 (IG i3 264.111.30), 444/3 (IG i3 268.1.27), 430/29 (IG i3 281.1.23) and 425/4 (IG i3 71.1.144–45) the Polichnitai are explicitly recorded as a dependency of Erythrai (no. 845). In 450/49 (IG i3 263.11.14) they paid alongside the other Erythraian dependencies; in 448/7 (IG i3 264.111.30) and in 447/6 (IG i3 265.1.60) the other dependencies paid on their behalf. In later years their payment is recorded separately from that of the other Erythraian dependencies, and the Polichnitai paid 4,000 dr. (IG i3 271.1.18) but in 428/7 1 tal., 3,000 dr. (IG i3 283.111.30).

861. Priene (Prienai) Map 61. From Ç4g, lat. 37.40, long. 27.20; if relocated (cf. infra), the precise location of the Archaic and Classical urban centre is unknown. Size of territory: unknown but probably 3 or 4. Type: A. The toponym is Πρέινης, η (Thuc. 1.115.2; Xen. Hell. 3.2.17; I.Priene 5.8 (C45)). The city-ethnic is Πρεινεύς (Hecat. fr. 233; IG i3 269.1.28 (443/2); I.Priene 1.7 (334), 2.4 = Tod 186.4 (334) or Πρεινεύς (IG i3 260.8.X.8 (453/2)). Priene is called a polis both in the urban sense (Xen. Hell. 4.8.17; Ps.-Skylax 98) and in the political sense (Hdt. 1.141.4, 142.3, 143.3; I.Priene 1.1.14–15 (334), 2.7 (334)). The polis cognate polites is attested in I.Priene 10.7 (C3), and politeia in I.Priene 2.8 (334) denoting Priorian citizenship. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in decrees (I.Priene 2.4, 7, 13–14) or in abbreviated form on Ç4m coins (infra), and externally in Hecat. fr. 234; Hdt. 1.15; IG i3 260.8.X.8. For the individual and external use, see Hipponax fr. 123, West
between Samos (no. 844; *IPriene* 3.3.13 (C4–C3e)) and with the territory of Thebes (no. 869) on Mt. Mykale (*IPriene* 365.24–25 (C4m)). Ps.-Skytak 98 refers to Priene as a *polis* with two harbours, one of which was *kleistos*.

Priene was part of the Ionian *dodekapolis* (Hdt. 1.142.3) and was traditionally in charge of the Panonian festival located in its territory on Mt. Mykale (*IPriene* 139.1 with Hiller von Gaertringen’s comment and Strabo 14.1.20). The Panonia were moved from Mt. Mykale to the territory of Priene (no. 844), perhaps as a result of an early (?) war between Samos (no. 864) and Miletos (no. 854) over Prienian territory (Hornblower (1982), (1991) 527–29), but were probably transferred back into Prienian control in C4 (*IPriene* 139 (C4m) and *PEP Priene* 11 (C4m)). Stylianou (1983) 248 suggested that the move back to Mt. Mykale was initiated in 373. According to Aeschin. 2.116, Priene filled one of the two Ionian seats in the Amphiktyonic Council, alternating with Eretria (no. 370); but see Lefèvre (1998) 60.

Priene underwent *andrapodismos* in 546 (Hdt. 1.161), but had been re-established as a community by 495/4 at the latest, when it contributed twelve ships to the battle of Lade (Hdt. 6.8.1). Priene was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionian district and is recorded from 454/3 (*IG* 11 259.11.11) to 442/1 (*IG* 11 270.1.21, completely restored) a total of eight times, once completely restored, paying a *phoros* of 1 tal. (*IG* 11 263.v.22). It is absent from the full panel of 440/39 (*IG* 11 272.1–11.7–25). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (*IG* 11 71.1.149). The *polis* may have been regarded as a potential dependency by both Miletos and Samos, whose fight for domination gave rise to a war and subsequent Athenian intervention on Samos in 440/39 (Thuc. 1.115.2). In 398/7 troops from Priene assisted Derkyllidas in his campaign in the Maiandros plain (Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.17), and the latest secure reference to the urban centre of Priene is found in *Hell.* 4.8.17, referring to Thibron’s movements in the Maiandros plain in 391/90.

It is normally assumed that after this point the Prienian citizens abandoned their original (and still unlocated) urban centre in favour of the harbour town of Naulochon until the refoundation of Hellenistic Priene (Hiller von Gaertringen (1906) x1). The question of refoundation and urban relocation, however, is subject to continuous debate. The dates suggested for the refoundation of Priene vary from C4m (implying Athenian or Hekatomnide involvement) to 334 (van Berchem (1970); Hornblower (1982a) 326–28; Schipperreit (1998)). On *a priori* topographical grounds it would be very surprising if Archaic and Classical Priene was not located on the same site as the Hellenistic city. If there was a separate site, one would have expected some trace of it to have been identified or noticed. Demand (1990) 140–46 presents important arguments against a relocation and maintains that there is evidence for continuous occupation throughout C4 on the site of Hellenistic Priene. Botermann (1994) 165 has refuted some of Demand’s arguments, assuming a refoundation by Alexander the Great while still following Demand in suggesting that the urban centre was not necessarily relocated. Botermann’s argument rests primarily on the lack of epigraphical material antedating 334; but this point could be made for most of the Aiolic and Ionian *poleis* of Asia Minor and thus is not conclusive.

Schipperreit (1998) adduced further arguments in favour of Demand’s position by drawing attention to remains of older constructions at the site of the Demeter sanctuary, the orientation of which does not agree with that of the late Classical temple (1998) 195–96. Furthermore, as Schipperreit points out (ibid. 202–3), only about a third of Priene has been excavated so far, and this supports Demand’s warning against arguments from silence regarding the existence of an earlier settlement on the site.

Naulochon (no. 857) rather than Priene figures in a list of *theorodokoi* to host *theoroi* from Argos (no. 347) (*SEG* 23 189.11.10 (330–234)); but the date of the inscription after Alexander’s instructions regarding Naulochon (*IPriene* 1) weakens the text as evidence against the existence of Priene in C4e–m. *IPriene* 5.10–13 (before 326/5, and so roughly contemporary with the list of *theorodokoi*) prescribes that *theoroi* elected by the Prienian *demos* are to be dispatched to Athens in connection with the Panathenaia.

Nothing is known about the constitution of Priene before 334, and *IPriene* 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 are insecurely dated and may belong in C3e (Crowther (1996)). During the last three decades of C4 Priene appears to have been governed by some form of democracy. The decree *IPriene* 2.3 (334) mentions an assembly meeting (*κυρίον συλλόγον*). *IPriene* 9.4 (C4) mentions the *boule*, and its proboulëmatic function is securely attested in *IPriene* 4.52 (*δεδόχθαι την βουλήν τη[ν] κα[τά] τά[ς] δήμου (332–324)), but the other attestations of this function in C4 inscriptions (*IPriene* 2.1 and 5.1) are entirely due to Hiller von Gaertringen’s not very reliable restorations. The eponymous official is designated *prytanis* in *IPriene* 2.4 (334). For the title of *stephanephoros* in *IPriene* 4 (332–324), see
Crowther (1996) 205–6. The following types of official are attested epigraphically: a grammateus elected by the assembly (I.Priene 4.6, commending the 20-year tenure of this position by Apellis and thus going back at least as far as the last two decades of C4) and a board of timouchoi (I.Priene 10.24). I.Priene io refers to the Prienian administration of justice, which provided for public actions brought by volunteer prosecutors (l. 33). A grant of proxenia bestowed on Antigonus of Makedonia, who is also given citizenship, is attested in I.Priene 2 (334). Shortly before 322 Priene renewed a block grant of citizenship bestowed on the Athenians (I.Priene 5.7–8; see also IG ii 566.7–8, presumably referring to the earlier grant).

A grant of enktesis ges kai oikias is bestowed on Antigonus of Makedonia in I.Priene 2.9. A distinction between real property owned by the citizens of Priene and property owned by resident non-Prienians in Prienian territory is made in I.Priene 1.8–13, with a view to taxation imposed by Alexander the Great. Import and export taxes were mentioned in I.Priene 2.9–11, as well as a general grant of ateleia, but excepting taxes on land, which will still have to be paid by the honorand. On personal taxation in I.Priene 4, and whose other Prienian evidence all belongs to C3 or later. Maronita resident in Priene are mentioned in I.Priene 10.21, a C4 decree bestowing various judicial privileges on citizens of Maroneia (no. 646). Evidence for a group of land-owning, permanent non-Prienian residents designated Pedieis is found in I.Priene 1.7–13 and later in I.Priene 3 (C3 according to Crowther). There is a possibility that Pedieis refers to non-Greek residents in Prienian territory (Corsaro (1984)); but this proposition has been questioned by Schuler (1998) 205.

The urban centre of Priene was surrounded by walls which can be dated to C4, although their precise date is disputed (Wiegand and Schrader (1904) 35ff; Lawrence (1979) 119, 478); they enclosed an area of 37 ha, of which 15 ha was suitable for habitation (Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994) 193) and accommodated c.500 houses (ibid. (1994) 190). The agora of C4 Priene is currently under investigation (Gates (1994) 269). The main sanctuary was that of Athena Polias (I.Priene 156: Αθηνᾶ Πολιάς Ἀδελφή τῶν ναῶν Αθηναίων ὡς Πολιάδι (c.334, but the date is disputed; see Carter (1988) 133 n. 59) and Botermann (1994) 162)). The C4 temple of Athena was probably not completed until C3 (Mellink (1993) 126–27); there can be no doubt, however, that the construction of the temple was begun in the 330s at the latest. The Demeter sanctuary, which may contain remains predating the refoundation of the city, is discussed by Schipporeit (1998). For the date of the theatre (TGR iii. 441–42), see Gogos (1998), who argues for a date not earlier than C3 for the entire structure. With Crowther’s redating of I.Priene 4 to C3, the only written evidence for a C4 theatre disappears (32). This is also true of the references to a pry-taneion in I.Priene 3.16 and 4.35–36. A grid plan is attested from at least C4 (Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994) 188–222).

The Prienian calendar shows close affinities with that of Miletos (no. 854) and two of the Attic months are attested in C4 inscriptions: Metageitnion in I.Priene 2.2 and Boedromion in I.Priene 10.1–2 (Trümpe, Monat. 94–96 § 83).

Prienian bronze coinage is known from at least as early as C4m. (1) Types: obv. Athena wearing helmet; rev. maeander pattern; legend: ΠΡΙΗΝΗΣ (2) Obv. head of Athena, l.; rev. dolphin in circle formed by maeander pattern; legend: ΠΠ. Head, HNP 590 drew attention to the similarity between (2) and the types minted by Naulochon (no. 857). Regling’s (1927) reluctance to date any Prienian issues to the period before C4m has been questioned by Schipporeit (1998). SNG von Aulock 2151 and SNG Cap. Ionia 1076 (bronze) are dated to 340–334. Coins of C2 have the full form of the city-ethnic: ΠΡΙΗΝΗΩΝ (SNG Cap. Ionia 1100).

862. Pteleon (Pteleousios) Map 56. Lat. 38.30, long. 26.25. Size of territory: unknown but probably 1 or 2. Type: B. The toponym is Πτελεούς, τό (Thuc. 8.24.2, 31.2). The city-ethnic is Πτελεούσιος (IG i3 264.111.30 (4487); Eust. ll. 297.28). The settlement is designated as a teichos in Thuc. 8.24.2, but this designation does not rule out that Pteleon was a polis. The collective and external use of the city-ethnic is attested in the Athenian tribute lists.

Pteleon was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionic district and is recorded from 450/49 (IG i3 263.11.16) to 430/29 (IG i3 281.1.21) a total of ten times, three times completely but plausibly restored. In 430/29 Pteleon is explicitly recorded as a dependency of Erythrai (IG i3 281.1.20). In 450/49, 448/7 and 447/6 Pteleon paid alongside the other dependencies of Erythrai (no. 845); they all formed a syntely, but the Pteleousioi paid on their own behalf (IG i3 263.11.16, 264.111.30, 265.1.64). In later years their payment is recorded separately from that of the other Erythraian dependencies, and they seem in all years to have paid 100 dr. (IG i3 272.11.20). In 425/4 Pteleon was assessed for tribute separately from Erythrai and the other Erythraian dependencies (IG i3 71.11.93).
The community was located in Erythraian territory and was undoubtedly an Erythraian dependency (Thuc. 8.24.2: ἐν τῇ Ἕρυθραίᾳ), but the Athenians maintained control over the site during Erythrai's revolt in 412. The designation τείχος in Thuc. 8.24.2 indicates that Pteleon was walled; see also Thucydides' report at 8.31.2 of Astyochos' failure to capture the site.

863. Pygela (Pygeleus) Map 61. Lat. 37.50, long. 27.15. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A. The toponym is Πύγελα, τά (Hipponax fr. 92.15, West; Xen. Hell. 1.2.2; SEG 23 189.11.9 (330–324)) or Φυγελα (I.Ephesos 3110.6 (C4)). The city-ethnic is Πυγελεύς (Xen. Hell. 1.2.2) or Πυγελεύς (IG 1³ 266.1.7 (446/5)) or Φυγελεύς (I.Ephesos 3110.3 (C4)). Pygela is attested as a polis in the political sense in I.Ephesos 3110 (C4), and retrospectively in the sense of town by Polyæn. 7.3.2 (rC4). The polis cognates polites and politeia in the sense of citizenship are attested in I.Ephesos 3110. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on C4 coins (infra) and externally in Xen. Hell. 1.2.2; IG 1³ 269.1.29 (443/2); I.Ephesos 3110 (C4). For the individual and external use of the city-ethnic, see IGBulg. 416 (C5–C4) and Dion. Hal. Thuc. 5 (rC5) (referring to Thucydides' predecessor Δηµοκρῆς ὁ Φυγελεύς).

The χώρα of Pygela is mentioned in Xen. Hell. 1.2.2 (r409). I.Ephesos 3111.11–13 (c310) records that a grant of citizenship was passed with 350 votes (Gauthier (1990) 91–92).

Pygela was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionian district and is recorded from 446/5 (IG 1³ 266.1.7) to 415/4 (IG 1³ 290.1.24) of a total of eleven times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 1 tal. in 440/39 (IG 1³ 272.11.13) and 1 tal., 3,000 dr. in 432/1 (IG 1³ 280.1.47). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG 1³ 71.1.151).

In C4 Pygela entered into an isopoliteia agreement with Miletos (no. 854) (I.Ephesos 3110) in which Pygelean envoys to Miletos are honoured (2). Prior to the isopoliteia agreement Milesian citizens resident at Pygela appear to have enjoyed some form of limited citizenship, perhaps bestowed on them by a block grant. Likewise, Pygelean citizens resident at Miletos seem to have had some privileges. The treaty itself may have extended the civic rights of resident Pygeleans in Miletos: the end of the decree stipulates that the Pygeleans are to be assigned to theōn by lot by the prytaı̂n (II. 17–18). I.Ephesos 3111 (C4) shows that in C4 the Pygelean assembly controlled the admission of new citizens by decree (psephisma, l. 4).

The independence of Pygela seems to have been under constant threat from its more powerful neighbours, especially Samos (no. 864) and Ephesos (no. 844). The latter clearly had absorbed Pygela in the early Hellenistic period, when the inhabitants of Pygela were referred to as Ephesian citizens (I.Ephesos 1408.2, 4–5).

The civic subdivisions of Pygela were phylai and gene. The phyle Ἐγαµεµνονίς and the genos Ἑὐριδίας are attested, and a board of prytaı̂n are given responsibility for assigning naturalised citizens to civic subdivisions by lot and, together with the tamias, for having the citizenship decree inscribed on stone (I.Ephesos 3111.5–6).

Pygela was fortified in 409 (Xen. Hell. 1.2.2). During excavations of the site between Ephesos and Kuṣadasi, Gürçay and Akurgal cleared 40 m of the city walls. Sherds dating from C4 were found during this operation (Mellink (1976) 280). A sanctuary of Artemis is attested epigraphically (I.Ephesos 3111.5–6). Pygelean theorodokoi to host theoroi from Argos (no. 347) are attested in SEG 23 189.11.9 (330–324).

Pygela struck coins of silver and bronze throughout C4. (1) Silver, C4: denomination: tetradrachm. Types: obv. head of Artemis Munychia, facing; rev. buttling bull; legend: ΨΥΓΑΛΕΩΝ and magistrate's name. (2) Bronze, C4: obv. head of Artemis Munychia wearing stephane, r. or facing; rev. buttling bull; legend: ΨΥΓ. (Babelon, Traité ii.2 nos. 1856–63; Head, HN² 590; Regling (1922); BMC Ionia p. 228; SNG Cop. Ionia 1072–75).

864. Samos (Samios) (to 365) Map 61. Lat. 37.40, long. 26.55. Size of territory: 4 (468.3 km²), but probably 5 including the Samian peryia. Type: A. The toponym is Σάµος, ἕ (Aesch. Pers. 882; Hdt. 3.48.2), denoting both the island (Hdt. 3.120.3) and the city (Hdt. 3.54.1). The city-ethnic is Σάµιος (I.Ephesos 115 (C6); F.Delphes 111.4 455 (C5); Hdt. 1.51.3). In C5 Samos is called a polis both in the urban sense (Hdt. 3.54.1; Thuc. 1.116.2) and in the political sense (Hdt. 3.139.1; Thuc. 8.21); the territorial sense is sometimes a connotation (Thuc. 4.75.1). In C4 again, both the urban sense (Ps.-Skylax 98; Isoc. 13.107.8) and the political sense (Xen. Hell. 2.3.7; Arist. Pol. 1287c37–38) are attested. Samos is called asy at Anac. frr. 353 and 448. Page. The designation polites is applied to citizens of Samos in Hdt. 3.45.4 (rC6) and Xen. Hell. 2.3.7, while the Samian politeia in the sense of constitution is mentioned in Thuc. 1.115.2; IG 1³ 127.19–20 (405); and [Arist.] Ath. Pol. 24.2 (rC5). A Σάµιου πολιτεία was included among the 158 Aristotelian constitutions (fr. 591.1; cf. frr. 588–95). The verb politeuein/politi-
the battle at Salamis in Cyprus against Persian and Cretan forces. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in a C5e dedication quoted at Hdt. 4.88.2 and in abbreviated form on CSl–C4 coins (infra), and externally in IG II² 1365A.11 (C6); Thuc. 7.57.4 (C5); and Arist. Oec. 1359b6. The individual and external use of the city-ethnic is attested in I. Ephesos 115 (C6) and IG II² 1366 (C6–C5). In the collective grant of citizenship by Athens in 405, the honorands are classified as both Samians and Athenians (IG II² 127.12). The collective form of the city-ethnic is used retrospectively in a number of Samian honorific decrees bestowed on the benefactors of the exiled Samian demos (IG XII.6 17.5–6, 24.6–7).

The Samian territory in its entirety is referred to as χώρα in Hdt. 6.22.1, and it is designated Συμβολή in Hdt. 9.96.1. A study of the settlement pattern of ancient Samos is given by Shipley (1987) 231–68. Apart from Samos itself, Barr. records only four settlements of the Archaic and Classical periods: Kazania (Barr., AC), Manolates (Barr., A), Neo Karlovasi (Barr., C) and Neokhorion (Barr., AC), plus one fort at Ag. Ioannis (Barr., AC).

The size of the Samian citizen population cannot be ascertained. From the number of Samian ships at Lade in 440, Shipley (1987) 12–15 suggests a population figure of 30,000–50,000, including women, resident aliens and slaves.

According to Hdt. 5.99.1, Samos supported the Chalkidian side in the so-called Lelantine War (C8f?), and Samian forces also assisted the Spartans in a war against the Messenians (Hdt. 3.47.1), presumably the Second Messenian War (C7). In C6 Samian troops distinguished themselves in the battle at Salamis in Cyprus against Persian and Phoinikian forces (Hdt. 5.112.1). Around 371 the conquest of Samos was allegedly completed successfully by Otanes; the entire population was allegedly killed and the Persians handed over “an empty island” to Sylosin (Hdt. 3.147–49); but Otanes repopulated the island soon afterwards.

Samos belonged to the Ionian dodekapolis (Hdt. 1.142.4), and the Samians took part in the Ionian Revolt in 499 and provided sixty triremes at the battle of Lade in 494 (Hdt. 6.8.2). After the failure of the Ionian Revolt, which led to the reinstatement of Aiakes II as tyrant with Persian backing, many wealthy Samians went into exile and settled at Zankle (no. 51), driving out the Zanklaïans (Hdt. 6.22–24; Arist. Pol. 1303a35–36). The Samians fought on the Persian side in 480/79 (Hdt. 8.85) but joined the Greeks before the battle of Mykale (Hdt. 9.90–92) and were accepted as members of the Hellenic League after the battle (Hdt. 9.106.4). Samos was among the earliest members of the Delian League (Hdt. 9.106.4) and, alongside Chios (no. 840) and Lesbos, the Samians maintained their status as an autonemos ally of Athens (Arist. Ath. Pol. 24.2, but see Pol. 1284b39–40). Yet, in 441/0 they revolted after Athenian interference in their war against Miletos (no. 854) and their installation of a democratic government on the island (Thuc. 1.115.2–3). After a protracted siege (Thuc. 1.115.4–117.2) the Samians were forced back into the alliance and had to pull down their walls, surrender their fleet, and pay a large war indemnity (Thuc. 1.117.3; IG II² 48 = Staatsverträge 199). The oligarchs who had left Samos in 441/0 during the democratic regime but had returned and instigated the Revolt in 440 (Thuc. 1.115.4) went into exile once again, and many of them settled in Anaia (no. 838) (Thuc. 3.32.2, 4.75.1; see Gehrke, Stasis 143–44). Samos was now perceived as a tribute-paying member of the alliance (Thuc. 7.57.4), although it is never attested in the Athenian tribute lists. Samos remained a member for the duration of the Peloponnesian War, in spite of two attempted secessions in 412 and 411 staged by the Samian elite, both of which were prevented at the eleventh hour (Thuc. 8.21 and 8.63.3). In 412 Samos regained its status as an autonemos member of the League (Thuc. 8.21). After the Athenian defeat at Aigos potamoi, the Samians massacred their oligarchs (Xen. Hell. 2.2.6) and sent envoys to Athens (IG II² 127.7–8). Athenian citizenship was conferred on all Samians, but their autonomia was guaranteed (IG II² 127.11–18). After the end of the Peloponnesian War, a decarchy was imposed on Samos by Lysandros after the expulsion of Samian citizens and the return of oligarchic exiles (Xen. Hell. 2.3.6–7; Diod. 14.3.4–5; Shipley 1987 131–33). Some of the exiled Samian democrats settled in Notion (no. 858) and Ephesos (no. 844) (IG II² 1.48–49 = Tod 97 (403/2)). The Samians displayed their loyalty by dedicating a statue of Lysandros at Olympia (Paus. 6.3.15). Samos presumably remained a Spartan ally until Konon’s victory in the battle of Knidos in 394 (Paus. 6.3.16), but Samos was subsequently forced back into an alliance with Sparta in 391 (Diod. 14.97.3). In 366/5 Samos was conquered by Timotheos (Isoc. 15.111; Dem. 15.9) and turned into an Athenian klerouchy (no. 865).

Samos was renowned as a hegemonic sea power during the reign of Polykrates (Hdt. 3.39.3–4, 122.2; Thuc. 1.13.6), who allegedly had 100 pentekonteres and 1,000 archers at his disposal (Hdt. 3.39.3), and Samos deployed sixty triremes at the battle of Lade (Hdt. 6.8.2, 14.2). In 440–439 the Samians
had a considerable naval force engaged in their rebellion against the Athenians (Thuc. 1.116.1, 117.1–2). They were compelled to hand over their fleet after their defeat, but in 406 ten Samian ships under a Samian commander fought in the battle of Arginousai (Xen. Hell. 1.6.25, 29). A contingent of Samian troops participated in the Sicilian expedition (Thuc. 7.57.4), and Samian strategoi are honoured in IG i² 127.8.

The constitutional history of Samos before Polykrates is obscure. A C6 basileus, Amphikrates (Hdt. 3.59.4), may have been an eponymous official rather than a king (Shipley 1987 37). On the basis of Plutarch’s rather late and anecdotal account at Mor. 303E–304C, it is normally assumed that Samos from C7 was ruled by an oligarchy of wealthy landowners (the geomoroi), that the rule of the geomoroi followed after the murder of the monarch Demoteles, and that the oligarchy remained in place until a successful Samian coup was staged in the battle of Argo nusai (Xen. Hell. 1.6.25, 29). A contingent of Samian troops participated in the Sicilian expedition (Thuc. 7.57.4), and Samian strategoi are honoured in IG i² 127.8.

The constitutional history of Samos before Polykrates is obscure. A C6 basileus, Amphikrates (Hdt. 3.59.4), may have been an eponymous official rather than a king (Shipley 1987 37). On the basis of Plutarch’s rather late and anecdotal account at Mor. 303E–304C, it is normally assumed that Samos from C7 was ruled by an oligarchy of wealthy landowners (the geomoroi), that the rule of the geomoroi followed after the murder of the monarch Demoteles, and that the oligarchy remained in place until a successful Samian intervention in a war between the Megarians (no. 225) and Perinthians (no. 678), when the Samian demos staged a coup and “liberated” the polis (Shipley 1987 39–41). Demoteles may have been a tyrant whose rule represented an interruption of the oligarchy of the geomoroi (ibid. 49). However, Thucydides at least confirms that the Samian aristocracy was still referred to as geomoroi as late as 412, when a ban on intermarriage between the geomoroi and the rest of the Samians was instituted (8.21).

The period of tyranny at Samos started in the 590s with the coup of Syloson I, known only from Polyben. 6.45. For a reconstruction of the succession of tyrants from Syloson I to Polykrates, see Shipley (1987) 70–72. Polykrates ruled as tyrant of Samos from, probably, the 540s (ibid. 74–80) until 522, when he was crucified by Oroites (Hdt. 3.125.2–3). He first ruled jointly with his two brothers, Syloson II and Pantagnostos, but soon killed Pantagnostos and exiled Syloson II (Hdt. 3.39.2). After Polykrates’ death, Mian rios offered the Samians isonomie (Hdt. 1.142.3; Raalfu (1985) 130–31), but stasis soon broke out, and Syloson II was subsequently installed as tyrant with Persian backing. Aiakes II, the son of Syloson II, had succeeded his father as tyrant by 514 (Hdt. 4.158.2), but he was ousted from the tyranny in 499, allegedly at the instigation of Aristagoras of Miletos (Hdt. 6.13.2). It is not known what type of regime was set up after his fall, but he was reinstated as tyrant by the Persians again immediately after the I onian defeat in 494 and presumably ruled until 492 when, allegedly, demokratia was imposed on the Ionian poleis by Mardonios (Hdt. 6.43.3). The last Samian tyrant was Theomestor, who had power handed to him by the Persians in return for his loyalty in the battle of Salamis (Hdt. 8.85.3). The constitution of Samos after the Persian defeat at Mykale was probably oligarchic and may have remained so until replaced by an Athenian-backed democracy in 441 (Thuc. 1.115.2–3; Ath. Pol. 24.2). The view that oligarchy was introduced only in 454/3 (Barron 1966 89) is countered by Gehrke, Stasis 140 n. 3. Samos probably remained democratic until the end of the Peloponnesian War (Hornblower 1991 192–93), in spite of the oligarchic threat in 412 and 411 (Thuc. 8.21, 73.2). Oligarchy was imposed on Samos by Lysandros after the Athenian defeat in 404 (Xen. Hell. 2.3.6–7), and it may have remained oligarchic even after the battle of Knidos in 394 (Gehrke, Stasis 144–45), and right down to 365, when the Athenians set up their klerouchy on the island.

The Samian political institutions are poorly known since, so far, not one single public enactment antedating 365 has been found. A Samian boule is attested in IG i² 127.8 (405), while a Samian assembly (ekkesie) was allegedly convened by Mianndrios after Polykrates’ death in 522 (Hdt. 3.142.2). An honorific decree passed by the koinon of the Samians and set up in the Samian agora after the battle of Lade is mentioned in Hdt. 6.14.3, and Samian nomoi are referred to in IG i² 127.15. In IG xii.6.478 (C5) Telesandros and Demagores are attested as elected supervisors of a public construction of a bridge. A board of gynaikonomoi is attested in IG xii.6.461 (C4f).

The only thing known about civic subdivisions is that the citizens of Perinthos (no. 678), a Samian colony, were subdivided into the six Ionian phylai. It seems reasonable to presume that the system was taken over from the metropolis (Jones, POAG 195–97). The well-attested subdivision of the citizen body into phylai, chiliastyes, hekatostyes and gene (IG xii.6.18.21–23 (C4/1)) was introduced after the expulsion of the Athenian klerouchs in 322/1 (Jones, POAG 195–97; Shipley 1987 284–92 suggests an earlier date). In C4 the Samians granted proxenia to a citizen of Gela (no. 17) (IG xii.6 33), and a grant of proxenia was received from Athens (no. 361) by Pronos Thyionos Samios (SEG 37.70 = IG ii² 64 + 425 + 293 (375–350)). A block grant of Athenian citizenship was received by the entire Samian population in 405 (IG i² 127). The earliest recorded Samian grants of proxenia and/or citizenship date from the period after 322. The following funerary monuments commemorate non-citizens who were presumably buried in Samos in the period before the Athenian klerouchy: PEP Samos 521 (Miletos (C5)); PEP Samos 548 (Kolophon (C5)); and PEP Samos 571 (Kyzikos (C5)).
The Samian acropolis, which was apparently fortified in C6, is attested in Hdt. 3.143.1, 144 and 146.2. An Archaic city wall is attested in Herodotus' account of Polykrates (3.39.4) and the Spartan siege of Samos in 524 (3.54.1–2). The urban centre of Samos may well have remained fortified until the Athenians forced the Samians to demolish their walls in 439/8 (Thuc. 1.117.3). Samos was still *ateichistos* in 411 (Thuc. 8.51.2), when the Athenians had to fortify the city in a hurry in the face of an (allegedly) impending attack by Peloponnesian forces (Thuc. 8.51.2). Samos was also fortified in C4 (Arist. *Occ. 1350b*; Diod. 16.21.2). Kienast (1978) 94–103 identifies three building phases for the walls: the first in polygonal masonry (the Archaic wall), the second in ashlar masonry (presumably C4e and at any rate earlier than 290), and the third in pseudo-polygonal masonry. The city wall encompassed an area of c.103 ha.

A Samian agora is mentioned in Hdt. 3.42.2 (rC6s) (probably anecdotal) and Hdt. 6.14.3. A proasteion is mentioned in Hdt. 3.54.1 and 142.2. The mole in the harbour of Samos, attributed to Polykrates by Hdt. 3.60.3, has been located through underwater surveys in 1988 (*BCH* 113 (1989) 673). Other large-scale public works assigned to Polykrates' reign are ship sheds (Hdt. 3.45.4) and the famous Eupalinos tunnel (Hdt. 3.60.1–2; Kienast (1995)). A *bouleuterion* is mentioned by Plut. *Mor.* 304B in connection with the Samian people's coup against the ruling oligarchs c.700. An Archaic fountain house was published in Tölle-Kastenbein (1975) 212 (see further Giannouli (1996)). A theatre is mentioned in a C4I honorific decree (*IG* xi1.6 150.3).

Of sanctuaries the most famous was the Heraion, located outside the urban centre. The first Heraion can be dated as early as C8, and it was replaced by a C7 structure. The construction of the so-called Rhoikos temple began c.575 but was soon replaced by the monumental Heraion praised in Hdt. 3.6.4. Construction appears to have begun during the last three decades of C6, and it was apparently not finished earlier than the end of C6 (Kyrileis (1981); Klose (1999) 361–63). An Artemis sanctuary is attested in Hdt. 3.48.3 (rC6) and on the C5–C4 *horos* *IG* xi1.6 266. Hdt. 3.142.2 contains an account of the construction of an altar and *temenos* for Zeus Euletherios by Maiandrios (rC6); but see Raaflaub (1985) 139–40, but see Thuc. 2.74.1). According to Paus. 2.31.6 and Diod. 1.98.5–6, Samos also contained a sanctuary of the Pythian Apollo. *IG* xi1.6 238–44 are C5 *horoi* of the sanctuary of *Athena Athenon medeusa*, while *IG* xi1.6 245–46 are C5 *horoi* of the sanctuary of *Ion Athenethen*. *IG* xi1.6 527 and 528 are C5–C4 altars of Apollo Nymphhegetes.

According to Hdt. 3.48.3, the Samians instituted a festival for Artemis after their successful attempt to rescue a number of children from Korkyra whom Kypselos was exporting to Sardis. Another important festival was the Heraia, temporarily renamed the Lysandria after the end of the Peloponnesian War (Douris *FGrHist* 76 frt. 26, 71). Three Olympian victors from Samos are known: *Olympionikai* 123 (532), 399 (380) and Skaios, son of Duris, who apparently participated during the Samians’ period in exile from their island (Paus. 6.13.5). *SEG* 22.483 (C4f) may commemorate a Samian victor in the Pythian Games (but ἐκ *Σαμιτῆς* is restored). The Samians set up a statue in honour of Lysandros in Olympia (Paus. 6.3.14–15 (rC5l)), while *E.Delphes* 111.4 455 (C5e) is a communal dedication by the Samians to Apollo at Delphi. A C6 *kerykeion* was found in the Heraion (*AM* (1972) 138–39), and two others are listed in the inventory of the treasurers of the Heraion of 346/5 (*IG* xi1.6 261.53).


The Samians were active colonisers, founding Kelenderis (no. 1008) in C8I, Nagidos (no. 1010) at an unknown date, Perinthis (no. 678) in 602, and Bisanthe (no. 673) in C6(?). In the reign of Amasis Samians took part as co-colonisers of Naukratis (no. 1023), where they had their own sanctuary of Hera (Hdt. 2.178.3); another Samian settlement in Egypt was
Oasis (no. 1024), founded at an unknown date. Samian exiles, including Polykrates’ brother Sylos, participated in a refoundation of Kydonia (no. 968) in Crete in 60C. Other foundations probably or possibly of Samian origin are Samothrace (no. 515), c. 700; Dikaia (no. 643), C6; Nymphaion (no. 704), 5600; and the three poleis on Amorgos: Aigiale (no. 471), Arkesine (no. 472) and Minoa (no. 473), founded at an unknown date.

865. Samos (the klerouchy of 365–322) In 366/5 an Athenian squadron under Timotheos conquered Samos after a siege of eight months (Ios. 15,11; Dem. 15,9). The Samians were expelled (Diod. 18.18.9; Heracl. Lemb. 35; Arist. no. 129; Habicht in Hallof and Habicht (1995); IG xii.6 42.10–30). Subsequently three contingents of Athenian klerouchs were sent to the island: in 366/5 (Diod. 18.18.9; Arist. fr. 143.1 no. 35), in 361/0 (Aeschin. 1.53 with schol.) and in 352/1 (Philoch. fr. 154). One of the three contingents alone numbered 2,000 klerouchs (Arist. fr. 143.1; Strabo 14.11.18; see Cargill (1995) 17–21; Habicht in Hallof and Habicht (1995) 286–88 (301–303)). The exiled Samians settled in different poleis all over the Aegean, and some undoubtedly set up home on the former Samian perai, especially at Anaia (IG xii.6 42, 43). A series of honorific decrees passed by the Samian demos after their return to the island in 322 provide some information about communities that allowed the Samians to settle in their territory: Iasos (no. 891) (IG xii.6 17.18), Rhodes (no. 1000) (IG xii.6 149) and Ephesos (no. 844) (IG xii.6 39). Some may even have settled as far away as Herakleia (no. 20) in Sicily (IG xii.6 38 (C4l) with Kebric (1975), (1977) and Shipley (1987) 164).

During the period of Athenian occupation the Athenian settlement on Samos shared many of the characteristics of a polis, although it is not referred to as polis in the personal/political sense in any contemporary source (Demades (fr. 4) purportedly characterised Samos as a fragment broken off from the Athenian polis (ἀπόρρωγα τῆς πάλεως)). The klerouchy is, on the other hand, described as patris in IG ii² 1169.5 (C4m) (διασαί δ’ αὐτ’ πατρίδες α’ ἢ μὲν φύσει, ἡ δὲ νόμοισιν); the Dionysios of this epigram is commonly identified with Διονύσιος Ἀλκίνου Κολλυτέως (LSAG ii no. 414), who is attested as klerouch on Samos in Michel 832.2. Accordingly, the two patrides mentioned in the text should be Athens (patris by physis) and the Athenian klerouchy on Samos (patris by nomos). The community of Athenians in Samos seems in many respects to have functioned independently of Athens and can in that respect be compared to a dependent polis; cf. IG ii² 1443.11.89–91, which records a wreath bestowed in 346/5 on the Athenian demos by the demos in Samos (not the Samian demos). IG xii.6 253 (C4m) refers to the assembly (demos) of Athenians in Samos, and to their boule in a probouleutic capacity. IG xii.6 262 is a list of bouleutai and other officials in Samos (c. 352–347). The boule numbered 250 bouleutai, and on that basis it has been suggested that the number of Athenian citizens was roughly half that of Athens itself in C4 (Habicht in Hallof and Habicht (1995)). The other officials mentioned in IG xii.6 262 are the nine archontes (xii.1–10), a grammateus (xii.11–12), five strategoi (xii.13–18), a grammateus demou (xii.19–20), a grammateus boules (xii.21–22), an official epi tois nomois (xii.23–24), a keryx demou (xii.25–26) and an antigrapheus (xii.27–28). IG xii.6 261 is an inventory of the treasurers of the Heraion of 346/5. The Athenians in Samos had their own eponymous archon (IG xii.6 261 (346/5)). IG xii.6 260 is part of a sacred law passed in C4m. A bouleuteron is attested in IG xii.6 257, 3. IG xii.6 252 has been interpreted by Hallof (2003) as a citizenship decree passed in Samos, by which the honorand is made an Athenian citizen (17–19). It is not known if this would also give the honorand the right to enrol as a citizen in Athens proper, should he wish to settle there. That some kind of dual citizenship of the klerouchy and Athens proper was in operation is indicated by the status of the philosopher Epikouros: he was born in Samos, but was enrolled as an ephebe in Athens (Strabo 14.1.18; Diog. Laert. 10.1).

The civic subdivisions in the klerouchy were the same as the Athenian ones, and nine of the ten Kleisthenic phylai are attested in IG xii.6 262. IG xii.6 253.12 mentions envoys, which may indicate that the Athenians in Samos maintained their own diplomatic relations with the outside world; IG xii.6 263 and 264 are communal dedications set up by the Athenian demos in Samos to Apollo in Delphi in c.340 and 334/3 respectively, again an indication of the separate communal identity of the klerouchy.

In addition to local institutions manned by klerouchs, Athenian officials were sent from Athens to Samos (Arist. Ath. Pol. 62.2), in particular a strategos (στρατηγός ἐς Σάμον: IG ii² 1628.17–18, 28; 109–10, 119; I. Priene 6.6; IG xii.6 42.4–5; cf. Kroll and Mitchel (1980) 91–92).

The Athenian klerouchs were expelled in 322/1, and the island given back to the Samians (Diod. 18.18.9; Diog. Laert. 10.1; IG xii.6 43.8–14 (C4l)).

866. Sidousa (Sidious) Map 56. Lat. 38.40, long. 26.30, but see infra. Size of territory: ? Type: A. The toponym is Σιδούσση, ἦ (Thuc. 8.24.2) or Σίδουσα (Hecat. fr. 229). The
city-ethnic is \( \Sigma \delta \omega \sigma \iota \sigma \sigma \iota \sigma \) (IG 13 265.1.61 (447/6)). Sidousa is called a polis in the urban sense by Hecat. fr. 229 (Hansen 1997) 24–25. Thuc. 8.24.2 refers to the settlement as a teichos located in the territory of Erythrai (no. 845), perhaps on the Mimas peninsula; although Plin. HN 5.137 believed that Sidousa was an island. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute quota lists (IG 13 265.1.61).

Sidousa was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionian district and is recorded from 450/49 (IG 13 263.11.15) to 430/29 (IG 13 281.1.24) a total of ten times, three times completely but plausibly restored. In 430/29 Sidousa is explicitly registered as a dependency of Erythrai (IG 13 281.1.24). In 450/49, 448/7 and 447/6 it paid alongside the other dependencies of Erythrai (no. 845); they all formed a syntely, but the Sidousiots paid on their own behalf (IG 13 263.11.15, 264.11.30, 265.1.61). In later years their payment is recorded separately from that of the other Erythraian dependencies, and they seem in all years to have paid 500 dr. (IG 13 271.1.19).

The community was located in Erythraian territory and was undoubtedly an Erythraian dependency (Thuc. 8.24.2: \( \delta \varepsilon \nu \tau \gamma \) \( \varepsilon \rho \theta \rho \tau \alpha \iota \alpha \iota \alpha \omega \)), but the Athenians maintained control over the site during Erythraí’s revolt in 412. The designation \( \tau \epsilon \chi \iota \sigma \) in Thuc. 8.24.2 indicates that Sidousa was walled.

867. Smyrna (Smyrnaïos) Map 56. Lat. 38.25, long. 27.10.
Size of territory: ? Type: A. The toponym is \( \Sigma \mu \iota \rho \eta \), \( \eta \) (Mimmermos fr. 9.6, West; Hdt. 1.16.2) or \( \Sigma \nu \iota \rho \iota \) (Ps.-Sky lax 98) or, later, \( \Sigma \mu \iota \rho \iota \) (F.Delphes 111.3 145.2 (C3j)).
The city-ethnic is \( \Sigma \mu \iota \rho \iota \alpha \iota \) (Pind. fr. 204, Maehler; Hdt. 1.143.3) or, later, \( \Sigma \mu \iota \rho \iota \alpha \iota \) (F.Delphes III.3 145.3 (C3j)).
Smyrna is called a polis both in the urban sense (Hdt. 1.150.1) and in the political sense (Hdt. 1.149.1). A possible C4b attestation of Smyrna as a polis in the political or territorial sense may be found in IG 11 28.19 = Tod 114 (387), but only if the very doubtful restoration of \( \tau \alpha \mu \mu \iota \pi \omega \lambda \epsilon \omega \) in ll. 17–18 is accepted. The designation asty is applied to the urban centre of Smyrna in Pind. fr. 204, but the context may be historical. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on a C4b coin (infra) and externally in Kallinos fr. 2, West (C7); Pind. fr. 204, Maehler; Hdt. 1.143.4. For the individual and external use, see IG 11 10369, an Attic C4s sepulchral inscription, and Ephor. fr. 1, referring to a contemporary Smyrnaean teacher.

Smyrna was originally an Aiolian foundation from which the settlers were driven out by Ionian exiles from Kolophon (no. 848) (Mimmermos fr. 9, West; Hdt. 1.149.1–150.2). This probably happened prior to 688 (the date of the Smyrnaean Onomastos’ victory in the Olympic Games), when Smyrna was considered Ionian (Paus. 5.1.7). Hdt. 1.16.2 refers to Smyrna as “founded from Kolophon”, which probably relates to the Kolophonian take-over. The most likely interpretation of Hdt. 1.143.3 is that the Smyrnaeans subsequently asked to participate in the Panonia, but were refused. There is no evidence for Smyrnaean participation in the Archaic or Classical periods, nor for Smyrna’s interaction with other Greek states.

According to Strabo 14.1.37, Smyrna was inhabited kome- don for about 400 years, dating from the Lydian conquest of the polis c.585 (Hdt. 1.16.2). The physical destruction of Smyrna’s urban centre may also be alluded to in Theognis fr. 1104, West. However, archaeological evidence points to a later date for the destruction, viz. 545, connected with the Persian conquest of Ionia (Meriç and Nollé 1988) 230–32. Strabo’s claim that the Smyrnaean dioikismos lasted until the refoundation of Smyrna by Alexander the Great or his successors may also have to be modified. E. Akurgal (1983) 56–58 discusses architectural remains from C4 on the site of Archaic Smyrna. See further Mellink (1985) 563 and Gates (1994) for results of later excavations of C5 and C4 structures. Bingöl (1976–77) dated a number of roof tiles found in the harbour area to C4, before the refoundation. On the other hand, numerous second-order settlements scattered all over Smyrnaian territory, some of them fortified, may be dated to the period after the dioikismos. Some of these are discussed by Bean (1955). The locations mentioned are Belkahve (6 m-thick Archaic wall, ceramics from C4 and later), Adatepe (presumed by Bean to be a Hellenistic installation), Akaçakaya (described by Weber in AM 10 (1885)), also believed by Bean to be Hellenistic in origin, Akkaya (for which Bean ventures no date), Yamanlar road site (no date), Çobanpınarı (terminus post quem C5 on the basis of ceramic surface finds). Meriç and Nollé (1988) 225–26 discuss a fortified site on Çaltakaya in Smyrnaian territory. The ceramics found on the site are predominantly Archaic and Hellenistic.

According to Hdt. 1.150.2, the Aiolians who had been thrown out of Smyrna by the Kolophonians were received and given citizenship by the remaining eleven Aiolic poleis, but this may very well be anachronistic. The same may be true of his allegation (1.150.2) that a treaty was made between the Kolophonians and the combined forces of the Aiolian poleis, who had aided the original Smyrnaeans, according to which the Smyrnaeans were allowed to take their movable property with them into their exile.
As far as the public architecture of Smyrna is concerned, an open square with wells was identified and dated to C4 by E. Akurgal (1983) 56. For a comprehensive discussion of the Athena temple, see Cook and Nicholls (1998), who regard the structure Temple III A–B (C7) “as the local beginnings of wholly monumental temple architecture” ((1998) 198). A late C7 fountain house was identified and published by M. Akurgal (1996). According to him, the well seems to have been in continuous use down to the middle of C4. Another well, dating from 630–600, was excavated and described by Nicholls (1958–59) 58–64. E. Akurgal identified what he called the “high street” of Old Smyrna, the so-called “Athenastrasse”, about 4 m wide. He connected this with the “Orientalizing settlement” (E. Akurgal (1983) 45). He also discussed a number of smaller streets dating to the same period (ibid. 46). For a summary of the discussion of the street plan of Old Smyrna, see Lang (1996) 241–43. E. Akurgal (1983) 14 estimated that there were c.500–600 houses in the urban centre of Old Smyrna in the period 630–545, and that the settlement housed c.3,000 inhabitants.

The only written attestation of the city wall of Smyrna is found in Hdt. 1.130.1 in his account of how the Kolophonians took advantage of a Smyrnaian Dionysos festival outside the walls, which the Smyrnaioi were attending. The Kolophonians took possession of the urban centre and locked the gates. The archaeological evidence points to a date of the first city wall at least as early as 750 (Wall II); but the even earlier remains of Wall I were interpreted as remains of a city wall by Cook and Nicholls, who dated this to c.850. This date was later accepted by E. Akurgal (1983) 25–26, who argued that a fire in a building complex dated by him to 875–825 affected the neighbouring city wall. For the problems surrounding the interpretation of Wall I, see Lang (1996) 241, who prefers to interpret it as a terrace wall. Wall II appears to have been destroyed by an earthquake c.700 and was replaced by city wall III in C7. Akurgal argued for considerable damage having been inflicted on city wall III under Alyattes, and for the city’s being unfortified in C6 ((1983) 54).

The occupation of the urban centre of Smyrna goes back at least as far as 1050, according to E. Akurgal (1983) 15–59, who argues for an Aiolic phase running from 1050 to 1000 on the basis of ceramic finds (Aiolic grey ware), found together with Protogeometric and Geometric decorated sherds. In contexts of the late Geometric period, the amount of grey ware increases (ibid. 15). There are very few architectural remains dating from this phase, but Akurgal mentions a number of square buildings (ibid. 22). The next phase is the Protogeometric settlement, running from 1000 to 875. An “Ovalhaus” is dated to 925–900 on the basis of ceramic finds (ibid. 17–18). Early Protogeometric ceramic is interpreted as evidence for an Ionian take-over of Smyrna (ibid. 10–21). The third phase, the early and middle Geometric settlement, runs from 875 to 825 (ibid. 22–27). Akurgal interprets rich architectural remains from this period as part of a large housing complex (ibid. 24–25). Phase four, the late Geometric settlement, runs from 750 to 675/650. Architectural finds include a tholos (ibid. 28), a large building complex (ibid. 29) and a house with two rooms and an ante-room. Not much evidence, apart from ceramic finds, remains from what Akurgal designates the sub-Geometric settlement, 675–640 (ibid. 34), but finds increase in the next stratum, the Orientalising settlement (640–600), summarised ibid. 35–50. Architectural finds include a double megarony building, the oinochoe house, perhaps with towers. Another building complex included a bath dating from the last third of C7 (ibid. 39–40). The Archaic settlement (C6) follows (ibid. 50–56) with a number of architectural remains, along with attested repairs to older large buildings, such as the megaron house. For a summary and some critical remarks on Akurgal’s reconstruction; see Lang (1996) 241–43. There can be little doubt, however, that the urbanisation of Smyrna was very early (C8 at the latest: Lang (1996) 242–43).

There was not much C5 material available in 1983 (E. Akurgal (1983) 53); but this may have been due to incomplete excavation, rather than to absence of habitation in this period. Akurgal notes plenty of ceramic finds. There are considerable architectural remains from C4 (ibid. 56–58). In the 1990s excavations uncovered a quite dense C4 settlement (see the reports in Gates (1994), (1996)). The city seems to have been abandoned at the end of C4 (E. Akurgal (1983) 58), but Cook and Nicholls (1998) 183 note that a small settlement west of the tell seems to have had continued occupation into the Hellenistic period.

Apart from the Dionysia mentioned by Hdt. 1.130.1, nothing is known of Smyrnaian festivals. In addition to Onomastos mentioned above, a further Smyrnaian victor at the Olympic Games, allegedly the first of the Ionians, is mentioned in Paus. 6.13.6 (Olympionikai 29).

Smyrna struck electrum coins in C6f. Denominations: stater, hekte and fractions down to one-forty-eighth. Types: obv. lion’s head; rev. rough incuse square (Babelon, Traité ii.1 nos. 177–89; Head, HN² 591; BMC Ionia 236). A unique silver tetradrachm on the Rhodian standard has been dated to
C4f: obv. head of Apollo, laureate; rev. lyre in slightly concave field; legend: ΣΜΥΡΝΑΩΝ. Head, HNX 592 interpreted the coin as evidence for the existence of Smyrna prior to its late C4 refoundation and relocation, an assumption that now seems to be confirmed by the archaeological evidence for the C4 settlement.

868. Teos (Teios) Map 56. Lat. 38.05, long. 26.45. Size of territory: unknown but probably 3 or 4. Type: A. The toponym is Téos, ἦ (Hdt. 1.142.3; Thuc. 8.16.1; Ps.-Skylax 98). An alternative toponym, Ἀθάμακαντίς, is attested in Anac. fr. 142, Gentili. The city-ethnic is Τῆιος (ML 7b (C6e); PEP Teos 39 = SEG 2 579.1 (C4l); Hdt. 1.168) or Téos (IG 13.1.127 (425/4)). Teos is called a polis both in the urban sense (ML 30.B.12–13 (c.470); Thuc. 8.16.3; Aen. Tact. 18.15, 19; Ps.-Skylax 98) and in the political sense (SEG 31 985,18 (C5f) = Nomima 1 105; Hdt. 2.178.2; Aen. Tact. 18.13). The designation patris is applied to Teos in Hdt. 1.169.1. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on C4 coins (infra) and in inscriptions (ML 30.2–3 (c.470); SEG 2 579.1 (C4l)) and externally in Hdt. 6.8.1; Thuc. 8.16.3; and IG 13.1.127. For the individual and external use, see ML 7b (C6e); IG 13.172 (C5); Hdt. 3.121; Ar. Thesm. 161; Carm. Anac. 1.2, West.

The territory is referred to as γῆ ἡ Τηίη in ML 30.89–10. If Ager’s (1991) interpretation of this inscription defines the entire territories of Teos and Klazomenai (no. 847), starting from the border of Kolophonin in the east and moving westwards on to the isthmus of the Mimas peninsula to the territory of Erythrai (no. 845). For some objections, see Brixhe, BE (1992) 498–99. PEP Teos 135 (Classical) may be a horos demarcating Teian territory: οὕρος Τε in [SEG 2 598].

In C4l there were 600 wealthy Teian citizens (euporountes) subject to proeisphora (Syll.3 344.116), and Gauthier (1990) 86 infers that the total number of citizens must have come to at least 2,000–3,000.

According to Pherekydes (FGrHist 3) fr. 102, Teos was founded by Athamas. It was part of the Ionian dodekapolis (Hdt. 1.142.3) and was considered the central point of Ionia (Hdt. 1.170.3). When the city was conquered by the Persians c.544, all Teians left for Thrace and founded Abdera (no. 640) (Hdt. 1.168; Ps.-Skymnos 670–71; SEG 47 1646B.1–2 (C2); Strabo 14.1.30; see Demand (1990) 39), but some returned later (Strabo 14.1.30), and the public imprecation of 480–450 found in the territory of Teos (SEG 31 985) indicates that, to some extent, Teos and Abdera remained two parts of one polis.

Teos joined the Ionian Revolt in 499 and provided seventeen ships for the battle of Lade (Hdt. 6.8.1). Teos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Ionian district and is recorded from 451/0 (IG 13.1.127) to 430/29 (IG 13.281.150, mostly restored) a total of thirteen times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 6 tal. It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG 13.1.127). In 412, she grudgingly let in the forces of Erythrai (no. 845) and Klazomenai (no. 847), at this point pro-Peloponnesian (Thuc. 8.16.3); but the Athenians seem to have regained control before 406, when Teos was sacked by Kallikratidas (Diod. 13.76.4; cf. Xen. Hell. 1.15.15, if the emendation of Ἦιονα to Τεον is accepted). After 406 Teos appears to have remained a Peloponnesian ally until induced to secede by Pharnabazos and Konon in 394 (Diod. 14.84.3, perhaps corrupt).

On the basis of SEG 31 985,16–17 = Nomima 1 105 it was argued by Lewis (1982) that the constitution of C5 Teos must have been a democracy. The passage requires a quo- rum of, presumably, 200 for any decision on penalties involving confiscation of property, imprisonment or death made by a court or assembly, a figure that Lewis regarded as relatively high. See, however, Gauthier’s note of caution (1990) 85–86. “The law of the polis” is referred to in SEG 31 985.A19. The instruction on synoecism with Lebedos (no. 850) of 303 mentions Teian laws in existence (Syll.3 344.56–57). In C4l the eponymous official was the πρύτανες (SEG 2 579.21–22 = PEP Teos 39). In C5 the following officials are attested: aisymentes (ML 30.B.3); a board of timouchoi (ML 30.B.29; SEG 31 985.D.11), tamias (SEG 31 985.D.11) and a phoinikographeus (SEG 31 985.D.19–20). Most interpretations regard the aisymentes as an office which had been abolished on the grounds that previous office-holders had used their position to exercise tyrannical power (Koerner (1993) 298–99). A Teian strategos is attested in Aen. Tact. 18.16. The phyle of the Geleontes is known from two inscriptions (PEP Teos 121 and 132). Both are undated, but since the Geleontes was one of the old Ionian phyloi, the presumption is that its existence in Teos goes back a long way.

SEG 2 579 = PEP Teos 39 contains detailed information on taxation levied internally in Teos. Not only did a number of liturgies fall on citizens (and presumably also resi- dents aliens); but taxes were also levied on the rearing of sheep and pigs, and on a number of other commercial activities, including wood, medicine and sale of wool and clothes.

Teian grants of proxenia are attested in Syll.3 344.23–24 (c.303), and SEG 2 579 = PEP Teos 39 (C4l) is conventionally
interpreted as a grant of *ateleia* for a period of ten years to recently naturalised citizens of Teos. A grant of citizenship by Ephesos (no. 844) to a Teian is found in *I.Ephesos* 1437 (322/1); Teian *theorodokoi* to host *theoroi* from Argos (no. 347) are attested in SEG 23, 389, 11.5 (330–324).

The following festivals are attested for C5: Anthestera, Heraklea and a festival of Zeus (ML 10.8.31–35). As for the Teian calendar, only two months are attested for the Archaic and Classical periods: Λευκαθεών (SEG 2 579.21 (C4)) and Πασιδήνιων (Anac. fr. 362, PMG Page), both attested in other Ionian *poleis* (Trümpy, *Monat*. 105–6 §90).

The Teian acropolis was fortified, and remains of Archaic and Classical periods: Λευκαθεών (SEG 2 579.21 (C4)) and Πασιδήνιων (Anac. fr. 362, PMG Page), both attested in other Ionian *poleis* (Trümpy, *Monat*. 105–6 §90).

The Teian acropolis was fortified, and remains of Archaic and Classical periods: Λευκαθεών (SEG 2 579.21 (C4)) and Πασιδήνιων (Anac. fr. 362, PMG Page), both attested in other Ionian *poleis* (Trümpy, *Monat*. 105–6 §90).

The Teian acropolis was fortified, and remains of Archaic and Classical periods: Λευκαθεών (SEG 2 579.21 (C4)) and Πασιδήνιων (Anac. fr. 362, PMG Page), both attested in other Ionian *poleis* (Trümpy, *Monat*. 105–6 §90).

The Teian acropolis was fortified, and remains of Archaic and Classical periods: Λευκαθεών (SEG 2 579.21 (C4)) and Πασιδήνιων (Anac. fr. 362, PMG Page), both attested in other Ionian *poleis* (Trümpy, *Monat*. 105–6 §90).
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Several cult sites are attested epigraphically. In addition to the Athena sanctuary, Theban territory contained cult sites of Hermes Ktenites (*I.Priene* 361.4 and 362.9), Mykale (*I.Priene* 362.7), Nymphs (*I.Priene* 362.7), Maiandros (*I.Priene* 362.11) and Hekate (*I.Priene* 363.20–21). *I.Priene* 362.8 mentions the festival Targelia (*sic*). The names of the months Kyanopsis (*I.Priene* 362.2) and Ta[u]reon (*I.Priene* 362.6) in the Theban calendar are attested both in Samos (Trümpy, *Monat*. 78), Miletos (Trümpy, *Monat*. 89–93) and Priene (Trümpy, *Monat*. 94–96), and Milesian control of Thebes did not necessarily imply that the latter’s calendar was changed (Trümpy, *Monat*. 94).
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I. The Region

The name of the region was Καρία, ἥ (Ar. Eq. 173) or, in Ionic, Καρίη, ἥ (Hdt. 1.142.3). The corresponding ethnic denoting the non-Greek population was Κάρος (Hom. ll. 10.428; Hdt. 1.171.2). The traditional border between Karia and Ionia was the Maiandros river (Strabo 12.8.15, 14.2.29), although Tralleis (no. 941) north of the border was also considered Karian (Xen. Hell. 3.2.19, pace Diod. 14.36.2). Miletos (no. 854), Myous (no. 856) and Priene (no. 861) did not belong to Karia despite Hdt. 1.142.3 (Blümel (1998b) 164). To the east the border between Karia and Phrygia was at Tabai (Strabo 12.7.2). To the south, the border between Karia and Lycia was at Telemessos (no. 936) (Ps.-Skylax 100). Ancient writers sometimes distinguish between Καρία ἥ ἐπὶ θαλάσση (Thuc. 2.9.4) and ἥ ἄνω Καρία (Paus. 1.29.7). In ancient sources a distinction is often made between Karians and Lelegians, as the original population of Karia, as opposed to Greeks. Modern archaeologists have argued that some settlements and buildings can be classified as “Lelegian”, but new studies have shown that the peculiarities of certain buildings are probably due to the quality of the building material (Carstens and Flensted-Jensen (2004)).

The communities of Karia constitute a mixture of Karian settlements (possibly city-states) in the hinterland and Greek settlements, which were mainly situated on the coast. The majority of the Karian sites were probably not Hellenised until C4, but they were clearly in contact with the Greek world from the Geometric period onwards, as evidenced by the presence of Greek pottery (see e.g. Keramos (no. 900) and Labraunda (no. 913)). Diod. 17.2.4.1 (7334) clearly distinguishes between Greek and Karian poleis. Few places are specified as Karian or mixed in the sources, but in addition to the fact that several toponyms—such as Karyanda and Koranza—are Karian, Karian names of individuals are attested at Alabanda, Armelitai, Halikarnassos, Kyblisseis, Hydaieis, Kasolabeis, Kaunos, Keramos, Killareis, Koliyergeis, Koranza, Ouranion, Pladasa and Syangela. Inscriptions in Karian have been found at Chalketor, Iasos (graffiti), Kaunos, Killareis and Kindye. Mylasa must have been a Karian city, too, but no systematic excavation has taken place there, which accounts for the lack of Karian inscriptions (Blümel (1998b) 170). On the other hand, in C5 a great number of settlements were members of the Delian League, and in C4 a number of Greek political institutions are attested.

The Karian settlements were ruled by dynasts. In C5 dynasts are attested at Alabanda (Hdt. 7.195), Killareis (IG12 71.11.96–97; cf. Bean and Cook (1957) 99–100), Kindye (IG12 71.1.155–56; an earlier one: Hdt. 5.118.2), Mylasa and Syangela (IG13 284.7–8). Hekatomnos of Mylasa and his family ruled Karia as Persian satraps from the 390s. The most famous member of the Hekatomnid dynasty was Mausolos, who was satrap 377–353. C.370 Mausolos moved the capital of the dynasty from Mylasa to Halikarnassos and enlarged the city by synoecising some smaller settlements into it (Moggi, Sin. 263–71; Hornblower (1982) 82; Demand (1990) 123). Strabo, on the authority of the C4 historian Kallisthenes of Olynthos, explains that Mausolos “united” (συνήγαγεν) six of the former “Lelegian” poleis into Halikarnassos. He does not supply the names of the settlements, but says that Myndos and Syangela did not participate (13.1.59). Pliny claims that the synoeconom was initiated by Alexander and that the oppida in question were “Theangela, Side, Medmassa, Uranium, Pedasum, Telmisum”. In his words, the oppida “contributed to” Halikarnassos (HN 5.107). Since Theangela/Syangela was one of the cities which, according to Strabo, did not participate, it is generally thought that “Termera” should be substituted for “Theangela” (Hornblower (1982) 82 n. 27). These are the only written sources referring to the synoeconom. Little is known about the urban organisation of Halikarnassos, and although the extensive city walls there are generally believed to have been built by Mausolos, it is impossible to say what kind of
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synoecism took place, except of course that the six poleis did not form a new polis, but supplied an already existing one with new citizens.

Stephanos of Byzantion cites the Periegesis of Hekataios of Miletos for five Karian toponyms which are otherwise unknown. A typical citation runs: Τύνιος, πόλεις Καρίας, ἢ στάθησαν τά δὲ παλαιότερα ἥ τε χώρα.

In addition to these toponyms and the seventy-two Archaic–Classical settlements (or communities) are known, but were in all probability not poleis or cannot be shown conclusively to have been so.

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis

*Amnistas (Ἀμνιστίος) Tit. Cam. 112a.1 (C3m): Ἀμνίστιος; Tit. Cam. 159a.8 (C2): Ἀμνιστίος)[1]ων [κ]ουν[όν] (Bean and Cook (1957) 75 no. 2 (Hell.: Ἀμνίστιος)). At modern Söğüt are remains of an imposing C5l–C4e fortification with some later restorations (Pimouget (1994) 251–55). In the Hellenistic period Amnistas was a Rhodian deme (Bean and Cook (1957) 61). Barr. 61, H, but C also attested.

*Chrysaoris (Χρυσαορίς) Steph. Byz. 696.9: πόλις Καρίας ἢ ὄστερον Ἰδρίας ὀνομαθείσα; Paus. 5.21.10, referring to Stratonikeia: τά δὲ παλαιότερα ἢ τέ χώρα καὶ ἣ πόλις ἐκαλεῖτο Χρυσαορίς. Perhaps to be identified with a classical site (Şahînler) north-east of Stratonikeia (Marchese (1986) 97). Barr. C.

*Kasara (Κασαρεύς) The toponym is reconstructed from the ethnic Κασαρεύς, attested on tombstones found near modern Asardibi (I.Rhod.Per. 56 (C3–2), 58 (C3f) and on Rhodos (IG XII.1 273–82 (C3e to first century AD). In the Hellenistic period a deme of Rhodos in the Rhodian peraia. The physical remains of the settlement include Classical material. See I.Rhod.Per. pp. 21–27. Barr. C.

*Kastabos (Καστάβειος) On the Karian Chersonese, about 10 km east of the isthmus that links the Knidian peninsula to the mainland, is the sanctuary of Hemitha, referred to by Diod. 5.62–63. The sanctuary probably dates to C4μ (Cook and Plommer (1966) 168), although the cult goes further back (ibid. 167). The theatre belonging to the sanctuary probably dates to C4l (TGR iii. 489). Although there is no other indication that it was ever more than a sanctuary, an ethnic is attested in C2 (I.Rhod.Per. 401.7: τοῖς Κα[σ]ταβει[οις]). Barr. 61, HR, but C4 also attested.

Loryma (Λορύμα) Loryma is mentioned in several literary sources (e.g. Hecat. fr. 247 = Steph. Byz. 424.1 (πόλις);
Thuc. 8.43.1). It is known from inscriptions of the Hellenistic period (I. Lindos 282.1.25; IG XII 1.298.111.2), and the finds show that the site was inhabited from C7 (infra); but it cannot be shown to have been a polis prior to the Hellenistic period. Thuc. 8.43.1 records that the Athenians attacked Loryma in 412/B.C. (Λωρύμωνος τοῖς ἐν τῇ ἥπειρῳ τροφασάλαντες); a Persian fleet of more than ninety triremes tarried at Loryma in 395 (Diod. 14.83.4–5: διέτριβον δὲ περὶ Λωρύμωμα ... πτερυγίαις ἑκοντες πλείους τῶν ἐνενήκοντα), and it thus seems reasonable to assume that there was a harbour there; in fact, Diod. 20.82.4 mentions a harbour there in reference to 305 (τῶν ἐν Λωρύμωνοι λιμένα). Surface finds show that the site of Loryma was inhabited from C7 to the Hellenistic period. The remains of the city wall clearly show that it was built in two phases. Very little is left of the older part, but it is in crude polygonal masonry and probably dates to C6. More much is preserved of the later phase, and it is in much better condition; it dates to C5–C4. The masonry is trapezoidal to polygonal, tending to isodomic in some places. There are remains of towers and gates (Held 1999 170–72). The acropolis wall is built in the same phases, but a tower belonging to a third phase may have been built by C5 (Pimouquet 1994 247). The earliest known inscriptions from Phoinix are C3 and mention a damos (I. Rhod. Per. 101.1), a naos of Dionysos (ibid. 1), a prytaneus (I. Rhod. Per. 103.1), and priests of Athena and Zeus Polieus (ibid. 5–6). 

Phoinix (Φοῖνιξ) Strabo mentions a phourion Phoinix on top of a mountain on the peninsula of Loryma (14.2.4). At the site of Phoinix there are remains of a fortress in different types of masonry, possibly going back to C5 (Pimouquet 1994 247). The earliest known inscriptions from Phoinix are C3 and mention a damos (I. Rhod. Per. 101.1), a naos of Dionysos (ibid. 1), a prytaneus (I. Rhod. Per. 103.1), and priests of Athena and Zeus Polieus (ibid. 5–6). 

Barr 61, HRL, but C also attested.

Physkos (Φύσκος) Steph. Byz. 675.8–9 (πόλις Καρίας); Strabo 14.2.4 (πολιτείας), 14.2.29, 5.22 (τῆς Ῥοδίων περαιάς). A Rhodian possession and a deme of Lindos already in C4 (I. Lindos 51117: Φυσικῶν (c.325)). Barr. C.

Side (Side) Plin. HN 5.107 (oppidum), one of the towns which were synoecised into Halikarnassos by Mausolos c.370, cf. Hornblower (1982) 82; Demand (1990) 123. Barr. C.

Temoessos (Τεμοεςσός) In a C4m treaty between Mylasa (no. 913) and Kindye (no. 902) a district by name of Temoessos is mentioned: an envoy from Syangela is described as ἃς (= ἔς) Τεμοεςσόν (SEG 40 991.14), so presumably Temoessos was in the vicinity of Syangela, in the Halikarnassian peninsula. Not in Barr., but C is attested.

Thera (Θῆρα) Gabrielsen (2000) 134–35 argues that Thera was a polis in the Hellenistic period, but it cannot be shown to have been one in the Classical period. At the site of Thera (identified by inscriptions, Fraser and Bean (1954) 72) there are the remains of a C4s fortress built in trapezoidal masonry with several towers. There are no traces of habitation (Descat 1994b 206). Barr. 61, C.

Triopion (Τριόπιον) A promontory (Hdt. 4.38.2; Thuc. 8.35.2) and an adjacent settlement as attested at Ar. Anab. 2.5.7, where Triopion is mentioned alongside towns (e.g. Myndos) and islands (e.g. Kos) as a place won over by the Persian commander Orontobates; cf. Steph. Byz. 636.10 (πόλις Καρίας); Diod. 5.61.2. Barr. C. See Knidos (no. 903) infra.

2. Unidentified Settlements

Kavakli In the 1890s Paton saw a tower, a hill fortress and some remains of monumental architecture, and he reports that the site was “thickly strewn with pottery” (Paton 1900 60). Barr. C.

Kayuklou Kale A C4 fortress in the territory of Mylasa and a settlement in the Hellenistic period (but not earlier), see Hornblower (1982) 99. Thus, a Classical site, but not a Classical settlement. Barr. C.

Sarnic A large fortified site (Fraser and Bean 1954) 75–78. Barr. C.

II. The Poleis

870. Alabanda (Alabandae) Map 61. Lat. 37.35, long. 27.55. Size of territory: ?. Type: C4. The toponym is Ἀλάβανδα, τά (Hdt. 7.195) or Αλάβανδα, η (Strabo 14.2.22). The city-ethnic is Ἀλαβανδεῖς (SEG 40 992.9 (C4m)) or Ἀλαβανδεῖς (I. Labraunda 37.3 (c.200)). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in a treaty between Mylasa and Kindye of 354/3 (SEG 40 992.9).

A keryx from Alabanda is mentioned in the treaty between Mylasa (no. 913) and Kindye (no. 902) (SEG 40 992.9–10 (354/3)); the names listed in this inscription suggest that there was a strong Karian element in the population of this community (Blümel 1990 38–42 (= SEG 40...
991–92)), and it is a moot point to what extent the Alabandeis can be considered a Hellenic polis in the Archaic and Classical periods.

During the Persian War Alabanda was apparently ruled by a Karian dynast (τύραννος), Aridolis (Hdt. 7.195).

A late Classical building has been excavated 1 km south of Alabanda (AR 45 (1998–99) 156). The circuit wall of Alabanda encloses an area of 75 ha and is dated to C4 (Marchese (1989) 147; McNicoll (1997) 31–38).

871. Alinda (Alindeus). Map 61. Lat. 37.35, long. 27.50. Size of territory: ? Type: B:7. The toponym is Ἀλινδα, τά (Arr. Anab. 1.23.8; Robert and Robert (1983) no. 15.11, 13 (201)). The city-ethnic is Ἀλινδαῖοι (IG i3 262.v.21, restored: Ἀλινδηθείς); C2 coins (infra). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on C2 coins (ἈΛΙΝ∆ΕΩΝ, SNG Cop. Caria 17–18), and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 262.v.21). The earliest reference to Alinda as a polis is in Strabo (14.2.17 (1334)).

Alinda was possibly a member of the Delian League in C5m. It is registered perhaps twice in the tribute lists, in 453/2 (IG i3 260.1.3, completely restored) and in 451/0 (IG i3 262.v.21: Ἀλινδηθείς), paying a phoros of 1 tal. and ? dr. It is absent from the full panel of 441/0 (IG i3 271.1–116.63–86).

Alinda is described as a strongly fortified place (χωρίον) at the time of Alexander (Arr. Anab. 1.23.8; cf. Strabo 14.2.17). Possessed by the Hekatomnid Queen Ada, sister and wife of Idrieus, from 340, Alinda was offered to Alexander by her in 334 (cf. Strabo 14.2.17); cf. Bean (1971) 190–98.

The city wall, in isodomic ashlar masonry, headers and stretchers, was perhaps built by Mausolos. The acropolis wall encloses an area of 2 ha, that of the town an area of 20 + ha. There are remains of altogether nineteen rectangular towers (McNicoll (1997) 26–31; PECS s.v.; cf. Bean (1971) 192). The site of the town is described by Robert and Robert (1983) 5–17; see also Bean (1971) 192–98 with a town plan (fig. 29) and the two citadels (figs. 29, 30). Strabo 14.2.17 calls the town "double" (διττή). Most of the buildings are post-Classic. C150 m from the site of the town is a hill-top enclosure which could be the ruins of Queen Ada’s palace (Lawrence (1979) 138–40).

872. Amos (Amios) Map 61. Lat. 36.45, long. 28.15. Size of territory: ? Type: A:β? The toponym is Ἀμοῖος (Steph. Byz. 87.1) or Ἀμιῶος, ἥ (Aeschin. Ep. 9.1). The city-ethnic is Ἀμιῶος (IG i3 283.111.33; I.Rhod.Per. 354A2 (C3–C2). In the Athenian tribute lists the Amioi are once recorded under the heading ἡαῖδε τῶν πώλεων (IG i3 283.111.31–33). The collective use of the city-ethnic is used externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 283.111.33). The individual city-ethnic is used externally in a C3–C2 grave inscription from Loryma (I.Rhod.Per. 42.2).

Amos was a member of the Delian League, but is registered in the tribute lists only once, in 428/7, paying a phoros of 2,250 dr. (IG i3 283.111.33).

A C6 grave inscription from Amos is inscribed in the Knidian alphabet (I.Rhod.Per. 351). All other inscriptions from Amos are post-Classic.

The C4 fortification wall on the acropolis is in polygonal masonry (PECS s.v.). The city wall is built in different types of masonry: pseudo-isodomic, regular polygonal and crude polygonal tending to ashlar. Pimouguet argues that it seems reasonable to conclude that the wall was built in the course of C4 and strengthened or repaired later (Pimouguet (1994) 249–51). The C4 date is supported by Saner (1994), who also mentions five towers in a 400 m stretch of the wall. Only the northern and western parts of the wall are preserved, but the enclosed area must have been over 10 ha.

873. (Amynandeis) Map 61. Lat. 37.00, long. 27.40. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: C:β. A toponym is not attested. The city-ethnic is Αμυνανδεῖος (IG i3 260.1.15). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 260.1.15).

The Amynandeis were members of the Delian League. They are registered from 453/2 (IG i3 260.1.15) to 444/3 (IG i3 268.1v.26) a total of three times, paying a phoros of 3,000 dr. (IG i3 260.1.15). In 446/5 they paid 4,500 dr. in syntely with Syangela (IG i3 266.111.21–22). Their payment was probably included in that of Syangela in the remaining years (ATL i.468); thus they are absent from the full panel of 440/39 (IG i3 271.1–116.63–86) but were assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.1.112, almost completely restored).

Bean and Cook (1955) 165 assume that the Amynandeis may have lived on the coast, either at Kargıcık or Alâkilise. At Kargıcık there are some ancient remains of an oblong perimeter constructed of great blocks, apparently with three towers and a gate to the north (ibid. 134).

874. Amyzon (Amyzoneus) Map 61. Lat. 37.35, long. 27.40. Size of territory: ? Type: B:β. The toponym is Ἀμυζών, τά (Robert and Robert (1983) no. 2.3) or Μυδών (IG i3 267.111.29, mostly restored), later Ἀμὺζών, ἥ (I.Priene 51.3 (C2); cf. Strabo 14.2.22). The city-ethnic is Μυδῶνεῖος (IG i3 264.11.4), later Ἀμυζώνεῖος (Robert and Robert (1983) no. 2.7–8 (321/0); I.Priene 51.1 (C2)). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in Robert and Robert (1983)
no. 2.8, and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 264.11.4).

In 321/0 the Iranian Bagadates and his son, Ariarames, were granted politeia by Amyzon, at the instigation of the satrap Asandros (Robert and Robert (1983) no. 2, inscription and comm. 97–118; cf. Hornblower (1982) 73). In l. 4 a prostates is mentioned, in l. 4–5 three archontes, in l. 5 an orophylakos, in l. 6 a tamieus, in l. 7 a synepimeletes and in l. 8 ekklesia kyria.

Amyzon was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is recorded “as Μυλασα; see Hornblower (1982) 278; cf. Robert and Robert (1983) 36) from 454/3 (IG i3 259.vi.6) to 440/39 (IG i3 272.1.84) a total of eleven times, five times completely restored, paying 1,500 dr. (IG i3 261.1.5).

In a honorary decree of 321/0 the month name Μαρσήλλιος (a hapax) occurs (Robert and Robert (1983) no. 2.2), which indicates the existence of a local calendar which was later replaced by an Ionian calendar, although Macedonian month names are also attested (Trümpey, Monat. 277–78).

At the site of Amyzon there are remains of fortification walls in ashlar masonry, probably dating to C4 (Marchese (1986) 105). Moreover, on two large terraced areas, enclosed by walls, are preserved the remains of a Doric temple dedicated to Apollo and Artemis with C6 terracottas. A temple of Artemis is mentioned in an inscription of 321/0 (Robert and Robert (1983) no. 2). Most of the other buildings date to C4. One of the terraces was entered through a propylon dedicated by Idrieus in C4m (OGIS 235; Marchese (1986) 107 with fig. 41. See also Robert and Robert (1983); Hornblower (1982) 278, 292, 313.

876. (Armelitai) Unlocated, not in Barr., but Blümel (1998a) 165 suggests that the Armelitai may have lived near Keramos (no. 900) and Ouranion (no. 920). Type: Cγ. A toponym is not attested. The ethnic is Ἀρµελίτης (SEG 40 992.14 (C4m)); the collective and external use is attested in a C4m treaty (SEG 40 992.14).

The Armelitai are known solely from a fragmentary C4m treaty between Mylasa (no. 913) and Kindye (no. 902) (SEG 40 992), but they are listed alongside well-known poleis such as Kaunos (no. 898), Koranza (no. 906) and Latmos (no. 910), which suggests that the Armelitai may have been a polis too. Moreover, a keryx from the Armelitai is mentioned in l. 16. On the other hand, the names listed in this inscription (ll. 14–15) suggest that there was a strong Karian element in the population of this community (Blümel (1990) 38–42 (= SEG 90 991–92)), and it is a moot point to what extent Arlissos can be considered a Hellenic polis in the Archaic and Classical periods.

877. Aulai (Auliates) Map 61. Lat. 36.45, long. 28.10. Size of territory: ? Type C?. The earliest attestation of the toponym Αὐλαία, aι is in an honorary decree of C1 to the first century AD (I.Rhod.Per. 471.3). The city-ethnic is Αὐλιάτης (IG i3 271.11.68, Αὐλιάτης (IG i3 269.iv.2) or Αὐλιάτης (IG i3 263.1.9) in the tribute lists, once misspelt Ἄλιατης (IG i3 264.11.7), although Blümel claims that the toponym Aulai does not necessarily correspond to the ethnic Αὐλιάτης in the tribute lists (I.Rhod.Per. 471.3 n.). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 271.11.68).

Aulai was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is registered in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i3 259.vi.13) to 415/4 (IG i3 290.1.3) a total of sixteen times, once completely restored, paying in all years a phoros of 500 dr.

878. Bargasa (Pargasea) Map 61. Lat. 37.00, long. 27.45. Size of territory: ? Type Cγ. The earliest attestation of the toponym Βάργασα is in Strabo 14.2.15. The city-ethnic is Παργασεύς (IG i3 263.11.36) or, later, Βαργασηνός.
879. Barya (Barylieus)  Map 61. Lat. 37.10, long. 27.35. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: B:β. The toponym is Βαργυλία, τά (Polyb. 16.24.3; BCH 45 (1921) 1C.3 (C3); SEG 39 1180.25 (C1)). The city-ethnic is Βαργυλιεύς (IG 1³ 260.x.10) or Βαργυλίτης (IG 1³ 272.11.81). The form Βαργυλιότης is also attested (Iscr. Cos ED231B4 (C2)). The earliest attestation of polis used of Barya (here in the political sense) is found in an honorary decree of 100 dr. (IG 1³ 260.x.10). The individual and external use is attested in an Athenian citizenship decree of 303/2 (IG 1¹ 246.23).

Barya was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is registered in the tribute lists (IG 1³ 260.x.10). It was assessed for tribute in the remaining three years. It is absent from the full panel of 444/0 (IG 1³ 271.1–11.63–86).

880. Bolbais (Bolbaieis)  Map 61, unlocated. Type: C:?. The toponym is Βόλβαιος, attested only in Steph. Byz. 174.8. The city-ethnic is Βολβαίος (IG 1³ 260.1.12). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG 1³ 260.1.12). Bolbais was a member of the Delian League. It is registered twice in the tribute lists, in 453/2 (IG 1³ 260.1.12) and in 446/5 (IG 1³ 266.v.13), paying a phoros of 1,000 dr. (IG 1³ 260.1.12).

881. Chalketor (Chalketoreus)  Map 61. Lat. 37.20; long. 27.40. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A:β. The toponym is Χαλκήτωρ, ο (Strabo 14.2.22) or Χαλκήταρες (Strabo 14.1.8; see I.Mylasa 11 p. 107). The city-ethnic is Χαλκήταρες (IG 1³ 267.v.30; I.Mylasa 912.5 (C3)) or, in the plural, Χαλκητορεύς (Krateros (FGGrHist 342) fr. 20). Chalketor is called a polis in the political sense in a fragmentary C² decree (I.Mylasa 911.8–9: περί τημ πολίων την Χαλκήταρεσ). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in the C⁴ decree (supra) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG 1³ 267.v.30). The individual and external use is attested in a C⁵ proxeny decree (SEG 36 982A.1).

In C⁵ […]sos, son of Artaos, from Chalketor was granted proxeny by Iasos (no. 891). Furthermore, he was granted asylia, proedria, isotelia and eisagoge/exagoge (SEG 36 982A). In C⁴ Chalketor passed a decree granting proxeny and citizenship to a man from Koranza (no. 906) (I.Mylasa 911). In l. 3 the word ekkleia occurs (restored: έκκλησια λησίης [κυρίας] [ήσ]): A C⁴–C⁵ lex sacra (I.Mylasa 914) mentions tainiai (l.1) and demos (l.6).

Chalketor was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is recorded from 451/0 (IG 1³ 262.v.24) to 440/39 (IG 1³ 272.11.75, completely restored) a total of ten times, four times completely restored, paying a phoros of at first 2,000 dr. (IG 1³ 262.v.24), from 448/7 2,100 dr. (IG 1³ 264.11.24). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG 1³ 71.11.101) a minimum of 2 tal. In the assessment decree of 410/9 the ethnic is almost completely restored (IG 1³ 100.11.8).

Some C⁴ coins inscribed with the legend ΧΑ could be attributed to Chalketor, although it is also possible that they were struck by the island of Chalke (no. 477). Obv. female head; rev. spearhead; legend: ΧΑ (BMC 18 [Caria and Islands] 79).

The wall around the acropolis is preserved. It is built of squared blocks in “Legeian” masonry. In the territory of Chalketor were also two fortresses in dry rubble masonry (Bean (1971) 49).
A bilingual inscription (Karian and Greek), dating to C4–C3e (Neumann (1969) 152; cf. L. Robert (1950); Deroy (1955)), indicates that Chalketor was not completely Hellenised by the early Hellenistic period. The Greek inscription (= I. Mylasa 914) is a lax sacra.

882. **Chersonesos** (Chersonesos) Unlocated, not in Barr. Type: B/a. The toponym is Χερρόνησος, ἵπτ, attested only in Steph. Byz. 691.7. The city-ethnic is Χερρόνησιος (IG i³ 265.1.18). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i³ 265.1.18), and they were assessed for tribute in 21264.

The Chersonesoi were members of the Delian League. They belonged to the Karian district and are registered in the tribute lists from 452/1 (IG i³ 265.1.49) to 429/8 (IG i³ 282.14.52) a total of twelve times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 3 tal. down to 447/6 (IG i³ 265.1.18), then 2 tal., 4,200 dr. from 444/3 (IG i³ 268.1v.20) to 441/0 (IG i³ 271.1.79) and 3 tal. again from 433/2 (IG i³ 279.1.22). They were assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.1.137).

The Chersonesoi struck coins around 500. The types on the coins are very similar to those on Knidian coins, and they are struck on the same standards as the Knidian coins: i.e. first the Milesian standard, then the Aiginetan. The earliest coins are Milesian triteretemoria of c.530–520: obv. head of lion; rev. the front part of a bull in a square. After that the Chersonesoi struck coins on the Aiginetan standard until c.480: denominations: staters, drachms, obols, trihemiboloi. Obv. front part of a lion (similar to Knidian type); rev. front part of a bull in a square along with the legend ΧΕΡ in the Knidian alphabet (Cahn (1970) 200–11; SNG Cap. Caria 190).

883. **Chios** (Chios) Map 61, unlocated. Type: C/β. The toponym is Χῖος, ἵπτ, only attested in Steph. Byz. 693.11. The city-ethnic is Χῖος in the Athenian tribute lists, where the people once are qualified as being Κάρης (IG i³ 259.v.21). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i³ 265.1.23).

Chios was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is registered three times in the tribute lists, in 454/3 (IG i³ 259.v.21), in 448/7 (IG i³ 264.1.21) and in 447/6 (IG i³ 265.1.23), paying a phoros of 2,000 dr. (IG i³ 264.1.21). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.11.105) a minimum of 2 tal.

The identity of the Chioi is unknown, but it may be worth quoting Steph. Byz., who says: ἕστι καὶ ἑτέρα πόλις Καρίας Χῖος . . . κατὰ τὸ Τριόπιον κειμένη ἐν τῇ Χερρονήσῳ (693.11–14), on the basis of which the editors of ATL suggest that “[t]he Χῖος must form an enclave in the Knidian territory, probably at its western end” (ATL i.565). However, on the basis of an investigation of the communities listed together with Chios in the tribute lists, Bresson (1990) concludes that the Chioi lived in the vicinity of Iydma (no. 893), Kedreai (no. 899) and the Chersonesoi (no. 882).

884. **Erineis** Map 61, unlocated. Type: C/α. A toponym is not attested. The city-ethnic is Εὐρωπεῖς (IG i³ 266.111.24). The collective city-ethnic is used externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i³ 266.111.24).

The Erinei were members of the Delian League. They belonged to the Karian district and are registered in the tribute lists from 453/2 (IG i³ 260.1.14) to 444/3 (IG i³ 268.1v.34) a total of four times, paying a phoros of first 4,130 dr., then 3,240 dr., and thereafter 1,000 dr. They were assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.11.99) 1 tal.

885. **Euromos** (Euromeus) Map 61. Lat. 37.25, long. 27.40. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: B/β. The toponym is Εὔρωμος (Polyb. 18.44.4; Strabo 14.2.22); Steph. Byz. 287.14 has Εὐρωπός. The city-ethnic is Ηυρωπεῖς (IG i³ 265.11.106; SEG 36 982.B4 (C5f) or Κυρωνεῖς (IG i³ 71.11.143–44) or Εὐρωπεῖς (Hdt. 8.133; I.Magnesia 59.b27 (c.200); cf. I.Labraunda 84.9 (c.200)), later Εὐρωπεῖς (SEG 43 703.7 (C3e), 704.4 (C3)). Euromos is called polis in the political sense in a proxeny decree of 298–288 (SEG 43 703.6, 12–13). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form on a coin (infra) and in a proxeny decree of 298–288 (SEG 43 703.7), externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i³ 265.11.106). The individual city-ethnic is attested externally in a C5f proxeny decree (SEG 36 982.B4).

Euromos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is registered in the tribute lists from 450/49 (IG i³ 263.v.30, completely restored) to 440/39 (IG i³ 272.11.71, completely restored) a total of seven times, four times completely restored, paying a phoros of 2,500 dr. It was assessed for tribute in 425/4, once in a syntelic group with the Edrieis (no. 892) and the Hymissieis (no. 890), the whole group assessed at 6 tal. (IG i³ 71.11.144), and once individually assessed at 5 tal. (IG i³ 71.11.100).

In C5f Arlissis, son of Idyssolos, from Euromos was granted proxeny by Iasos (no. 891). He was also granted enktesis≥ kai oikion, asyilia, proedria and dikai (SEG 36 982.B4).

The town was situated on flat ground. The city wall is in ashlar masonry with towers, and dates to a period no later than 300 (Bean (1971) 47; PECS s.v.). The other remains at
Euromos (a theatre, a temple dedicated to Zeus, and two stoas) are all Hellenistic or later (Bean (1971) 46–48).

Euromos struck silver coins in C6. Only a single specimen is known, presumably a tritartemorion. Type: obv. forepart of boar; rev. head of Zeus with laurels; legend: ΥΠΩ (SNG von Aulock no. 2521).

886. Halikarnassos (Halikarnassus) Map 61. Lat. 37.05, long. 27.20. Size of territory: 2; with dependencies: 5. Type: Αβ. The toponym is Ἀλικαρνασσός, ή (Thuc. 8.42.4; Arr. Anab. 1.21.3), Ἀλικαρνησσός (Hdt. 7.99.2). The city-ethnic is Ἀλικαρνασσεύς (I.Milet. vi.1.2 407 (C5); IG vii2 142.9 (C4f)), Ἀλικαρνάσσιος (Andrioton (FGrHist 324) 12), Ἀλικαρνησσός (Hdt. 1.144.3), or the epichoric Ἀλικαρνατε[ι]ς (Syll.3 45.2 = ML 32). Halikarnassos is called a polis in the political sense by Hdt. 1.144.3 and in a C4 honorary decree (Michael 452.4), and in the urban sense in an inscription of c.400 (SEG 43 713.33, 37.45). The individual ethnic is attested externally on a grave stele from Miletos (I.Milet. vi.1.2 407 m (C5)). The collective city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG 1 265.1.10), and internally on coins (SNG Cop. Caria 336–37).

Halikarnassos was a Dorian city, allegedly colonised by Troizen (no. 357) (Hdt. 7.99.3; cf. Paus. 2.30.9, 32.6; Strabo 14.2.16). On the connections between Halikarnassos and Troizen, see Jameson (2004). Halikarnassos was one of the Greek poleis to build the Hellenion in Naukratis (no. 1023) (Hdt. 2.178.2).

Halikarnassos was the capital of a dynasty which Hdt. 7.99.1 describes as a tyranny. The first tyrant was Lygdamis, succeeded by his daughter Artemisia (Hdt. 7.99.1–2; Suda H536). During Xerxes’ invasion of Greece she was the commander of five ships from Halikarnassos, Kos (no. 499), Nisyros (no. 508) and Kalynda (no. 485) (Hdt. 7.99.2). Later in C5 Halikarnassos was ruled by another Lygdamis. In C5 in a faction joined by Herodotos was exiled after an abortive attempt to overthrow Lygdamis (Suda H536).

Halikarnassos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG 1 259.14v.13) to 429/8 (IG 1 282.14v.15) a total of sixteen times, twice completely restored, paying in most years a phoros of 1 tal., 4,000 dr. (IG 1 259.14v.13–15), but in 447/6 a phoros of 2 tal. (IG 1 265.1.10) and in 441/0 a phoros of 1 tal., 4,840 dr. (IG 1 271.1.78). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG 1 271.1.144).

C.370 Mausolos moved the capital of the dynasty from Mylasa (no. 913) to Halikarnassos and enlarged the city by synoecising some smaller settlements into it (Plin. HN 5.107; Hornblower (1982) 82; Demand (1990) 123; supra 1108). The city seems now to have been laid out on a Hippodamian grid plan (Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994) 227).

A law of C5 mentions a κηρύγγα γιγόμεθα as the venue of the syllogos of the Halikarnassians and the Salmakians (no. 929) (Syll.2 45.3 = ML 32). The law (called both νόμος (19), and νόμος (32) was passed by the syllogos and the tyrant Lygdamis and concerns property disputes. A number of magistrates are mentioned: prytauris (5–6), mnemones (8) and dikastai (20). A keryx from Halikarnassos is mentioned in a C4 treaty between Mylasa (no. 913) and Kindye (no. 902) (SEG 40 991.16).

Some citizens of Halikarnassos were appointed proxenoi by the Chians (no. 840) (PEP Chios 50.4 (C4m)). In 410/9 a decree was passed by the Athenians in honour of the Halikarnassian polis (restored) as euergetis of Athens (IG 1 103). In C4 Zenodotos, son of Baukis, had been honoured by Troizen (no. 357), and therefore more honours were bestowed upon him (Michael 452): he was invited to the prytaurion at Halikarnassos (l. 11; cf. Miller (1978) no. 323). This measure (psephisma, l. 13) is decided by the demos (l. 12), after having been deliberated by the boule (l. 15). In 392 Phormion of Halikarnassos won a victory at Olympia (Olympionikai 378).

Seven month names are attested. They constitute a mixture of Ionian and non-Ionian names; see Trümper, Monat. 113–14.

The city wall is mentioned in a C5m inscription (Syll.3 46.15 = ML 32). Under Mausolos, from 377/6 (Diod. 16.36.2), the city was enlarged by the inclusion of Salmakis (no. 929) and the land between the city proper and Salmakis. The city wall was replaced by a new 7 km wall which encircled the enlarged city, including the harbour; it enclosed an area of c.220 ha (Jeppesen (2000) 334). The wall is built in different types of masonry, which is probably due to the building materials, rather than different construction periods. It had two main gates, one towards Myndos, the other towards Mylasa (Arr. Anab. 1.20.4–5), of which only the Myndos gate has been located (Pedersen (1994)). Two smaller gates have been discovered, one on the southern side of the tower on the east, the other in connection with a gate complex on the north-eastern extension. This gate undoubtedly gave access to Pedasa to the north of Halikarnassos (Pedersen (2000) 288). There was a moat in front of the wall (Arr. Anab. 1.20.8; Diod. 17.24.4). Thirteen towers have been found, all in different types of masonry and material, but the drain system and the general coherence indicate that the wall and towers were planned and constructed at one time, with later repairs.
(Pedersen (2000) 288–91). On the hill commanding the road to Mylasa is a free-standing tower built in large boulders in an almost “cyclopean” fashion. It is probably contemporary with the city wall (ibid. 291).

In the city of Halikarnassos a temple of Apollo is attested in a C5f inscription (Syll.3 45.45 = ML 32). Fragments of early Classical Ionic columns found in the city may be associated with this temple. The few architectural remains show that the temple was influenced by the Polykrates temple in Samos (Jeppesen (2000) 333). Furthermore, the remains of a temple in Ionic style are generally interpreted as the temple of Ares mentioned by Vitruvius (2.8.11). Ares seems to have been the principal divinity worshipped by the Halikarnassians (Hornblower (1982) 302). The excavated but unpublished theatre is sometimes dated to C3e, but may go further back.

Diod. 15.90.3 (1362) says that Halikarnassos had a famous acropolis and was “the basileia of Karia”. At the time of Alexander, he describes it as the largest polis in Karia, endowed with several citadels (17.23.4). Diod. 17.25.5 mentions the walls of the acropolis. Alexander took and razed the city in 334 (Diod. 17.27.6; Arr. Anat. 1.20.2–23.6).

In C4 Halikarnassos was endowed with one of the most famous monuments of Antiquity: the tomb of Mausolos, the Mausoleum, or, more correctly, the Maussolleion, of which very little is left. In Antiquity, it ranked among the Seven Wonders of the World, and it existed until the fifteenth century, when it was destroyed by the Knights of Rhodes. Work on it was begun in 367, and it was finished after the death of Mausolos’ wife Artemisia in 351. The architect was Pythis of Priene in collaboration with another architect named Satyros. The famous sculptors Bryaxis, Leochares, Timotheos and Skopas were involved in the work. The monument consisted of three parts: thirty-six Ionic columns stood on a very tall rectangular base, 38.4 x 32 m. Upon the columns was a pyramidal structure with twenty-four steps, and the monument was crowned with a sculptured group imposed on a platform. The building was adorned with numerous sculptures and friezes (Lawrence (1996) 146–47; Jeppesen (1994) with refs.). So far no remains have been found of Mausolos’ palace, built on the Zephyrion promontory east of the harbour and mentioned at Vitruvius 2.8.10; cf. Jeppesen (2000) 338.

According to Ps.-Skylax 99 Halikarnassos had an enclosed harbour and one “by the island”. Diod. 15.90.3 (1363) calls Halikarnassos ἑστία καὶ μητρόπολις. In the C5m inscription which deals with purchase and sale of land and houses in Halikarnassos, a number of districts or areas are mentioned (SEG 43 713).

Halikarnassos struck coins before 480, silver coins on the Rhodian standard in 400–367 (and again in 188–166). Staters are mentioned in a C5f law (Syll.3 45.40 = ML 32). There are various types, and the legend is ΑΛΙΚΑΡΝΑΣΣΕΩΝ or abbreviations thereof (Head, HN2 617–19; SNG Cop. Caria 336–37).

Halikarnassos was a polis with a mixed population. The names listed in the C5m inscription concerning confiscation and resale of property (SEG 43 713) constitute a mixture of Greek and Karian names. In some cases, a man has a Greek name, but his father a Karian (Zηµνόδορος Ἀριστάσιος, I. 10, or Διότιμος Σαµυσώλλο, II. 169–70), or even vice versa (Πανώνιας Αὔηηητρία, I. 50). Two of the Halikarnassians mentioned in the C4 treaty between Kindye and Mylasa have Karian names (SEG 40 991.15–16). There is no doubt that there was a strong Karian element in the population in the Classical period.

887. (Hybliseis) Map 61, unlocated, but Blümel (2000) 96 suggests a location south of Bargylia (no. 879); probably between Bargylia and Killareis. Type: [Α]γ. A toponym is not attested. The city-ethnic is Τυβλισεύς (IG i3 262.v.26), Κυβλισσεύς (SEG 40 991.8) or Κυλβισσεύς (EA 32 95.16 (C2e)). In a C4m treaty between Mylasa (no. 913) and Kindye (no. 902) the Kyblisseis are among the city-ethnics listed after the heading παρήγαν ἀπὸ πόλεως, where polis is attested in the political sense (SEG 40 991.8). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 262.v.26) and in the C4m treaty (SEG 40 991.8).

The Kyblisseis were members of the Delian League, but they are recorded in the tribute lists only once, in 451/0 (IG i3 262.v.26), paying a phoros of 1,000 dr. In the list of 453/2 (IG i3 260.1.7) the city-ethnic is completely restored. They are absent from the full panel of 441/0 (IG i3 271.1–11.63–86), but were probably assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.11.108: Τυβλισεύς) a minimum of 2,000 dr.

A keryx from the Kyblisseis is mentioned in the C4m treaty between Mylasa and Kindye (SEG 40 991.9). The names listed in this inscription (8–9) suggest that there was a strong Karian element in the population of this community (Blümel (1990) 38–42 (= SEG 40 992)), and it is a moot point to what extent the Kyblisseis can be considered a Hellenic polis in the Archaic and Classical periods.

888. (Hydaieis) Map 61. Lat. 37.15; long. 27.40. Size of territory: i or 2. Type: [Β]γ. A toponym is not attested. The
city-ethnic is 'Υδαίεύς (IG v 71.11.150; I.Mylasa 901.9 (undated)); 'Υδαίεύς (SEG 40 992.4 (C4m); I.Mylasa 903.5 (C4f)), and Κυδαίεύς (IG v 71.11.150; restored: ΚΥΔΑΙΕΥΣ with IG v 264.11.22, restored: ΚΥΔΑΙΕΥΣ). The Hydaiæs are listed alongside well-known poleis such as Kaunos (no. 898) and Koranza (no. 906) in a C4m treaty (SEG 40 992.4), which suggests that they may have been a poleis too. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG v 71.11.150) and in a C4m treaty between Kindye (no. 902) and Mylasa (no. 913) (SEG 40 992.4).

The Hydaiæs were members of the Delian League. They are registered in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG v 259.11.150, heavily restored: ΚΥΔΑΙΕΥΣ) to 447/6 (IG v 265.11.12, completely restored) a total of six times, once completely restored. They were assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG v 71.11.150), 2,000 dr.

A keryx from the Hydaiæs is mentioned in a treaty of C4m (SEG 40 992.5). The names listed in this inscription (ll. 4–5) suggest that there was a strong Karian element in the population of the community (Blümel (1990) 38–42 (= SEG 40 991–92)), and it is a moot point to what extent it can be considered a Hellenic polis in the Archaic and Classical periods.

The acropolis was surrounded by a wall, now decrepit (Bean (1971) 50).

889. Hydisos (Hydisseur) Map 61. Lat. 37.10, long. 27.50. Size of territory: 2 or 3. Type: Atl. The toponym is 'Ιασός (Steph. Byz. 645.17). The earliest attestation of the toponym is in a C1 inscription (I.Stratonikeia 508.10 (c.81)): 'Ιασός, although it was mentioned by Apollonius Aphrodisiensis, whose Kariakoi may be dated to C3 (FGrHist 740 fr. 4). The city-ethnic is 'Ιασόσεύς (IG v 265.11.51; Apollonius Aphrodisiensis (FGrHist 740) fr. 4 (perhaps C3)) or 'Ιασοσεύς (I.Mylasa 401.8 (C2–C1)).

Hydisos was a member of the Delian League, but is registered only twice, in 448/7 (IG v 264.11.21, restored: 'ΙΑΣΟΣ) and 447/6 (IG v 265.11.51, restored: 'ΙΑΣΟΣ), paying a phoros of 1 tal.

At the site of Hydisos there are remains of city walls and towers, probably of early Hellenistic date (L. Robert (1935) 339–40).

890. (Hymisseis) Map 61, unlocated, but possibly situated between Amyzon (no. 874) and Mylasa (no. 913) (Pontani (1997) 7; cf. L. Robert (1955) 226). Type: C:/. A toponym is not attested. The city-ethnic is 'ΥΜΙΣΣΕΥΣ (IG v 262.11.19; restored: ΥΜΙΣΣΕΥΣ) or 'ΥΜΕΣΣΕΥΣ (IG v 71.11.143; IG xii suppl. 127.58 (C3)). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the tribute lists and in the assessment decree of 425/4 (IG v 71.11.143).

The Hymisseis were members of the Delian League. They are recorded three times in the lists from 451/0 (IG v 71.11.143) to 447/6 (IG v 265.11.50), paying a phoros of 1,200 dr. In the assessment decree of 425/4 they form a syntely with the Edries (no. 892) and Kyroméis, and the three together are assessed at 6 tal. (IG v 71.11.143–44). A Hymisseus is recorded in a C3 list of proxenoi from Eresos (no. 796) (IG xii suppl. 127.58).

891. Iasos (Iaseus) Map 61. Lat. 37.15, long. 27.35. Size of territory: 2 or 3. Type: Atl. The toponym is Τασός, ἧ (Thuc. 8.28.2; Archestratos fr. 26.1, Olson and Sens) or Ίασός (I.Lasos 2.23; Steph. Byz. 322.18–19). The city-ethnic is Ίασεύς (I.Lasos 32.6 (C4)); IG v 898 Ίασος (C4)). Iasos is called a politis both in the urban sense (I.Lasos 2.20, 33; Archestratos fr. 26.1, Olson and Sens) and in the political sense (I.Lasos 1.3, 30.3 = Tod 190; Diod. 13.104.7 (1405)). The town is described as a polisma at Thuc. 8.28.4. Politai of Iasos are mentioned in a proxeny decree of 333–332 (I.Lasos 30.4). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in decades (I.Lasos 32.6) and on coins (infra), and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG v 279.1.69). The individual use is attested internally in a C2 dedication (I.Lasos 272.2) and externally in a C4s Attic funerary inscription (IG ii 8931).

The names of two districts (?) in the territory of Iasos are known from I.Lasos 1 (Πρόδας, ll. 37 and 51, and Τυννεύσος, ll. 31 and 34).

On the basis of the 800 adult males mentioned by Diod. 13.104.7 in 405, Bean and Cook (1957) 101 calculate that the urban population of Iasos must have numbered ε,3,000 at the time.

Iasos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is registered in the tribute lists from 450/49 (IG v 263.21.21) to 415/14 (IG v 390.1.12) a total of sixteen times, five times completely restored, paying a phoros of 1 tal. from 450/49 (IG v 263.21.21) to 432/1 (IG v 280.1.63), and 3 tal. from 421/0 (IG v 285.1.91). In 412 Iasos was taken by the Spartans at the instigation of Tissaphernes (Thuc. 8.28.3); having pillaged the town and apparently exposed its population to an andrapodismos, the Spartans handed it over to Tissaphernes (Thuc. 8.28.4), who then left Iasos with a garrison (Thuc. 8.29.1); but the city must have joined the Athenians again, because it is called an Athenian ally in 405 by Diod. 13.104.7; Iasos was a member of a symmachia attest-
dating to C5l–C4e; the other poleis striking ΣYN coins were Byzantium (no. 674), Ephesos (no. 844), Knidos (no. 903), Kyzikos (no. 747), Lampasakos (no. 748), Rhodos (no. 1000) and Samos (no. 864) (Karwiese (1980); Debord (1999) 273–77).

Lysander took Iasos in 405, killed the male population of military age (800 men), sold women and children as slaves, and razed the city to the ground (Diod. 13.104.7; the MSS have Θάσον Καρίας, which Palmer has emended to Ίασον τῆς Καρίας; but cf. Xen. Hell. 2.1.15 and infra no. 899). In ΣΥΝ M Iasos belonged to the Hekatomnid Empire (I. Iasos 1 (367–354)).

Iasos had a boule and a demos (I. Iasos 32.4), called ekklesia (SEG 40 959.15 (c. 330–325?)) which met every month (I. Iasos 32.2) and the first-coming citizens were paid for attendance (SEG 40 959.4–6: ekklesiastikon). The meetings were presided over by an epistates (I. Iasos 32.2–3), and the proposals were moved mostly by a board of prytaneis (I. Iasos 52.3) in accordance with the probouleumatic procedure: ἐδόξε τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῶν δύμων (I. Iasos 32.4; Rhodes, DGS 338). The eponymous official was a stephanophoros (I. Iasos 32.1). Public enactments were published by the nepoiai, sometimes in the sanctuary of Apollo (I. Iasos 42.8), sometimes in an archeion (I. Iasos 30.12). The fact that decrees (psephismata, I. Iasos 42.8) were passed regularly by the boule and the demos and that citizens were paid for attendance indicates that Iasos had a democratic constitution (Hornblower (1982) 111; Rhodes, DGS 340). The Aristotelian collection of politieiai included one of Iasos (Heracl. Lemb. 73; cf. Gigon no. 66).

Copious information about officials is obtained from a decree of 367–354 which deals with plots against Mausolos and the polis of Iasos (I. Iasos 1). The property of the plotters is being sold, and it appears that the transactions were undertaken by four archontes (6–8), four tamiae (8–9), two astynomoi (10), four synegoroi (11–12), six prytaneis (12–14), eleven priests of Zeus Megistos (16–18) and, finally, a number of representatives of the phylai, i.e. citizens (18ff; Jones, POAG 333). Another decree, of c. 330, mentions prostatiai (I. Iasos 20.12). A keryx from Iasos is mentioned in the ΣΥΝ treaty between Mylasa (no. 913) and Kindye (no. 902) (SEG 40 991.13).

The citizens were subdivided into phylai and patriai (I. Iasos 47.4 (C4l)). Each phyle seems to have been headed by an official called neopoies (SEG 40 995.14 and 17) and if the six names recorded in ll. 2–4 are those of the neopoiai (Gauthier (1990) 425–26), there must have been six phylai (Jones, POAG 333). Both grants of proxenia and citizenship are attested in the C4 decrees (I. Iasos 32, 42; SEG 36 983, reissued in C3–C2 = SEG 38 1059). The three men granted proxeny by Iasos—Myrmex, Manes and Targelios, sons of Peldemos—may be identical with the three unnamed sons of Peldemos (the variations in spelling may be due to problems in transcribing) who were punished for plotting against Mausolos (SEG 36 983; cf. Blümel ((1998b) 171). Iasos is registered in the Argive list of theorodokoi of c.330 (SEG 23 189.17).

A cult and priest of Zeus Megistos attested in a C4 lex sacra (LSAM 59 = I. Iasos 220), and investigations inside the temple of Zeus and Hera have revealed sherds which show that the temple was in use at least from C6 to the Hellenistic period (Berti (1987) 33–34). A cult of Artemis Astias is attested in a C4 dedication (I. Iasos 259.3–4; also mentioned by Polyb. 16.12.4). For a sanctuary of Apollo where public enactments were set up, see I. Iasos 42.8. A grave connected to the so-called heroon dates to C5 (Berti (1995)).

In Antiquity Iasos was situated on a small island, which is now joined to the mainland by an isthmus. Harbours are mentioned in a decree of c.300 (I. Iasos 3.6, 14, 25). The city on the island was surrounded by a wall in isodomic ashlar masonry (Hornblower (1982) 317). The wall is c.2.4 km long (thus longer than the 1.8 km stated by Polyb. 16.12.2); it encloses an area of c. 26 ha and is built in various types of masonry; it is now dated to the period after Alexander’s conquest of Asia Minor (McNicoll (1997) 109–11). Dry rubble masonry on the acropolis dates from the Protogeometric or Geometric period (ibid. 111). On the mainland there is a massive wall the purpose of which has puzzled scholars. The date of the wall is also uncertain, but a C4 date seems plausible (Hornblower (1982) 317 with n. 184, but McNicoll (1997) 117 suggests the time of Philip V). The extant wall has a length of 3.5 km and is built with crudely trimmed rectangular blocks. The wall has many jogs and towers (Winter (1971) 241–43; Lawrence (1979) 184–87). The function of the wall seems to be purely military; thus, there is general agreement that there were no buildings on the mainland (Winter (1971) 242–43).

Iasos struck alliance coins (silver staters) c.394. Type: obv. head of Apollo; rev. infant Herakles strangling serpents; legend: ΣΥΝ, interpreted as ΣΥΝΜΑΧΙΚΟΝ or ΣΥΝΜΑΧΩΝ (HN 621; Kraay (1976) 248); for the ΣΥΝ coins, see Karwiese (1980)). Other coins, struck for Iasos alone, have obv. Apollo; rev. incuse square with lyre; legend: ΙΑΣΕ (SNG Cop. Caria 408).

Two Karian graffiti incised on ΣΥΝ sherds have been found at Iasos. The letters are similar to those in the Karian inscrip-
tions from Killareis and Chalketor (Berti and Innocente (1998)). The c.100 names recorded in *Iasos* 1 are mostly Greek, which suggests that in C4M Iasos was a Hellenic community (Blümel (1990) 38–42 (= SEG 40 991–92)).

892. **Idrias** (Edreius)  Map 61. Lat. 37.15, long. 28.10. Size of territory: ? Type: C:B. The toponym is *Īrēs*, attested only in Steph. Byz. at 326.18. The city-ethnic is *Īrēs* (IG 13 71.11.143). The collective city-ethnic is used externally in the tribute assessment list of 425/4 (IG 13 71.11.143). The territory, *Īrēs* χώρα, is mentioned by Hdt. 5.118.1.

The Edreis may have been members of the Delian League. They were assessed for tribute in 425/4, in a syntelic group with Euromos (no. 885) and the Hymisseis (no. 890), the whole group assessed at 6 tal. (IG 13 71.11.143–44).

893. **Idyma** (Idymeus)  Map 61. Lat. 37.05, long. 28.20. Size of territory: ? Type: B:β. The toponym is *Īdyma*, τά (it is restored [*I]δύμων in the tribute assessment list of 425/4, IG 13 71.11.95) or *Īdymos* (I.Rhod. Per. 601.6 (Hell.)). The city-ethnic is *Īdymos* (IG 13 267.v.27; once spelled *Īdymos*, IG 13 265.1.27), *Īdymos* (I.Rhod. 603.9 (late Hell.)) or *Ēdýmous* (on a C5 coin (SNG Cop. Caria 419)). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the tribute lists (IG 13 267.v.27), and internally on coins (Head, HN² 621, *IΔΥΜΙΟΝ*).

Idyma was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is registered in the tribute lists from 453/2 (IG 13 260.1.16) to 442/1 (IG 13 270.v.13) a total of six times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of first 1 tal., 900 dr. (IG 13 260.1.16), then 5,200 dr. (IG 13 264.1.25), and thereafter 2,000 dr. (IG 13 267.v.27). It is absent from the full panel of 441/0 (IG 13 271.1–11.63–86) but is registered in the assessment decree of 425/4 (IG 13 71.11.140). It is usually registered by its city-ethnic, but once by its ruler: *Πακτύνος Ίδυμω[ν] (IG 13 260.1.16).

Idyma struck silver coins on the Phoenician standard in C5s and C4f. Denominations: drachmai and smaller silver coins (Head, HN² 621). Obv. head of Pan, or female head; rev. fig leaf and the legend *ΙΔΥΜΙΟΝ*, all in incuse square. A few C4f bronze coins are also known (Head, HN² 621, SNG Cop. Caria 419–20).

Bean and Cook (1957) 144 say that there is a “large classical site” at Idyma; moreover that it was not a Greek, but a Karian site.

894. **Kalynda** (Kalyneus)  Map 65. Lat. 36.45, long. 28.50. Size of territory: ? Type: B:β. The toponym is *Καλυντία*, τά (Polyb. 31.5; SEG 37 1234.20 (second century AD)). The city-ethnic is *Καλυντιδείς* (IG 13 271.11.70) or *Καλυντιδείς* (Hdt. 8.87.2; SEG 12 473.24 (C2)). The earliest attestation of Kalynda as a polis is in Polyb. 31.5, who refers to events in 164/3. He calls Kalynda a polis in the political sense at 31.5.3 and in the urban sense at 31.5.4. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the tribute lists (IG 13 271.11.70); the individual city-ethnic is used externally in a C2 list of donations (SEG 12 473.24).

Hdt. 8.87.2–3 explains how Artemisia, perhaps accidentally, rammed a Kalyndian ship commanded by Damasithymos, king of the Kalyndes, although they were her allies.

Kalynda was a member of the Delian League. It is recorded in the tribute lists from 444/3 (IG 13 268.v.8) to 440/39 (IG 13 272.11.90, completely restored) a total of five times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of 1 tal. (IG 13 269.iv.8). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG 13 71.11.131).

Kalynda was a neighbour of Kaunos (no. 898), and Hdt. 1.172.2 mentions the boundary between the two communities. It was probably situated c.10 km from the sea, where there are the remains of a ring wall in polygonal masonry. The wall is possibly early Hellenistic (Bean (1953) 26 n. 82).

895. *Karbasyanda* (Karbasyandeus)  Map 65. Lat. 36.50, long. 28.35. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: C:γ. The toponym is reconstructed from the city-ethnic *Καρβασυαντιδείς* (IG 13 259.iv.23) or *Καρπασυαντιδείς* (SEG 44 890.27 (C2)). However, at that time it was no longer a city-ethnic, but a sub-ethnic, Karbasyanda having become a civic subdivision of Kaunos (no. 898).

Karbasyanda was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is registered in the tribute lists from 455/3 (IG 13 259.iv.23) to 421/0 (IG 13 285.11.13–14) a total of nineteen times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of 1,000 dr. in all years (IG 13 v. 260.v.18).

The Karbasyandei were neighbours of Kaunos (IG 13 271.1.68–69), and their city may have been located at a hill 1.6 km south-west of Kaunos. On the hill there are remains of a 65 × 20 m fort in isodomic ashlar masonry, and very scanty remains of a dry rubble wall apparently encircling the hill (Bean (1953) 15, 21, 24).

896. **Karyanda** (Karyandeus)  Map 61. Lat. 37.10, long. 27.30. Size of territory: 1. Type: A:β. The toponym is *Καριανόν*, τά (Hecat. fr. 242; Ps.-Skylax 99, emendation of ΜΣ Καριάνδα). The city-ethnic is *Καριανδείς* (IG 13 261.1.31; Hdt. 4.44.1). Ps.-Skylax 99 describes Karyanda as νήσος και πόλις και λιμήν (οὐτοί Κάριες), using polis in
the urban sense. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form (ΚΑΡΥ) on coins (infra) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 272.1.76, 263.V.25). The individual city-ethnic is used externally on a C4m gravestone from Peiraieus (IG ii2 8963) and in a list of dedicators from Egypt (CIG 4702 (C4m)).

Karyanda was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is registered in the tribute lists from 452/1 (IG i3 261.3.31) to 415/4 (IG i3 290.1.7), a total of eleven times, paying a phoros of 1,000 dr. in the first year and 500 dr. in the following years (IG i3 268.IV.27). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.11.138).

It is clear from Ps.-Skylax that in C4m Karyanda was an island with a polis and a harbour. Later, and probably in the early Hellenistic period, the population moved to the mainland and settled near a lake somewhere between Bargylia and Myndos (Strabo 14.2.20; see Bean and Cook (1955) 155–60). In the island, which has tentatively been identified as the early site of Karyanda, there are considerable remains of a settlement. There is a 160 m wall, built in dry rubble, and remains of houses etc., probably dating to C4 (PECS s.v. Salihadi).

A few bronze coins from Karyanda are known. Head dates them to C3 “or earlier” (Head, HN² 612). Obv. female head; rev. forepart of a bull; legend: ΚΑΡΥ.

897. Kasolaba (Kasolabeus) Map 65, unlocated, but Descat (1994a) suggests a location north of Halikarnassos. Type: [A]:γ. The toponym is Κασολάβα (Hsch. Κίονος = Aesch. fr. 119, Mette). The city-ethnic is Κασολαβεύς (IG i3 263.11.32; SEG 40 991.7). In a C4m treaty between Mylasa (no. 913) and Kindye (no. 902) the Kasolabes are among the city-ethnic lists after the heading παρήσαν ἀπὸ πόλεων, where polis is attested in the political sense (SEG 40 991.7). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 263.11.32) and in the C4m treaty (SEG 40 991.7).

The Kasolabes were members of the Delian League. They are listed from 454/3 (IG i3 259.IV.27) to 447/6 (IG i3 265.1.44) a total of seven times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of 2,500 dr. They are absent from the full panel of 441/0 (IG i3 271.1–11.63–86) but were possibly assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.11.172: [Κασολαβεύς] β[ε]ι[@]).

A keryx from the Kasolabes is mentioned in the C4m treaty between Mylasa (no. 913) and Kindye (no. 902) (SEG 40 991.7–8). The names listed in this inscription (7–9) suggest that there was a strong Karian element in the population of Kasolaba (Blümel (1990) 38–42 (= SEG 40 991–92)), and it is a moot point to what extent Kasolaba can be considered a Hellenic polis in the Archaic and Classical periods.

898. Kaunos (Kaunios) Map 65. Lat. 36.50, long. 28.35. Size of territory: ? Type: A:γ. The toponym is Καῦνος, ¯ (Hdt. 5.103.2; Ps.-Skylax 99; IG i3 271.1.69). The city-ethnic is Καῦνος (IG i3 260.VII.8). Kaunos is called a polis in the urban sense (Holl. Oxy. 23.3; Ps.-Skylax 99) and in a C4m treaty between Mylasa (no. 913) and Kindye (no. 902) the Kaunians are listed after the heading παρήσαν ἀπὸ πόλεων, where polis is attested in the political sense (SEG 40 991.18 (354/3)). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian treaty lists (IG i3 279.1.9) and in a treaty of 354/3 (SEG 40 992.5 (C4m)) and internally in the abbreviated form KA on C4 coins (Konuk (1998) 219).

Kaos was taken by Harpago in C6 (Hdt. 1.176.3). Around 497 it participated in the Ionian Revolt (Hdt. 5.103.2).

Kaunos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is registered in the tribute lists from 453/2 (IG i3 260.VII.8) to 421/0 (IG i3 285.1.11) a total of fourteen times, three times completely restored, paying a phoros of 3,000 dr. in all years. It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.11.98) of 10 tal. Kaunos revolted, either c.440, or in the early 420s (Ktesias (FGHist 688) fr. 14.45; cf. Hornblower (1982) 28 n. 176). The tribute lists show that Kaunos was back in the League by 421/0, but it seceded from Athens once again in 412/11 (Thuc. 8.39.3–4, 41.1, 42.2, 57.1). In 397/6 Konon had his headquarters at Kaunos (Holl. Oxy. 23) and was besieged by a Spartan squadron under Pharax (Diod. 14.79.5). Kaunos was taken by the Macedonians in 333 (Arr. Anab. 2.5.7). In C4—C3 a citizen of Kaunos was granted proxenia by Iasos (no. 891) (I.Lasos 45).

Kaunos had a harbour (Ps.-Skylax 99: λιμήν κλειστός), and Diod. 20.27.2 refers to two citadels in 309, one with a Herakleon, the other with a Persikon. Diod. 14.79.4 mentions a phrourion, Sassanda, 150 stadia from Kaunos. The early city was located on a small acropolis overlooking the harbour (Gates (1994) 266). Investigations of the fortifications seem to show that a major expansion took place in the Hekatomnian period (ibid.). Remains of city walls in various styles of masonry date from the Hellenistic period, although some parts of the wall may be dated to C4. The walls enclose an area of c.190 ha (Bean (1953); Hornblower (1982) 315–16; McNicoll (1997) 192–99). Diod. 14.79.4 mentions that Kaunos was besieged by the Spartan nauarchos Pharax in
396, so the city must have been walled by then. The earliest finds at Kaunos go back to c.700 (Gates (1994) 266)

According to some numismatic publications, Kaunos struck silver coins on the Aiginetan standard in C6, and bronze coins from C4m (Head, HN² 612–13; SNG Cop. Caria 179–83); but recently a group of C5 silver coins have been attributed to Kaunos (Troxell (1979); Meier-Brügge (1998); Konuk (1998)). Some of the coins belonging to this group bear a legend in Karian script, and thanks to the decipherment of the recently found bilingual inscription from Kaunos (Frei and Marek (1997)), it is now evident that the legend is the name of Kaunos in Karian. Incidentally, the name of Kaunos in Karian is χιβιδε seriousness, and the ethnic is χιβιδεινι (ibid. 23). Thus the name “Kaunos” is not a trans-

scription, but a Greek name. The types of the Archaic coins are obv. forepart of a lion; rev. incuse square divided into two oblong halves. The C5 coins have been found in the following denominations: staters, drachms, hemidrachms, tritartemoria, trihemitartemoria. Obv. winged Iris. rev. rec-
tangular or triangular shape in an incuse square or griffin, sometimes a legend in Karian script (for the details of these coins, see Konuk (1998)). The types of the C4 coins are obv. forepart of a bull; rev. Sphinx along with the legend KA. These are the first Kaunian coins with Greek legends (see also Konuk (1998) 219).

According to Hdt. 1.172.1, the Kaunians were indigenous Karian-speaking people who, however, believed that they had come from Crete. In Ps.-Skylax 99 Kaunos is still classified as a Karian polis. Furthermore, kerykes from Kaunos are mentioned in the treaty between Mylasa (no. 913) and Kindye (no. 902) (SEG 40 991.18–19); the names listed in this inscription as well as the bilingual inscription (supra) suggest that there was still a strong Karian element in the popu-
lation of this community (Blümel (1990) 38–42 (= SEG 40 991–92)). Only coins of C4 have legends in Greek, and it is a moot point to what extent Kaunos can be considered a Hellenic polis in the Archaic and Classical periods.

899. Kedreai (Kedreates) Map 61. Lat. 37.00, long. 28.10. Size of territory: ? Type: Aβ. The toponym is Κεδραῖον, ή (Strabo 14.2.15). The city-ethnic is Κεδραίας (IG i³ 265.1.8) or Κεράμος (IG i³ 267.v.25; SEG 40 992.13 (C4m)). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in a proxeny decree of C4l (I.Keramos 3.5) and externally in a treaty of 354/3 (SEG 40 992.13).

Keramos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is registered in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i³ 259.v.17) to 415/14 (IG i³ 290.1.20) a total of sixteen times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of 3,000 dr. (IG i³ 261.122) down to probably 440/39 (IG i³ 272.1.80, amount restored), but 2,000 dr. in 432/1 (IG i³ 280.1.69). It was still an Athenian ally in 405 (Xen. Hell. 2.1.15).

Kedreai suffered andrapodismos in 405 after an attack by Lysander in 405 (Xen. Hell. 2.1.15).

Remains of an early Hellenistic city wall at Kedreai have been found, generally in polygonal masonry (Bean (1971) 54–55; cf. Anabolu (1994)), although some parts are in rec-
tangular isodomic masonry (Pimouguet (1994) 253–54). Furthermore, there are scanty remains of a temple, probably Archaic (Bean (1971) 55).

Xenophon states that Kedreai was a mixed settlement, μικροβάρβαροι, in 405 (Xen. Hell. 2.1.15).

900. Keramos (Kerameus) Map 61. Lat. 37.00, long. 28.00. Size of territory: ? Type: Bγ. The toponym is Κέραμος, ή (Strabo 14.2.15). The city-ethnic is Κεραμεύς (IG i³ 265.1.8) or Κεράμος (IG i³ 267.v.25; SEG 40 992.13 (C4m)). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in a proxeny decree of C4l (I.Keramos 3.5) and externally in a treaty of 354/3 (SEG 40 992.13).

Keramos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is registered in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i³ 259.v.18) to 415/14 (IG i³ 290.1.25) a total of twelve times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 1 tal., 3,000 dr. in all years (IG i³ 261.1.4).

A keryx from Keramos is mentioned in the treaty of 354/3 between Mylasa (no. 913) and Kindye (no. 902) (SEG 40 992.13).

In C4l Keramos granted proxenia, politeia and enkeisis kes kai oikias to a certain [c.7]ov Μάρπωνος (I.Keramos 3). Moreover, he was granted the right to participate in sacrifices (9–11). A phyle, Τεβρεµουν, is mentioned in ll. 11–12.

The remains at Keramos have been described by Spanu (1997). Most of the buildings are post-Classical, but the city wall may be as early as C4m (Lawrence (1979) 258). Spanu, and Bean and Cook suggest a C4l–C3e date for the wall (Spanu (1997) 82 n. 27; Bean and Cook (1957) 66), and McNicoll a C2 date between 168 and 133 (McNicoll (1997) 170). The acropolis walls are in Lesbian and polygonal
masonry (ibid. 161). The city walls are built in two different styles, undoubtedly contemporary: polygonal and pseudo-isodomic ashlar masonry (Spanu (1997) 61–91; Dornisch (1992) 145). Spanu reports that there are eight towers, seven gates and eight sally-ports (Spanu (1997) 61–91), whereas McNicoll states that although only thirteen towers—all rectangular—are visible today, the number of towers must have totalled at least eighteen. There were possibly three main gates and thirteen tower entrances and sally-ports (McNicoll (1997) 160–64); see also Dornisch (1992) 144–51. There were four grave areas around the city, and some of the graves date to C4s (Spanu (1997) 164–72).

Keramos is generally considered Karian in origin (PECS s.v.; Spanu (1997) 15). The name of the phyle Teβεμον is clearly Karian (I.Keramos 3.12). An Archaic kouroi has been found at Keramos (Richter (1960) 111 no. 130), as well as the torso of another (Gürrmann (1977)), and while this shows both that Keramos existed as early as C6 and that there was some contact to the Greek world by C6, it does not of course show that Keramos was in any way Hellenised. The names of the Keramioi listed in the C4m treaty between Mylasa and Kindye (SEG 40 991.2) suggest that there was a strong Karian element in the Keramian population, and it is a moot point to what extent the community can be considered a Hellenic polis even in the Classical period.

Until recently it was believed that Keramos struck coins only from C2; but recently an isolated C4 issue of bronze coins has come to light. The coins bear the legend KE, and it has been suggested that they be attributed to Keramos, although nearby Kidreai (no. 899) is another possibility. Obv. bull standing to the right; rev. swimming dolphin and the legend KE (Ashton et al. (1998)).

901. (Killareis) Map 61. Lat. 37.10, long. 27.40. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: [A]:γ. A toponym is not attested. The city-ethnic is Κιλλαρεύς (IG i3 262.v.28; EA 32 95.13 (C2e)) or Κιλδαρεύς (SEG 40 991.11 (C4m)). In a C4m treaty between Mylasa (no. 913) and Kindye (no. 902) the Killareis are among the city-ethnics listed after the heading παρίσαν ἀπὸ πόλεων, where polis is used in the political sense (SEG 40 991.11). The collective use of the city-ethnic is used externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 262.v.28) and in a C4m treaty between Mylasa and Kindye (SEG 40 991.11).

The Killareis were members of the Delian League, but they are recorded in the tribute lists only once, in 451/0 (IG i3 262.v.28), paying a phoros of 1,000 dr. In the list of 453/2 (IG i3 260.1.8) the city-ethnic is completely restored. Moreover, they may have been listed in the tribute assessment decree of 425/4 (IG i3 71.11.96–97), where we find [Κ1]λι[αρευς] ἡν[πολις] Σα[… ἀρχει], which indicates that the Killareis were ruled by a dynast (Bean and Cook (1957) 99–100). The Killareis were assessed at 2 tal.

Around C4m the Killareis passed a decree, granting honours to Hyssollos, son of Samoos (I.Mylasa 961 = L. Robert (1950) 14 no. 11). In l.1 the word ekklesia occurs. A keryx from the Killareis is mentioned in the C4m treaty between Mylasa and Kindye (SEG 40 991.12).

The remains of the site of the Killareis consist of C4 fortifications. There is an outer circuit in squared masonry with towers, and a citadel linked to the outer circuit on the northern side. Inside the citadel there are underground galleries which have been interpreted as cisterns (Bean and Cook (1957) 99). A C3m inscription mentions a harbour (although the site of the Killareis was located c.10 km inland (Blümel (1992) 128 D4 and comm. ad. loc.; cf. SEG 42 994.D4).

The stone which carries the C4 decree of the Killareis (see supra) is inscribed in Karian as well (Deroy (1955) 314), which indicates that there was a Karian element in the area at the time. The Karian text contains the city-ethnic, but not the personal names of the Greek text, so the inscription is not a bilingual one (Blümel (1992) 128; Blümel and Adiego (1993)). Similarly, the names listed in the treaty between Mylasa and Kindye suggest that there was a strong Karian element in the Killarian population (SEG 40 991.11–12; see Blümel (1990) 38–42 (= SEG 40 991–92)), and it is a moot point to what extent the community can be considered a Hellenic polis in the Archaic and Classical periods.

902. Kindye (Kindyeus) Map 61. Lat. 37.10, long. 27.40. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: B:β. The toponym is Κινδυέη (Strabo 14.2.20) or Κινδύει (IG i3 263.v.23). The city-ethnic is Κινδυεύς (IG i3 272.1.69; SEG 40 991.6 (C4m); Hdt. 5.1.18.2). The collective use of the city-ethnic may be attested internally in abbreviated form on a coin (infra) and is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 272.1.69) and in a C4m treaty (SEG 40 991.6). For the individual and external use, see Hdt. 5.1.18.2.

Kindye was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is registered in the tribute lists from 453/2 (IG i3 260.x.9) to 440/39 (IG i3 272.1.69) a total of six times, once completely restored. It is recorded once by toponym (IG i3 263.v.23), and otherwise by city-ethnic, paying a phoros of 1 tal. (IG i3 272.1.69). It is absent from the full panel of 441/0 (IG i3 271.1–11.63–86) but is registered in the assessment decree of 425/4 (IG i3 71.1.155–56). It is restored
The legend thought to be coins of Pikres (of Syangela) have now been described. A treaty of 354/3 between Mylasa (no. 913) and Kindye concerns the purchase of a land plot (SEG 40 991). Mylasa buys a piece of land from Kindye, and the borders are described. A *kome* is mentioned in I. 4.

At the site of Kindye there are remains of city walls (approximately 450 × 200 m) of the Classical period, with a citadel (c.120 m) built in dry rubble masonry, in places tending to polygonal. There are few remains of the temple of Artemis Kindyas, mentioned by Strabo at 14.2.20 and known from a c.200 lex sacra (EA 32 91) from Bargylia (no. 879) (cf. also Polyb. 16.12.3) (Bean and Cook (1957) 97–99). Apparently Bargylia (no. 879) had absorbed Kindye by the early Hellenistic period (Hornblower (1982) 100; cf. Bean and Cook (1957) 96).

Some coins mentioned by Bean and Cook (1957) 95 and thought to be coins of Pikres (of Syangela) have now been attributed to Kindye, because a later-published coin bears the legend *ΚΙννοδίος*. The coins are of the late Archaic period. Type: *Ovβ* head of griffin; *rev* diamond-shaped lattice frame encasing four-pointed star. One coin has the legend *ΚΙννοδίος* (Kagan and Kritt (1995)).

A fragmentary C₄1 (or possibly C₃e) funerary distichon from Kindye carries some Karian letters as well, which suggests that there was still a Karian element at Kindye in the early Hellenistic period (L. Robert (1950) 10 no. 6 = Deroy (1955) no. 6; cf. Hornblower (1982) 342).

**Knidos** (Knidos) Map 61. Lat. 36.45, long. 27.40 until **C₄f**; from **C₄m** lat. 36.40, long. 27.20 (Berges (2000); see infra). Size of territory: 4 or 5. Type: *Λατ*. The toponym is *Κνίδος*, *Η* (Hymn. Hom. Ap. 43; Hdt. 2.178.2; Thuc. 8.35.3; I.Knidos 5.6 (C₄f)). The city-ethnic is *Κνίδιοι* (I.Knidos 501.2 (C₆l); IG Ἰ. 261.14.8). Knidos is called a *polis* both in the urban sense (Thuc. 8.35.3; Ps.-Skylax 99: *polis Hellenis*) and in the political sense (I.Knidos 5.4, 603.12; SEG 44 901 (C₄f); Hdt. 1.144.3, 2.178.2). The word *politai* occurs in a C₆l epigram (I.Knidos 501.1). Knidos is called *πατρις* on a C₄ grave inscription (I.Knidos 625). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in C₄ proxeny decrees (I.Knidos 1.7, 5.1, 603.6) and on coins (infra), and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG Ἰ. 261.14.8) and in literary sources (Thuc. 3.88.2). For the individual and external use, see C₄–C₃ gravestones from Attika (IG Ἰ. 9393–93) and the Eleusinian accounts of 329/8 (IG Ἰ. 1672.191).

The site of the city of Knidos has been a matter of great dispute. Bean and Cook have argued that the political centre of Knidos was at one point moved from a site on the south coast of the Knidian peninsula to the tip of the peninsula (1952). No ancient source mentions such a move, and the argument was based solely on the fact that no archaeological remains at Tekir seem to antedate C₄. The suggestion was followed notably by Robert and Robert (BE (1954) 168) and Hornblower ((1982) 101), and recently by Bresson (1999) and Berges ((1994), (2000)). Since the publication of Bean and Cook’s article, excavations at Tekir have revealed remains that do go further back than C₄ and that, along with the fact that no ancient source mentions a relocation have led others to argue that Knidos was located at Tekir from the outset (Love (1972); Demand (1989); Blümel (1991) 131–32). The latest suggestion, that of Bresson, is that that while there can be no doubt that there were two urban centres on the peninsula, the political centre was at Burgaz until C₄, when it was moved to Tekir.

The name of the territory of Knidos was *Κνίδιος* (Hdt. 1.174.2; Thuc. 8.35.2). The find of a C₆ inscription in the Knidian alphabet (= *I.Rhod.Per.* 351) on the Loryma peninsula, supports, according to Blümel, Cook’s suggestion that the Loryma peninsula was part of Knidian territory at the time, or at least an “Einflussgebiet” (Cook (1961a) 60; Blümel (1991); pace Held (1996) 166–67, who argues that it was independent of Knidos and Rhodos (no. 1000) before C₄). Ps.-Skylax 99 indicates that in C₄s some of the hinterland of Knidos was dominated by Rhodos.

According to Hdt. 1.174.2, the Knidians were colonists from Lakedaimon (no. 345) (cf. Malkin (1994) 81; Cartledge (2002) 93–94), whereas Strabo 14.2.6 says that they came from Megara (no. 225). Knidos was one of the original members of the Dorian *hexapolis*, and the common Dorian sanctuary at Triopion was probably situated on Knidian territory (infra). In C₆e Knidos was one of the Dorian *poleis* behind the *Hellenion* at Naukratis (no. 1023) (Hdt. 2.178.2).

Knidos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 452/1 (IG Ἰ. 261.14.8) to 427/6 or 426/5 (IG Ἰ. 284.13) a total of thirteen times, four times completely restored, paying a *phoros* of 3 tal. in 452/1 (IG Ἰ. 261.14.8), 5 tal. from 450/49 IG Ἰ. 263.1.4), again 3 tal. from 444/3 (IG Ἰ. 268.14.19), and 2 tal. from 428/7 (IG Ἰ. 283.111.20). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG Ἰ. 71.1.134). In 412 Knidos revolted against Athens at the instigation of Tissaphernes (Thuc. 8.35; cf. Debord (1999) 219 with n. 127), and at Delphi the statues of those who fought with Lysander at Aigos potamos in 405 included...
one of Theodamos of Knidos (Paus. 10.9.9). Knidos was a member of a symmachia attested exclusively by the so-called ΣΥΝ coinage (whose legend abbreviates symmachon, symmachikon or symmachia vel sim.) dating to C5l–C4c; the other poleis striking ΣΥΝ coins were Byzantine (no. 674), Ephesos (no. 844), Iasos (no. 891), Kyzikos (no. 747), Lampsaos (no. 748), Rhodos (no. 1000) and Samos (no. 864) (Karwiese (1980); Debord (1999) 273–77).

Aristotle twice refers to the Knidian constitution: at Pol. 1305b12 he states that the oligarchy at Knidos was overthrown by the demos, because hoi gnorimoi were split into two factions; at Pol. 1306b5 he refers once again to the citizens overthrowing a despotic oligarchy at Knidos. Some have taken these passages to refer to two different revolutions, the first Archaic, the second perhaps C4 (Hornblower (1982) 117). A preferable view seems to be that they both refer to the same revolution (Gehrke, Stasis 79; Robinson (1997) 101–3) which, however, cannot be dated.

Oligarchic Knidos was ruled by a council of sixty amnemones appointed for life from among the aristoi and acting as probouloi (Plut. Mor. 292A–B). The attestation of probouloi seems to match the observation by Rhodes, DGS 330: that any mention of a boule involved in the decision-making process is of the Roman period. The preserved C4 decrees are proposed by a board of prostatai and carried by “the Knidians”: ἐδοξε Κνίδιοι [οιοι]ς γνώμα προ[στατε]ράν (I.Knidos 603.1–3 (C4f)). Of two C4 Knidian dedications in Delphi, the older has Κνίδιοι (Syll.2 140 (shortly after 386)), the other Κνίδιοι ὁ δήμος (Syll.2 290 (c.332)). Hornblower (1982) 116 infers that an oligarchy of C4f was replaced by a democracy in the age of Alexander. From c.300 the coins of Knidos have on the obv. the head of Demokratia with the legend ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ (Head, HN3 616; SNG Cop. Caria 305).

A tradition going back to Hermippos (fr. 16, Wehrli) reports that Eudoxos of Knidos (c.408–355) legislated for his home town of Knidos (Diog. Laert. 8.88; Plut. Mor. 1126B). Combining these sources, Hornblower (1982) 117–18 suggests that the C4f oligarchy was introduced by Eudoxos in concert with Mausolos, but was replaced by a democracy in consequence of Alexander’s conquest of Asia Minor.

Some prostatai of Knidos are mentioned in a C4f lex sacra (I.Knidos 160.2) and in a C4f proxeny decree (I.Knidos 603.2–3; cf. I.Knidos 604.1). A citizen of Knidos was awarded proxenia by the Karthaian (no. 492) (IG XI1.5 542.26 (C4m)). Envoyes from Knidos are mentioned by Diod. 20.95.4 (1304). In C4f the Knidioi granted Dionysios of Miletos (no. 854) proxeny (I.Knidos 1), about the same time proxeny was granted to Amphares of Athens (no. 361) (I.Knidos 5), and c.363 the Knidioi granted Epameinondas of Thebes (no. 221) proxeny (Blümel (1994) 157–58; on the significance of this decree, see Buckler (1998), (2000) 439).

A number of cults are attested at Knidos. According to Paus. 11.1.3 (1394 and earlier) the Knidioi worshipped Aphrodite, and they had three temples dedicated to her, one for Aphrodite Doritis (the oldest), one for Aphrodite Akraia, and one for the Aphrodite called Knidia by most Greeks, and Euploia by the Knidioi. There was a cult of Demeter and Kore at Knidos, as attested in a dedicatory epigram of C4f (I.Knidos 131; cf. I.Knidos 132), and cult of the Dioskouroi is attested in a C6f dedication (I.Knidos 601). Games in honour of Apollo Tripios were held there (Hdt. 1.144).

The Knidian peninsula was also the site of the sanctuary of the Dorian hexapolis at Triopion with a temple of Apollo (Thuc. 8.35.2; Diod. 5.61.2). The exact site of Triopion has also been the subject of debate: most scholars assume that it was located at Tekir, whereas Berges argues that the sanctuary of Triopion was situated at an extensive (c.100 × 80 m) terraced site c.15 km east of Burgaz. The site has not been thoroughly excavated (yet), but the remains of walls and (inter alia) a graffito with a hieros gamos scene clearly point to an Archaic (C7l–C6e) foundation date. There are remains of a small temple of the Hellenistic period, and some very large Doric drums which might be the remains of a temple of considerable dimensions (Berges (1995–96) esp. 114–19; cf. Berges and Tuna (1990)). While it seems certain that the place was a sanctuary, it is too early to tell whether it was the Triopion.

At modern Tekir there are remains of a stoa, built in two phases, of which the earliest is C4s in isodomic masonry (for this stoa, see Love (1972) 63–64). The Propylon which leads to the sanctuary of Apollo may date to c.300 (Bankel (1997) 68). A temple of Dionysos mentioned in a lex sacra of C4s (I.Knidos 160 = LSAM 55).

At modern Tekir there are remains of acropolis walls, the earliest parts of which date from C4m and are built in pseudo-isodomic and isodomic ashlar masonry (AR (1999)); they enclose an area of 20 ha (Bean (1971) 149). It is assumed that the habitation area was located on the small island which is now connected with the peninsula by a narrow isthmus, while the public buildings were located on the peninsula. No remains of the habitation area—assumed to have had a Hippodamian layout—have been found, whereas there are rich finds from the peninsula site. The majority of the remains, such as the theatre and the bouleuterion, are late.
According to Thuc. 8.35.3, Knidos did not have city walls in 412. At modern Burgaz there are remains of C5l fortification walls built in ashlar masonry (AR (1999); Gates (1995) 236, (1997) 282). Berges argues that these walls surrounded the acropolis (Berges (1995–96)).

At modern Burgaz there are traces of buildings and paved streets dating to the Archaic and Classical periods (AR (1999); Gates (1995) 236, (1997) 282). Sherd show that the site goes back to C8. The harbour has been located, and the moles date to C4. A C4 boundary stone (provenance: built into the mosque in Karaköy, not far from Burgaz) marked the harbour (I.Knidos 613; the inscription reads: Ὄρος λιμένος).

The Knidioi put up a treasury (Bommelaer (1991) pl. V no. 219) and several communal dedications at Delphi. The earliest dates to C6m (I.Knidos 211), and two more were put up in C4 (I.Knidos 212 (C4e), 213 (C4f); cf. Jacquemin (1999) nos. 113–18). Knidian C6m dedicatory graffiti are also found in the temple of Apollon Milasios at Nurkatis (I.Knidos 214–25), and in the temple of Athena at Lindos (I.Knidos 217).

Knidos struck silver coins on, first, the Milesian and, then, the Aiginetan standard from the late Archaic period. Denominations: drachm, diobol, obol. Type: obv. forepart of lion; rev. incuse square with the head of Aphrodite; legend: sometimes KNI or KNIDION, after 411 KNIDION. After 387 also didrachm and hemidrachm, and the obv. and rev. types are reversed, with a magistrate’s name sometimes added on the rev. (HN² 614–6; Cahn (1970); SNG Cop. Caria 199–331). In addition, Knidos was among the poleis which in C5l–C4e struck the so-called ΣYN coins (for which see Karwiese (1980)).

The Knidioi founded a colony at Lipara (no. 34) (Thuc. 3.88.2; Paus. 10.11.3), along with the Rhodians (Diod. 5.9), c.580–576.

904. (Kodapeis) Map 61. Unlocated. Type: C.?. The toponym is Κόδαπευς (IG i³ 267.111.32). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i³ 267.111.32).

The Kodapeis were members of the Delian League. They are registered in the Athenian tribute lists from 453/2 (IG i³ 260.11.2) to 445/4 (IG i³ 267.111.32) a total of five times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of 1,000 dr. (IG i³ 262.1.29). They are absent from the full panel of 440/39 (IG i³ 271.11.63–86) but were assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.11.103) a minimum of 2,000 dr.

905. (Koliyrgeis) Map 61. Lat. 37.20, long. 28.15. Type: C.?γ. The toponym is Κολιυργεύς (I.Stratonikeia 289,6 (Roman)) or Κολιυργα (I.Stratonikeia 293,31 (Roman)). The ethnic is Κολιυργεύς (SEG 40 992.18 (C4m)); the collective and external use is attested in a C4m treaty (SEG 40 992.18).

The Koliyrgeis are mentioned in a fragmentary C4m treaty between Mylasa (no. 913) and Kindye (no. 902) (SEG 40 992), and they are listed alongside well-known poleis such as Kaunos (no. 898), Koranza (no. 906) and Latmos (no. 910), which suggests that the Koliyrgeis may have been a poleis too. The names listed in this inscription (II.17–18) suggest that there was a strong Karian element in the population of this community (Blümel (1990) 38–42 (=SEG 40 991–92)), and it is a moot point to what extent the Koliyrgeis can be considered a Hellenic polis in the Archaic and Classical periods.

906. Koranza (Koarendeus) Map 61, unlocated. Type: A.?γ. The toponym is Κόρανζα, τα (I.Labraunda 111.2 42.2 (C3e)). The city-ethnic is Κοαρενδεύς (SEG 40 992.7 (C4m)), Κοαρενδεύσε (I.Mylasa 8.9 (C4)), Κοαρανζεύς (I.Stratonikeia 502.2 (C4m)) or Κοαρανζεύς (I.Stratonikeia 503.9 (318)); cf. Blümel (1998a) 170. In later inscriptions (Hellenistic, Roman) only a form without -ι- (i.e. -αρν-) is found; see Şahin (1973) 189 (cf. Blümel (1998a) 170), who presumes that the original name was Κοαρένδα with the typically Karian ending -ida. Koranza is called a polis in the political sense in an honorary decree from Laguna of 318 (I.Stratonikeia 503). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in a treaty of 354/35 (SEG 40 992.7), and internally in dedicatory inscription of c.350 (I.Stratonikeia 502). The individual city-ethnic is used externally in a proxemy decree from Chalketor (I.Mylasa 911 (C4)).

In a dedicatory inscription of c.350 (I.Stratonikeia 502.10–16) a number of persons entrusted with the publication of the decree (δόγμα) are listed as coming εξ Υθωβίρων, ἐκ Παταρούσων, Ἀγγυρέως, Λαγίνας and Ωνδέας respectively. Şahin presumes that Υθωβίρα and Παταροῦσα are villages or districts belonging to Koranza, whereas Ἀγγυρέως, Λαγίνας and Ωνδέας are demotics (Şahin (1973) 191–92). In later times Koranza was itself a civic subdivision of Stratonikeia.

Envoy from Koranza are mentioned in a fragmentary C4 inscription from Mylasa (I.Mylasa 8.9), and a keryx is listed in a treaty between Mylasa (no. 913) and Kindye (no. 902) (SEG 40 992.8).

In 367/6 Mausolos and the Koarendeis granted ateleia to a certain […]ιδι Ὀσαρτηύµου Μ[ά]λνη, and in 318 the polis of Koranza granted politeia and enktesis to Konon, son of

In C4 Chalketor (no. 881) passed a decree granting pronoxy and citizenship to a man from Koranza (I.Mylosa 911). Around 350 a man named Skoaranos and his wife dedicated a plot of land to Apollo and Artemis (I.Stratonikeia 502). Moreover, the Koranzans granted exemption from slave taxes and other taxes except for the royal one to anyone who looked after Skoaranos’ tomb (II. 20–22).

Two archons are mentioned in a decree of 318 (I.Stratonikeia 503,3).

A month name, Διος, from Koranza is known from a decree of 318 (I.Stratonikeia 503,2).

The names of the archons in the decree of 318 (I.Stratonikeia 503) and the envoys from Koranza listed in I.Mylosa 8 and in SEG 40 992,7–8 suggest that there was a strong Karian element in the Koranzan population, and it is a moot point to what extent the community can be considered a Hellenic polis in the Classical period.

907. Krya (Kryeus) Map 65. Lat. 36.40, long. 28.50. Size of territory: probably 1 or 2. Type: C. The toponym is Κρύα, ία (Steph. Byz. 387.13; Studiamius 258–59). The city-ethnic is Κρυεύς (IG i3 263.1.6). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 270.1v.6).

Krya was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is registered in the tribute lists from 453/2 (IG i3 260.v11.10) to 428/7 (IG i3 283.11.28, partially restored) a total of fifteen times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 2,000 dr. It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.11.155). It was also a Hellenic polis in the Classical period.

908. Kyllanodos (Kyllandios) Map 61. Lat. 37.05, long. 28.25 (for another location, see I.Rhod.Per. p. 160). Size of territory: ? Type: C. The toponym is Κύλλανδος, attested only in Steph. Byz. 392.7, although it was clearly mentioned by Hekataios as well (fr. 250). The city-ethnic is Κυλλανδιος (IG i3 259.v.20) or Κυλλάντιος (IG i3 262.1.32) or Κυλλαντιος (IG i3 265.1.21). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 259.v.20). The district η Κυλλανθία is mentioned in the so-called Nikagoras dossier of c.197 (IG xii 11036.10; cf. Bean and Cook (1957) 84; Blümel (1998a) 171; Gabrielsen (2000) 140, 153 ff).

Kyllanodos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is registered in the tribute lists from 453/2 (IG i3 260.v.20) to 447/6 (IG i3 265.1.21) a total of five times, paying a phoros of 2 tal. It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.11.141–42). It is usually registered by city-ethnic, but in the assessment decree by its ruler: Τυµν - Κυλλανθίος.

909. Kyrrhisos (Kyrrhisos) Map 61, unlocated. Type: C. The toponym is Κυρρησίας (IG i3 259.1v.16). The city-ethnic is Κυρρησιαίος (IG i3 262.1.33).

Kyrrhisos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is registered in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i3 259.1v.16) to 445/4 (IG i3 267.v.28) a total of eight times, paying a phoros of 2,000 dr. It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.11.106), a minimum of 2,000 dr. It is registered sometimes by city-ethnic (IG i3 262.1.33) and sometimes by toponym (IG i3 259.1v.16).

910. Latmos (Latmios)/Herakleia (Herakleotes) Map 61. Lat. 37.30, long. 27.30. Size of territory: ? Type: Αβ. The toponym is Λάτμος, η (Hecat. fr. 239; EA 29 (1997) 137.7–8, 323–313), later 'Ηράκλειος, η (Ps.-Skyllax 99; Strabo 14.1.8). According to Strabo 14.1.8, the town was originally called Λάτμος, and later the name was changed to 'Ηράκλειο (η ὑπὸ Λάτμω, to distinguish it from its homonyms). The latest attestation of the toponym Λάτμος is in the above-mentioned C41 inscription; the earliest attestation of 'Ηράκλειος is that of Ps.-Skyllax 99. The city-ethnic is Λάτμοι (I.Didyma 12 (C6s), restored: [Λά]τμοι; IG i3 260.x.3; EA 29 (1997) 137.14). The earliest possible attestation of the city-ethnic 'Ηρακλεώτης is on a Panathenaic amphora of C4m (infra); the earliest unquestionable attestation is in L.Priene 51.1 (C2s). Latmos/Herakleia is called a polis both in the urban sense (EA 29 (1997) 137.27–28; Ps.-Skyllax 99: polis Hellenis) and in the political sense (EA 29 (1997) 137.3, 16–17, 18). The collective use of the city-ethnic (Λάτμωιοι) is attested internally in the treaty with Pidasa (EA 29 (1997) 137.14 (C41)) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 260.x.3) and in a C4m treaty between Mylosa (no. 913) and Kinde (no. 902) (SEG 40 992.11 (C4m)).

Three “Lelegian” ring walls have been located in the territory of Latmos, two on Mt. Latmos and one on the southern bank of the Bafa Lake. They are all built in dry rubble masonry, and since there are no remains of buildings inside the perimeter, it is assumed that they were Fluchtburgen (Peschlow-Bindokat (1996) 22–23).

Latmos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 453/2 (IG i3 260.x.3) to 432/1 (IG i3 280.1.64) a total of fourteen times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 1 tal. (IG i3 261.11.29).
The outstanding source for C₄ Latmos is the treaty with Pidasa (EA 29 (1997) 137) about a physical and political amalgamation of the two poleis. The treaty was concluded in the period 323–313, but some of its information can be interpreted retrospectively to shed light on the social and political organisation of Latmos in the late Classical period: an agora (31–32) and a temple of Athena (35–36) are mentioned, and in the town of Latmos there is a publicly owned open space (demosie) where the Pidaseis can build their new houses (27–29). The oath is to be taken by 200 Latmioi (30), and the citizens were organised into an unknown number of phylai and phratriai (6–13; cf. Jones (1999)). A board of timouchoi are to make a sacrifice in order to ensure the homonoia of the polis (2–4).

Latmos was abandoned in C₄ and refounded under the name Herakleia. The date of the move is uncertain: P斯基lax mentions Herakleia (99), but not Latmos, and since no chapter of the Periplous is likely to be dated later than c.330 (Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 137–38), it must be presumed that Herakleia existed already by then. Hornblower’s suggestion (1982) 320) that the move was initiated by Mausolos squares with P斯基lax’ account and with some fragments of a C₄m Panathenaic amphora found at Labraunda and inscribed Ἡρακλεώτης. Hellström argues that the ethnic must be interpreted as referring to Herakleia under Latmos (Hellström (1965) 8). If so, it suggests that a citizen of Herakleia participated in the Panathenaic Games in C₄m. However, both the toponym Latmos and the city-ethnic Latmioi are attested in the treaty between Latmos and Pidasa concluded in the period 323–313 (EA 29 (1997), supra). The presumption is that, for a relatively short period of time, the two places existed simultaneously (already suggested by Hornblower) and that both city-ethics could be used to designate a citizen of this community. The two sites are situated less than 1 km from each other (Peschlow-Bindokat (1996) 23, Abb. 23).

Latmos was unfortified until C₄e, when the city wall was built and at the same time the city was enlarged. The city wall enclosed an area of 0.90 ha; it had fourteen towers, and two gates can be seen today. The city wall and the buildings erected at the same time as the wall are built in the same building technique: isodomic ashlars, headers and stretchers (Peschlow (1994) 155). There is not much left of Latmos, since building material was to a large extent employed in the building of Herakleia. At Latmos remains of 100 houses have been revealed. They are of various sizes, 20–100 m², and almost invariably of quadrangular plan. In the centre of the city an agora has been identified (mentioned in EA 29 (1997) 31–32). Sherds found at Latmos date from C₆–C₅ (Peschlow-Bindokat (1996) 23–27).

The names of the Latmian listed in the treaty between Mylasa (no. 913) and Kindye (no. 902) (SEG 40 992.11) suggest that there was a strong Karian element in the population of Latmos (Blümel (1990) 38–42 (= SEG 40 991–92)).

911. Lepsimandos (Lepsimandeus) Map 61. Lat. 37.05, long. 27.05. Size of territory: 1. Type: C? The toponym is Λέψιμανδος (Steph. Byz. 414.8). The city-ethnic is Λέψιμανδιός (IG i³ 260.1.13) or Λέψιμανδεύς (IG i³ 267.11.28) or Λέψιμανδεύς (IG i³ 269.v.2); cf. Blümel (1998a).

Lepsimandos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is registered in the tribute lists from 453/2 (IG i³ 260.1.13) to 440/39 (IG i³ 272.11.77) a total of twelve times, paying a phoros of 1,000 dr. in 453/2 (IG i³ 260.1.13), 1,500 dr. from 452/1 (IG i³ 261.iv.25) and 1,000 dr. (IG i³ 267.11.28) from perhaps 446/5 (IG i³ 266.11.17, amount restored). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.11.102), a minimum of 2,000 dr., and in 410/9 (Krateros fr. 7 = IG i³ 100).

912. Medmasos (Madnaseus) Map 61. Lat. 37.05, long. 27.20. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: B:Β. The toponym is Μέδμασος (Hecat. fr. 244 = Steph. Byz. 440.3, where Meineke prefers the conjecture Μέδμασα). The city-ethnic is Μάδνασευς (IG i³ 261.32). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i³ 261.32).

Medmasos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i³ 259.1.26) to 432/1 (IG i³ 280.1.13) a total of eleven times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 2 tal. in 454/3 (IG i³ 259.1.26) and 452/1 (IG i³ 261.1.32) and 1 tal. in the rest of the period (IG i³ 263.v.27).

Medmasos was one of the settlements which were synoecised into Halikarnassos (no. 886) by Mausolos c.370 (Plin. HN 5.107; Hornblower (1982) 82; Demand (1990) 123).

The site of Medmasos is c.300 m long and enclosed by a circuit wall built in dry rubble or polygonal masonry, with gates and towers. The walls have been dated to c.400 (Hornblower (1982) 96). There are house foundations and cisterns within the perimeter. Moreover, there is an inner perimeter with a tower built in ashlar masonry, enclosing a building complex. Sherds date the settlement to the Classical period (Bean and Cook (1955) 121–22, 155; cf. Hornblower (1982) 96).
913. **Mylasa** (Mylaseus) Map 61. Lat. 37.15, long. 27.50, later moved to lat. 37.20, long. 27.45 (Cook (1961) 98–101).

Size of territory: ? Type: A.

The toponym is Ἔλια τρεῖς φυλαί (Aesch. fr. 1128), the city-ethnic is Μυλασεύς (IG i² 267.v.31; I.Mylasa 1.3 (367/6); Hdt. 5.121). Mylasa is called a *polis* both in the urban sense (Arist. Oec. 1348a12) and in the political sense in a decree of 361/0 (I.Mylasa 2.7–9). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in the decree of 367/6 (I.Mylasa 1.3) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i² 267.v.31). The individual city-ethnic is attested externally in a C4m dedication from Labraunda (I.Labraunda 17) and in a C4 Attic sepulchral inscription (Agora xvii 519.7).

In the territory of Mylasa were several forts, one of which is described at length by Radt (1969–70). The fortification consists of a ring wall and, inside that, a fortified citadel. The whole complex is c.400 m long, and the oldest parts were built in the Archaic–Classical period with additions in the early Hellenistic period. In addition to the three fortifications already known, yet another one was discovered in 1995. The masonry is of the Classical period, and it overlooks the plain of Mylasa, but also Hydai to the west (Rumscheid (1996) 127).

The name of the district Ἀρλαια (or perhaps Ἀρλαιαθής; see Blümel (1998b) 165 n. 9) in the territory of Mylasa is known from I.Mylasa 21.8 (c.317). Mylasa was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 450/49 (IG i² 263.1.12) to 440/39 (IG i² 272.11.76, completely restored) a total of eight times, twice completely restored. Mylasa paid 1 tal. down to 447/6 (IG i² 265.11.105) and 5,200 dr. from 446/5 on (IG i² 267.v.31).

Crampa argues that a very fragmentary C4l inscription concerns the democratic constitution of Mylasa (I.Labraunda 41; see other possible restorations and interpretations in Hornblower (1982) 70–71 with n. 128).

**Nomoi patrioi** are mentioned in I.Mylasa 1.11 (367/6).

A single Ionian month name is attested at Mylasa (SEG 40 991.2: Μυρνός [Ἀρ]τεμισιώνος (C4m)).

Three *phylai* are attested at Mylasa. A decree of 367/6 mentions αἱ τρεῖς φυλαί (I.Mylasa 1.4; cf. I.Mylasa 2.4, 3.13). The name of the *phyle* Ὄστρωκονδεῖς is attested frequently from C2 (see e.g. I.Mylasa 106.2); Ὁριβησάται is attested once, in C2 (I.Mylasa 301.3); and Κονώδαρκονδεῖς is attested once, in C2 (I.Mylasa 119.14).

In 357–355 Erythrai (no. 845) bestowed proxeny and other honours upon Μαύσσωλλος Ἐκατόμμω Μυλασεύς (Tod 155). In C4–C3 Delphi (no. 177) bestowed proxeny on Μοσχίων Μυλασεύς (SEG 23.307).

One inscription contains three decrees, dated to 367/6, 361/0 and 355/4 respectively, dealing with plots against Mausolos (Tod 138 = I.Mylasa 1–3). In the first case Arlissis, son of Thyssollos, had been sent as an envoy to the Persian king by the Karians and, while an envoy, had plotted against Mausolos and was subsequently executed on the king’s orders. Moreover, the *polis* of Mylasa seized his property and handed it over to Mausolos. In the second case, the sons of Peldemos had damaged an image of Hekatomnos, father of Mausolos, thus wronging the sacred dedications, and the *polis* therefore confiscated their property and sold it. They may have sought refuge in Isos (no. 891), because proxeny was granted in C4 to three men: Myrmex, Manes and Targelios, sons of Peldemis (SEG 36 983; cf. Blümel (1998b) 171). In the third case Manita, son of Paktyes, plotted against Mausolos during the annual offering and festival of Zeus Labrandeus. Manitas himself was killed immediately in hand-to-hand fighting, and the *polis* confiscated the property of Manitas and his accomplice Thyssos, son of Syskos, and sold their estates. In all three cases the decrees are passed by the assembly, with the ratification of the three *phylai*, and curses are invoked on anyone who puts a question to the vote or proposes something which would change these decisions.

Hdt. 1.171.6 mentions a sanctuary dedicated to Zeus Karios and calls it “ancient”. Zeus Karios was also worshipped by the Mysians and the Lydians (Hdt. 1.171.6). Remains survive of the wall surrounding the temenos of the temple of Zeus Osogos; it probably dates to C5 (Bean (1971) 42). A temenos of Hermes and Herakles is attested c.317 (I.Mylasa 21.13).

The cult centre of Mylasa was the sanctuary of Zeus at Labraunda, situated c.15 km north of Mylasa and connected to it by a sacred way. Annual sacrifices and a *panegyris* are mentioned at I.Mylasa 1.3.4–5. Strabo mentions the road and says that it measured 60 stades (10.8 km) (14.2.23). The road, of which parts have been preserved, was constructed in the Hekatomnid period (Westholm (1963) 9–10). The sanctuary consists of several buildings: the temple itself (for which see Hellström and Thieme (1982)), a peristyle, two andrones, two stoas and several other buildings (PECS s.v.). Although the majority of the remaining buildings at Labraunda were constructed in C4 as part of the Hekatomnid building project, there was activity at the site earlier, as evidenced by Archaic buildings on the temple terrace (Westholm (1963) 105) and by sherds dating to the Protogeometric period and
onwards (Jully (1981)). In the area surrounding the sanctuary there are several forts, which may have been part of a defence system and which probably date to Hekatomnid period (Westholm (1963) 13–15). The acropolis at Labraunda is also of Hekatomnid date (ibid. 15–19).

Strabo says that Mylasa used to be a kome, and on the basis of this, Radt assumes that Mylasa was not a conurbation in the Archaic and Classical periods but that it consisted of “einzelne Flecken und Gehöfte”, comparing it with the settlement pattern of the Halikarnassian peninsula before the Mausolus synoecism (Radt (1969–70) 167). However, Rumscheid argues that Mylasa probably existed already by c7r ((1995) 77–78, (1999) 206). In Arist. Occ. 1348r12–13 Mylasa is described as atechistos in the 360s. Accepting the account as historical, Rumscheid argues that Mylasa did not have a city wall, but that it was protected by a number of fortifications in the territory (Rumscheid (1999) with fig. 3). A palaistra and a gymnasion are mentioned in an inscription of c.317 (I.Mylasa 21.9, 12).

It is generally stated that Mylasa did not strike coins until C3l (Akarca (1999) 18; Head, HN² 622), except for the bronze coins struck by the dynast Eupolemos in his own name at the time of Alexander or a little later. Obv. three Makedonian shields; rev. sword in sheath; legend: ΕΥΠΟΛΕΜΟΥ (HN² 622). However, Hurter describes two Mylasic tetradrachms in the so-called Pixodaros hoard, which was deposited c.330 (Hurter (1998) 147–50). These two coins have obv. Zeus Labraundios, rev. Zeus Osogos (a combination of Zeus and Poseidon) holding a trident and an eagle.

914. Myndos (Myndios) Map 61. Lat. 37.05, long. 27.15. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: A: a. The toponym is Μύνδος, ἱ (Hecat. fr. 243; Dio. 20.37.1; Strabo 13.1.59). The city-ethnic is Μύνδις (IG i³ 71.11.141). Myndos is implicitly classified as a polis Hellenis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 99; cf. Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 142, and it is retrospectively called a polis in the political sense by Arr. Anab. 1:20.6 (1334).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on Hellenistic coins (SNG Cop. Caria 439–43: ΜΥΝΔΙΩΝ (C2–C1)) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i³ 271.11.86). For the individual and external use, see Hdt. 5.33.3; I.Knidos 23.9–10 (C2).

Hdt. 5.33.2 mentions a Myndian ship in the fleet of Aristagoras c.500. Myndos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is recorded in the tribute lists from 453/2 (IG i³ 260.vi.16) to 421/0 (IG i³ 285.1.92–93) a total of nineteen times, four times completely restored, paying a phoros of 500 dr., except in 421/0 when it paid 1,000 dr. It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.11.141), 1,000 dr. Myndos must have defected from Athens during the Dekeleian War, since at Delphi the statues of those who fought with Lysander at Aigos potamoi in 405 included one of Theopompos of Myndos (Paus. 10.9.10). In 334 Alexander attacked Myndos, which, however, resisted his assault because of the failure of a secret agreement between Alexander and a faction behind the walls (Arr. Anab. 1:20.5–7).

Citing the C4 historian Kallisthenes of Olynthos, Strabo says that when Mausolos synoecised some poleis into Halikarnassos (no. 886), Myndos was left as it was (Strabo 13.1.59; Callisthenes (FGrHist 124) fr. 25). The coastal site on the tip of the Halikarnassos peninsula does not go further back than the Mausolus period, so “old Myndos” must be sought elsewhere (cf. the distinction between Myndos and Palaimyndos, Plin. HN 5.107; Steph. Byz. 462.4). Bean and Cook identify “Lelegian” Myndos with a site not far from “new Myndos”. It is generally assumed that it was Mausolos who initiated the move (Hornblower (1982) 97). At the hilltop site of “old Myndos” very little remains. There are foundations of a tower in irregular masonry and a ring wall in loose polygonal or dry rubble masonry. Sherds seem to indicate that the site was abandoned in C4 (Bean and Cook (1955) 118). At the site of “new Myndos” there are remains of an outer circuit in ashrar masonry, which must have been c.3.5 km long and enclosed an area of c.45 ha. We know from Arr. Anab. 1:20.6 that Myndos was walled in 334. McNicoll suggests that the walls were erected after 367 and before 334 (1997) 23). Furthermore, there is a so-called Lelegian wall, which is, however, too recent to be “Lelegian” and is of different masonry (Hornblower (1982) 305–6). McNicoll suggests that this wall was built after 334. It is in hammer-faced isodomic ashlar, whereas the tower to the north-east is in isodomic ashar masonry with headers and stretchers (McNicoll (1997) 22–24). Nothing remains of the foundations of temples and the stadion seen by Newton (1865) 575–77; cf. Bean and Cook (1955) 108–12, 118, 145). According to Ps.-Skylax 99, Myndos had a harbour (cf. Strabo 14.2.20).

915. (Narissbares) Map 61. Unlocated. Type: C2. A toponym is not attested. The city-ethnic is Ναρισβαρεύς (IG i³ 271.1.71). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i³ 271.1.71).

The Narissbares were members of the Delian League. They belonged to the Karian district and are recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i³ 259.vi.5) to 440/39 (IG i³ 271.1.71).
916. Naryandos (Naryandeus) Map 61. Unlocated. Type: Cy. Apart from Plin. HN 5.107 (Nariandos) the toponym is not attested. The city-ethnic is Ναρυάνδεος (I.Mylasa 8.8 (C4)). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in a C4 inscription from Mylasa (I.Mylasa 8.8). For the individual and external use, see SEG 44 890.55 (C2).

The Naryandeis are known from a fragmentary C4 list of presbei in which the Ναρυάνδεον πρέσβεις (I.Mylasa 8.8) are mentioned alongside presbei from Koranza (no. 906) (l. 9), and thus presumably are the representatives of a polis.

A Demeter Naryandis is mentioned in an undated (probably Hellenistic) list of priests from Panamara (I.Stratonikeia 283.1–2).

917. Naxia (Naxiates) Map 61. Lat. 37.35, long. 27.40. Size of territory: presumably 1 or 2. Type: C. The toponym is Ναξία (IG i3 267.111.29). The city-ethnic is Ναξιάτης (IG i3 261.v.8) or Ναξιάτης (IG i3 269.iv.23). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 261.v.8).

In IG i3 267.111.29 Meritt’s restoration: Ναξιάς παρὰ Μ[π]? (όνα) is far from certain, but L. Robert’s suggestion (1978) 481 n. 32 that Μ[... stands for Miletos or Myous is in conflict with the recording of Naxia in the Karian district (IG i3 271.1.73).

Naxia was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is registered in the Athenian tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i3 259.1.25) to 432/1 (IG i3 280.1.32) a total of thirteen times, twice completely restored. It is recorded once by toponym (IG i3 267.111.29), and otherwise by city-ethnic, paying a phoros of first, 1,000 dr. (IG i3 259.1.25, partly restored), then 500 dr. from 448/7 on (IG i3 264.11.2).

918. (Olaiæs) Map 61. Lat. 37.05, long. 28.20. Size of territory: ? Type: C. A toponym is not attested. The city-ethnic is Ὀλαιαεύς (IG i3 260.1.18). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 260.1.18).

The Olaiæs were members of the Delian League, but they are registered in the Athenian tribute lists only once, in 453/2, paying a phoros of 1,000 dr. (IG i3 260.1.18).

919. Olymos (Hylineus) Map 61. Lat. 37.25, long. 27.45. Size of territory: ? Type: C/b. The earliest attestations of the toponym Ὀλυμπος or Ὀλυμπός is from C2s (I.Mylasa 806.11). The city-ethnic is ἱλιµέυς (IG i3 263.11.39), or, later, Ὀλυμπός (EA 32 (2000) 99 no. 1.2 (= I.Mylasa 868.2 (C3); no. 2.2 (C3)). On the equation of the Hylimeis as the inhabitants of Olymos, see L. Robert (1955) 226–27. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 263.11.39).

Olymos was a member of the Delian League. It is recorded for the first time in 450/49 (IG i3 263.11.39), and then possibly in 448/7 (IG i3 264.iv.29: ἱλιµέυς) and 447/6 (IG i3 265.1.86, completely restored). The amount paid by Olymos is unknown. It is absent from the full panel of 440/39 (IG i3 271.1–11.63–86).

There are practically no archaeological remains left at the site of Olymos, but a large number of Hellenistic inscriptions bearing the toponym and the ethnic make the site identification certain (I.Mylasa 11 pp. 29ff; Bean (1971) 48).

920. Ouranion (Ouranietes) Map 61. Lat. 37.05, long. 27.15 (for a different location, see Varinligülo et al. (1992)). Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: Bγ. The toponym is Οὐρανίαιν, πός (Diod. 5.53, referring to some period after the Trojan War). The city-ethnic is Ὀυρανιητής (IG i3 260.1.17). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 260.1.17) and in a C4m treaty (SEG 40 992.16).

Ouranion was a member of the Delian League, but it is recorded only twice in the tribute lists, in 453/2 (IG i3 260.1.17), paying a phoros of 1,000 dr., and in 451/0 (IG i3 262.v.27), paying 500 dr. It is absent from the full panel of 440/39 (IG i3 271.1–11.63–86) but was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.1.117), paying in a syntelic group with some other Karian towns.

A keryxa from Ouranion is mentioned in a C4m treaty (SEG 40 992.16).

Ouranion was one of the settlements which were synoecised into Halikarnassos (no. 886) by Mausolos c370 (Plin. HN 5.107; Hornblower (1982) 82; Demand (1990) 123), but it seems likely that the place still functioned as a manned stronghold even after the civilian population had been moved (Hornblower (1982) 88).

At the site of Ouranion there are remains of a fortification which is c.50 m long and enclosed by a wall built in coursed masonry. The fortifications have vertical drafting at the edges, which points to a C4 date (Hornblower (1982) 95). There are remains of an outer perimeter in polygonal masonry. Sherds found at the site were of the Archaic and Classical periods (Bean and Cook (1995) 117–18).

According to Diod. 5.53, Ouranion was settled by Karians fleeing from the island of Syme because of drought, some-
time after the Trojan War. The names listed in the C4m treaty mentioned above suggest that there was a strong Karian element in the population of Ouranion (Blümel (1990) 38–42 (= SEG 40 991–92)), and it is a moot point to what extent it can be considered a Hellenic polis in the Archaic and Classical periods.

921. (Parpariotai) Map 61. Lat. 37.35, long. 27.30 (although Marchese (1989) 39, 153 suggests a location in northern Karia). Size of territory: ? Type: C?: A toponym is not attested. The city-ethnic is Παρπαριώτης (IG i3 263.11.8). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 263.11.8).

The Parpariotai were members of the Delian League. They belonged to the Karian district and are registered from 451/0 (IG i3 262.11.8) to 440/39 (IG i3 272.11.82) a total of eleven times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of 1,000 dr.

922. Passanda (Pasandeus) Map 65. Lat. 36.50, long. 28.35. Size of territory: ? Type: C:γ. The toponym is Πάσσανδα (Steph. Byz. 509.12) or Πασανάδα (Stadiasmus 264–65). The city-ethnic is Πασανάδευς (IG i3 279.11.11). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 279.11.11). The individual city-ethnic is used externally in a list of contributors from Kaunos (SEG 12 473.13, before 190 or after 167; cf. SEG 44 890.90). However, at the time it was no longer a city-ethnic, but a sub-ethnic, Passanda having become a civic subdivision of Kaunos (no. 898).

Passanda was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is registered in the tribute lists from 451/0 (IG i3 262.11.23) to 421/0 (IG i3 285.11.12) a total of twelve times, thrice completely restored, paying a phoros of 3,000 dr.

923. Pedasa (Pedaseus) Map 61. Lat. 37.05, long. 27.25. Size of territory: probably 1. Type: C:β. The toponym is Πήδασα, τά (Strabo 13.1.59). The city-ethnic is Πήδασεος (Syll.3 46.140 (C5); Hdt. 1.175). Pedasa was described as a polis in the urban sense at Hdt. 8.104, but the passage is a repeat of a story told at 1.175 and is probably a late addendum. The external use of the city-ethnic is attested collectively at Hdt. 1.175 and individually at Syll.3 46.140.

A cult of Athena is attested at Hdt. 1.175 in connection with the story that the priestess of Athena grew a beard when an evil threatened the city.

Pedasa was one of the settlements which were synoecised into Halikarnassos (no. 886) by Mausolos c.370 (Strabo 13.1.59; Plin. HN 5.107; Hornblower (1982) 81 n. 24; Demand (1990) 123).

The archaeological remains consist of a fortification, c.170 m long, built in irregular masonry, with towers in squared masonry on the southern side. The walls enclose an area of 2.5 ha (Bean (1971) 121). There are traces of buildings inside the perimeter. To the east and south there is an outer perimeter in dry rubble masonry (Bean and Cook (1955) 123–25; cf. Hornblower (1982) 308).

924. (Peleiatai) Unlocated, not in Barr. Type: C?: A toponym is not attested. The city-ethnic is Πελειάτης (IG i3 260.x.2). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 280.1.68).

The Peleiatai were members of the Delian League. They belonged to the Karian district and are registered in the tribute lists from 453/2 (IG i3 260.x.2) to 443/2 (IG i3 280.1.68) a total of thirteen times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 4,000 dr. in 453/2, reduced to 3,000 dr. in 450/49 (IG i3 263.v.28).

925. Pidasa (Pidaseus) Map 61. Lat. 37.25, long. 27.35. Size of territory: ? Type: Α?: A toponym is Πίδασας, τά (Blümel (1997) 137 l. 8; Milet. i 13 149.15 (CaF)). The city-ethnic is Πίδασεος (IG i3 260.x.7) or Πίδασεος (EA 29 (1997) 137.8). Pidasa was called a polis in the political sense in a CA treaty with Latmos (no. 910) (EA 29 (1997) 137.16–18). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i3 260.x.7). For the individual and external use, see Milet. 1 3 411.1.4 (Czs).

The Pidaiseis were members of the Delian League. They are recorded in the tribute lists from 453/2 (IG i3 259.111.5) to 447/6 (IG i3 265.1.14) a total of five times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of 2 tal. in 453/2 and 451/0 (IG i3 260.x.7), but 1 tal. in 447/6 (IG i3 265.1.14). They are absent from the full panel of 441/0 (IG i3 271.1–1.63–86) but were assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.11.149), 3 tal. The Pidaiseis/Pidaiseis of the tribute lists were not the Pidaiseis in the Halikarnassian peninsula; see ATL i.535; cf. Blümel (1997) 139; Pace Cook (1961b) 95.

A psephisma passed between 323 and 313 records a treaty between Pidasa and Latmos, called politeuma in the decree (41) (Blümel (1997); Habicht (1998); Jones (1999)). The treaty prescribes both a physical and a political amalgamation of the two poleis. Pidasa holds a subordinate position to that of Latmos and is in fact incorporated into Latmos: all Pidaiseis, hitherto organised into their own phylai and phratriai, are to be inscribed either into a new phyle or into one of the Latmian phylai (4–10); a common financial administration
is set up (14–20), and some of the Pidaseis are supposed to move to Latmos (27–28). In the treaty with Latmos, 100 Pidiasian citizens, selected by the Latmioi, are to swear to the treaty (29). It has been suggested that these 100 men constituted almost the whole number of citizens of Pidasa (Habicht (1998) 10), but the fact that the 100 citizens were selected by the Latmioi indicates that the total number of Pidiasian citizens was considerably higher.

The site of Pidasa has been identified by Cook ((1961) 91–96; cf. L. Robert (1978)). The scanty remains consist of a fortification c.200 m long in coursed masonry. Tiles found inside the perimeter point to a C4–C5e date. At a distance of 300 m is a watch-tower built with square blocks.

926. Pladasa (Pladasieus) Map 61. Lat. 37.05, long. 28.05. Size of territory: ? Type: A:C. A toponym is not attested. The city-ethnic is Πλαδασιός (SEG 40 996.7, 319/8 = I.Rhod.Ped. 701) or Πλατασιος (I.Labraunda 111.2 42.5) or Πλαδασιής (SEG 40 992.12 (C4m)).

Pladasa is called a polis in the political sense in a prokynex decree of 319/8 (Varinlioglu et al. (1990) = SEG 40 996.6). The collective use of the city-ethnic is used internally in a prokynex decree of 319/8 (SEG 40 996.10) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG I² 264.11) and in a C4m treaty between Mylasa (no. 913) and Kindye (no. 902) (SEG 40 992.12). The individual city-ethnic is used externally on an undated grave inscription from Chalke (IG XII.1 962b).

Pladasa was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is registered in the tribute lists from 448/7 (IG I² 264.1.11) to 440/39 (IG I² 272.1.89) a total of five times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of 2,000 dr. (IG I² 265.1.13). It was assessed for tribute in 245/4 (IG I² 265.1.150). It is absent from the full panel of 441/0 (IG I² 271.1–11.63–86).

An envoy from Pladasa is listed in a treaty from Mylasa of 354/3 (SEG 40 992.13). In 319/18 Pladasa granted proxenia, politeia and enktesis to Kratesippos, son of Polyon, from Plataiai (SEG 40 996.15–17).

One month name from Pladasa is attested in the prokynex decree of 319/8. The name of the month is Κοροβαλλαισ, a Karian name (SEG 40 996.4).

The names listed in the treaty between Mylasa and Kindye (SEG 40 992.12–13) suggest that there was a strong Karian element in the Pladasian population, and it is a moot point to what extent the community can be considered a Hellenic polis in the Classical period.

927. Pyrindo (Pyrindios) Unlocated, not in Barr. Type: C:a. The toponym is Πυρίνδος (Steph. Byz. 541.8) and I.Knidos 255 (undated). The city-ethnic is Πυρίνδios (I.Knidos 22.1).

Pyrindo is known from three sources only: viz. Steph. Byz. who calls it πόλις Καρίας (541.8), which has no value without a source reference; an undated fragment of an inscription in which only Πυρίνδου and YTO can be read; and more interestingly, a C4s list of Προστάται Πυρίνδου (then follow nineteen names, all Greek: I.Knidos 22. The provenance of the inscription is unknown).

928. Pyrnos (Pyrnios) Map 61. Lat. 36.55, long. 28.25. Size of territory: ? Type: C:? The toponym is Πύρνος (Steph. Byz. 541.10; Plin. HN 5.104). The city-ethnic is Πύρνος (IG I² 261.14.10). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG I² 262.1.17, 263.1.3).

Pyrnos was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district and is registered in the tribute lists from 452/1 (IG I² 261.14.10) to 433/2 (IG I² 279.1.23) a total of twelve times, three times completely restored, paying a phoros of 1,000 dr. (IG I² 263.1.3).

929. Salmakis (Salmakites) Not in Barr., but from C4 part of Halikarnassos (no. 886). Type: C:? The toponym is Σαλµακίς (SEG 43 713.11, 13 (c.400)). The ethnic is Σαλµακιτής (Syll.³ 45.2 = ML 32 (C5f)). The collective ethnic is used internally in Syll.³ 45.2.

Strabo 14.16.1 describes Salmakis as a fountain. From SEG 43 713.11 and 13 it appears that it was a district or area in Halikarnassos. The site has been identified via an inscription found in 1995 (Isager (1998)). However, in C5f the Salmakians were clearly some kind of political community, passing a law with the Halikarnassians and the tyrant Lygdamis. The Halikarnassians and the Salmakians formed the syllogos of Halikarnassos (Syll.³ 45.1–2 = ML 32), and they may constitute what is referred to as Ἀλικαρνασσείς σύμπαντες (41–42). Moreover, the Salmakians had their own magistrates (13–15: Σαλµακεῖων μνημονεύσοντον Μεγαβατέω ... καὶ Φορµίωνος). It is a possibility that they had polis status at the time, but were incorporated into Halikarnassos (no. 886) not too long after. See also Isager (1998) 10, comm. to l. 16.

930. Silioi (Sili) Map 61. Unlocated. Type: C:? The city-ethnic is Σιλίος (IG I² 262.3.30). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG I² 262.3.30). The Siloi were members of the Delian League, but they are recorded only once, in 451/0 (IG I² 262.3.30), paying a phoros of 1,500 dr. They are listed together with
some Karian communities, wherefore it has been argued that they too belong in the Karian district (ATL 1.5.49). In the list of 453/2 (IG i² 260.1.110) the city-ethnic is completely restored.

931. Syangela (Syangeleus)/Theangela (Theangeleus)

Map 61. Lat. 37.05, long. 27.35. Size of territory: 2 or 3. Type: Α.γ. The toponym is Συάγγελα, 7α (Kallisthenes (FGHist 124) fr. 25, quoted by Strabo 13.1.59; Kramer’s emendation of συαγγέλα (MSS CDx) and σύν ἄγελα (MSS hmwz), later Θεάγγελα, 7α (Staatsverträge 429.25 (c.310); Steph. Byz. 308.6). The city-ethnic is Συαγγελεύς (IG i² 284.7–8; SEG 40 991.13 (354/3); C4–C3 coins), later Θεαγγελεύς (IG ii 1956.11.98 (c.300); Ιλασος 50.4 (C4–C3)). In a treaty with Eupolemos of c.310 (Staatsverträge 429.29) Theangela is called a polis both in the urban sense (20) and in the political sense (24). In a C4m treaty between Mylasa (no. 913) and Kindye (no. 902) the Syangeleis are among the city-ethnics listed after the heading παρήσαν ἀπὸ πόλεων, where polis is used in the political sense (SEG 40 991.13). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins (ΣΥ (C4–C3), infra) and in the treaty with Eupolemos (Θεαγγελεύς, Staatsverträge 429.26) and externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i² 284.7–8) and in the C4m treaty (SEG 40 991.13). The individual city-ethnic is used externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i² 259.v16) and in a C4–C3 proxeny decree (Ι.Ιλασος 50.4).

Syangela (at modern Kaplan (Radt 1970) 224 or Alatzetin) was out of the synoecism of Halikarnassos by Mausolos c.370 (Kallisthenes (FGHist 124) fr. 25, pace Plin. HN 5.107; Hornblower (1982) 82; Demand (1990) 123). In C4l or C3e Menylos Nossou Theangeleus was granted proxeny by Iasos (no. 891) (Ι.Ιλασος 50.4). A keryx from Syangela is mentioned in the C4m treaty between Mylasa and Kindye (SEG 40 991.15). The names listed in the treaty between Mylasa and Kindye suggest that there was a strong Karian element in the population of Syangela (SEG 40 991.13–15; see Blümel (1990) 38–42 (= SEG 40 9922)), and it is a moot point to what extent the community can be considered a Hellenic polis in the Archaic and Classical periods.

Some coins inscribed with ΣΥ and formerly attributed to Syros (no. 523) and Syme (no. 522) respectively were in all probability struck by Syangela. Of eight coins one can be dated c.390. Obs. head of Dionysos; rev. kantharoi and vine branches in incuse square, along with the legend ΣΥ. The remaining seven coins are dated to 300–250 (Yarkin (1975); cf. Yarkin (1977); and Hornblower (1982) 98 n. 154, pace Franke (1984) 200, who opts for at date between 350 and 320). Franke (1984) assigns two more coins, one of which is a trihemiobol, to Syangela. He dates these two coins to C5l and argues on historical grounds that the silver coinage of Syangela must be dated to the period 413–391.

932. (Talagreis)

Unlocated, not in Barr. Type: C.? A toponym is not attested. The city-ethnic is Ταλαγρεύς (Ι.Μυλασα 4.6 (C4e)). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the decree from Mylasa. The Talagreis are attested in a fragmentary C4e decree from Mylasa. It seems that the Talagreis are mentioned on a par with Koranza (no. 906), which was a polis at the time, and therefore there is a possibility that the Talagreis could have been a polis too.

933. Taramptos

Map 61. Lat. 37.10, long. 27.30. Size of territory: 1. Type: C.? The toponym is Ταράμπτος (Syll.3
1044.18 (c.300)). The toponym is not attested. The evidence for Taramptos is very scarce: in the tribute assessment list of 425/4 [Τάραμπτος] is restored (IG i³ 71.1.115), and if the restoration is correct, it indicates that Taramptos was some sort of political community. The only other mention of Taramptos is in an inscription of c.300, mentioning rights of tillage in Ταράμπτος (Syll.3 1044.18).

934. (Tarbanes) Map 61. Unlocated. Type: C. A toponym is not attested. The city-ethnic is Ταρβανεύς (IG i³ 71.11.140). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG i³ 260.1.19).

The Tarbanes were members of the Delian League. They belonged to the Karian district and are registered in 453/2 (IG i³ 260.1.19) and 441/0 (IG i³ 271.1.85, partly restored), paying a phoros of 1,000 dr. (IG i³ 260.1.19). The city-ethnic is completely restored in the lists of 442/1 (IG i³ 270.v.11) and 440/9 (IG i³ 272.11.87). They were assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.11.140), 1,000 dr.

935. Telandros (Telandrioi) Map 65. Lat. 36.40, long. 28.55. Size of territory: ? Type: C. The toponym is Τελάνδρος, τό or Τήλανδρος, ἦ (Alex. Polyl. [FGrHist 273] fr. 54 = Steph. Byz. 620.10–12), whereas Steph. Byz. 620.10 lists Τηλάνδρος as the name of a polis in Karia and Τηλανδρία as a promontory. Plin. HN 5.131 describes Telandria as an island with a deserted oppidum; but according to Quintus Smyrnaeus 4.7–11, the city of Telandros lay inland on the bank of the Glaukos river (Nif Çay). Following Philipson (1910–13) and followed by Barr., ATL i.535 argues that the polis of Telandros was situated on the island of Telandria, to be identified with Tersane. ATL also attatches the reference in Steph. Byz. to this island (almost certainly incorrectly). Heberdey (Map of Lycia in TAM I) identifies the island of Telandria with Avthoki, where there is a ruined watch-tower (Bean (1978) 36 [date]?, and the polis of Telandros with the inland site of Nif Köy (following Arkwright (1895) 94). This is treated with scepticism by e.g. Ruge (1934) and L. Robert ([1980] 377–80, accepting the ATL identification), but Arkwright may be correct.

No matter whether the classical polis was situated inland or on the island, there can be no doubt that the city-ethnic is Τελανδρίδες, recorded in the Athenian tribute lists as a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district (IG i³ 269.iv.13), later incorporated into the Ionian district (IG i³ 279.1.10). It is registered in the tribute lists from 453/2 (IG i³ 260.1.11, completely restored) to 433/2 (IG i³ 279.1.10) a total of ten times, twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 1 tal. (IG i³ 262.v.31), reduced to 3,000 dr. in 448/7 (IG i³ 264.11.5). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.11.92).

936. Telemessos (Telemessaeus) Map 61. Lat. 37.00, long. 27.20. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: Bb. The toponym is Τελεμεσσαῖος (Syll.3 1044.37 (c.300)) or Τελεμεσσάς (Steph. Byz. 612.13, quoting Philon [FGrHist 790] fr. 48 and Τελεμεσσαῖος (Strabo 14.3.4). The earliest attestation of the city-ethnic is Τελεμεσσαῖος in IG xii.3 251.23–25 (C4) and Τελεμεσσέως in Iscr. Cos Ed 56.4 (C3), unless the Τελεμεσσεῖς mentioned by Hdt. 1.78.2 and 1.84.3 are the inhabitants of Karian and not Lykian Telemessos. The earliest attestation of Telemessos as a polis in the political sense is in a C3 decree of Telemessos (Iscr. Cos Ed 56.4). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally by Hdt. 1.78.2, 84.3, but see supra) and internally in a C3 decree (Iscr. Cos Ed 56.4).

An inscription of c.300 mentions a Telemessian Apollo giving an oracular response (Syll.3 1044.8–9). A citizen of Telemessos was granted προκειμένα by Anaphe (no. 474) (IG xii.3 251.23–25 (C4)).

Telemessus was one of the towns which were synoecised into Halikarnassos (no. 886) by Mausolos c.370 (Plin. HN 5.107; Hornblower (1982) 82; Demand (1990) 123).

937. Termere (Termereus) Map 61. Lat. 37.00, long. 27.20. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: Bb. The toponym is Τέρμερα, τά (IG i³ 263.11.12; SEG 43.713.D35 (425–350); Strabo 14.2.18 has Τέρμερον). The city-ethnic is Τερμερεύς (IG i³ 271.11.77).

Termere was a member of the Delian League. It is recorded in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i³ 259.iv.25) to 415/4 (IG i³ 290.1.22, restored: [Τéρμερα] [με] [πες]) a total of twelve times, once completely restored, paying a phoros of 2 tal., 3,000 dr. from 454/3 to 447/6 (IG i³ 265.1.26, amount completely restored), and from 443/2 (IG i³ 269.v.8, amount completely restored) a phoros of 3,000 dr. (IG i³ 271.11.77); for a possible explanation of this reduction, see Bean and Cook (1955) 116–18). Termere was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i³ 71.11.154).

Termere was one of the settlements which were synoecised into Halikarnassos (no. 886) by Mausolos c.370 (Plin. HN 5.107; Hornblower (1982) 82; Demand (1990) 123). The archaeological remains at Termere consist of a citadel c.40 m long with remains of a wall in squared masonry. Inside the walls there are traces of buildings and a cistern, possibly of the Classical period. There seems to have been an outer circuit in polygonal masonry—in places the wall stands to a height of 5 m—probably dating from C3, and inside this circuit are traces of habitation, along with sherds of C5 and C4 (Bean and Cook (1955) 116–18).
Termera struck silver coins on the Persian standard in the late Archaic period. A unique drachm has obv. Herakles; legend: ΥΤΜΝΩ; rev. lion’s head in incuse square; legend: ΤΕΡΜΕΡΙΚΟΝ. A tetradrachm has obv. Herakles; rev. lion’s head in incuse square (Head, HN 627; Cahn (1970) 120–21; Bean and Cook (1955) 147–49).

938. (Terssogasseis) Unlocated, not in Barr. Type: Cγγ. A toponym is not attested. The city-ethnic is ΤΕΡΣΑΣΟΓΑΣΑΣΕΩΣ (I. Mylasa 8.7 (C4); 866.2 (C3)).

In C3 citizenship and other honours were bestowed upon Polites Thyssoi Terssogasseus by Olymos (I. Mylasa 866.2 (C3)), and in a C4 list of envoys it has been suggested that ωγασσέων be restored ΤΕΡΣΑΣΟΓΑΣΑΣΕΩΝ (I. Mylasa 8.7, comm. ad loc.), in which case presbeis of the Terssogasseis would be attested and mentioned on a par with those of Korana (no 906).

939. (Thasthareis) Map 61. Lat. 37.35, long. 27.40. Size of territory: 1 or 2. Type: C?. A toponym is not attested, but the city-ethnic is ΘΑΣΘΑΡΕΩΣ (IG 13 264.11.3). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the Athenian tribute lists (IG 13 271.1.72).

The Thasthareis were members of the Delian League. They belonged to the Karian district and are registered from 451/0 (IG 13 262.1.29) to 440/39 (IG 13 272.1.83, completely restored) a total of seven times; twice completely restored, paying a phoros of 500 dr.

Theangela (Theangeleus) See Syangela (Syangeleus) (no. 931).

940. Thydonos Unlocated, not in Barr., but Pliny lists it with Euromos, Herakleia and Amyzon (HN 5.109), so it may have been in northern Karia. Type: C?. On the basis of Plin. HN 5.109 Thydonos, the toponym is restored Θυδο[νος] (IG 13 262. v.29; see Meritt (1939) 189–90), but it seems more likely to restore an ethnic, e.g. Θυδο[νοι].

Thydonos was a member of the Delian League, but is registered only once, in the tribute list of 451/0 (IG 13 262. v.29), paying a phoros of 1,000 dr. In the list of 453/2 (IG 13 260.1.9) the toponym (or city-ethnic) is completely restored.

941. Trralleis (Tralleus) Map 61. Lat. 37.50, long. 27.55. Size of territory: ? Type: Bβ. The toponym is ΤΡΑΛΛΕΩΣ (Xen. Hell. 3.2.19). The city-ethnic is ΤΡΑΛΛΕΩΣ (I. Tralleis 3.4–5), later ΤΡΑΛΛΕΙΑΝΟΣ (I. Tralleis 21.1 (C2m); Strabo 14.1.41). Trralleis is called a polis in the political sense at Arr. Anab. 1.18.1 and in the urban sense at Diod. 14.36.2 (1400).

The collective city-ethnic is attested internally in a decree of C4m (I. Tralleis 3). The only known public anactment is the C4m decree (supra) which concerns a sanctuary of Dionysos. The principal divinity of Trralleis, however, was Zeus Larasios (bronze coins of C3e, Head, HN 659; I. Tralleis 25.12 (C3)).

Xen. Hell. 3.2.19 says Trralleis is in Karia, whereas Diod. 14.36.2 calls it a polis in Ionia.

In 400 Trralleis was not walled, but occupied such a strong position that Thibron was unable to take it (Diod. 14.36.2; cf. Strabo 14.1.42). In 313, however, it was taken by Antigonos (Diod. 19.75.5).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. The Region

The name of the region is ἡ Λυκία (Hom. Il. 2.877; Thuc. 2.69; Ps.-Skylax 100; SEG 27 942.1, 3 (337/6)). The regional ethnic is Λύκος (Hdt. 1.173.1; SEG 42 1245.2, 6 (C4α)). The collective use of the ethnic is attested externally in Herodotos (1.28, 173.1) and internally in the epigram on the Inscribed Pillar (SEG 42 1245.2, 6). For the individual and external use, see Λύκος Κύβερνος Κοσσίκα (Hdt. 7.98). Ps.-Skylax 100 calls the Lykian people an ἰθνος. For the foundation myth of Lykia, deriving its origins from Crete, see Hdt. 1.173.1–2, 7.92; Strabo 12.8.5, 14.1.6; Apollod. Bibl. 3.1.1; Paus. 7.3.7. Herodotos reports that some Ionian cities took kings allegedly descended from Glaukos, the commander of the Lykian force in the Iliad (1.147.1).

In the Iliad Lykia seems to be considered as the Xanthos valley alone (Il. 2.876–7; Bryce (1983) 32, (1986) 13, 100). In the Classical period, Lykia bordered on Karia in the west and Pamphylia in the east (Ps.-Skylax 99–101). The western border of Lykia was at Telemessos (Ps.-Skylax 100; cf. Arr. Anab. 1.24.4 (1334)). The eastern border was west of Phellos, according to Hekataios, who placed that location in Pamphylia ((FGHHist 1) fr. 258). Ps.-Skylax 100, however, placed the eastern border at Perge. By the time of Strabo (14.4.1), the eastern border was set near Phaselis, and had probably been around there for most of the Classical period. Ps.-Skylax’s report may reflect a temporary extension of the command of the satrap of Lykia instituted by Alexander (see Keen (1997) 117 n. 50). The northern borders are never properly described in the Archaic and Classical periods, though it appears from Arrian (Anab. 3.6.6) that there was some area between the borders of Lykia and Mt. Taurus. Milyas was made part of Lykia by the Persians, having previously been part of Greater Phrygia (Arr. Anab. 1.24.5). Strabo (14.2.1, 3.9) implies that Lykia bordered on the Kibyrratis and Pisidia (Keen (1998) 17–19).

This is how the Greeks defined Lykia. According to Herodotos (3.90.1), Lykia was part of the first Persian satrapy; but how the region was delimited under Persian rule is unknown until we reach the Hekatomnid period (c.360–334). The region does not seem to have constituted a separate administrative unit, but was always joined with at least one of the neighbouring regions. For Achaemenid influence in Lykia, see Zahle (1989, 1991). In 340–334 Pixodaros was satrap of Karia and Lykia (Neumann (1979) 320c, the Aramaic version of the trilingual inscription from Letoon close to Xanthos; cf. Hornblower (1982) 47); but in 333 Alexander made Nearchos satrap “of Lykia and of the adjacent region until Mount Tauros” (Arr. Anab. 3.6.6), i.e. of Lykia and western Pamphylia. In C5m there may have been a Lykian kingdom which was largely coterminal with the Lykian cultural area and a member of the Delian League in its own right (Keen (1998); cf. infra).

If we shift the focus from administration to civilisation, we get a different but very clear picture of the extent of the region. An investigation of the distribution of Lykian inscriptions and tombs and of the attested Lykian mints shows that the Lykian people inhabited the region from Telemessos in the west to Gagai in the east. West of Telemessos, a few Lykian monuments have been found in the Glaucos valley, which was presumably the hinterland of Telemessos. No traces of Lykian civilisation have been found east of Gagai. Towards the north, the Elmali plateau was probably Lykian at least from C4 (Zahle (1980)).

It is clear from archaeological evidence that the Lykians had nucleated urban settlements quite early (Wurster (1978); Keen (1998) 28–29; Marksteiner (2002)). Some of the urban centres in Lykia can be traced back to the Archaic period, but the settlements were then much too small to be proper towns. A not insignificant urbanisation seems to have taken place in the course of the Classical period, starting in the first half of the fifth century. The main centres, principally known from excavations and surveys, are Xanthos, Limyra, Telemessos, Myra (?) and the site of Ayşar Tepesi. All these settlements were fortified; their walls enclosed an area of between 10 and 25  ha. All seem to have been inhabited by some 1,000–1,500 persons, and in Xanthos perhaps as many as 2,500 (Marksteiner (1997),
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(2002) 63–65). There may have been more urban settlements of the same type and size: e.g. Tlos, Pinara, Phellos and Apollonia, but the sites have not yet been surveyed or excavated (Wurster (1978); the ongoing Turkish excavations of Tlos and Patara have not yet been published). By far the best-known and best-excavated Lykian town is Aşar Tepeş, probably to be identified with Lykian Zagaba (Kolb and Tietz (2001)). So far, few public buildings have been found; but representations on Lykian reliefs may suggest that they were more common (Borchhardt (1993) 31–32). A number of sites (e.g. Arykanda, Kyanai, Limyra and especially Aşar Tepeş) have produced evidence of domestic houses, but analysis of this evidence is still at a preliminary stage (Marksteiner (1997)). It has been widely observed since the nineteenth century, however, that the Lykian tombs preserve the aspect of wooden-framed Lykian houses, of types still found in the area (Mellink (1969); Kjeldsen and Zahle (1975); Zahle (1983)). Finally, it is worth observing that few Lykian cities are in locations that lend themselves to regular grid-pattern urban planning (Wurster (1978) 23).

In the course of the Hellenistic period Lykia became completely Hellenised, and eventually formed a federation of twenty-three poleis (Strabo 14.3.3; Larsen (1968) 240–63; Behrwald (2000)). But Hellenisation began before Alexander’s conquest of Asia. The Lykian alphabet was an adaptation of the Greek (Bryce (1986) 54–63). To strike coins was something the Lykians learned from the Greeks. The legends are in the Lykian alphabet (Mørkholm and Neumann (1978)), but the types betray a strong Greek influence (Mørkholm and Zahle (1972), (1976)). Already in the Archaic period Greek pottery was widely used in some Lykian cities, especially in Xanthos (Metzger et al. (1972) 192–95). Is there a case for arguing that some of the Lykian cities had become Hellenic communities already in the Classical period? Or that they were mixed settlements with a sizeable contingent of Greek-speaking inhabitants and political institutions which show that they were proper poleis? Neither the written evidence nor the archaeological record can substantiate such a view (Marksteiner (2002) 68–71; Domingo Gygax (2001) 83, 85, 87, 89, 91–92). There is no evidence that any of the towns was a citizen community or had magistrates or a council, as virtually any polis had. There is no trace of a prytaneion or a bouleuterion, or a theatre or a stoa, all characteristic of the Greek polis, whereas in Xanthos remains have been found of what was probably the residence of the local dynast; again by contrast with the polis, where no remains of a “palace” can be found before the Hellenistic period, not even in poleis governed by a tyrant (Hansen (2002) 10). In the major towns, moreover, are tombs that because of their size and sculptural decoration must be the tombs of dynasts (Zahle (1983)). Nor were there any monumental temples, another characteristic of a polis. The Lykian towns were self-governing dynastic centres; they were presumably city-states, and in the Dynastic period Lykia may have been an indigenous city-state culture (Marksteiner (2002); Hansen (2002) 8–10), but it was not a region settled with Hellenic poleis until the Hellenistic period.

To Herodotos and other Classical Greeks, the Lykians were barbaroi (Hdt. 1.173.1; Ephor. fr. 162; Men. Aspis 25). Admittedly, in C4 the Lykians themselves used the term polis in internal documents, first in the inscription honouring the dynast Arbinas (SEG 39 1414.24 (C40)), then in an edict concerning exemption from commercial taxes (SEG 36 1216.4 (c.340–334)), and again in the trilingual inscription about the cult for Basileus Kaunios (Neumann (1979) N 320.b.12, 18 = SEG 27 942). All three documents come from the Letoon, close to Xanthos. Externally, polis is used by Ps.-Skylax 100 and, retrospectively, Diodoros 11.60.4. However, Menander (Aspis 30–32) talks of Lykia being settled in κόμματα. Arrian (Anab. 1.24.4 (1334)) characterises most western Lykian settlements as polismata, and the settlements of the Λύκαιοι οἱ κάτω as polis (1.24.5–6). But a polis is not necessarily a Hellenic community. The term is often used, mostly in the urban sense about non-Greek cities. It is noticeable too that Ps.-Skylax uses the heading πόλεις ἐν αὐτῇ Ἑλληνίδες . . . αἴδε in the chapters on Lydia (98) and Karia (99), whereas the chapters on Lykia (100), Pamphylia (101), Kilikia (102) and Cyprus (103) are introduced with the heading πόλεις ἐν αὐτῇ αἴδε, combined with the occasional occurrence of πόλις Ἑλληνις to describe an individual town as a Hellenic polis. However, by contrast with the first section of his treatise (1–33), Ps.-Skylax no longer shows the same consistency in the way he classifies individual settlements as either polis or polis Hellenis. And one of the towns recorded in the chapter on Lykia, viz. Phaselis, is classified as πόλις καὶ λιμὴν only, although it was undoubtedly a fully-fledged Hellenic polis.

Some of the Lykian cities were members of the Delian League. The Lykians as such appear in the tribute lists of 452/1 (IG i3 261.1.30, 451/0 (IG i3 262.v.33, restored) and 446/5 (IG i3 266.11.34), see infra 114i. The Telemessiosi were members in 446/5 (IG i3 266.11.33), and the ethnic is restored twice in earlier lists (IG i3 261.1.29, 262.v.32). Iera (IG i3 71.11.153–54) and, probably, Tymnessos (IG i3 71.i.141) were assessed for tribute in 425/4. But membership of the Delian League was not
restricted to Greek poleis. The Lykian entries indicate that Hiera, Telemessos and Tymessos were political communities of some kind, not that they were Hellenic poleis.

Two Lykian cities were claimed to have been founded by the Rhodians: viz. Gagai (Etym. Magn. 219.6–16) and Korydalla (Steph. Byz. 376.15). But in both cases the tradition is late and probably reflects Hellenistic attempts to link the Lykian cities to Greek civilisation. More important is Ps.-Skylax’s note that Megiste was a Rhodian island (τοῦ κατὰ ταυτὰ νησίδος ἔστιν Ἡρώδους Μεγίστης). This is in fact our earliest evidence for a Lydian peraios, but it does not in itself show that Megiste was a Hellenic polis. Some C4 coins with Rhodian types and the legend ME were previously attributed to Megiste (Head, HNP 635), but the legend is now interpreted as a magistrate’s name (Ashton (1990)).

Xanthos is in fact the only Lykian city for which there is some evidence that it had become a mixed Graeco–Lykian settlement before the Hellenistic period (Hornblower (1982) 119–22). Thus, it is the only Lykian community which deserves inclusion in this Inventory of Greek poleis in the Archaic and Classical periods. In all other cases polis formation seems to have postdated Alexander’s conquest, and if it happened earlier, there is not (yet) any evidence to show it.

To sum up, this part of the Inventory includes no site list and only two descriptions of poleis, viz. Phaselis, not a Lykian community but a Greek colony lying in the region of Lykia as defined by the Greeks, and Xanthos, the only Lykian community for which there is some substantial evidence of Hellenisation antedating Alexander’s conquest.

II. The Poleis

942. Phaselis (Phaselites) Map 65, Lat. 36.30, long. 30.35. Size of territory: ? Type: Δαίμονες. The toponym is Φάσηλος, Φάσηλος, Ἰούκη (Hdt. 2.178.2; Thuc. 2.69.1, 8.88; Lycurg. Leoc. 73 (emended); Strabo 14.3.9) or Φασηλίδας (Ps.-Skylax 100; Pseudo-Aristotle 973c8; Polyb. 30.9.4; Aristodemos (FGrHist 104) fr. 113.2 (rC5m)). The city-ethnic is Φάσηλος η Ἰούκης (IG i3 10.5, 8, 13, 17 (C55); TAM ii 1183.3, 4, 10 (C4m); Theodectas, TrGF 72 T 2 (epitaph of C4)). Phaselis is called a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax and in the political sense by Herodotos (2.178.2–3). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins of C5f and C4 (infra) and in a treaty with Mausolos of Karia (TAM ii 1183.3, 4, 10), and externally in an Athenian decree regulating relations with Phaselis (IG i3 10.5) and in literary sources (Dem. 35.1). The individual use is attested externally both in inscriptions (IG i3 1360; CID ii 4.1.72–73; IG xii 6.32.4 (306–301)) and in literary sources (Theodectas (TrGF 72 T 2); Dem. 35.10).

Ps.-Skylax and Strabo place Phaselis in Lykia; Aristodemos and Suda (Φασηλίς) place it in Pamphylia; it is in Solyma according to the Lindos Temple Chronicle ((FGrHist 532) fr. c.24). That Phaselis possessed a territory is shown by the report of Kimon ravaging the Χώρα of C669 (Plut. Cim. 12); it is also mentioned by Arrian (Anab. 1.24.6 (1334/5)). Lynmateia probably bordered on Phaselis (Arist. 973c8). In the Peace of Kallias in 449 Phaselis is the boundary west of which Persian fleets were not allowed to sail (Diod. 12.4.5).

Phaselis was supposedly colonized from Lindos on Rhodes in 691/0 (Euseb. 93b.2, Helm; Blumenthal (1963)), and at Plut. Cim. 12 the people of Phaselis are recorded as Hellenes. The oikistes was supposedly Laktios (Aristainetos (FGrHist 771) fr. 1; Ath. 7.297E–298A), a native of either Lindos or Argos (Philostephanos FHG ii 29), but he is possibly mythical; for the earliest attested version of the foundation myth, from C5/4, see Herophyto fr. 1. Phaselis is listed as one of the four Dorian poleis involved in the foundation of Naukratis (Hdt. 2.178.2).

Phaselis was a member of the Delian League. It belonged to the Karian district (IG i3 269.1v.9), later incorporated into the Ionian district (IG i3 279.1v.46). It was forced to join the League c.469 (Plut. Cim. 12.3–4) and is registered in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i3 259.1v.24) to 415/14 (IG i3 290.1v.17) a total of fifteen times, three times completely restored, paying a phoros of 6 tal. (IG i3 259.1v.24), reduced to 3 tal. in 450/49 (IG i3 263.11.35), but changed again before 433/2 (IG i3 272.1v.90), either back to 6 tal. or further reduced to 2 tal. It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i3 71.1v.129). In 411 Phaselis had fallen into Persian hands and was occupied by a Spartan force (Thuc. 8.99). Phaselis also had a long-standing friendship with Chios (Plut. Cim. 12). Phaselis made a treaty with Mausolos in the 350s (TAM ii 1183.3, 4, 10), apparently on equal terms. Proxenia and citizenship were received from Samos in 306–301 by Timophanes son of Archeopolis (IG xii 6 32). Mutual legal arrangements (ξυµβολαὶ αἱ δίκαι) existed in C5 with Athens (IG i3 10); disputes between Athenians and Phaselioi were to be tried at Athens. For the close commercial relations in C4 between Phaselis and Athens, see Dem. 35.1 et passim.

Phaselis had a cult of Athena Polias (TAM ii 1184, not later than C5). There was also an annual sacrifice to Kylabras, dating to the colony’s foundation (Ath. 7.297E–298A, citing Herophyto (FGrHist 448) fr. 1 and Philostephanos (FHG ii 29)). Phaselis was one of the cities responsible for building
the Hellenion at Naukratis in C6 (Hdt. 2.178.2–3), and made dedications to Athena on Lindos (Burn (1960) 48 n. 19).

The city was fortified c.469 (Plut. Cim. 12.3–4) and a few remains of the C5 fortifications are still extant. As rebuilt c.300, they enclosed an area of c.20 ha (Schäfer (1981) 49–86; for the dates, see 54, 58, 84, 164–66). A fortified settlement on a hill north of the city dates to the Hellenistic period (Schläger and Schäfer (1971); Schäfer (1981) 125–35). An agora is mentioned in the context of 334/3 by Plutarch (Alex. 18.4). Ps.-Skylax notes Phaselis’ limen (πόλις καὶ λιμήν), which is archaeologically visible. The were in fact two harbours, one north and one south of the acropolis.


Xanthos is called a polis in the urban sense on Erbbina’s statue base (SEG 39 1414.24 (C4e)) and in a tax exemption decree from Xanthos issued by Pixodaros, polis in the urban sense refers to the inhabitants of Xanthos, as well as those of Tlos, Pinara and Kadyanda (SEG 36 1216.4 (330–334)). Finally Xanthos is called polis by Ps.-Skylax 100 (as restored by Müller). Polis in the political sense is attested on a trilingual cult inscription from the Letoön (Neumann (1979) N 320.b.18 = SEG 27 342 (337)), but the Greek text is a translation of the Lykian (Blomqvist (1982); Briant (1998) 307). The Lykian word rendered by polis is teteri, for which see Kolb and Tietz (2001) 395. Xanthos is called an ἀστυ by Herodotos (1.176.1) and on Erbbina’s statue base (SEG 39 1414.5–6). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on the tax exemption edict of Pixodaros (SEG 36 1216.i.1–2, 8–9) and the trilingual cult inscription (SEG 27 942.5–6), and externally by Herodotos (1.176.2–3). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in a C3e bilingual epitaph from Kition (SEG 40 1355) and in literary sources (Suda Π2963 (rC4)).

Decrees of Xanthos set up at the Letoön (e.g. Neumann (1979) N 320) indicate that the sanctuary was part of the territory of Xanthos (Schwyer (1996) 28–29). Xanthos probably had upland estates, which is where those who escaped the destruction of the city in c.540 (Hdt. 1.176.3) were (Bean (1978) 50). Xanthos is placed in Lyka by Hekataios, Herodotos (1.176.3) and Ps.-Skylax (100).

The city was destroyed, and the mass of the population killed, in an act of mass suicide c.540 (Hdt. 1.176.1–2; App. B Civ. 4.10.80; Plut. Brut. 31.7) and subsequently resettled by ἐπικυληδεῖς (Hdt. 1.176.3).

Xanthos may have been a member of the Delian League, if a reference to Xanthos is concealed in the entry Λύκιοι (IG 1 β 336.21.1.30, 262.v.33) and Λύκιοι καὶ συν[τελεύται] (IG 1β 266.i.11.34; see Bean (1978) 25; Keen (1998) 40). In this case, it was included in the Καρκικὸς φόρος, and the syntely paid 10 tal. of tribute in 446/5.

Menekrates of Xanthos ((FGrHist 769) fr. 1 = Steph. Byz. 129.3) mentions Xanthian presbutai in a mythological context; note also that Jacoby suggests a possible reading here of πολίτας instead of πρεσβύτας.

A joint decree of Xanthians and periioikoi stipulates the foundation of a cult for Baseilus Kaunios (SEG 27 942.5–6: ἔδωξε δὴ Ξανθίοις καὶ τοῖς περιοίκοις, where periioikoi is a translation of ἐπεφθείμενοι in the Lykian original). The opposition has been interpreted as a purely geographical (Keen (1998) 55–56) or an institutionalised (Wörle (1978) 238) distinction between the Xanthians settled in the city and those in the hinterland. In the latter case the two strata of population were probably hierarchically organised rather than equal; analogy with other periioikic populations suggests that they were usually dependent communities (Domingo Gygax (2001) 19–40). It should be added, however, that joint decisions made by polis and periioikoi are known from Lyka only, and probably reflect Lykian rather than Greek institutions. The trilingual inscription attests an epimeletes (SEG 27 942.4–5), probably appointed by the local satrap (Bryce (1986) 133), and a hierus of Baseilus Kaunios and Arkesimas, appointed by the people of Xanthos (SEG 27 942.8). Lykian-language inscriptions (e.g. TAM 1 36 (C5–C4)) mention officials called merti (on which see Bryce (1986) 121–23).

SEG 42 1245.1 (c.400) identifies an agora, in which there was a temenos of the Lykian Twelve Gods (Trithc (1942) 41–42; Picard (1951) 137–38; Martin (1951) 169–74). Menekrates fr. 2.3 records a hieron of Apollo. On the Lykian acropolis are a C6 sanctuary (Metzger et al. (1963) 29–36) and the foundations of a building with three cellae (12 × 10.3 m), a C5 sanctuary of a
divinity, perhaps Artemis (Metzger et al. (1963) 40–42; identified from a Hellenistic inscription). Appian (B Civ. 4.10.78–9) records a Δαρμισ, see Metzger and Arkesimas, see Metzger et al. (1979)).

There is a dynastic residence on the acropolis (Metzger et al. (1963) 16–23; Bean (1978) 55). The Classical acropolis, mentioned by Herodotos (1.176.1), was the lower of two hills on the site, on which a c.475–50 polygonal wall survives (Metzger et al. (1963) 16–23; Bean (1978) 54). Further walls encompass the so-called Hellenistic acropolis; Herodotos (1.176) implies that the city was walled and capable of withstanding siege. The city had walls in the Hellenistic period (Plut. Brut. 30.8, 31.2, 4), of which much of the circuit and the south gate survive (Metzger et al. (1963) 9–10 for the circuit). There is an “early” polygonal wall at the Letoon (Bean (1978) 63). (On walls, see also Ritter (1859) 1020–21; Benndorf and Niemann (1884) 127, 138; Robert and Robert (1983) 124 ff n. 4.)

Xanthos minted silver coins on the light Lykian standard c.450–370. There is a variety of types including obv. head of Athena wearing crested helmet (the characteristic obv. motive from c.425 in common with west Lykian cities); rev. head of Athena, or head of Apollo or eagle. All carry Lykian legends until c.370/60 when the autonomous Lykian coinage ended (Arrinaha/Arrinah or abbreviation); most also carry a dynasty’s name (Mørkholm and Neumann (1978) M 205a–b, 221–223c, 224a–b, 240a–d). In C5 Xanthian dynasts struck coins too on the heavy east Lykian standard and on the so-called middle standard (Mørkholm and Zahle (1972), (1976); Mørkholm and Neumann (1978); Vismara (1989–96); Kolb and Tietz (2001); SNG Cop. suppl. 445, 447–48, 455, 460, 496A).

It is a much debated problem to what extent Xanthos was a Hellenic community before the Hellenistic period. The barbarian ethnicity of Xanthos is suggested by Herodotos’ considering it Lykian (1.176.3), since he considers the Lykians barbaroi (supra). All coins of the Classical period carry Lykian legends (supra). Also, most inscriptions of the Classical period are in Lykian (TAM 1 36–51 (C5–C4)) rather than Greek (cf. Bryce (1986) 211). The habit of striking coins, as well as Greek pottery found in Xanthos (Metzger et al. (1972)) are evidence of Greek contacts and Greek influence, but not of Greek settlers (Keen (1998) 61–70). In C4, however, the picture changes. The earliest bilingual inscription is a Greek epigram on the “inscribed pillar” of C3l–C4e (TAM 1 44C = ML 93; cf. SEG 45 1827). The C4e inscription from Xanthos honouring the Lykian dynast Arbinas is in Greek without a parallel text in Lykian (SEG 39 1414 = CEG 2 888). The Irano-centric interpretation of the text by Herrenschmidt (1985) has been countered by Levêque and Pleket (SEG 36 1215), emphasising Greek values. With the Hekatomnid domination of Lykia, Greek seems to have become an official language alongside Lykian (Le Roy (1987)), as is attested in Xanthos by Pixodaros’ trilingual edict concerning exemption from taxes (SEG 36 1216). The Hekatomnid Hellenisation of Karia (Hornblower (1982) 332–51) was presumably transferred to Lyki too, especially by Pixodaros. He was satrap of Lykia (SEG 27 942.1–2) from 340 to 334 (Diod. 16.74.2). Artemelis, his epimeletes in Xanthos, was a Karian, but Hieron and Apollodotos, his two archontes of Lykia, may have been Greeks (SEG 27 942.3–5). Furthermore, a local Greek historian, Menekrates of Xanthos, is commonly dated to C4 (FGrHist 769); he wrote a work entitled Lykaka in two books in which he reports, or perhaps invents, Homeric foundation myths for the Lykian cities and suggests that Xanthos colonized Pinara and two other unnamed cities. Thus, in C4s there were sufficient elements of Hellenisation in Xanthos to justify the inclusion of that city in the Inventory as an example of a mixed community (Keen (1998) 66–69).
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CRETE

PAULA PERLMAN

I. The Island

The name of the island is Κρήτη, ἦ (Eur. Bacch. 121; I.Cret. ι.ι.ι.7 (C3e)) or Κρήτη (Hom. II. 2.649; Hdt. 3.44); cf. the plural Κρήται, αἱ (Hom. Od. 14.199). The ethnic is Κρής (Hom. II. 2.645; I.Cret. ιv 176 (C2e)) or Κρηταιεύς (I.Cret. ι.ι.ιιι.21 (C2)). The ethnic in -eus was perhaps a creation of the Hellenistic Cretan koinon (Bile (189–90)). The collective use of the ethnic Κρής is attested externally in a graffito from Abydos of a mercenary soldier in the army of Amyrtaios (ἐπ᾽ Αμυρταίο ἐπίκοροι Κρῆτες, Memnonion 405 (c.400)) and internally in public documents of the Hellenistic period (e.g. πρεσβευταὶ Κρῆτες, I.Cret. ι.ι.ιiv.10 (C2l)). There are no examples of the individual use internally, but externally there are references to the Gortynioi Βρόταρχος Γορτύνιος Κρῆς, a merchant (Simon. AP 7.254 bis (C6s/C5e)), Νικίας Γορτύνιος Κρῆς, proxenos of Athens (Thuc. 2.85.5 (429)), and the grave stele of [Συμφωνεῖ]ν Κρῆτας from Athens (IG II² 9090 (C4m)). The collective use of the ethnic Κρηταιεύς is attested externally in Polybius (e.g. Polyb. 4.53.4–5) and internally in public documents of the Hellenistic period, principally in two expressions: τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Κρηταιεῶν (e.g. I.Cret. ι.ι.iii.4C (1159–138)) and πάντες Κρηταιεύς (e.g. I.Cret. ι.ι.ιιι.4V (C2)). There are no examples of the use of Κρηταιεύς as part of the personal name, but the ethnic does appear in private contexts (e.g. I.Cret. ι.ιιιι.21 (C2), a grave epigram from Polyrrhen).

The island of Crete is surrounded by many small islands.¹ There is little early evidence, written or material, for their settlement during the Archaic and Classical periods. The island of Dia, located 5 nautical miles north of Herakleion, is identified in the Odyssey as the place where Artemis killed Ariadne (Od. 11.325). Two settlements of the Classical period have been identified on the island of Ghavdos (ancient Kaudos), located in the Libyan sea 20 nautical miles south of Chora Sphakion, but nothing is known about their political status during the Classical period. Written sources of the Hellenistic and Roman periods indicate that Ghavdos and others of the small islands belonged in some fashion to one or another of the Cretan poleis. “Those who inhabited Kaudos” formed a dependent community, perhaps a dependent polis, of Gortyn (I.Cret. ιv 184 (C3l–C2e); Chaniotis (1996) 160–68, 407–20), while Lipara (if indeed an island; cf. Guarducci (1939) 117) appears to have belonged to Kydonia (I.Cret. ιι.ι.ι (C3)). Control of Leuke (modern Koupounisi) was contested by a succession of east Cretan poleis, including Stalai, Praisos, Itanos and Hieraptyna (Perlmam (1999) 146–51). Several of the Hellenistic treaties and alliances between Cretan poleis guaranteed the security of islands (νησίων) belonging to them (I.Cret. ι.ι.ιιι.7 (C3e); I.Cret. ιxvi.ι3. (C2e), xvi.ι5 (C2l)). For the most part these islands were inhabited if at all only on a seasonal basis. We should imagine that the Cretan poleis laid claim to them when motivated to do so by economic and strategic concerns. The shores of Crete mark the geographical limits of this chapter.

Greek epic tradition identified Crete as a land of many cities, 100 in the Iliad (Κρήτην ἕκατόμπολων, Hom. II. 2.649) and ninety in the Odyssey (ἐννήκοντα πόλισ, Hom. Od. 19.174). The persistence of the epic tradition into the Roman period is instanced by the use of the epithet ἐκατονταπολίται in a funerary inscriptions of a Roman gladiator from Gortyn (I.Cret. ιv 373). The survival of well over 100 toponyms of settlements of Graeco–Roman Crete is in part due to this tradition which encouraged the ancient geographers to compile lists of the fabled 100 poleis of Crete (Faure (1959), (1997)).

Written sources, including coin legends, provide us with the toponyms and city-ethnics of sixty-four Cretan

¹ For a list of 14 Cretan islets and a brief discussion of their environment and ecology, see Rackham and Moody (1996) 202–8.
settlements of the Archaic and Classical periods. Written sources from the Archaic and Classical periods survive for forty-five of these toponyms. The written sources for sixteen of the remaining nineteen toponyms are late, and the Archaic and Classical phases of these settlements are attested by the material evidence which in most cases consists of surface remains only. The locations of fifty-four of the sixty-four Cretan settlements of the Archaic and Classical periods have been identified beyond a reasonable doubt, the locations of the remaining ten with a certain amount of probability only. A further sixteen settlements with Archaic and Classical habitation phases have been identified with a certain amount of probability, with toponyms attested in late sources only. Finally, the remains of twenty Archaic and Classical settlements cannot be convincingly matched with any of the toponyms found in the written sources. Thus, the written and archaeological records do indeed provide evidence for 100 Archaic and Classical settlements altogether. Forty-nine of these are described in the Inventory, which on current evidence comprises every settlement on the island of Crete that was either certainly (type A) or probably (type B) or possibly (type C) an Archaic or Classical polis. The remaining fifty-one settlements are listed below.  

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis

Acharna (Ἀχάρνα) The toponym Acharna, which appears in the C5m agreement of Argos, Knosos and Tylisos (ML 42B, II. 35–36: τῶν Ἀρχαν τὸ τέμενος ἔχειν τῶν Ἀχάρνας), was probably located in the vicinity of the modern village of Acharnes. The Archaic agreement includes the sanctuary of Archos at Acharna among the features marking the border of Knosos and Tylisos (ML 42B, l. 27). Although the largely chance finds from the vicinity of Acharnes indicate occupation during the Archaic and Classical periods, on current evidence it is not possible to make any further claims about the nature of that occupation (Sakellarakis and Sapouna-Sakkellari 1997) 38–41; Chaniotis (1994)). Barr. C.


2 Toponyms preceded by the symbol (*) are not attested in the ancient sources and have been deduced from ethnics and other forms (e.g. adverbial) which are attested.

3 The early written sources may preserve two additional Cretan ethnics: Περσαίδα (BCH 70 (1946) 588–90 no. 1 (C6)) and Μαρωνεύτης (Suda s.v. Μαρωνεύτης), but the interpretation of the former as an ethnic (in -οντας) is problematic, and the reading Μαρωνεύτης (where ω = ο) in an Archaic Eteocretan text from Praisois (L.Cret. ii.3, l. 7 (C6); Faure (1988–89) 103–5) is highly speculative (Perlman (1996) 226, 276 n. 77). The 45 Cretan settlements attested in early written sources are Acharna, Allaria, Amyklaion, Aptara, Arkades, Aulon, Axos, Cherensonos, Datala, Deroe, Eleutherna, Elyna, Elyros, Gortyn, Hieraptyna, Hyrtakina, Itanos, Keraia, Knosos, Kydonia, Kytaion, Lappa, Latoresion, Lebena, Lisos, Lykastos, Lyktos, Melatos, Olous, Osmida, *Pergamos, Phaistos, Phalasarna, Polichne (Trypitos), Polichne (Vryses), Polythenia, Praios, Priansos, Rahoukos, Rhithymnons, *Rhitten, Rhyton, Sybrita, Tarrhos, Tylisos.

4 Anopolis, Apollonia, Biannos, Bionnos, Herakleion, Istron, Lassoia, Lato, Malla, Mata, Mino, Oleros, Pantomatronion, *Ptera, Phalanmai, Poikilaision. The locations of *Detonion (Kefali, Astzrli), Dragmos (Kastri, Koutsouloupetri) and Stalai (Dasonari?) are uncertain.

5 With the following exceptions, locations follow those of Map 60 of the Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World (Barr.), compiled by J. Bennet (ancient names are italicised). (1) Ampelos, Koxare = *Kourtolia? (Barr. does not include *Kourtolia in the catalogue and does not identify Ambelos, Koxare). (2) Kastellos, Varypetro = Λυκανθία (Barr. does not identify Kastellos, Varypetro and does not contain Lachanion in the catalogue). (3) Barr. does not include Lachanion in the catalogue. (4) Prophitis Elias, Kato Chorio = Larisa?, Kastelos Kalamakta is not identified (Barr. locates Larisa at Kastelos Kalamakta and does not identify Prophitis Elias?); (5) Veni, Apostoloi = Iltatai? (Barr. does not identify Veni and does not locate Iltatai). (6) Four entries Barr. includes are excluded here: Ag. Triada; Ag. Georgios, Gialos; Karphi; Lera. Evidence for occupation during the Archaic and Classical periods at Ag. Triada (La Rosa (1988–89)) and at Ag. Georgios, Gialos (M. S. F. Hood (1978) 49–50) is exiguous at best. Evidence for the Archaic period at Kastri occurs only in the vicinity of an open cult place at the spring of Vitzilovrysis. Occupation of the site ceased at the end of Late Minoan IIIIC (Novicki (2000) 547–64 no. 67). A sanctuary of Pan and the Nymphs was established in Lera cave on Akrotiri peninsula during the Archaic period (Guest-Papamani and Lambriaki (1976)). There was never a settlement there. (7) Barr. does not include the following unidentified Archaic and/or Classical settlements: Azoria, Kavousi; Charakas, Vainia; Ellinika, Zakros Gorge; Elliniko Kastello, Myrsini; Kastri, Tourloiti Kastri; Kefala, Ligortinos; Papoura, Kera; Patisionos Kefala; Skalia, Stavrochori.

6 The ten toponyms located with a certain amount of probability only are Amyklaion, Datala, Dragmos, Kytaion, Latoresion, Osmida, *Pergamos, Polichne (Trypito), Stalai, *Rhitten.

7 Ancient names are italicised. Arvi (= ancient *Ariai?); Ampelos, Koxare (= ancient *Kourtolia?); Avgousti, Ag. Georgios (= ancient *Erones; *Eranos?); Kastelos, Varypetro (= ancient Lachanion); Kasteriotis, Melidochori (= ancient *Hyrra?); Kastrri, Farmakofelelo (= ancient Ampelos?); Kefala, Aristri (= ancient *Detonion?); Kontokyngi (= ancient Pelki?); Phoinikias, Sellia (= ancient Phoinix?); Prophitis Elias, Kados (= ancient *Katre?); Prophitis Elias, Kato Chorio (= ancient Larista?); Sellis, Kissamos (= ancient Mykenai?); Trouli, Rokka (= ancient *Rokka?); Vathi (= former Kouneni) (= ancient Iatiai?); Veni, Apostoloi (= ancient Iltatai?); Vougari Armokastella, Melambes (= ancient Korion?).

8 Ag., Ioannis, Gavdos; Ag. Giorgios Papoura, Pinakiano; Ammatos; Anavlochos, Vrachasi; Azoria, Kavousi; Charakas, Vainia; Ellinika, Zakros Gorge; Elliniko Kastello, Myrsini; Kastelos, Kalamakta; Kastrri, Apodholou; Kastrri, Keratokambos; Kastri, Pantanassa; Kastrri, Tourloiti Kefala, Ligortinos; Koupas, Krousoussas; Papoura, Kera; Patela, Prinias; Patisionos Kefala; Skalia, Stavrochori; Vigla, Vizaro. Ola, Ellounda, is perhaps to be identified as the acropolis or upper city of Olous. If not, we should include it in the list of unidentified Archaic and Classical settlements.

9 In the following lists, the final modern citation of each entry (in parentheses) provides a discussion of the material evidence.


2. Unidentified Settlements


Annatos Branigan (1979a). Barr. C.


Arvi Possibly *Aria (Kitchell (1983)) under which it is listed in the Barr. directory. The toponym is deduced from the ethnics Ἀριαίοι and Ἀρίποι (ibid.). Milet. 13 140 (c.259–250): the community of the Ἀριάιοι identified as a polis. For the coins (C35), see Le Rider (1966) 227–29. S. Hood et al. (1964) 89–92 (42.1). Barr. C.

Argousti Possibly *Eronos/*Erannos? (Faure (1993) 69), under which is listed in the Barr. directory. The toponyms are deduced from the ethnics Ἐρώνοι (Michel 62; I.Cret. iv 179 (both C2f)) and Ἐράννιοι (Michel 62 (C2f)); in both texts the community of Ἐρώνοι/Ἐράννιοι is identified as a polis. Watrous (1982) 55–56. Barr. AC.


Elliniko Kastello Nowicki (2000) 103–4 no. 35. Not in Barr., but A is attested.


**Kasteriotis** Possibly *Hyrtai (Faure (1960) 196–98, (1993) 70)*, under which it is listed in the Barr directory. *Milet. i.3* 140 (c.259–250): πόλις. The toponym is deduced from the city-ethnic Υρταίος. Spratt (1865) i.319–26; Sanders (1982) 150 (7/5). Barr. C.

**Kastri (Apodholou)** Barr. C. S. Hood et al. (1964) 78–79 (32-4).


**Kastri (Keratokampos)** S. Hood et al. (1964) 82–83 (34). Barr. AC.

**Kastri (Pantannasa)** Hood and Warren (1966) 188–89 no. 36. Barr. C.

**Kastri (Tourloti (?))** Nowicki (2000) 104 no. 36. Not in Barr., but A is attested.

**Kefala** Possibly *Detonnion*? (Guarducci (1935) 46). The toponym is deduced from the ethnic Νεατόννιος (SEG 26 1679 (C3/C2)); cf. Διστόννιον (Polib. 22.15). Mariani (1895) 235–37; Nowicki (2000) 179 no. 78. Barr. s.v. Diatonion dates it H, but AC is also attested.

**Kefala (Ligortynos(?))** Nowicki (2000) 185–86 no. 84. Not in Barr., but AC is attested.


**Kontokynigi** Possibly *Πελκίς* (and listed s.v. in the Barr. directory), attested only in *BCH* 45 (1921) 111.104 (c.230–210) (Guarducci (1939) 84; Gondiccas (1988) 57–61, 63–66. Barr. C.


**Monopari** Possibly *'Οσυμία: Ps.-Skylax 47. Spratt (1865) ii.114–16; Sanders (1982) 163 (14/3). Barr. H.


**Vigla** S. Hood et al. (1964) 77 no. 30. Barr. C.


The ancient record suggests that nineteen of these fifty-one communities were *poleis* at some point during the Hellenistic period. Indeed, the evidence for the political status of three members of this group—Larisa (Prophitis...
Elias, Kato Chorio), Poikilasion and Polichne (Trypitos)—suggests that they may have been poleis already during the Classical period. Larisa joined with Hierapytna in a synoecism (Strabo 9.5.19). The synoecism must have taken place by the beginning of C4, when the material record for the settlement on Prophitis Elias ceases (Watrous and Blitzer (1995); autopsy). Strabo indicates that Larisa possessed a hinterland, the Λαρίσιους πεδίου (Strabo 9.5.19). Both Strabo and Stephanos identify Larisa as a poleis (Strabo 9.5.19; Steph. Byz. 413.3). If Larisa was a poleis, as the evidence hints, it was one during the Classical period. Poikilasion is mentioned in an alliance between Magas of Cyrene and the federation of the Oreoi, whose member states swore by τὸς ἐπί Ποικιλαίων θέσαν to uphold its terms (I.Cret. ii 2.161 (C3f)). The league dates to the period C4–C3. If Poikilasion was a member, the community was a poleis and perhaps one already by the late Classical period. Polichne (Trypitos) is perhaps referred to by Herodotos in his account of the Cretan response to the messengers sent out to marshal the Greek resistance in advance of Xerxes’ invasion (Hdt. 7.70a). According to the story told by Herodotos, the Praisioi and the Polichnites did not accompany the other Cretans to Sicily to avenge the death of Minos (πάντας πλὴν Πραισίων καὶ Πολιχνιτέων). The context is mythical, but the story was current in C5 and probably refers to a historical community. If Polichne (Trypitos) is a community distinct from the Polichne near Vryses, Herodotos’ narrative suggests that it was a poleis. An additional ten of the nineteen communities were either certainly or possibly poleis during the Hellenistic period, and three others were perhaps dependent poleis. The final four in this group of nineteen appointed theorodokoi, and so may have been poleis at some time, but were not necessarily still poleis at the time of the appointment of theorodokoi in C5.

Thus, of the seventy-nine toponyms of Archaic and Classical settlements on Crete, sixty-eight (86 per cent) were poleis at some point during the Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic periods, and forty-nine (62 per cent) were poleis already in the Archaic and Classical periods. Almost nothing may be said about the status of the remaining Archaic and Classical settlements. Only one settlement attested in an early source, Latosion, seems on current evidence not to have been a poleis, but rather a neighbourhood or district within the territory of Gortyn. Later sources provide a few terms which might reasonably be understood to refer to dependent communities of one sort or another (Perlman (1996) 239–44). Thus a Hellenistic inscription identifies Laxania as a kome, presumably of Kydonia (I.Cret. ii 1.1 (C3)), and Ptolemy calls Ina a choriōn (Ptol. Geog. 3.15.2).

But in no case are there grounds to project such terms back into the Classical period or to suggest that the terms represent civic subdivisions of the poleis. The only civic subdivisions attested for the Cretan poleis are the phylai, and these appear to have been personal. In so far as there is no evidence for the creation of new phylai following the end of the Classical period, phylai attested only in Hellenistic sources are most likely earlier, and so are included in the Inventory. In this case a retrospective interpretation of the sources seems justified. Thus, the only type of dependent community attested on Crete during the Archaic and Classical periods is the dependent poleis, and the only poleis known to have possessed such dependencies before the Hellenistic period is Gortyn: viz. *Rhitten and perhaps Aulos. Conversely, there is very little evidence for hyper-poleis organisations such as federations or leagues on Crete prior to the Hellenistic period, with the exception of the Oreoi, a federation of small poleis (Elyros, Hyrtakina, Lisos, Tarrha and perhaps Poikilasion) in west Crete, which may date as early as the late Classical period. Attempts to retroject the origins of the Hellenistic Cretan koinon back into the

---

10 Λασσοί (Milet. i.3 140 (c.259–250)); Εράννιοι/Εράννας (I.Cret. iv 179 (c.183)); Michel 62); *Λασσοί (Milet. i.3 140 (c.259–250)). In addition to those three Hellenistic poleis with evidence of earlier settlement phases, there is Araden, a Hellenistic poleis (I.Cret. iv 179 (c.183)) for which there is no earlier material evidence.

11 *Kourtolia (Perlman (1996) 247–48); Αμύδλαιοι (ibid. 252, 258, 260–61); Λίκαστος (ibid. 249–50); Παισιοτίατροι (Fauré (1993) 72; cf. Svoronos (1890) 251–52; Le Rider (1966) 248–50); Παρτίσι (Poluby. 13.10.5); Κάκην (Perlman (1996) 243, 276 n. 79). Two communities may have minted coins for a brief time during the Hellenistic period; Tanos (Svoronos (1890) 319 no. i; Seager (1924) pl. vii, VII) and the Annaiias (Varoucha-Christodouloupolou (1966)). Neither community has been located with certainty.


---

14 The four are Πελείας (BCH 45 (1921) 111.104; Perlman (1995b) 139); Λασσοί (BCH 45 (1921) 11.9; Perlman (1995b) 136 (Lasaia)); Ξέρνης (BCH 45 (1921) iv.3; Perlman (1995b) 138–39); Φάλαννα (BCH 45 (1921) iii.117; Perlman (1995b) 139). For the political significance of the appointment of a theorodokos, see Perlman (1995b). One additional community, Ψεύξονος, appointed a theorodokos (BCH 45 (1921) iv.1 121 Perlman (1995b) 139), but the material evidence for the settlement is no earlier than the Hellenistic period.

15 Perlman (1996) 254. Two other toponyms, Πέλα and Κασάνδρα, are attest-
Classical period have been largely unconvincing.\textsuperscript{16} Research into the Archaic and Classical history of Crete presents special problems, chief among which is the fact that in contrast to the rich material and epigraphic record for the early Archaic and Hellenistic periods, the evidence for life on Crete tails off during the late Archaic period and does not begin to revive until the late Classical period. The precise chronological limits of this period of decline appear to vary across the island, yet the pattern of decline and growth within the late Archaic and Classical periods is evident island-wide.\textsuperscript{17} One of the symptoms of this pattern is the relatively minor, even incidental role which the \textit{poleis} of Crete appear to have played in the life of the greater Greek world, as evidenced by the paucity of references to Crete and the Cretan \textit{poleis} in the written sources of the Archaic and Classical periods. The archaeological investigation of post-Minoan Crete offers the greatest promise of illuminating this Cretan “Dark Age” as research, excavations and surveys currently in progress are continually adding to our understanding. Readers with a particular interest in the epigraphic and archaeological evidence for settlement on Crete during the Archaic and Classical periods are encouraged to consult the annual epigraphic and archaeological reviews for the most recent discoveries.\textsuperscript{18}

The poverty of the record for late Archaic and Classical Crete has of course affected the compilation of the Inventory of the Archaic and Classical \textit{poleis}. Four points deserve special comment.

(1) Coins dating to the period c.330–280/270 provide the earliest evidence for the \textit{polis} status of thirteen communities.\textsuperscript{19} These communities may well have commenced striking coins only after the death of Alexander. Yet, it seems unlikely that they did not exist as \textit{poleis} in the political sense already in the late Classical period. The Inventory catalogues these communities as probable \textit{poleis} (type B).

(2) Four Cretan communities which were certainly \textit{poleis} in the Hellenistic period are excluded from this study. The location of three of them is not known.\textsuperscript{20} The location of the fourth, Araden, is known, but Archaic and Classical material has not been identified there.\textsuperscript{21} Future archaeological research may well identify pre-Hellenistic habitation phases for at least some of these settlements.

(3) Greater attention is paid to the written sources of the Hellenistic period than is perhaps to be expected in a study of the Archaic and Classical \textit{polis}.\textsuperscript{22} Such attention is perhaps justified by the observation that in general terms the organisation of settlement on Crete from the Geometric through the Hellenistic periods appears to favour consolidation rather than proliferation (van Effenterre (1991a)). Thus, one should not expect many new \textit{poleis} to emerge during the Hellenistic period. Rather, first-time evidence for \textit{polis} status in the Hellenistic period, particularly in the early part of the period, should be regarded in light of the general decline of evidence of all types during the Classical period.

(4) One Hellenistic document, \textit{Milet.} i.3 140, which preserves the texts of the agreements of three Cretan \textit{poleis} (Knosos, Gortyn and Phaistos) with Miletos, deserves special comment. Twenty-five Cretan communities are listed as subscribers to these agreements. The heading of the document identifies all of these communities as \textit{poleis}. The agreements have been dated to either c.293/2 or c.259–250.\textsuperscript{23} They provide the earliest evidence of \textit{polis} status for seven of the communities.\textsuperscript{24} The Inventory adopts the later date, but in view of the chronological uncertainty, this document is regarded as good evidence for the \textit{polis} status of the subscribers during the late Classical period if there is evidence for Archaic or Classical habitation of the site.

\section*{II. The \textit{Polis}}

\textbf{944. Allaria (Allariotas) Map 60. Lat. 35.25, long. 24.35.} Size of territory: 2. Type: B. The toponym is Άλλαρία, η (IG xii.3 328 (C3f)). The city-ethnic is Άλλαριώτας (coins, C45–C56; infra); cf. Άλλαριώτης (I.Cret. ii.1.1 (from Teos) (C3l)); Άλλαριον (Polyb. 13.10 f. 4.). The earliest attestation of Allaria as a \textit{polis} occurs in a Hellenistic \textit{asyla} decree (I.Cret. ii.1.1 (C3l) = Rigsby (1996))

\textsuperscript{16} Perlman (1992); cf. van Effenterre (1991b) 28–30.

\textsuperscript{17} Only at Knosos, however, is there a complete gap in the archaeological record during the period c.600–525. See Coldstream and Huxley (1999); Erickson (2000) 44–115, 127–54.

\textsuperscript{18} Two doctoral dissertations (Erickson (2000); Sjögren (2001)) are particularly helpful for the material record of C6 Crete.

\textsuperscript{19} Allaria, Aptara, Arkades, Chersonasos, Hierapytna, Keratia, Kytaion, Lappa, Olous, Polyryhen, Priamosos, Rhaikos, Rhythymnos. The Cretan \textit{poleis} did not mint bronze coins before the Hellenistic period. Knosos was perhaps the first Cretan \textit{polis} to do so, c.320–300 (Jackson (1971)). Elsewhere on Crete bronze coins began c.330 (M. Stefanakis, pers. comm.).

\textsuperscript{20} *Aria (Άραιοι), *Eranos/*Erannos (Εράννιοι/Εράννοι), *Hyrtia (Ὑρταῖοι).

\textsuperscript{21} Nixon et al. (1989) 207.

\textsuperscript{22} For the sake of consistency I have followed the dates in Chaniotis (1996) for all Hellenistic Cretan inter-state agreements.

\textsuperscript{23} For the earlier date, see Mikroyannakis (1968); for the later, see e.g. Chaniotis (1996) 34–35.

\textsuperscript{24} Apollonia, *Aria (Άραιοι), *Hyrtia (Ὑρταῖοι), Istron, Matala, Milatos, *Petra.
no. 151). Allaria is included in the Inventory as a probable polis (type B) on the strength of the coins, which may be as early as c.330 (infra). The collective use of the city-ethnic occurs internally on the coins (infra) and externally in the asyla decree (I.Cret. ii.1.1 (C31)). The individual use is attested in Polyb. 5.63.12, 65.7 (r220).

The location of Allaria is not certain, but is probably to be sought somewhere in west Crete near Eleutherna, perhaps at the eastern edge of the Rhethymno plain in the vicinity of the villages of Khamalevri and Stavromenos (Guarducci (1939) 1–3). Surface remains indicate that two ancient settlements, one just north of Khamalevri and the other on the coast at Palaiokastro, Stavromenos, were occupied during the Archaic and Classical periods (S. Hood et al. (1964) 62–66; Schiering (1982) Barr. only H and later). Excavations in the vicinity of Khamalevri, have revealed buildings of the late Classical–early Hellenistic periods (Gavrilaki and Tzifopoulos (1998) 343 n. 4). Allaria should perhaps be identified with the site at Khamalevri, and Pantomatirion with the one at Stavromenos (Faure (1988) 85–86, (1993) 72; cf. Andreadaki-Vlasaki (1995)).


945. Anopolis (Anopolites) Map 60. Lat. 35.15, long. 24.05. Size of territory: 2. Type: C. The toponym is Ανώπολος (BCH 45 (1921) 111.109 (c.230–210); SEG 8 269 (C3)). The city-ethnic is Ανωσοπολίτας (unpublished proxeny decree of Lappa (C2)) or Ανωσοπολίτης (I.Cret. iv 179 (c.183)). No ancient source calls Anopolis a polis. Stephanos identified Anopolis as another name for Araden: Ἀραδήν· πόλις Κρήτης, ἡ καὶ Ανώπολος λέγεται διὰ τὸ ἄνω εἶναι (Steph. Byz. 108.8–9). This may reflect either the assimilation of Anopolis by Araden, both of which are included in the list of theodorokoi from Delphi (BCH 45 (1921) 1–85, 111.108–10 (c.230–210)), or some confusion due to the proximity of the two communities (Guarducci (1939) 6; cf. Perlman (1995b) 135–36). Anopolis surely was a polis during the period C3s–C2—as is attested by the Delphic theodorokos (supra), by the proxeny decree from Lappa (supra) and by its C3 bronze coins (infra)—and this fact together with the material remains from the Classical period suggests that Anopolis was possibly a polis (type C) in the Classical period as well.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in a C2e alliance (I.Cret. iv 179). For the individual use there is an unpublished proxeny decree of C2 from Lappa for an Ἀνωσοπολίτας and the grave stele of Νεοτιμίδας Ἑπαύμων Κρής Ανωσοπολίτης from Eretria (IG xii.9 819 (C1)).

The polis town of Anopolis was located on the summit and northern slopes of the coastal ridge north of Loutro (ancient Phoenix, the only winter harbour on Crete’s south coast). The polis town was defended by a fortification wall with towers which may be no earlier than C3 (Nixon et al. (1989) 207). Parts of columns have been found on the ridge, but their date is uncertain (ibid. 208). Remains on the Anopolis plain to the north of the ridge represent isolated farms and small hamlets of several houses. Precise dates for these are not given, but in general the Classical and Hellenistic periods are better represented at Anopolis than is the Archaic period (ibid.). The western border of Anopolis (with Araden) probably followed the Araden gorge.

Anopolis struck bronze fractions after c.250 (Guarducci (1939) 7; Svoronos (1890) 5–6).

946. Apellonia (Apolloniatas) Map 60. Lat. 35.25, long. 25.00. Located at Ag. Pelagia on the north coast of Crete, c.20 km west of Herakleion (Alexiou (1984); cf. Faure (1963) 16–17, (1993) 70). Size of territory: 2. Type: C. The toponym is Ἀπελλωνία, ἡ (I.Cret. iv 182 (c.165)) or Ἀπολλωνία, ἡ (I.Cret. i.iii.1 (C3)). The city-ethnic is Ἀπελλωνιάτας (I.Cret. iv 182 (c.165)) or Ἀπολλωνιάτας (Milet. 1.3 140.37 (c.259–250)).

The earliest reference to Apellonia as a polis in the political sense occurs in a C3m agreement of Miletos πρὸς τὰς πόλεις τὰς ἐγ Κρήτης (Milet. 1.3 140.37, 37). Polybios provides the earliest reference to Apellonia as a polis in its urban sense (Polyb. 28.14 (1171/0)). Apellonia’s unquestionable status as a polis during the Hellenistic period combined with the identification of a building at Ag. Pelagia (with phases in the Archaic period and in C4–C3) as a prytaneion (infra) recommend the inclusion of Apellonia in the Inventory as a possible polis (type C) of the Archaic and Classical periods.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the C3m agreement of Miletos πρὸς τὰς πόλεις τὰς ἐγ Κρήτης (Milet. 1.3 140.37). For the individual use of the city-ethnic there is Θαρσυφᾶς Κρής Ἀπολλωνιαῖος, member of a theoria to Alexandria (SEG 24.1175 (233)).

The territory of Apellonia is called ἡ Ἀπελλωνία or ἡ χώρα ἡ τῶν Ἀπελλωνιατάν (I.Cret. iv 181 (c.168), 182 (c.165)).
A large public building (15 m \times 6.30 m) of C4–C3, oriented east–west, with two internal hearths, one at the east end and the other at the west, has been identified as a **prytaneion** (Alexiou (1975)). This building, which was destroyed in C2e, no doubt by the Kydonians (Polyb. 28.14 (1171/01)), overlies an Archaic (C6) structure with an *eschara*.
The existence of a **prytaneion** at Apollonia in the Hellenistic period is indicated by the promise of state hospitality, presumably in the **prytaneion**, for visiting ambassadors, ἐξενοτροφήθην δὲ καὶ οἱ πρειγευταταὶ καθὼς καθέσταται (I.Cret. i.iii.1 (C3l)). The protective deity of Apollonia was Apollo (Dekataphoros)? in whose sanctuary the public enactments of the **polis** were displayed (I.Cret. i.iii.1 (C3l)). The discovery at Ag. Pelagia of two Archaic bronze *lebetes*, one inscribed with a dedication to Apollo (SEG 34.913 (c.500)), in a votive context may mark the location of this sanctuary (Karetou (1978)).

947. Aptara (Aptaraios) Map 60. Lat. 35.25, long. 24.10. Size of territory: 3. Type B. The toponym is Ἀπτερα, Ἡ (SEG 41 731 (C3e)) or Ἀπτεραία (SEG 41 732 (C3e)).
The city ethnic is Ἀπτεραῖος (I.Cret. i.xxii.4A.39 (C3f)) or Ἀπτεραῖος (I.Cret. i.iii.1 (C3l)). Both forms of the city-ethnic occur on the earliest coins (C4s/C3f; *infra*). The literary sources use only the forms in -ε- (Steph. Byz. 107,8, 15; Polyb. 4.55,4). Bile (1988) 80 argues that the original forms were in -ε-, but forms with -ε- and with -α- appear in the earliest sources.

Pausanias refers indirectly to Aptara as a **polis**, presumably in the political sense, in his account of the Second Messenian War when the **Aptaraioi** sent archers to support the **Lakedaimonioi** (Paus. 4.19,4, with 4.20.8 (rC7l)). The first certain reference to Aptara as a **polis** in the political sense, however, occurs in the alliance of Aptara with Eleutherna (SEG 41 742 (C2e)). The earliest reference to Aptara as a **polis** in the topographical sense occurs in a C2f honorary decree (I.Cret. ii.iii.4.C). There is no proof that Aptara was a **polis** in the Classical period, but Pausanias’ retrospective reference to the **Aptaraioi**, the coins which may be as early as c.330 (infra) and the public buildings of C3 and C4 (infra) recommend the inclusion of Aptara in the Inventory as a probable **polis** (type B).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on the coins of C4s–C3f (infra). For the collective use externally there is Pausanias’ reference to τοξόται Ἀπτεραιῶν (Paus. 4.20.8 (rC7l)). For the individual use there is the *proxenos* of Olous, Ἀπτεραῖος Φιλτίδα (I.Cret. i.xxii.4A (C3f)).

The territory is called Ἰ Απτερεία χώρα (Ps.-Skylax 47). An honorary decree of C2m mentions harbours, ἑν τοῖς ἀμφοῖσις (I.Cret. ii.iii.4.C). One of these harbours was Kisamos (Strabo 10.4.13), perhaps to be identified with the ancient remains on the coast between Kalami, where an ancient mole has been identified, and Kalybes (Sanders (1982) 165 (171/1)).

Apart from the reference to τοξόται Ἀπτεραιῶν in Pausanias’ account of the Second Messenian War (Paus. 4.20.8 (rC7l)), evidence for the history and political institutions of Aptara dates no earlier than the Hellenistic period.

The **polis** town of Aptara was located on a plateau (Palaikastro, Megala Khoraphia, altitude 231 m) overlooking Suda Bay. Palaikastro appears to have been continuously settled from C8 on (for a general description, see Blackman (1976a); for the settlement history, see AR 42 (1996) 47). Bronze Age a-pa-ta-va (McArthur (1993) 127–28) was perhaps located c.6 km to the north at Stylos, where in addition to Bronze Age remains an important C7 building has been excavated (KrEst 7 (1999) 175–77). The Geometric, Classical and Hellenistic periods are represented in the cemetery, which was located outside the city wall in the saddle to the west, near the village of Megala Khoraphia (Drerup (1951a) 95; CretChron 12 (1958) 468–69; KrEst 5 (1997) 208). City walls (date?) c.4 km in length surround the entire plateau, enclosing an area of 6.63 ha. The several masonry styles (west: iso- or pseudo-isodomic; east: polygonal) may suggest several phases of construction (Drerup (1951a) 90–92; Blackman (1976a); cf. Coutsinas (2001) 64–66). The plateau was certainly fortified at the time of the Lykian War (Polyb. 4.55,4 (r223–219)). Possible traces of earlier walls have been noted at the eastern edge of the plateau (Blackman (1976a)). A section of paved road running north–south has been excavated towards the centre of the plateau (KrEst 5 (1997) 208–11). Several cult sites have been identified in this same area: (i) a small temple with a double *cella* of the Classical period (Drerup (1951b)); (ii) a Classical *peribolos* and small altar; (iii) a second Classical *peribolos* with a pyre and a large building (temple?) in an area which was in use from C8 (KrEst 5 (1997) 208–11). A Hellenistic inscription may refer to the **prytaneion** (I.Cret. ii.iii.2 (C3f)), inferred from the invitation ἐπὶ ξένια...[ἐπὶ τ]άν κοινάν ἐ[ν στίαν](infra). If so, in so far as the **prytaneion** is attested elsewhere on Crete during the Classical period (see Lato, *infra*), it is possible that the one at Aptara was also pre-Hellenistic. The extent of the enclosed area indicates that not only the public buildings of the **polis** but also its residential districts...
were intra-mural. The protecting deity of Aptara was Artemis Aptara, whose sanctuary is attested epigraphically (I.Cret. ii.ii.2 (C2f)).

Aptara struck coins (staters, hemidrachms) on the Aiginetan standard during the period c.330–280/270 (Le Rider (1966) 190, 198). Types (stater): obv. head of a goddess (Guarducci (1939) 13, Artemis Aptara?; Delepiere (1972), Aphrodite?); legend: ΑΠΤΑΡΑΙΩΝ or ΑΠΙΤΕΠΑΙΩΝ; rev. warrior standing (Guarducci (1939) 13, the hero Ateros?; Delepiere (1972), Aneas?); legend: ΠΤΟΛΙΟΙΚΟΣ (Svoronos (1890) pl. I.7, 9–10); cf. ΠΤΟΛΙΟΙΟΤΟΣ (ibid. pl. I.8). Types (hemidrachm): obv. head of a goddess as on staters; rev. bow; legend: ΑΠΙΤ ΑΡΑ (Svoronos (1890) pl. I.11–12; SNG Cop. Aeg.Isl. 322).

948. Arkades (Arkas) Map 60. Lat. 35.05, long. 25.20. Size of territory: 3. Type: B. The toponym is Ἀρκάδες, ο’i’ (I.Cret. iv 171 (C3m); BCH 45 (1921) iv.4 (c.230–210)); cf. Ἀρκαδία (Demetrios of Skepsiς apud Steph. Byz. 119.15–16; Theophr. apud Sen. QNat. 3.11.5). The city-ethnic is Ἀρκάς (coins, Και–ΚΣ, infrat; I.Cret. iv 171 (C3m)).

Seneca reports that according to Theophrastos, "circa Arcadiam, quae urbs in Creta insula fuit, fontes et rivos substitisse" (Sen. QNat. 3.11.5). If Seneca’s translation of Theophrastos is accurate, this is our earliest reference to Arkades as a polis. The use is either political or topographical qua asty. The earliest certain reference to Arkades as a polis occurs in the agreement of Miletos προς τὰς πόλεις τὰς ἐν Κρήτῃ (Milet. 1.3 140.1, 51 (c.259–250), in which the Arkades are included as one of the πόλεις αἱ ἐν Κρήτῃ. The passage from Seneca and the coins of Arkades which may be as early as c.330 (infrat) strongly indicate that Arkades was a polis in the political sense in C4. However, in so far as we cannot be certain whether Seneca was quoting rather than paraphrasing Theophrastos or whether the coins were struck in C4, Arkades must remain a probable polis (type B).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on the coins of Και–ΚΣ (infrat) and externally in the C3m agreement of Miletos προς τὰς πόλεις τὰς ἐν Κρήτῃ (Milet. 1.3 140.51). For the individual use of the city-ethnic there are Τυχαμενής Άκονδας Άρκας and Σώσα[ρχο]ς Άρηγ[ο]νος Άρκας, immigrants from Arkades to Miletos (Milet. 1.3 38x4, 38b5 (C3s)).

Arkades was located to the south-west of Lasithi in the eparchy of Monofati, but the precise location of the polis town remains a subject of controversy. Levi suggested that the plural form of the name reflected the fact that the community was settled κωµηδόν, with its principal centre during the Geometric and Archaic periods at modern Aphrati (Levi (1927–29) 15–23), but this important early settlement is perhaps to be identified as the polis town of ancient Datala (Viviers (1994) 234–41). The two inscriptions from Monofati which refer to Arkades by name (I.Cret. i.v.19A, 20A (both C2)) were found in the vicinity of modern Ini, which is situated in the plain to the south-west of Aphrati. On current evidence Ini seems the most likely location for the polis town of Arkades, despite the fact that there is very little surface evidence of habitation before the Roman period (Sanders (1982) 151 (7/25); Viviers (1994) 233–34).

Theophrastos relates that Arkades had been destroyed and resettled, although the passage as quoted by Seneca provides no indication of the date of the destruction or resettlement apart from the floruit of Theophrastos himself (Theophr. apud Sen. QNat. 3.11.5). Otherwise, the evidence for the history and political institutions of Arkades dates to the Hellenistic period.

Theophrastos mentions Arkades on account of her springs (Theophr. apud Sen. QNat. 3.11.5). A sanctuary of Asklepios, probably to be associated with these springs, and a festival, the Asklapieia, are attested epigraphically at Arkades (sanctuary: I.Cret. i.v.52 (C3l); festival: IC 111.1.1B (C3l)).


949. Aulon Map 60. Lat. 35.05, long. 25.00. Size of territory: 1. Type: C. The toponym is ᾿Αὐλόν (I.Cret. iv 64 (C5e)), Αὐλῶν (Steph. Byz. 147.8). An ethnic is not attested. Stephanos is the only ancient source to call Aulon a polis, but he further identifies the toponym as a τόπος (ibid.).

Guarducci suggests that Aulon was a suburb of Gortyn, in part because one likely location for the community is Ag. Deka, just 2 km east of the heart of the Roman city (Guarducci (1950) 30–31). Others identify Aulon as a peri-oikic community of Gortyn (e.g. Larsen (1936) 16; Willets (1955) 39; Nomina 52). An early honorary decree (I.Cret. iv 64 (C5e)) suggests that Aulon was a dependent polis of Gortyn, and so recommends the inclusion of Aulon in the Inventory as a possible polis (type C).

The decree is enacted by Γ' ὄρτων ἐπιτάνασα and ο’i’ ἐν ᾿Αὖλον Ἐοικίνατες, the latter phrase presumably indicat-
ing the political body, perhaps the assembly, empowered to make public decisions on behalf of the community. From the text we learn the following about the community at Aulon: (i) the community consisted of an “urban” centre, a hinterland with recognised boundaries, and perhaps smaller settlements in the hinterland (Manganaro (1974) 54–56); (ii) at Αφίων, Φοικιώτες were responsible for the disposition of real property within their community; (iii) they enjoyed their own laws regarding its disposition; and (iv) they, like the citizens of the other ἰπόβοικοι (dependent polis) of Gortyn, were subject to judicial procedures pertaining to foreigners (ὅπερ γίνεται) in Gortyn. On the other hand, Gortyn was able to dispose of property within the community and to grant its public benefactor the right to sue as a Gortynian citizen subject there to the procedures of Ἐστίαι δίκαι, suits pertaining to citizens (Perlman (1996) 266–68).

950. Axos (Axios) Map 60. Lat. 35.20; long. 24.50. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. Within Crete the toponym is either Ἀξίος (I.Cret. 11.1.v.20 B (C3l)) or Αξέως (SEG 23 563.14 (C3)). The city-ethnic is either Ἀξίος (coins, C4, infra; I.Cret. 11.v.17 (C3l)) or Αξέως (coins, c.330–270, infra; SEG 23 563.3 (C3)). Outside Crete the initial F is frequently represented with the omikron, e.g. Ῥαξίός, Ῥ (Hdt. 4.154; BCH 45 (1921) 111.120 (c.230–210)) and Ῥαξέως (IG ii² 9087 (C3)), but forms with initial digamma (Ϝαξίος, GIxii² 16.11 (C3f)) and alpha (Αξέως, IG vii 3197 (Cee)) are also attested.

Herodotos refers to Axios as a πόλις in the political sense in his narration of the foundation of Cyrene (Hdt. 4.154.1 (C3l)). The earliest contemporary references to Axios as a πόλις occur in an early public enactment (I.Cret. 11.v.1 (C6–C5)). The term appears twice in the text, once in its political sense (6–7) and once where its meaning is ambiguous (10–11) and may be either political (“deposit with the polis”) or urban (“store in the polis”). For polis in the urban sense, see Ps.-Skylax 47, where Oaxos is listed under the heading πόλεως πολλαί ἐν Κρήτῃ.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally first on the coins of C4 (infra) and later in several C3 inscriptions (e.g. SEG 23 563 (C3s); I.Cret. 11.v.20B (C3l)). The collective use is first attested externally in C3 as well (e.g. I.Cret. 1v 170). For the individual use there is the C3 grave stele from Athens of Θαρριάδης Φρονήμονος Κρής Ὀδέως (IG ii² 9087).

Axos probably shared borders with Tylios and Knosos to the east, with Gortyn to the south-east, and with Eleutherna to the west. One of the Archaic inscriptions from Axios has been identified as a treaty (I.Cret. 11.v.6 (C6–C5)). If so, this is one of the few Archaic treaties from Crete. The borders of Axios (τῶν Ἀξίων ἄρον) are mentioned in a description of the borders of Gortyn and Knosos (I.Cret. 1v 182 (C2f)).

According to Herodotos, Axios was ruled by a βασιλεύς, Etearchos (Hdt. 4.154–53). Etearchos was the maternal grandfather of Battos, the οἰκίστες of Kyrene, and so his regnum—if historical—should be placed in C8s or C7f. This is the only attestation of a post-Minoan king on Crete. The inscriptions of Axios refer to the βολά (I.Cret. 11.v.9 (C6–C5)) and κόσμοι (e.g. I.Cret. 11.v.6 (C6s), 9 (C6s); Bile (1988) 36–37.27 (C6l); SEG 23 565 (C5–C4)). The board of κόσμοι appears to consist of three (or four?) members in a lex sacra of C4l (SEG 23 566.11–12, with van Effenterre (1989) 6). The term ἀποκόσµος (“kosmos elect” or “ex-kosmos”) occurs in this same inscription (SEG 23 566.14; Bile (1988) 274). The term διοκέν occurs in one of the Archaic inscriptions (I.Cret. 11.v.1.2 (C6s)), and what is perhaps part of an enactment formula occurs in the lex sacra of C4l, καὶ φυλαῖς Ἀξίων “and (the following) decree pleased the tribes” (SEG 23 566.12–13, with van Effenterre (1989) 6–7); but the earliest fully preserved enactment formula is Hellenistic: ἔδοξεν Ἀξίων τοῖς κόσµοι καὶ τὰ πόλις ἰσαρμέναι κατὰ τῶν νόμον (I.Cret. 11.v.17 (C3l)). Here πόλις refers to the assembly. The term ἐκκλησία occurs in this same inscription (6). The Archaic laws demonstrate that the polis had the authority to fine its magistrates (I.Cret. 11.v.9 (C6s)) and to grant individuals tax exemption and sustenance at public expense (I.Cret. 11.v.1.2–3, 14–15 (C6s)).

Free non-citizens, in this case citizens of another polis, may be indicated by the phrase χάνες ἢ ἀστάς (“foreigners or citizens”), which occurs in an uncertain context in the lex sacra of C4l (SEG 23 566.7). This same text preserves the terms φυλα and ἐπαρκεία (SEG 23 566.12, 17). A Hellenistic inscription preserves part of the name of one of the tribes, πιθανὸν (I.Cret. 11.v.28 (C3l/C2e)). The name is clearly a patronymic, and as such is unparalleled elsewhere on Crete (Jones, POAG 223). The name of a second tribe or perhaps of another civic subdivision, Κυδαντεῖοι, occurs in an Archaic lex sacra (I.Cret. 11.v.9 (C6s); cf. Guarducci (1939) 57, sive festum sive gens).

The polis town occupied the hill above the modern village of Axios and extended north-east toward Livadha. A residential district (Hellenistic) and a cemetery (some Archaic graves, but principally Hellenistic and Roman) lay to the south of the acropolis (KrEst 4 (1991–93) 266–68). The undated acropolis fortifications appear not to have formed a complete circuit, but rather to have been built where the
natural defences of the acropolis were inadequate (Taramelli (1899) 312). The masonry is polygonal. Two Archaic temples, one on the acropolis (Temple I) and a second below it to the east (Temple II), were excavated in 1899 (Levi (1930–31) 44–57). Some of the Archaic laws of Axos were probably inscribed on their walls (Guarducci (1939) 48; Jeffery (1949–50) 34–36). The protecting deity of Axos was probably Apollo, perhaps surnamed Axiōs (Hsch. Θίαξς: Θάξς), whose son the eponymous ancestor of the polis, Oaxios, was said to have been (Guarducci (1939) 42–44). Temple I may have belonged to him (Perlman (2000) 73). Temple II has been attributed to Aphrodite on the basis of the votive figurine types (Levi (1930–31) 50; Rizza (1967–68) 291–93). Other public buildings include a large cistern located on the acropolis to the north-west of Temple I (Levi (1930–31) 48) and an andreion which is attested epigraphically ([I.Cret. 11.vi.1 (C6s), 25 (C4–C3)])). Part of a residential district (Archaic?) was excavated south-west of Temple I (Levi (1930–31)).

Axos struck coins (staters, drachms, hemidrachms, obols), on the Aiginetan standard during the period c.380/370–280/270. Earlier coins (c.380/370–330) have obv. head of Apollo; rev. tripod; legend (on some coins only): monogram A or ΦΑΞΙΩΝ written retrograde in the epicorphic alphabet (Svoronos (1890) pl. II.30–34, with Le Rider (1966) 197). Later coins (c.330–280/270) have obv. head of Apollo; rev. tripod; legend: ΦΑΞΙΩΝ or ΑΞΙΩΝ (Svoronos (1890) pls. II.38, III.1–3, with Le Rider (1966) 197).

951. *Biannos* (Biannios) Map 60. Lat. 35.05, long. 25.25. Size of territory: 2. Type: C. The city-ethnic is Βιάννος (I.Cret. 1.i.vi.1 (C3l), 2 (C2m); I.Cret. iv 179 (c.183)). The toponym must have been the unattested *Βίαννος*.

No Archaic or Classical source calls *Biannos* a polis. The earliest sources to do so are Hellenistic (I.Cret. 1.i.vi.1 (C3l), 2 (C2m)). The term is used in its political sense in both inscriptions. In so far as *Biannos* evidently was not a Hellenistic foundation, the evidence for its political status, albeit late, suggests that Biannos was a polis during the Classical period as well (for the possibility that Lyktos had absorbed *Biannos as it extended its territory south to the coast, see Viviers (1994) 255–56, whose argument largely depends upon taking the statement of Ps.-Skylax 47, ἐν μεσογείᾳ δὲ Λύκτος, καὶ διήκει αὐτῇ ἄμφοτέρωθεν, to mean "reached to either coast (north and south)"").

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in the asyli decree for Teos (I.Cret. 1.i.vi.1 (C3l)) and in its renewal (I.Cret. 1.i.vi.2 (C2m)), and externally in the alliance of *Biannos and the members of the Cretan koinon with Eumenes II (I.Cret. iv 179 (c.185)). The individual use of the city-ethnic is not attested.

The name of the territory is ὰ βιάννια (I.Cret. iv 174-32 (C3l/C2e)). *Biannos probably shared a border with Hierapynta to the east (I.Cret. iv 174 (C3l/C2e)). The polis town was located on a hill (Chorakia) immediately to the north-west of modern Vianno, where sherds of all periods from Orientalising through Roman have been reported (S. Hood et al. (1964) 83). A Hellenistic inscription refers to the prytaneion (I.Cret. 1.i.vi.2 (C2m)). In so far as the prytaneion is attested elsewhere on Crete during the Classical period (see Lato, infra), it is possible that also at *Biannos the prytaneion was pre-Hellenistic. The polis town of *Biannos was the closest urban centre to the important sanctuary of Hermes and Aphrodite at Symi, and communications between the sanctuary and the town were relatively easy.

These topographic considerations suggest that the sanctuary was located within the territory of *Biannos, but there is no explicit evidence for this, and the inscriptions, especially the dedications, from Symi suggest that the sanctuary was in some sense “pan-Cretan” (cf. Chaniotis (1988) 33–34). The protecting deity of the polis was probably Ares, to whom the Biannios offered a sacrifice called the ἐκατομφόνα (Steph. Byz. 168.19–20) and in whose sanctuary the public enactments of the polis were displayed (I.Cret. 1.i.vi.1 (C3l), 2 (C2m)).

Coins struck by *Biannos are all Hellenistic (Guarducci (1935) 29; Svoronos (1890) 43).

952. Bionnos Map. 60. Lat. 35.10, long. 24.30. Size of territory: 1. Type: C. The toponym is Βιάννος (BCH 45 (1921) iv.13 (c.230–210)). The city-ethnic is not attested.

Bionnos is listed between Psycheion and Matala in the catalogue of theorodokoi from Delphi (BCH 45 (1921) iv.13 (c.230–210)). The toponym is perhaps to be identified with the remains of a fairly substantial settlement on the high ground (Pyrgos) and slope to the east (Konia) above the sea 2 km south of the modern village of Kerame in Ag. Vasilios eparchy (Guarducci (1939) 310; Hood and Warren (1966) 173–74 no. 8). The remains cover 1.5 ha and include a massive fortification wall with towers. Surface pottery is principally Classical and Hellenistic, with smaller amounts of Geometric and Archaic material (Hood and Warren (1966) 173–74; Coutsinas (2001) 62–63).
No ancient source refers to Bionnos as a polis. However, the discovery at Pyrgi of a fragment of a C41/C3e treaty (I.Cret. 11.xxx.1) suggests that Bionnos was perhaps a polis during the late Classical period. The appointment of a theoreodoros c.230–210 to host the theoroi sent out from Delphi suggests the same for the Hellenistic period (BCH 45 (1921) iv.13; Perlman (1995b) 128–36). This evidence in combination with the observation that the settlement near Kerame was already established in the Classical period recommends the inclusion of Bionnos in the Inventory as a possible polis type C.

The C41/C3e text from Pyrgi outlines judicial procedures (I.Cret. 11.xxx.1). The δικαστήριον is mentioned, as are actions to collect debts (πράξεω [s]), but the text is too fragmentary to draw any conclusions about the precise nature of the procedures described.

953. *Chersonasos (Chersonasios) Map 60. Lat. 35.20, long. 25.25. Size of territory: 1. Type: B. The toponym Χερρόνησος is attested only in late literary sources (Xenion (ForHist 460) fr. 14; Strabo 10.4.14; Paus. 6.16.5). The local spelling of the toponym was probably Χερσόνασος (Guarducci 1935) 33). The city-ethnic is Χερσόνασοι (coins, C45–C3e, infra; IVO 276 (C48); cf. Χερρόνησοι/Χερρνησίται at Steph. Byz. 692.6–7).

The earliest reference to *Chersonasos as a polis occurs in the agreement of Miletos πρός τάς πόλεις τάς ἐγ' Κρήτη (Milet. 1.3 140.1, 36 (c.259–250)). The term polis is used in its toponymical sense ἀρχή totality of territory of *Chersonasos in a treaty (alliance?) between *Chersonasos and Rhodos (SEG 41 768 (C31)). The mint of *Chersonasos, which may have begun production as early as c.330 (infra), and the individual use of the city-ethnic around the same time (IVO 276 (C45)) strongly suggest that *Chersonasos was a polis in the political sense by the late Classical period (Perlman (1996) 246–52). Late authors refer to *Chersonasos as a πολεισμάτιον (Stadiasmus 349; Steph. Byz. 692.2–3).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on the coins of C45–C3f (infra), and in Hellenistic treaties (e.g. SEG 41 768 (C31)). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in the agreement of Miletos πρὸς τὰς πόλεις ἐγ' Κρήτη (Milet. 1.3 140.36 (c.259–250)). For the individual use of the city-ethnic there is Φιλωνίδης Ζωίτου Κρής Χερσόνασος, hemerodromos and bemaistes of Asia for Alexander (IVO 276 (C45)).

The polis town of *Chersonasos was located to the south of a peninsula (Kastri) at the foot of what passes for an acropolis (Sanders (1982) 144–46 (6/7)). Remains there date no earlier than C4, but two fragments of a C6 grave stele were discovered 1 km south of the port near the village of Koutoulouphari at a place called Hellenika (LSAG 316 no. 20). Little is known about the polis town of Chersonasos. A story preserved in Plutarch about the foundation of Lyktos suggests that the coastal region where the polis was located was called ἡ Χερρόνησος (Plut. Mor. 247D). Viviers argues that *Chersonasos was in some sense a dependency of Lyktos already in C6 (Viviers (1994) 252–54). If he is right, Lyktian control did not affect the political status of *Chersonasos, since it thereafter minted coins (infra) and joined in international agreements (e.g. Milet. 1.3 140 (c.259–250)), and its citizens were appointed proxenoi by other Cretan poleis (I.Cret. iv 387 (C2); I.Cret. i.xix.3 (C2)). After its sympoliteia with Lyktos (I.Cret. i.xix.3A (c.183)), the two appear together (Lyktos and “Lyktos by the sea”) as signatories in interstate agreements (SEG 41 770 (C25); I.Cret. i.xviii.9A (111/10)). For Strabo, *Chersonasos was the harbour of Lyktos: Λύττου δὲ . . . ἐπίνειων ἔστω ἡ λεγομένη Χερρόνησος (Strabo 10.4.14).

Although attested in a Hellenistic alliance of Olous and Lyktos (SEG 41 770 (Cal)), the tribal name Δάφυλοι is likely to be early, and so is mentioned here. Strabo mentions a sanctuary of Britomartis at Cherronesos (Strabo 10.14), and this goddess (or Artemis-Britomartis), if not the protecting deity of the polis, surely enjoyed a state cult there (coin types).


954. Datala (Datales) Map 60. Unlocated. Type: A. The toponym is not fully preserved in any ancient source. It has been restored Δατάλη (άλα) [I.Cret. i.xvi.5, l. 64 (C2l)], but is written ΔΑΤΑΛΑΑ in a facsimile edition of a lost copy of this treaty which was reported to have come from Kydonia (Chanioti (1996) 367 no. 61.142). This same spelling has been restored Δήλοι (άλα) in an Archaic law from Lyktos (SEG 35 991B4 (C6)). The city-ethnic was written Δατάλες.
used in its political sense both in the enactment formula (Viviers 1994). Scholarly opinion remains divided as to whether (i) the Dataleis and the polis should be identified; (ii) the Dataleis represent a sub-unit of the polis, in which case the name of the polis is not known; or (iii) the Dataleis represent an altogether distinct community from the unnamed polis (Viviers 1994)). The first alternative, viz. the polis is Datale, is adopted here. The term is used in its political sense both in the enactment formula quoted above and in the phrase ποικικάζεν και μναµονεύ'ν πόλιν. Independent of the Spensithios decree, the identification of Datale as a polis in the political sense is supported by the individual use of the ethnic in the artist’s signature Δαµόθετος ἐποεσ’ ὀ ∆αταλές (Prakt 1973 191 (C6); Perlman 1996 246–52). The collective use occurs in the Spensithios decree (SEG 27 631 (C6l)).

During the Archaic period Datale perhaps shared a border with Lyktos (SEG 35 991B4 (C6); van Effenterre and van Effenterre 1985 182–83). The polis of Datale disappears from the record following C6. It seems likely that the community was absorbed by a more powerful neighbour (Viviers 1994)). In Cz the toponym was apparently in use to designate an area at the border of Lato and Lyktos, [κης τ]ἀν ∆αττ[άλλα] (I.Cret. 1.xvi.5.1. 64; van Effenterre 1973) 35–37. Perhaps αν ∆αταλάλα was the name of the territory of the polis during the Archaic period.

The Spensithios decree (SEG 27 631 (C6l)) provides a good deal of information about the public institutions of Datale, but each detail has proved to be controversial (for a review of the scholarly interpretations of this text, see Nominae 22. The enactment formula of the decree (ἐγαδε Δαταλέουν και ἐσπέναµες πόλις... ἀπὸ πυλὰν πέντε ἀπτ’ ἐκάστας) indicates that the assembly, identified by both the collective city-ethnic Δαταλέουν and the term πόλις, perhaps together with a council consisting of five individuals from each of the phylai (ἀπὸ πυλὰν πέντε ἀπτ’ ἐκάστας), were responsible for ratifying the public enactments of the community. The κόσµος was apparently the chief official at Datale. He (or they, if the singular κόσµος is here used for a board) enjoyed unspecified procedural rights at law (δίκαια), which henceforth the ποικικάζας was to share. The ποικικάζας served as “recorder” and “remembrancer” for the polis, πόλι ποινικάστας, and was responsible for performing δαµόσια θύµατα if there was no priest. The authority of the polis was clearly recognised in several areas. Affairs of state, ἀν κόσµοι, included both sacred and secular matters. The polis was authorised to award individuals ἀντέλεια, and so, presumably, could impose and collect taxes, and judicial immunity (ἀπλοτία), and was able to guarantee protection against bodily seizure (μηδ’ ἐπάγραν... μηδ’ ἑρτύνων).

Finally, the citizens (presumably) of Datale belonged to ἀνδρεία, to which they were required to contribute food.

If the identification of Datale with the settlement at Aphrati (Prophitis Ilias) is correct, more may be said about the organisation of the polis. At the summit of the acropolis, fortifications with towers enclosed a small area, roughly trapezoidal in shape, supplied with water from a cistern (Levi 1927–29 32–37). Excavations conducted by the Greek Archaeological Service (A. Lebessi) in 1968 and 1969 uncovered on the south-eastern slope of the acropolis what was in Cz a large one-room building (12 m × 6.8 m) with benches along its interior walls. A scatter of C6 material attests the continued use of the area in the Archaic period. The building is probably to be identified as a temple (ArchDelt 24 (1969) Chron. 415–18; ArchDelt 25 (1970) Chron. 455–60; cf. Viviers 1994) 244–49: andreion or bouleuterion. Residential districts were situated on the protected eastern slopes of the acropolis (Levi 1927–29 38–57), where Lebessi uncovered a building complex (domestic?) of C6–C5 with a closed deposit of c.425–400 (ArchDelt 25 (1970) Chron. 458–60). Geometric and Orientalising cemeteries were located on the upper western slopes of Prophitis Ilias (Levi 1927–29 78–400; for a sarcophagus of C6 from “Orthi Petres”, see ArchDelt 30 (1975) Chron. 341–42). The settlement may have been abandoned for much of C4 (Erickson 2000 361–62). A magistral dedication from Aphrati indicates that the κόσµοι served as the eponymous officials for the community (I.Cret. 1.v.4 (C5)). The dedication is to Athena, and the inference may be drawn that the goddess enjoyed a state cult there.

The alternative candidate for the site of Datale, Pinakiano (Ag. Giorgios Papoura), is located to the north of Lasithi on a ridge 70 m above the plain (Watrous 1982 39–40).
Evidence for habitation dates from the Protogeometric through the Archaic period, when it was the largest settlement in this area. Remains of C5 and C4 (volatile terracotta plaques and black glazed pottery) are concentrated on the south-east slope of the ridge and perhaps attest a shrine which survived the abandonment of the settlement.

955. Dragmos (Dragmioi) Map 60. Lat. 35.10, long. 26.10. Size of territory: 1. Type: C. The toponym is Δράγμος ( Xenion (FGGrHist 460) fr. 4). The city-ethnic is Δράγμιος (I.Cret. iii.iv.9, lines 58, 68 (rC3f); I.Cret. iii.iv.10, l. 12 (C2l)).

The only source to identify Dragmos as a poleis is Steph. Byz. 238.6 quoting Xenion for the toponym ( FGGrHist 460 fr. 4). It is uncertain whether the site-classification poleis stems from Xenion’s work. Dragmos possessed a territory (χώρα) and shared a border with Itanos which was defined in a treaty between the two communities. The border with Itanos followed the course of the river Sedamnos (modern Dragmos), which empties into Karumes Bay about 5 km south of Palaikastro (I.Cret. iii.iv.9, 59–61 (rC3f); Faure (1963) 18). In so far as there is very little evidence on Crete for the existence of territorial sub-units of the poleis (komai vel sim.), the fact that Dragmos had both a territory and borders and that it entered into a treaty in C3f demonstrates that the community was a poleis in the political sense in the early Hellenistic period. The location of the poleis town of Dragmos is not known. Map 60 identifies the poleis town of Dragmos with the remains of a fortified settlement on Koutsoulometres (Kastri). Visible remains include sherds from the Geometric through Hellenistic periods, fortification walls with towers, house walls, cisterns and tombs ( BCH 79 (1955) Chron. 307–9; Faure (1963) 18; cf. Chaniotis (1996) 184, who prefers Epano Zakro on the grounds that Koutsoulometres is too far north). If this identification is correct, the record of the settlement during the earlier periods suggests that Dragmos may already have been a poleis in the political sense by the late Classical period. On the strength of this evidence, Dragmos is included in the Inventory as a possible poleis (type C).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested in the arbitration of Magnesia for Itanos and Hierapytna (I.Cret. iii.iv.9, ll. 58, 68 (rC3f)); the use is probably external.

Praisos absorbed Dragmos (I.Cret. iii.iv.9, ll. 61–65). The date of the absorption of Dragmos by Praisos has as its terminus post quem perhaps the period 270–260 (Perlman (1995a) 165).

956. Dreros (Deros) Map 60. Lat. 35.15, long. 25.40. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym Δρήνος appears only in the grammarian Hdn. iii.1 190.19. The city-ethnic is Δρήνιος (BCH 60 (1936) 280–85 (C4/C3)).

The earliest references to Dreros as a poleis in the political sense occur in the enactment formulas of two Archaic laws (έξ αὐτὸς πόλις, SEG 27 620 = ML 2.1 (C7m), Nomima 1 81 (C7m); πόλις ἠξ αὐτὸς, BCH 70 (1946) 590–97 no. 2 (C7l) = Nomima 1 64). For a possible Archaic use there is the “public record of the ancient Drerian land” (ὑπόμναμα τᾶς Δρηνίας χώρας τὰς ἀρχαίας), which refers to the eminence of the Milatische towards τὰς πόλεις τῶν Δρηνίων (I.Cret. i.ix.1, ll. 147–48; for the date of the ὑπόμναμα, see Nomima 1 48 (C6l); cf. Chaniotis (1996) 200 (c.220)). The term is perhaps used in the sense of poleis in the phrase κοι ἵκαθι όι τῶν πόλεων, “the 20 of the city” (Nomima 1 81 (C7m)).

The collective use of the city-ethnic occurs internally in the ὑπόμναμα quoted above (I.Cret. i.ix.i, ll. 147–48 (C6l or c.220)), and externally in the agreement between Knosos and Miletos which Dreros co-signed (Milet. 1.13 140.38 (c.259–250)). For the individual use of the city-ethnic there is the immigrant from Dreros to Miletos, Εὔξιππο (SEG 9 1384 (C3s)). One of the ὑπόμναμα of Dreros refers to the territory, χώρα, contested by Dreros and Milatos, her neighbour to the west (I.Cret. i.ix.i, ll. 149–52).

The term πολά occurs in the enactment formula of an Archaic law, πόλις έξ αὐτὸς διάλησασι πυλᾶσι (BCH 70 (1946) 590–97 no. 2 (C7l) = Nomima 1 64): “the poleis decided after consultation with the phylai” or “the poleis decided after dismissing the phylai” (for the derivation of the term διάλησασι (pl. part.) from *εἴλλω/άλλω, see van Effenterre (1946) 592). The names of two phylai are preserved in the dating formulas of public enactments: Δυμαναίες (BCH 60 (1936) 280–85 (C4/C3)); Αἴδαλεησ (BCH 61 (1937) 29–32 (C4/C3); I.Cret. i.ix.i, ll. 3–9 (c.220)). The eponymous κόσμοι were organised by phylai. One of the ὑπομνάματα of Dreros mentions the citizen ἀγέλαια (I.Cret. i.ix.1, l. 154 (C6l or c.220)), while the Hellenistic civic oath mentions the ἐταιρεῖαι (I.Cret. i.ix.1, ll. 124, 135 (c.220)). Both may be attested as well in an Archaic law (SEG 23 530 (C7l); but cf. Nomima II 89). An adult male citizen population of c.7,000 for C3 Dreros has been suggested on the basis of the 180 ἀγέλαια παναξίωστοι who swore the civic oath (I.Cret. i.ix.1, ll. 10–14 (C3l); Marinatos (1936); cf. Chaniotis (1996) 199: the 180 is a representative group only, and so is of little use in estimating the size of the population).

The public enactments of Dreros were ratified by the πόλεις (SEG 27 620 (C7m); BCH 70 (1946) 590–97 no. 2 (C7l)). Whether πόλεις in this context refers to the political
community or to the assembly cannot be determined. The term δάμος is used for the assembly in the enactment formula of a Hellenistic proxeny decree (BCH 60 (1936) 280–85 (C4/C3)). The κόσμοι appear to have been the chief officials of the Archaic polis and to have exercised both executive and judicial authority (SEG 27 620 (C7m)). The board of κόσμοι consisted of five members plus the γραμματεύς in a public enactment of c.220 (I.Cret. i.xi.1). Whatever the precise motive for the enactment of SEG 27 620 (fear of tyranny, demands on the part of the élite for equal representation, experience of judicial misconduct), the interest of the city in controlling the authority of the κόσμοι is demonstrated by the harsh penalties, including atimia for life, which the polis imposed upon κόσμοι who disregarded the law. For other laws of C7, see SEG 23 530; BCH 70 (1946) 590–97 no. 2, 600–2 no. 4. During the Hellenistic period, and no doubt earlier as well, one member of the board of κόσμοι served as the eponymous magistrate for the polis (BCH 60 (1936) 280–85). In addition to the κόσμοι, the Archaic laws of Dreros preserve four terms which may denote public officials: (i) δάμοι (SEG 27 620 (C7m)), comptrollers (Ehrenberg (1943) 14), or citizen landowners (van Effenterre (1985) 394–96; (ii) οἱ ίκαστο οἱ τὰς πόλεις, the twenty of the city (SEG 27 620 (C7m)), a council perhaps of the men of the city who were eligible to serve as κόσμοι (Nomima 1 81: “dirigeants politiques de l’acropole”); (iii) τοῖς θυστασί (αἱ), “les redresseurs” (Nomima 1 27 (C575); cf. Bile (1988) 359 n. 124: τοῖς θυστασί (priests)); and (iv) δ ἄγρετας, assembler (BCH 70 (1946) 590–97 no. 2), either a political official who convened the assembly or a military officer who called out the troops (van Effenterre (1946) 590–97). The council (βουλα) is not attested before the Hellenistic period (BCH 60 (1936) 280–85 (C4/C3)).

The polis town of Dreros occupied a double acropolis and the connecting saddle. There were two circuit walls built in part of polygonal masonry; one protected the entire polis town (two peaks and the saddle), an area of c.28 ha, and a second the acropolis proper, viz. Ag. Antonios, the eastern summit (Marinatos (1936) 217–19; Demargne and van Effenterre (1937) 7). An altar and four cisterns were located on the summit of the Ag. Antonios (Marinatos (1936) 216; Demargne and van Effenterre (1937) 7). A large public building (24 m × 10 m), probably a temple, was excavated on the western summit (Xanthoudides (1918) 23–28; cf. Marinatos (1936) 254: the building is an andreion). Residential areas occupied the northern (and southern?) slopes of both acropolises (Xanthoudides (1918) 28–29; Marinatos (1936) 216–17). The public centre (agora with plateia and theatrical steps, cistern, temple of Apollo Delphinios, and possibly prytaneion) was located in the saddle (for the temple, see Marinatos (1936) 219–83; cf. Mazarakis Ainian (1997) 217–18: the temple was not free-standing but part of a building complex; for the agora, see Demargne and van Effenterre (1937) 10–32). The Archaic laws of Dreros were probably inscribed on the east wall of the temple, and would have been visible from the plateia and theatrical steps below and to the east of the temple terrace. It has been suggested that these steps were used for meetings of a political institution (Hansen and Fischer-Hansen (1994) 62). The terracing and construction of the theatrical steps of the agora and the construction of the temple appear to be contemporary (C8f: Demargne and van Effenterre (1937); cf. van Effenterre (1992a): the plateia and theatrical steps were laid out in C6). The cistern was built c.220 (Demargne and van Effenterre (1937) 27–32; Chaniotis (1996) 195–201) and the “pyrteaneion” during C4/C3f (Demargne and van Effenterre (1937) 15–18). A sub-Mycenaean geometric cemetery was located to the northeast of the acropolis (van Effenterre (1948a) esp.15–22).

Apollo Delphinios was probably the protecting deity of the polis.

957. Eleutherna (Eleuthernaios) Map 60. Lat. 35.20, long. 24.40. Size of territory: 3. Type: A. The toponym is Έλευθερνα, ἡ (IG ix².17, ll. 87–88 (C3f)); cf. Έλευθενά (SEG 41 742 (C2f)); Έλουθερνα (I.Cret. xi.ii.22 (C38)). Ps.-Skylax 47 gives the plural ‘Έλουθερναι, αἱ. Stephanos identifies several toponyms as early names of Eleutherna: Ἀπολλωνία (Steph. Byz. 106.13–14), Άωρος (154.3–5), Σάτρα (557.16), Σάωρος (265.11–12). There is no further evidence for Allonia as an early name of Eleutherna. Άωρος, Σάτρα and Σάωρος may all derive ultimately from the toponym preserved in Apollo’s cult title Σαθραίοις (SEG 41 743 (C3e); van Effenterre (1991) 28). The city-ethnic is Έλευθερναίος (coins, C4–C3f, infra; I.Cret. xi.ii.20 (C38)); cf. Έλευθερναίος (coins, C4–C3f, infra; SEG 41 741 (C3m)), Έλουθερναίος (I.Cret. xi.ii.22 (C3i)). The earliest evidence for -ρυς is the legend ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΩΝ of the C4m coins (infra). Later inscriptions and coins from Eleutherna suggest no pattern in the use of the assimilated versus unassimilated form of the group -ρυς- (cf. Bile (1988) 121–22, which appeared before the publication of SEG 41 739–55).

The earliest attestations of the term πόλις in connection with Eleutherna occur in uncertain contexts in two Archaic laws (I.Cret. xi.ii.14a, with κόσμος in the following line; I.Cret. xi.ii.16Ab (both C6)), but the earliest certain refer-
ence to Eleutherna as a polis in the political sense occurs in the agreement of Milots πρὸς τὰς πόλεις τὰς ἐς Ἐκθέτη (Milet. i.3 140.1, 38 (c.259–250)), in which the Eleutheranai are included as one of the πόλεις αἱ ἐς Ἐκθέτη. The term πόλεις is paired with ἀπαµία in I.Cret. 11.xii.16Ab, μὴ ἴν ἀπαµίαι μὴ ἴν πόλει, “neither in the apamia nor in the polis”. The term ἀπαµία seems to refer to land in the chorа, in which case πόλεις here is used in the urban sense (Nomina 1 26; cf. Chaniotis (1996) 19–20: private land cultivated by serfs). For polis in the urban sense, see also Ps.-Skyllax 47, where Eleutherna is listed under the heading πόλεις ἐς Ἐκθέτη.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on the coins of Сαμ–C3 (infra), and externally in the agreement of Milots πρὸς τὰς πόλεις τὰς ἐς Ἐκθέτη (Milet. 1.3 140.1, 38 (c.259–250)). For the individual use of the city-ethnic, there is the proxeny decree of Gortyn for Κύρτος Ἀνδρουσίλος Ἄλευθεναι (I.Cret. 1ν 206F (C3/C2a)).

An Archaic law regulating the consumption of wine mentions symposiastic consumption on Διόν ἄκρον (SEG 41 739 (C6)). The toponym refers to a cape on the north coast of Crete between Panatomiata and Heraklion (Ptol. Geogr. 3.15.5 (from west to east): Cape Lianos, Chondros, Korakias or Bali) which perhaps marked the eastern border of Eleutherna with Axios (van Effenterre (1991c) 18–20). Wherever its exact location, this inscription indicates that the territory of the Archaic polis extended to the north coast. The inland asty is likely to have been served by one or more harbours on the north coast. A coastal settlement (Archaic and later) has been identified at Stavromenos, 11 km east of Rhethymnon (S. Hood et al. (1964) 62–66; Schiering (1982) 17–47). Coins with the legend ΠΑ (rev.) found (in some quantity?) there suggest that this might be ancient Παντομάτρων (Faure (1993) 72). The relatively large number of coins of Eleutherna found there indicate that it was frequented by Eleuthernians, and that it perhaps served as a port for the polis (Le Rider (1966) 252–54). Whether the settlement at Stavromenos was part of the polis of Eleutherna during the Archaic period cannot be determined. The πολιστήμα of the Artemitai (I.Cret. 11.xii.22 (C3l)) may represent either a territorial civic subdivision of Eleutherna (Perlman (1996) 252–54) or a dependent community of Eleutherna (Chaniotis (1996) 402–6: non-citizens, possibly freedmen, settled near a sanctuary of Artemis).

The term δροµεύς, perhaps referring to citizens of the younger age-grades who enjoyed limited citizen rights, appears in the Archaic law concerning the consumption of wine (SEG 41 740; Tzifopoulos (1998) 150–69). The compound ἄλλοπολιάτας, partially restored in an Archaic law (I.Cret. 11.xii.3 (C6l)), has been understood to refer to resident aliens (Guarducci (1939) 148) or to expatriates of Eleutherna (van Effenterre and van Effenterre (1985) 187–88; Nomina 1 10). The partly preserved ---- ἄλλοπολιάτας (I.Cret. 11.xii.4) most likely refers to foreigners or to officials or laws pertaining to foreigners. This same text may preserve a reference to δάµος or δαµόσωσις (vel sim.) in line 1 (---- μὴ δὲ ἰν [---] or [---] ἰν [---] ἰν [---] ἰν). The term ἀπαµία (I.Cret. 11.xii.16Ab, l. 2), a category of land holding, implies that the community of Eleutherna identified certain of its members as ἀφαµιῶται, a term attested in literary sources (largely lexigraphical), where it is defined as a Cretan term for an individual of dependent status (Athenaeus VI 263f; Hsch. s.v.; Strabo 15.1.34).

The kosmate is attested in what is perhaps a reference to the eponymous kosmoi of the current or of a previous year (I.Cret. 11.xii.9, l. 3): --- και Τίµαρκος ἐκδάσιμων “in the year when ὃ δείονων [---] and Timarchos were kosmoi”). From this we may deduce that the kosmate was eponymous and was organised as a board (for the kosmate, see also I.Cret. 11.xii.14 (C6l); I.Cret. 11.xii.20–22 (C3)). The Archaic laws preserve the terms μολέν “to bring an action” (I.Cret. 11.xii.15a+b), δικαζόντας “adjudicate” (I.Cret. 11.xii.11), and ποινικάζοντας “record (in writing)” (ibid.). Two of the laws refer to witnesses or to the act of testifying: --- μαστυρ[---] (I.Cret. 11.xii.8); --- μαστυράµενο or --- μαστυρά µὲν ὃ (I.Cret. 11.xii.13). Others refer to oaths: the act of taking an oath (κόρκον πιθέµεν, I.Cret. 11.xii.3), denial by oath (ἐκ <σο>οµνύηι, SEG 23 571; ἀσπαµ[i], I.Cret. 11.xii.17), and perhaps to the oath curse: (--- τοι δὲ ἦρκ[---] τὰν ἰνῆµε[v], “the curse shall be included in the oath”, I.Cret. 11.xii.3). Two of the laws guarantee immunity from prosecution: ἀσπανω/ἀσπάτος ἦµεν (I.Cret. 11.xii.3, 11).

The only early documentary evidence for the foreign relations of Eleutherna is the reference to a θηράς in an Archaic law (I.Cret. 11.xii.11 (C6l), with Nomina 1 14). All other evidence for the foreign relations of Eleutherna dates to the Hellenistic period. The presence of pottery from Corinth (C7s–C6f), Lakonia and Argos (C6), Attika (from C6l), Gortyn (C7–C4), Knosos (C6–C5), and possibly Kydonia and Aphrati (C6) attests to Eleutherna’s participation in intra-island and Mediterranean trading networks, but is not sufficient to demonstrate direct relations with any one of these places (Erickson (2000) 237–56).

Zeus Polioachos was worshipped by the polis (SEG 41 744 (C2s); coins, infra), but it is not clear that Zeus was the
The *polis* town of ancient Eleutherna was built on two neighbouring ridges: Pyrgi to the east (perhaps called Sasthra in Antiquity: van Effenterre (1991b) 28) and Nisi to the west (perhaps called Wilkon in Antiquity: ibid. 28–30). Pyrgi appears to have been the centre of the early settlement. Remains there include the Geometric–Classical cemetery at the western foot of Pyrgi and two (or perhaps three) sanctuaries. Another sanctuary was located on southern Nisi. During the Classical period a large *peribolos* (35 m × 50 m) with a Doric pentastyle propylon was built on Nisi in the location of the earlier sanctuary. Its function remains uncertain. Van Effenterre identifies the *peribolos* as the sanctuary of Apollo Wilkonios and the meeting place of the Cretan koinon (van Effenterre (1991b) 28–30). Fortifications of uncertain date are identified on Nisi to the north of the Classical *peribolos* and enclosing a Hellenistic residential district further to the north, and on the summit of Pyrgi to the south of Hellenistic buildings. A terminus ante quem for the fortifications of 221/0 is provided by Polyb. 4.55.4. For an overview of the settlement history of the *polis* town of Eleutherna, see Kalpaxis (1994) with plan 1; for the Geometric–Classical cemetery, see Stampolidis (1993); Erickson (2000) 156–228; for plans of the Classical *peribolos* on Nisi and the Hellenistic buildings on Pyrgi which show the provenance of SEG 41 739–55, see Kalpaxis (1991); for the Hellenistic residential district on northern Nisi, see Kalpaxis et al. (1994).

The term “stater” occurs in two inscriptions of C6 (SEG 2 12.13, 23.571). If the term refers to coinage rather than to a unit of weight, these inscriptions provide some of the earliest evidence for the use of coins on Crete. If so, the term most likely refers to Aiginetan sanctuaries. Eleutherna’s proximity to Kydonia, whence Aiginetan coinage is likely to have been introduced into the island during the final quarter of C6 (Stefanakis (1999)), makes this an attractive possibility. Eleutherna began to strike her own coins (staters) on the Aiginetan standard c.350 (Le Rider (1966) 197). Types: obv. Apollo holding a stone and a bow, with a dog and flanked by two trees (Svoronos (1890) 130, styrax trees?); rev. Artemis the huntress; legend: *EAIYΘΕΘΕΠ* written retrograde in the epichoric alphabet (Svoronos (1890) pl. XI.4). Later coins (staters, drachms, hemidrachms, c.330–280/270) have obv. head of Apollo or head of Zeus; rev. Apollo standing; legend: *ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΝΑΙΟΝ* or *ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΝΑΙΟΝ* and abbreviations down to *ΕΛΕΥ*, some retrograde (Svoronos (1890) pls. XI.5–6, 9–11, 14–17, 22, 24, 27–39; XII.1–2, with Le Rider (1966) 197; SNG Cap. Aeg. Isl. 429). Obols of this period have obv. head of Apollo; rev. Apollo standing or E or ΕΛ in monogram (Svoronos (1890) pl. XI.12–13, 18–20, 25).

958. *Eltynia* (Eltynieus) Map 60. Lat. 35.15, long. 25.10. Size of territory: 2. Type A. The toponym is not attested, but must have been *Eltynia*. The city-ethnic is *Ελτυνιεύς* (*I.Cret.* i.x.2 (C5e)), *Ελτυνιούς* (*I.Cret.* iv 206G (C3/C2); *Milet.* i.3 140.36 (c.259–250)). For the early use on Crete of e-ov- for -euv-, see Bile (1988) 111–12. Cf. also *Ελτυνιεύς* (*I.Cret.* iv 179 (c.183)). In the Hellenistic period the form *Ελτύνιος* occurs in inscriptions from sites outside the island (SB 5273 (C3f); I.Magnesia 21 (C2e)).

The earliest reference to Eltynia as a *polis* in the political sense occurs in a law concerning damages for personal injury which requires that fines be paid ἐς πόλιν (*I.Cret.* i.x.2 (C5e)).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in the law concerning personal injury (*I.Cret.* i.x.2 (C5e)), and externally in the agreement of Miletos πρὸς τὰς πόλεις τὰς ἐν Κρήτῃ (Milet. i.3 140.36 (c.259–250)). For the individual use of the city-ethnic, there is the proxeny decree of Gortyn for Πόλλος Φαιστιόννας *Ελτυνιεύς* (*I.Cret.* iv 206G (C3/C2)).

The chief public official of Eltynia appears to have been the κόσμος (or board of κόσμοι), who served both executive (πραδέν τὰς πόλεις τιμάω, “exact the fine for the *polis*”) and judicial (γνόσκεν δικαίωσαι, “decide having sworn the oath”) functions (*I.Cret.* i.x.2 (C5e)). The board perhaps consisted of just two members (κόσμοι...στέρνον, *I.Cret.* i.x.2, l. 3, with Bile (1997) 116). Line 2 of this same text probably preserves part of an enactment formula: [θλοί- τάδε] ἐσ' ἐφ' αὐτόν τοῖς *Ελτυνιούσι*. If so, τοῖς *Ελτυνιούσι* in this context refers to the assembly. The terms πτίσκος and ἀγέλαος occur in the law concerning bodily injury (*I.Cret.* i.i.x.2 (C5e)) and refer to age-grades (“child” and “youth”) respectively of the citizen class of the *polis*.

Almost nothing is known archaeologically about Eltynia apart from the chance discovery of the *membra disjecta* (capital and wall blocks including the one bearing *I.Cret.* i.x.2) of an Archaic? Doric temple (Xanthoudides (1920) 75–81). Four terms, probably referring to public areas in the *polis* town, occur in a provision of the law concerning personal injury, which details where the injury takes place (ibid. ll. 6–7 (C5e)): (i) ἄνδρος; (ii) ἀγέλας; (iii) *συνβολήταρα*, place where contracts are made (Bile (1988) 179) or “combat zone” or refectory (Nomima 11 80); (iv) κορός, agora (Bile (1988) 344 n. 84) or dance floor (Nomima 11 80). Certainly
the ἀνδρίον was defined architecturally. Whether or not the others were cannot be determined.

959. *Elyros* (Elyrios) Map 60. Lat. 35.15, long. 23.50. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Ἑλυρος (Ps.-Skylax 47). The city-ethnic is Ἐλύριος (coins, C4s–C3f, see *infra*; *I.Cret.* iv 185 (C3i/C2e)). There is one example each of the toponym and the city-ethnic spelled with initial iota (see Bile (1988) 86 n. 45): ἐν Ἄλυρα (BCH 45 (1921) 111.106 (c.230–210)); Ἐλυρίος (SEG 9 2.54; cf. SEG 42 1663 (C4s)).

The earliest reference to Elyros as a *polis* occurs in Ps.-Skylax 47, who uses the term in its urban sense. The term is used in its political sense in the enactment formulas of Hellenistic proxeny decrees (e.g. *I.Cret.* ii.iii.1 (C3/C2)). There is little doubt that Elyros was a *polis* in the political sense in the late Classical period. The evidence for this is: (i) inclusion among the *poleis* given grain by Cyrene during the 320s (SEG 9 2.2); (ii) participation in the C4 federation of the Oreoi (infra); and (iii) striking coins as early as c.330 (infra). Grave *stelai* of C5/C4 indicate that the *polis* town was already settled during the Classical period (*CretChron.* 9 (1955) *Chron.* 569; *Ergon* 1964 (1965) *Chron.* 150–51). It would seem probable, then, that Elyros was already a *polis* in the political sense by the end of the Classical period.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on the coins (infra) and externally in the list of recipients of grain from Kyrene during the grain crisis of the 320s (SEG 9 2.2). For the individual use of the city-ethnic there is Σηρίων Δέξιο Ἐλύριος (SEG 45 1335 (Hellenistic)) from Lisos.

The territory of Elyros is called Θηρίου ἔρημος (*I.Cret.* iv 185 (c.200–189)). Stephanos identifies Souia as the harbour (*ἐπινέας*) of Elyros (Steph. Byz. 590.8). This may mean nothing more than that Souia was the most convenient harbour for Elyros (Perlman (1995b) 132–34); but some level of co-operation between the two communities is suggested by the aqueduct (date?) which brought water from a source near the village of Livadha to Elyros (c.4.5 km to the south–east) and thence to Souia (Savignioni and de Sanctis (1901) 424).


Elyros is little known archaeologically, although there is no question that it was settled already in C5 if not earlier (see e.g. Baldwin Bowsky (1997) for C3f atticing grave *stelai* from Elyros). Cf. Barr, HRL only. The hill on which the *polis* town was built was protected by a circuit wall approximately 3 km long. The summit of the hill was perhaps fortified with a second defence wall, and so may be regarded as the acropolis proper (Pashley (1837) ii.104–9). Early travellers report the remains of a theatre (Savignioni and de Sanctis (1901) 424) and a temple (Pashley (1837) ii.104–9) near the church of the Panaghia. There is no reason to identify this temple as that of Apollo (cf. Pashley (1837) ii.104–9), although Elyros did maintain particularly close ties with Delphi, appointing *theorodokoi* at home to entertain the *theoroi* sent out from Delphi (BCH 45 (1921) 111.106 (c.230–210)) and a *theorodokos* at Delphi to entertain her own *theoria* to the festival there (*I.Cret.* ii.xiii.1A (C2/C3)). Pausanias describes a bronze goat dedicated by the *Elyroi* to Apollo at Delphi (Paus. 10.16.5). The story which Pausanias tells concerning this dedication suggests that the mythic founders of Elyros were the twin sons of Apollo and the nymph Akakallis, Philandros and Philakides (Frost (1996)).

Elyros struck coins during the period c.330–280/270. Types: obv. goat (head or full); legend: ΕΛΥΡΙΟΝ; rev. bee (Svoronos (1890) pl. XII.9–13, with Le Rider (1966) 197–98; *SNG Cop. Aeg. Isl.* 437).

960. *Gortyn* (Gortynios) Map 60. Lat. 35.05, long. 24.55. Size of territory: 4. Type: A. The toponym is Γόρτυντος (Γόρτυνς, *I.Cret.* iv 64 (C5e), coins, C5m, *infra*; Γόρτυνς, II. 2.646) or Γόρτυνα (Ps.-Skylax 47). Bile suggests that of the two inflections (theme in -ν and theme in -α), the theme in -ν perhaps originated from the accusative of the theme in -ν (Bile (1988) 201–2). The city-ethnic is Γόρτινος (I.Cret. iv 23 (C6s); coins, C5m, *infra*; Simon. Anth. Pal. 7.254 bis (C6/C3)).

Gortyn is called a *polis* in a fragment of an Archaic law, […] | πόλις πάνσας πρά[----] (I.Cret. iv 1362 (C71)), where the use is probably political (*Nomisma* 1). The earliest certain instances of the use of *πόλις* in the political sense occur in the enactment formula of an early decree: ἔδοκαν ἀ πόλις (*I.Cret.* iv 43Bα3 (C5e)) and in a provision of a law of the same period which requires that fines be paid "to the *polis*" (*I.Cret.* iv 78 (C5e)). For similar clauses in slightly later laws, see e.g. *I.Cret.* iv 41.iii.16–17 (C5f), *I.Cret.* iv 79 (C5m). Cf. also the law concerning mortuary practices, ἐν Ἰεραὶ ἀ πόλις θνήσκονται (*I.Cret.* iv 146 (C5s–C4f)). *Polis* in the urban sense occurs in two provisions in the Gortyn Law Code which distinguish houses located in the *polis* from those in the *chora* (*I.Cret.* iv 72.iv.31–33, viii.1–2 (C5m)). For *polis* in the urban sense, see also Ps.-Skylax 47, where Gortyn is listed under the heading *πόλεις πολλαὶ ἐν Κρήτη.* The broader topographical use of *polis* to mean the totality of territory occurs in two laws, the later perhaps a reformulation of the
earlier, which concern wages paid to non-citizens (metics and slaves) who live in the polis. In both examples, the relevant clauses are restored τοῖς ἐμπλοτεύοντα τοῖς πένθουσιον τοῖς ἠλευθεροὶ καὶ τοῖς δάλῳ (I.Cret. iv 79 (C5m), 144 (C55/C4e)).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is first attested internally in an Archaic law (I.Cret. iv 23 (C6s)) and externally in a late Classical inscription (SEG 9 2.33 (C4s)) and in Ephor. fr. 149). For the individual use of the city-ethnic, there are the early epitaphs of the merchant Βρόη Προνης (Thuc. 181 supr). Lastly in an Archaic law (I.Cret. iv 23 (C6s)) and slaves) who live in the acropolis was monumentalised by the construction of a δικαστερίον (C6s/C55) and the copper smelter Στρομύνης (IG IV 1349 bis (C5s)), and the reference to the προσφυγος of Athens, Νικίας Γορτύνιος (Thuc. 2.85.5).

Little is known about the organisation of the polis town during the Archaic and Classical periods (for an overview, see Perlman (2000)). The inhabitants of three Geometric settlements, Ag. Ioannis, Prophitis Ilias and Charkhi Pervoli, appear to have abandoned their hill-top villages around 700, most likely to resettle (κατὰ κώμας or in a single settlement?) at the foot of the ridge of hills which marks the northern edge of the Mesara (Allegro (1991); Di Vita (1991); La Torre (1988–89); Perlman (2000)). This resettlement probably marks an important step in the formation of the polis of Gortyn. Ag. Ioannis (275 m) probably served as the acropolis. In C7f (c.675–650) an open-air sanctuary on the acropolis was monumentalised by the construction of a temple, perhaps in part open-air (Scriniari (1968) 23–56). The form of the cella (tripartite?) has been understood to imply that the temple originally belonged to three deities, but votive figurine types indicate that by the Classical period the temple belonged to Athena (Rizza (1968) 191–93, 249–50), who is called Poliouchos in Hellenistic documents (I.Cret. iv 171 (C3), 185 (c.C3/C4e)).

Archaeological exploration of Gortyn has to date yielded few other traces of the Archaic and Classical polis town. The most significant of these remains are the following. (i) The temple of Apollo Pythios (C7s) built on the plain 700 m south-east of the foot of the acropolis (Ricciardi (1986–87)), within which one or two generations after the construction of the Pythion (C7f–C6e), the Gortyans began to inscribe their laws upon its walls (I.Cret. iv 1–27, 29–38, 40; Perlman (2002)). (ii) The Gortyn Law Code (I.Cret. iv 72 (C5m)) was inscribed boustrophedon in columns on the inner face of the walls of a curved structure whose blocks were reused in the Roman Odeion located below Ag. Ioannis on the east bank of the river Metropianos. (iii) A second group of similarly inscribed blocks (I.Cret. iv 41–49, 51 (C5f)) was reused in a rectangular structure of the Hellenistic period (Guarducci (1950) 87–90). This Hellenistic building, parts of which were incorporated into the Odeion, has been interpreted as a bouleuterion (Meinel (1980) 597). Halbherr identified some geometric material beneath the Odeion and traces of Archaic walls, perhaps belonging to a stoa, to its south-west (Pernier (1925–26)). It is assumed that the buildings on which the Great and Second Codes were inscribed were located in the same vicinity; but to date no suitable foundations have been found (Halbherr (1887); cf. Di Vita in Blackman (1997) 104). (iv) A third group of blocks bearing inscriptions dating to C5f were reused in the walls of the early Byzantine church at Mavropapas, located 200 m south-west of the Pythion. These blocks probably belong to a late Archaic building located in the vicinity of, if not directly under, the church (Halbherr (1897) 170–219; Perlman (2000) 61–62) would have come from a public building associated with the ἐθνικὴ «collectors of fines»). (v) A sanctuary (C6f) was established about 700 m north-east of the Pythion (Di Vita (1984) 71: a sanctuary of Demeter and Kore). Several public buildings (or open-air meeting places) are attested in early inscriptions: (i) agora (I.Cret. iv 43Bb (C6e); I.Cret. iv 80 (C5e); I.Cret. iv 72.7.11, 3.x.35–36, x.10–14 (C5m); I.Cret. iv 75A, 81 (C5m); for the location of the agora in the vicinity of the later Roman Odeion, see Perlman (2000) 72–73); (ii) ἀγρίων (I.Cret. iv 9a–b (C7f); Guarducci (1950) 32, 55: where the army assembled?; Koerner (1993) 367: where homicide trials took place?); (iii) δικαστεριον (I.Cret. iv 72.10–15–16 (C5m); Guarducci (1950) 169: building used by the δικασταί in the agora? [or the institution?, ed.]). A stretch of wall contemporary with the early phases of the settlement on Ag. Ioannis (c.190–970) has been identified as a defence wall (Hom. Il. 2.646: Γορτύνιος τειχόσθενα; Rizza and Scriniari (1968) 21–22; cf. Hayden (1988) 12–13), but Strabo’s claim that the polis was unfortified until Polemy (IV) paid for the construction of a circuit wall is supported archaeologically (Strabo 10.4.11; Allegro and Ricciardi (1988)). Two toponyms, Aulon and Latosion, have been identified as suburbs of the polis town of Gortyn. For Aulon, see supra no. 949. Guarducci suggests that Latosion supra 1149 was located in the vicinity of the modern village of Metropoleis, 1 km west of Gortyn, and that it was a district of the polis town where metics and freedmen were allowed to reside (Guarducci (1950) 181; Chaniotis (1996) 162–63; cf. van Effenterre and van Effenterre (1985) 187–88).

The name of the territory was Ἡ Γορτύνια (Strabo 10.4.7). There is no evidence for territorial subdivisions, but Gortyn may have controlled dependent polesis from as early
as C5e (infra), whose citizens were called ὑπόβοικοι (Perlman (1996) 239–42). For settlement patterns in the Mesara during the first millennium, see La Torre (1988–89); Sanders (1976); Simpson et al. (1995); Watrous et al. (1993).

Gortyn’s neighbour to the west was Phaistos. The two poleis were joined together in a sympolitía during the period C5m–C4m (coins, infra; Cucuzza (1997)) and again in the Hellenistic period (I.Cret. iv 165; SEG 23 563 (both C3s); Chaniotis (1996) 104–8, 422–28). Amykalia, a dependent community (πόλις) of Gortyn (I.Cret. iv 172 (C3l); Chaniotis (1996) 399; cf. Perlman (1996) 260–61), was probably located in the vicinity of modern Kommos (Cucuzza (1997) 66–72). If so, it would appear that Gortyn had extended her influence, if not her control, to the western Mesara by C5m (I.Cret. iv 72.iii.5–9 (C5m)). Mt. Ida formed the border of Gortyn to the north-west. Gortyn may have controlled the cave sanctuary of Zeus on Mt. Ida in the Classical period (I.Cret. iv 80 (C5e), 146 (C4f)). Patella Prinias commanded the principal north–south route east of Mt. Ida. The Archaic community there appears to have been abandoned c.550 (Rizza (1991)), perhaps a victim of Gortynian expansion to the north. Henceforth, Patella Prinias occupied the frontier between Gortyn and her northern neighbour(s). One of these neighbours was Rhaikos (modern Ag. Myron?). Gortyn and Knosos destroyed Rhaikos (C2m) and divided her territory between themselves. Thereafter they shared a border which appears to have cut through what had been the polis town of Rhaikos (Polyb. 30.23.1; I.Cret. IV 182 (C2m)). Pyranthos and Rhyton were perhaps dependent poleis located within the territory of Gortyn at the eastern edge of the Mesara (for Pyranthos, see Perlman (1996) 241, 268–70; for Rhyton, see ibid. 241, 256–57, 268–70). Further east were the poleis Arkades and Priansos. A Hellenistic alliance of Gortyn and Hierapytta with Priansos describes the Hellenistic border of Priansos and Gortyn (I.Cret. iv 174 (C3l)). Several small communities were located at the southern edge of the Mesara. The evidence for two of these, Boibe and Pyloros, is not sufficient to draw any conclusions concerning their political status (for Boibe, see Perlman (1996) 261–62, 268–70; for Pyloros, see ibid. 262, 269). *Rhitten may have been located in the southern Mesara (no. 988). The largely uninhabited Asterousia mountains separated the Mesara from several small communities located on the south coast of Crete (Faure (1965) 37–40). They are (from east to west) Einatos, the harbour of Priansos (no. 985); Lebena (no. 972); Lassoa (see supra); and Matala (no. 976). The toponyms Keskora and Pala occur together in a Gortynian decree concerning the lease of public lands located ἐν[ν] Κεσκόραι καὶ ἐν Πάλαι (I.Cret. iv 43Ba (C5e)). Keskora and Pala were probably located in the Mesara, but nothing further about them is known (Perlman (1996) 242–43).

The terms πολίαται (“citizen”) and πολιατεύειν (“to exercise the rights of a citizen”) occur in the early laws of Gortyn (πολίαται, I.Cret. iv 72.x.35–36, x14 (C5m); πολιατεύειν, I.Cret. iv 51 (C5f); I.Cret. iv 72.ix.31–33 (C5m); cf. Lévy (1997) 26: “s’il exerce effectivement ses droits de citoyen”, that is, “s’il est présent dans le pays”). Three other terms are associated with the status of citizen: (i) ἐλεύθερος (e.g. I.Cret. iv 72.i.1–7 (C5m)) “citizen” (Lévy (1997) 26–30) or “potential citizen” (Bile (1988) 343); (ii) δρομεύς (e.g. I.Cret. iv 72.v.40–42), new citizen who enjoys limited citizen rights (Tzifopoulos (1998) 150–69); (iii) Παισία (δίκαια (I.Cret. iv 64 (C5e)), legal procedures for citizens. Male citizens belonged to hetairaiai (I.Cret. iv 42B.11–14 (C5f), 72.x.37–39; cf. ἀπέτατος, infra). The only civic subdivision attested is the phyle (πυλα (I.Cret. iv 19,104 (C7/C6)); I.Cret. iv 72.vii.40–viii.38 (C5m)). The Gortynian phylai appear to have been personal rather than territorial organisations (Jones, POAG 224–25). The names of seven phylai are attested in the dating formulas of public texts (decrees, magistral dedications, manumissions): (i) Αἴθαλεις or Αἴθαλεις (I.Cret. iv 72.v.5 (C5m); I.Cret. iv 142 (C5m/C4e)); (ii) Αἰλάνωνες (I.Cret. iv 196 (C2f)); (iii) Παισία (I.Cret. iv 236 (C4s/C3f)); (iv) Ἀχρήστα (I.Cret. iv 186B + 187 (C3l/C2e)); (v) Ἀστυλήται (I.Cret. iv 261 (C2s/C1f)); (vi) Δεκά[---] (I.Cret. iv 171 (C3f)); (vii) Διμάνωνες (I.Cret. iv 197 (C1f)). Marriage within the phyle was recommended when possible (I.Cret. iv 72.vii.40–viii.36 (C5m); cf. Morris (1990)). The σταρτός, attested in the Gortyn Law Code (I.Cret. iv 72.v.5 (C5m)) and in the treaty of Gortyn and *Rhitten (I.Cret. iv 80 (C5e)), may represent a sub-unit of the phyle, perhaps the γένος (Willetts (1955) 111–13; cf. Guarducci (1950) 159, 185; Jones, POAG 225–26; Nomina 17). Terms for various categories of free non-citizens or that attest the presence of free non-citizens in the polis include (i) κανένος (κακένος (κάκως) (I.Cret. 14g–p.1–2 (C6), 30 (C6), 78 (C5e), 72.xi.16–17 (C5m)), official responsible for foreigners; κοινεία (δίκαια (I.Cret. iv 80 (C5e)), suits pertaining to foreigners; (ii) ὑπόβοικοι (I.Cret. 1xv.1 (C3l)), citizen of a dependent polis of Gortyn (Perlman (1996) 239–42); (iv) ἀπέτατος (I.Cret. iv 72.ii.5 (C5m), 84 (C5)), a free man denied citizen status—bastard, disenfranchised citizen vel sim. (Willetts (1967) 103–9; Lévy (1997) 26–28); (v) ἀπελευθ[θερο---] (I.Cret. iv 78 (C5e)), manumitted slave (Guarducci (1950) 181; Chaniotis (1996) 162–63; cf. van
Effenterre and van Effenterre (1985) 187–88; Nomima 1 16: ἀπελευθερωμένοι vel sim. ("expatriates"). The terms δόλος and Γορτύνων (e.g. I.Cret. iv 72 passim) designate categories of the unfree (Lévy (1997) 30–40).

The public enactments of Gortyn use the collective city-ethnic of Γορτύνων (e.g. θαυμάζω τοῖς Γορτύνων πασίπώλωσαν [I.Cret. iv 78 (C5e)] and the term πόλις (e.g. τάδ’ ἐγγέδω τοῖς πόλις λαξινάδονοι οἱ ψαθίδες τοῖς Περσαίοις πράζω [I.Cret. iv 378 (C3)]) to refer to the assembly. The legislative function of the assembly is attested first in C5e: τάδ’ ἐγγέδω τοῖς Γορτύνων πασίπώλωσαν [I.Cret. iv 78]. The term πλεθύς may refer to the assembly in an early law or decree (I.Cret. iv 87 (C5m); Nomima 1 97). A quasi-judicial role as corporate witness is suggested by the requirement that both adoptions and the renunciation of adoptions be declared in the agora when the citizens are assembled, κατάζημεν τὸν πολιστάν (I.Cret. iv 72.x.35, xi.14 (C5m)). The boule is not securely attested at Gortyn. ΕΣΒΟΛΑΝ occurs in an Archaic law and has been interpreted as either ἐς βολάν (“to the council) or ἐκβολή ("ejection, divorce") (I.Cret. iv 23.4 (Col); Bile (1988) 156 n. 356).

One member of the annual board of κόσμοι (also ὀδαμοὶ/κόρμοι) was eponymous (e.g. I.Cret. iv 72.v.6 (C5m), 142 (C5m/C4e), 236 (C4s/C3f)). The size of the board of κόσμοι is not known (cf. I.Cret. iv 259 (C2f): ten κόσμοι plus αἱ ἱαροργός). The kosmate was organised by tribe (I.Cret. iv 72.v.6 (C5m), 236 (C4s/C3f)). An Archaic law on iteration restricted service to once every three years (I.Cret. iv 14g–p (C6)). There is no reason to conclude that the κασένιος κόσμος ("kosmos for non-citizens") was a member of the board of κόσμοι (I.Cret. iv 14g–p (C6), 30 (C5e), 78 (C5e), 79 (C5m)). Iteration was restricted to once every five years (I.Cret. iv 14g–p2 (C6)), and a special "recorder", the μνάμον ὤ τὸ κασένιον, was attached to the office (I.Cret. iv 72.xi.6–23 (C5m)). Other public officials attested in the early inscriptions from Gortyn include (i) τίτας (I.Cret. iv 15a–b (C7), 14g–p (C6), 78 (C5e), 79 (C5m)),”magistrate who fines” or "comptroller" (Bile (1988) 327). The term occurs in the plural in two inscriptions (I.Cret. iv 78 (C5e), 79 (C5m)). They were chiefly responsible for the collection of fines assessed by the polis against private individuals (I.Cret. iv 78 (C5e) and officials (I.Cret. iv 79 (C5m)). (ii) γνώμον, "supervisor" vel sim. (Nomima 1 82) or "councillor" (Bile (1988) 339). Iteration was restricted to once every ten years (I.Cret. iv 14g–p (C6)). (iii) ἐσπραττα (I.Cret. iv 75d (C5m), 87 (C5m), 91 (C5m)), “collectors of fines”. The term is associated with the verb πράξω, "to pay" (Bile (1988) 327; Nomima 1 97), and occurs only in the plural in conjunction with δικαστάς. They seem to have been responsible primarily for the collection of fines assessed in judicial proceedings. A special μνάμον τῶν ἑσπραττῶν was attached to the office (I.Cret. iv 87 (C5m)). (iv) ὁ ἐπόττας (I.Cret. iv 84 (C5)), “oversee”?, “inspector”? (Guarducci (1950) 193). The function of this official is not known (Bile (1988) 331 n. 54: fiduciary official?). (v) καρποδαίσται (I.Cret. iv 77 (C5e)) were probably responsible for the collection and redistribution of produce tithed for the syystia (Guarducci (1950) 179; Willetts (1967); Bile (1988) 323; Nomima 1 49). (vi) πρειγίσται. The term occurs in two agreements of Gortyn and dependent communities: (i) for the dependent polis of "Rhitten (I.Cret. iv 86 (C5e)) and (2) for “those living on Kaudos” (I.Cret. iv 184 + SEG 23 589 (C3l/C2e)); for the political status of this community, see Chaniotis (1996) 411–17. This suggests that the Gortynian πρειγίσται was an official involved in the administration of dependent communities (cf. Guarducci (1950) 186–87; Chaniotis (1996) 419–20). (vii) σταρταγέται (I.Cret. iv 80 (C5e)), “leader of the startos (supra) or military commander? (Guarducci (1950) 185). (viii) δικαστάς. The term does not occur in the earliest laws of Gortyn (see Perlman (2001) 197), but is common in the inscriptions of C5 (I.Cret. iv 41 (C5f), 42B (C5f), 45 (C5f), 72 passim (C5m), 76 (C5m), 106 (C5m)). An unknown number of δικασται, at least some of whom enjoyed specialised duties, served the polis (e.g. the δικαστάς for the heitaireiai and for cases concerning security deposits (I.Cret. iv 42B (C5f)); the ὀργανοδικαστά (I.Cret. iv 72.xii.6–19 (C5m)); cf. μέλεν ὧ ἐπὶ κ’ ἐπιβάλλει, πάρ τὸ δικαστάς ἐ ἐγγαρατεῖ (I.Cret. iv 72.vi.25–31, ix.18–24 (C5m)). The simple term always occurs in the singular (cf. the compound ὀργανοδικαστά, I.Cret. iv 72.xii.6–19 (C5m)), and it seems likely that all cases were heard by a single δικαστάς. The δικαστάς either “applied the law”, δικαζεῖν (e.g. I.Cret. iv 72.xi.5–9, v.28–39, ix.43–54 (C5m)), or “determined the facts under oath”, ὄμνυντα κρίνεν (e.g. I.Cret. iv 42B (C5f), 72.xi.24–40, xi.46–55 (C5m)). Both procedures are described in a law from the Gortyn Law Code (I.Cret. iv 72.xi.26–31 (C5m)). A μνάμον sometimes assisted the δικαστάς when he “applied the law”. Decisions of the δικαστάς could not be appealed. Nothing is known about the qualifications, appointment, tenure or pay of the δικαστάς. Citizenship may not have been a requirement for the μνάμον (I.Cret. iv 72.xi.24–40 (C5m); cf. Lévy (1997) 26). For the δικαστάς, see in general Willetts (1967) 127–34; Bile (1988) 348–51.

The legendary founder of Gortyn was Γορτύς, the son of either Tegeates according to the Tegeans or Rhadamantys.
according to the Cretans (Paus. 8.53.4–5). Conon preserved
a tradition that in the third generation after the conquest of
Amyklai by Sparta (C8e), the Spartans Poliss and Delphos
led a group of Imbrian and Lemnian immigrants from
Lakonian Amyklai to Gortyn, where they settled together
with some Cretan perioikoi (Conon (FGrHist 26) fr. 1.xxxvi;
Malkin (1994) 111–13). An early association with Sparta is
suggested as well by the tradition concerning the Gortynian
poet and lawgiver Thaletas, who taught Lykourgos and
resided in Sparta for some time (Paus. 1.14.4; doubted by
Arist. Pol. 2.9, 1274a25–31). Plato’s Cretan, Kleinias, however,
identified the Gortynians as Argive in origin (Pl. Leg. 4.708A;
Bürchner (1912) 1667). For the ethnic composition of the
early polis, see Perlman (2000).

The early inscriptions of Gortyn tell us very little about its
foreign relations. According to Strabo, Gortyn and Lyktos
temporarily superseded Knosos as the foremost cities of
Crete (Strabo 10.4.7). If Strabo’s account is historical, a like-
ly time for the emergence of Gortyn as a leading power on
the island is C6–C5 (Hood and Smyth (1981) 18–19). During
the Archaic and Classical periods Gortyn may have formu-
lated agreements with four poleis whose territories bordered
the Mesara: (i) with Lebena (I.Cret. iv 63 (C6l/C5e)); (ii)
with the dependent polis *Rhitte (I.Cret. iv 80 (C5e)); (iii)
sympholitica or alliance with Phaistos (coins, infra); (iv) a
sympholitica or alliance with Sybria? (coins, infra). For
aspects of Gortyn’s consolidation of the Mesara, see
Perlman (1996) 258–70; Cucuzza (1997). The Cretan polis
Polichne, located west of Kydonia (at Vryses?), may have
been an ally of Gortyn. In 429 the Gortynian Νικίας, προ-
xenos of Athens, contriving to support Polichne, arranged for
an Athenian naval squadron to attack Kydonia (Thuc. 2.85;
Policnitai was the name of a federation of small non-
Dorian communities in west Crete). During the grain crisis
of the 320s, Gortyn received 10,000 medimnoi of grain from
Kyrene (SEG 9.2).

Gortyn struck coins on the Aiginetan standard from c.470
(Price (1981)). Types on the earliest staters (C5f–C4m) attest
a sympholitica or alliance with Phaistos (Le Rider (1966) 161).
Types: obv. Europa riding the bull, facing r.; rev. lion’s scalp
(Le Rider (1966) pl. XI.8–19). The beginning of local coinage
at Gortyn (staters and drachms with same types as above) is
indicated by the legend (rev.) ΓΟΡΤΥΝΟΣΤΟΠΑΙΜΑ
(Γόρτυνος τό παίμα) written retrograde in the epichoric
alphabet (Svoronos (1890) pl. XII.21,28) and somewhat later
ΓΟΡΤΥΝΙΟΝ (Le Rider (1966) pl. XI.11–13). The earliest
drachms, hemidrachms and obols have obv. recumbent
bull; rev. lion’s scalp; legend (drachm obv.): ΓΟΡΤΥΝΙΟΝ
written retrograde in the epichoric alphabet (Svoronos
(1890) pl. XII.27–33; SNG Cop. Aeg. Isl. 439). Staters of C4f
(c.360/350–300) have obv. female figure (Le Rider (1966) 14
n. 1, Europa or Britomartis?) seated in a tree; rev. standing
bull; legend: ΓΟΡΤΥΝΙΟΝ, sometimes retrograde in the
Drachms and obols of this period (C4f) have: obv. head of a
bull; rev. head of Europa? (Le Rider (1966) pls. XIX.11–26,
XX.13–14). Sybria minted coins with the same types in C4f
and may have been joined with Gortyn in a sympholitica or

961. Herakleion (Herakleiotas) Map 60. Lat. 35.20, long.
25.10. Size of territory: 3 (Hellenistic period). Type: C. The
toponym is Ηράκλειον, τό (Strabo 10.4.7). The city-ethnic
is Ηρακλεώτατας (Milet. 1.3 140.37 (c.259–250); SB 4272
(C3f)).

The earliest reference to Herakleion as a polis in the polit-
sical sense occurs in a C3m agreement of Miletos πρός τάς
πόλεις τάς ἐν Κρήτῃ (Milet. 1.3 140.37). The Stadiasmus
348 refers to Herakleion as a polis in the urban sense,
‘Ηράκλειον ... πόλεις ἐστίν. ἕχει λιμένα καὶ ὕδωρ. The
ancient city was located under the modern one; the com-
bined evidence from chance finds and salvage excavations
indicates the existence of a settlement there already in the
Classical period, although continuous occupation since
Antiquity has made it impossible to reconstruct its organi-
sation (for remains from the Classical period, see e.g.
Vallianou (1987); cf. Barr., H only). The traces of Classical
habitation and the fact that there is no doubt that
Herakleion was a polis in the political sense during the
Hellenistic period recommend its inclusion in the Inventory
as a possible polis (type C).

For Strabo, Herakleion was the harbour of Knosos, ἕχει
δ’ ἐπίνειον τό Ηράκλειον ἤ Κνωσός (Strabo 10.4.7).
The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally
in the C3m agreement between Knosos and Miletos (Milet.
1.3 140.37). For the individual use of the city-ethnic there is
the graffito of Φιλῖος Ηρακλεώτατας (SB 4272 (C3f))
and the proxeny decree of Aptara for |Δᾶρματρός καὶ
Ὀρθόννας Εὐφρόνος [καὶ] Νέαρχος Εὐνώιδα καὶ
Φίλων Παρµεν| ...‘Ηρακλεώτατα (I.Cret. 11.iii.11C
(C2)).

962. Hierapytna (Hierapytinias) Map 60. Lat. 35.00, long.
25.45. Size of territory: 4. Type: B. The toponym is
Ἴεράπυττνα, ἡ (I.Cret. 11.iii.1B (C3l); IG xi1.5 840 (C3m)).
Stephanos records three earlier names: ἡ πρότερον Κύρβα,
eîta Πύτνα, eîta Κάµιρος (Steph. Byz. 328.4–5). For Κάµιρος, cf. the tribal name Καµιρίς ἱνθα. The city-ethnic is Ἰεραπατίτινος (I.Cret. iii.iii.1A (C3s). iv.3 (C3c)).

Probably the earliest ancient sources to call Hierapytna a polis in the political sense are the decree of isopoliteia with Arkades (I.Cret. iii.iii.1B 10 (C3l)) and the alliance between Hierapytna and Rhodos (I.Cret. iii.iii.3A (C3l)). Hierapytna is included in the Inventory as a probable polis (type B) largely on the strength of its mint, which began to strike coins in C4f (infra).

The collective and internal use of the city-ethnic occurs in the alliance with Antigonos Doson (I.Cret. iii.iii.1A (C3s). For the individual use of the city-ethnic there is the decree of Lilaia in honour of Ἐννυκάρτης Αρισταγόρον Ἰεραπατίτινον (FD iii.14 134 (C3l)).

The polis-town of Hierapytna was more than likely located in the vicinity of the modern city of Ierapetra. To date almost nothing from the Archaic and Classical periods has come to light (for a description of the Archaic and Classical material from these periods on display in the Archaeological Museum of Ierapetra, see Papadakis (1986) 77–80). On current evidence it would seem that Hierapytna was a foundation of C5f at the earliest. Several public buildings and open-air meeting places are attested epigraphically: prytanion (I.Cret. iii.iii.3C (C3l/C2e)); χορός (I.Cret. iii.iii.1A (C3l)); τὸ ἀνδρήιον (I.Cret. iii.iii.4 (C3l/C2e)). In so far as these buildings/open-air meeting places are attested at other Cretan poleis during the Archaic and Classical periods (prytaneion; see Lato (no. 971); choros; see *Eltynia (no. 958) supra; Lyktos (no. 974); andreon; see Axios (no. 950), Datala (no. 954) and *Eltynia, no. 958), it is possible that also at Hierapytna (no. 962) they were pre-Hellenistic.

The protecting deity of the polis was probably Athene Polias, in whose public sanctuaries encomiaisons were displayed (I.Cret. iii.iii.3C, ll. 9–10 (C3l/C2e), 4 ll. 78–79 (C3l/C2e), 5 ll. 5–6 (C2)).

Strabo indicates that the polis of Larisa (see Introduction) joined with Hierapytna in a synoecism (Strabo 9.5.19). Larisa has been identified with the substantial LMIIIIC-Classical settlement on Prophitis Elias (Watrous and Blitzer (1995)). Surface remains indicate that this settlement was abandoned by c.325. If the identification is correct, the settlement history of Larisa suggests that her synecism with Hierapytna occurred late in the Classical period. The borders of Hierapytna are attested only in documents of the Hellenistic period (Hierapytna and Praisos: I.Cret. iv.174 ll. 30–32 (C3l/C2e); Hierapytna and Praisos: I.Cret. iii.iv.9 ll. 65–67 (rC3l/C2f)). At some time before C2l Hierapytna may have made the Archaic and Classical settlement at Oleros (see Introduction) a dependent polis whose territory either lay within or shared a border with the territory of Hierapytna (Perlman (1995b) 131–35, 138–39).

The names of three tribes, attested in the dating formulas of C2 magistral dedications but likely to be early and so included here, have been identified as Hierapytnian: Δυμάνες (I.Cret. iii.iii.9), Πάµφυλοι (I.Cret. iii.iii.1 with Guarducci (1942) 133, from Oleros) and Καµιρίς (I.Cret. iii.iii.1 with Jones, PoAG 231: an unusual feminine adjectival form in -is perhaps comprising a stratum of the population claiming descent from Rhodian colonists; from the sanctuary of Zeus Diktaios at Palaikastro).

Hierapytna struck coins (staters) on the Aiginetan standard from C4f. Types: obv. IP AΠ Υ between the limbs of a triskeles; rev. boar protome (Svoronos (1890) pl. XVII.6, with Head, HN 468). Later issues (c.330–280/270) have obv. head of Zeus; rev. palm tree and eagle; legend: IEPA (Svoronos (1890) pl. XVII.7, with Le Rider (1966) 190, 197–98).

963. Hyrtakina (Hyrtakinios) Map 60. Lat. 35.15, long. 23.45. Size of territory: 2. Type: [A]. The toponym is preserved in literary sources, where it is variously spelled Ὑρτακίνα (Ps.-Skylax 47), Ὑρτακός (Steph. Byz. 652.20) and Ὑρτακίνος (Steph. Byz. 652.20). The city-ethnic is either Ὑρτακίνοις (SEG 9 2 (C4s); coins, C4s–C3f, infra; I.Cret. 11.xv.2 (C2f)) or Ὑρτακίνος (Milet. 1.3 38.fr. II.5–6 (C3s)).

In Ps.-Skylax 47, where polis is used in the urban sense, Hyrtakina is one of the toponyms listed under the heading πόλεως πολλαὶ ἐν Κρήτῃ. The earliest explicit reference to Hyrtakina as a polis, and here in the political sense, occurs in the renewal of asylum for Teos (I.Cret. 11.xv.2 (C2m)). There is little doubt that Hyrtakina was a polis in the political sense during the late Classical period. The evidence for this is: (i) striking coins as early as c.330 (infra); (ii) forming an alliance with Lisos in C4s/C3s (coins, see infra); (iii) inclusion among the communities given grain by Kyrene in the 320s (SEG 9 2.49); (iv) membership in the C4l–C3 federation of the Oretoi (van Effenterre (1948a) 119–27; Chaniotis (1996) 106–8, 421–22; cf. Sekunda (2000) 337–38: league founded C5f).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on the coins (infra), and externally in the list of recipients of grain from Kyrene during the grain crisis of the 320s (SEG 9 2.49). For the individual use of the city-ethnic there is the grave stele of Διόδωτος Πάτρωνος Ὑρτακίνος from Sidon (Rev. Bib. (1904) 552 (C2)).
The *polis* town of Hyrtakina occupied a fortified hill (Kastri), but archaeological investigation of the settlement has been minimal. On current evidence the principal phases of occupation date to the Classical and Hellenistic periods. Early explorers describe two sectors of the city in some detail: (i) along the southern sector of the fortification wall, where there is a gate with a road which can be traced from the south (perhaps from Lisos, Niniou-Kindeli (1990)) leading into the city; and (ii) inside the city to the west near the fortification wall, where there is a large building and a public cistern (Savignoni and de Sanctis (1901) 408–24). An open-air sanctuary of Pan (C4–C3) was located at the eastern edge of the acropolis (Theophanides (1942–44b)).

The late Classical or Hellenistic circuit wall was built of polygonal masonry (Savignoni and de Sanctis (1901) 408–24). Tombs (C5–C4) are numerous on the southern and northern slopes of the acropolis and on the hill Ag. Ioannisis to the east. The existence of a *pyraineion* called the Δελφίνοι may be inferred from the offer of ξένια ἐπὶ τάν κοινὰ ἐστίαν ἐς τὸ Δελφίνοι (I.Cret. ii.xv.2 (C2m)). If so, in so far as the *pyraineion* is attested elsewhere on Crete during the Classical period (see Lato (no. 971)), it is possible that also at Hyrtakina it was pre-Hellenistic.

Hyrtakina struck coins (drachms) during the period c.330–280/270. Types: *obv.* Goat’s head, legend: ΥΡ or ΥΡΤΑΚΙΝΙΩΝ; *rev.* bee (Svoronos (1890) pl. XVIII.7–11, with Le Rider (1966) 197–98). In C4s–C3f (cf. Sekunda (2000) 337, C3m), Lisos and Hyrtakina produced an alliance coinage of small denominations in silver and gold. Types: *obv ./ rev.* dove (or eagle?), or dolphin, or star; legend (*obv./rev.*): Ά-Γ, ΥΡ-ΑΙ or ΥΡ-ΑΙΣΙΩΝ (Svoronos (1890) pl. XVIII.12–20; SNG Cop. Aeg. Isl. 469).

964. Istron (Istronioi) Map 60. Lat. 35.10, long. 27.15. Size of territory: 2. Type: C. The toponym is Ἰστρων (I.Cret. i.xiv.1 (C3l)). The city-ethnic is Ἰτανίοι (I.Cret. iii.vii.3 (C6?); coins, C4s–C3f, infra).

The earliest reference to Istron as a *polis* in the urban sense occurs in Herodotos’ narrative of the foundation of Kyrene (Hdt. 4.151.2). The city-ethnic is Ἰτανίοι (I.Cret. iii.vii.3 (C6?); coins, C4s–C3f, infra).

The earliest reference to Itanos as a *polis* in the urban sense occurs in Herodotos’ narrative of the foundation of Kyrene (Hdt. 4.151.2). The city-ethnic is Ἰτάνως (I.Cret. iii.vii.3 (C6?): coins, C4s–C3f, infra).

The earliest reference to Istron as a *polis* in the political sense occurs in an agreement between Knosos and Miletos (Milet. 1.3 140.38 (c.259–250)) and in an *asylia* decree for Teos (I.Cret. i.xiv.1 (C3l)). For the individual use of the city-ethnic there is the proxeny decree for Νικάνος Ίστρων (IG xii.5 suppl. 304 (C3m)).

The largest buildings on Nisi Pandeleimon are on the south-eastern knob of the promontory and on its southern slopes. A stretch of circuit wall (c.1.5 m thick) is preserved just above sea level on the north-western side of the promontory (Hayden et al. (1992) 330–32, 343/NP1). In treaties of Cal the eastern border of Lato seems to encompass the territory of ancient Istron, suggesting that by then the *polis* had been absorbed by Lato (Faure (1967) 111; van Effenterre and Bougrat (1969) 38; Hayden et al. (1992) 299 with fig. 3).

The protecting deity of Istron was Athene Polias, in whose sanctuary the public enactments of the *polis* were displayed (I.Cret. i.xiv.1 (C3l)).

965. Itanos (Itanios) Map 60. Lat. 35.15, long. 26.15. Size of territory: 3. Type: A. The toponym is Τάνως, ὅ (Hdt. 4.151.2). The city-ethnic is Τάνως (I.Cret. iii.vii.3 (C6?): coins, C4s–C3f, infra).

The earliest reference to Itanos as a *polis* in the urban sense occurs in Herodotos’ narrative of the foundation of Kyrene (Hdt. 4.151.2 (rC7)). Messengers from Thera arrived ἐς Τάνως πόλιν. The earliest uses of the term in its political sense occur in Hellenistic inscriptions (I.Cret. iii.iv.2–3 (c.266/5–263/2), 8 (C3f)).

The city-ethnic *ITANION* is attested in an Archaic eustropheion inscription written *boustrophedon* in the epichoric alphabet (I.Cret. iii.vii.3 (C6?):). It is unclear whether the use is individual or collective. The first certain example of the collective use of the city-ethnic internally occurs on the coins (C4s–C3f, infra) and externally in an Archaic law of Lykto (SEG 35 991A (C6)); cf. Faure (1993) 69–70). For the individual use of the city-ethnic there is the signature of the sculptor Δαμωκράτης Αριστομιχέως Ίτανος (I.Cret. iii.iii.31 (C3/C2)).

Apart from a possible reference to hostilities with Lykto (SEG 35 991A (C6)); cf. Faure (1993) 69–70), all evidence for the foreign relations of Itanos is Hellenistic.

Apart from the story of the participation of the Itanian purple-fisher, Korobios, in Thera’s colonisation of Kyrene (Hdt. 4.151–53 (rC7)) and the possible reference to hostilities
with Lyktos (supra), evidence for the foreign relations of Itanos is Hellenistic. The presence of pottery from Corinth (C7e–C6e), Attika (C6f–C4), but nothing from C40–C420, Ionia, Paros(?), Knossos (Orientalising and Hellenistic), Eleutherna (Orientalising and Hellenistic) and Aphrati attests Itanos’ participation in intra-island and Mediterranean trading networks, but is not sufficient to demonstrate direct relations with any one of these places (Greco et al. (1999); Tsingarida (2001)).

The Itanians distinguished between their territory on Crete itself (χώρα) and several small islands which they claimed, the most important of which was Άεικη (probably modern Koupounisi) (I.Cret. 311.iv.8 ll. 9–11 (C5f), 9 ll. 37–39 and passim (C2a)). The Magnesian arbitration of the dispute between Itanos and Hierapyna describes the southern border of Itanos (I.Cret. 311.iv.9 ll. 59–67 (C2a)). The sanctuary of Zeus Diktaios at Palaikastro was located near this border (Chaniotis (1988); cf. Perlman (1995a)). For the extent of the territory of Itanos (from the sanctuary of Zeus Diktaios in the south to the sanctuary of Athena Samonia on Cape Sideros to the north), see Kalpaxis et al. (1995).

The polis town of Itanos was built on two small acropolises, the eastern acropolis (altitude 24.35 m) and the western acropolis (altitude 17.45 m). A large hill (altitude 61 m) delimits the plain of Itanos to the south. Public buildings are likely to have been located on the two small acropolises. The east acropolis may have been fortified. A monumental terrace on the west acropolis was probably built to accommodate a temple. A rectangular basin of roughly 40 ha. A large, roughly trapezoidal building with a central hearth in the main room, tentatively identified as an andreion, was built in the Archaic period (abandoned C5f) in the area of a Geometric cemetery on a low hill to the north of the acropolises (Viviers (2001)). During the late Classical period a cemetery was established on a terrace east of the Archaic building. Apart from the Archaic building, all other walls in the polis town (fortification, building and terrace) appear to be Hellenistic and later, but pottery from the Archaic and Classical periods is reported from the east acropolis, the Hellenistic and later residential quarter in the saddle between the two acropolises, and the rural sanctuary and temple (of Demeter?) at Βάμιες. See Gallet de Santerre (1951); Deschayes (1951); Kalpaxis et al. (1995); Greco et al. (1996), (1997), (1998a), (1998b), (1999).

Itanos began to strike coins on the Aiginetan standard c.380. Subsequent issues are sporadic (Le Rider (1966) 196; Kraay (1976) 53–54). The earliest coins (staters and obols, c.380–320) have obv. marine deity; rev. star (Svoronos (1890) pl. XVIII.11–36, with Le Rider (1966) 196; SNG Cop. Aeg.Isl. 470–71), later opposing sea monsters; legend: ΙΤΑ (Svoronos (1890) pl. XVIII.37). Itanos continued to mint this latter type (obv. marine deity; rev. opposing sea monsters; legend: ΙΤΑΝΙΟΝ or ΙΤΑΝΙΩΝ) during the period c.320–280/270 (Svoronos (1890) pl. XIX.1–9, with Le Rider (1966) 196) and introduced a new series with obv. head of Athena; rev. eagle or star; legend: ΙΤΑΝΙΟΝ/ΙΤΑΝΙΩΝ (Svoronos (1890) pl. XIX.20–24, with Le Rider (1966) 196).

966. Keraia (Keraitas) Map 60. Lat. 35.25, long. 24.00. Size of territory: 1. Type: C. The toponym is Κεραία (BCH 45 (1921) 111.11 (c.230–210)). The city-ethnic is Κεραιτας (coins, infra); cf. Κεραιτας (I.Magnesia 21 (C2e)), Κερέτας (Polyb. 4.53.6), Κερεδτής (Steph. Byz. 167.4–5).

No ancient source identifies Keraia as a polis. But there is no question that Keraia was a polis in the political sense during the Hellenistic period (Polyb. 4.55.2; I.Magnesia 21 (C2e); I.Cret. iv 179 (c.183)). Keraia is included in the Inventory as a probable polis (type B) on the strength of its mint, which may have begun production as early as c.330 (infra).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on the coins (infra), and externally in the alliance of Keraia and the members of the Cretan koinon with Eumenes II (I.Cret. iv 179 (c.183)). For the individual use there is the proxeny decree of Gortyn for Βαλαγγύρας Νεοκοινίος Κεραιτας (I.Cret. iv 206K (C3/C2)).

The remains of the polis town at Meskla occupied at least two and possibly three hills: (i) Τειχίδια with stretches of fortification walls built of large blocks without mortar; (ii) Πουλέ with a C4 rampart and a bastion; and (iii) Ζαγρέ or Ζαγροπαπουφα with Roman villas. Surface remains date from the Archaic through the Byzantine period. The southern frontier of Keraia was defended by a guard-post at Βουσσαλόταρος. A second guard-post was located to the south of Meskla at Έλληνικό (Faure (1962) 49–54).

Keraia struck coins (drachmas) during the period c.330–280/270. Types: obv. head of Artemis wearing a crown of goat horns; rev. heads of a javeline and an arrow; legend:

967. Knosos (Knosios) Map 60. Lat. 35.20, long. 25.10. Size of territory: 4. Type: A. The toponym is Κνωσός, ἥ (Hom. II. 2.646; Pl. Leg. 753A), in Linear B, ko-no-so (McArthur (1993) 21–23). According to Strabo, Knosos was formerly called Καίρατος, the ancient name (now revived) of the river and valley area where Knosos is located (Strabo 10.4.8). The city-ethnic is Κνώσιος (coins, C4f, see infra; SEG 9 2.31, 59 (C4s)). Literary sources use both these and geminated forms of the toponym (Κνωσός, Diod. 16.62.3 and the city-ethnic (Κνώσσιος, Hdt. 3.122.2). Geminated forms do not appear in the inscriptions.

Knosos is called a polis in the political sense in the agreement of Knosos, Tylos and Argos which provides for the division of booty αἱ δὲ συμπλέονες πόλεις ... ἔλοιεν (ML 42B.31–32 (C5m) = Nomima 1 54.11). It is most likely that Knosos should be understood as one of the poleis. In literary sources Knosos is called a polis both in the political sense (Pl. Leg. 702C, 752E) and in the urban sense (Hymn. Hom. Ap. 477; Bacchyl. 1.123, in both cases in a mythological context). The phrase Κνώσαι πατρα in Pind. Ol. 12.16.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on the coins (infra) and externally in the agreement of Knosos, Tylos and Argos (ML 42B.8 (C5m)), in the proxy decree for the assembly of Argos, Tylos and Knosos (SEG 9 2.31, 59). For the individual use there is the sculptor Ηριφών Ακέστορος Κνώσαος who made the statue of Battos and Libya riding in a chariot which Pausanias saw at Delphi (Paus. 10.15.7 (rC5)). The individual use is not attested epigraphically before C4 (Γλυκέρα Ἀντιόχο Κνώσιο, IG Πιτθ. 11 9044 (C4f)).

Very little is known about the Archaic and Classical (pre-C4m) history of Knosos. According to Strabo, in the time of Homer and for a long while thereafter Knosos was the most illustrious polis on Crete. She later lost her leading position to Gortyn and Lyktos, but managed to recover her former status as the metropolis of Crete (Strabo 10.4.7). Pindar indicates that Knosos suffered a period of stasis in C5e, which resulted in the exile or immigration to Himera of the long-distance runner Ἐργοτέλης Φιλάνωρος, twice victor at the Pythian Games and once at the Olympian (Pind. Ol. 12.1.16 (C5f)). Knosos is not known to have produced other Panhellenic victors, but Knosos and Tylos agreed to dedicate jointly at Delphi a tithe of the booty they captured together (ML 42B.7–10 (C5m)). Knosos and Tylos formed an alliance in C5m (ML 42). The assembly of Argos (τό πλεθος) served as the mediator in the resolution of disputes between the two poleis concerning questions of war and peace (ML 42A.6–17; Merrill (1991); cf. ML: the text implies a federal structure with a federal assembly called τό πλεθος which decided questions of war and peace; members included Knosos, Tylos and Argos, and perhaps other states as well (συμπλέονες πόλεις, ML 42B.31–32); cf. Gschwitzer (1958) 44–47: ML 42 is an alliance between Knosos and Argos; Tylos is a dependency of Argos). The border between Knosos and Tylos (ἄροι τάς γᾶς) is described in this alliance (26–29, infra), and regulations concerning property and trade are stipulated: (i) both poleis are prohibited from absorbing territory (γῆ) belonging to the other (25–26); (ii) Knosioi are prohibited from owning land in Tylos (μεν τυπασκέθο), although a Tylos may own land in Knosos (23–25); (iii) export from Tylos to Knosos and from Knosos to Tylos is tax-free; (iv) Tylosioi pay the same taxes as citizens of Knosos for trans-shipment from Knosos (11–14). After a gap in the historical record of almost a century, evidence for the history of Knosos resumes in C4m, when Mausolos and Artemisia issue a proxy decree for the Knosioi (I.Labraunda 40 (c.357)), and Knosos hires mercenaries of Phalakos for a campaign against Lyktos (Diod. 16.62 (346)), and honours the Athenians with a gold crown (IG Πιτθ. 11.14.3 11.121–22 (345/4)).

The κόσμοι appear to have been the chief magistrates of the poleis already in the Classical period. They were responsible for providing foreign envoys with ξένια. The βολά oversaw the κόσμοι (ML 42B.40–42 (C5m)). Although the phylai appear only in Hellenistic sources, they are likely to be early and so are mentioned here. Five tribal names are attested: (i) Ἀρχεία or Ἀρχεία (I.Cret. iv 199-200 (C2e)); SEG 33 729 (C1); cf. the sanctuary of the hero Ἀρχαῖος at Archanes, ML 42B.27, 35–36 (C5m)); (ii) Πάμφυλοι (I.Cret. iv 181 (C2f)); (iii) Ε[...] (C2f)); (iv) Ἀθηναῖοι (I.Cret. iv 197 (C2)); (v) Υπόλειοι (SEG 33 728 (C1)).

The territory of Knosos is called (in Argolic) τὰ Κνοβία γά (ML 42A.21–22 (C5m)). If the river mentioned in the C5m description of the border of Knosos and Tylos is the Platyperama (ML 42B.28), the territory of Knosos reached the north coast between Herakleion and Apollonia. To the east her territory encompassed the sanctuary of Zeus Thenatus at Amnios (Chanioti (1992)), while to the south it extended towards modern Archanes (ML 42B.2–4; see Huxley (1994) 126–27 for a brief discussion of the territory; cf. also I.Cret. i.19.1.52 for a C3 reference to the borders...
(οὐδέπεια) of Knosos, and I.Cret. iv 182 and Polyb. 22.15.1 for the C2f border of Knosos and Gortyn). Strabo identifies Herakleion and earlier (in the time of Minos) Amnisos as the harbours (ἐπινείοι) of Knosos (Strabo 10.4.7–8). The so-called cave of Eleftheria was located within the territory of Knosos (see e.g. Paus. 1.18.5; Strabo 10.4.8).

The *polis* town of Knosos seems to have enjoyed nearly continuous habitation from prehistoric times and always to have been settled as an urban centre with the important exception of the period c.630–525, when on current evidence the settlement appears to have been largely abandoned (Coldstream 1984; Coldstream and Huxley 1999). Very little is known about the *polis* town of Archaic and Classical Knosos (for the Archaic and Classical remains within the urban centre of Knosos, see Hood and Smyth 1973), Coldstream and Macdonald (1997); Coldstream (1999), (2000)). According to Strabo, the circuit of the ancient city was 30 stadia (Strabo 10.4.7), but there is no archaeological evidence that a circuit wall protected the *polis* town. For a Classical fort (C4) on Kefala ridge north of the Minoan Palace, see Hood and Boardman (1957). The public centre of the *polis* town is suspected to have been in the region of the Roman Civil Basilica, c.0.5 km to the north-west of the Minoan palace, where architectural blocks bearing the text (painted) of a law were found (I.Cret. i.viii.5 (C3)). Three early sanctuaries have been excavated: (i) of Rhea? (C5 and earlier?) above the ruins of the South Propylaion of the Minoan palace (Evans 1928) 3–5; Coldstream (2000) 284–88; (ii) of Demeter (from C8 onwards) south of the Minoan palace on Lower Gipsades Hill (Coldstream 1973); (iii) of Glaukos? (from c.500) west of the Minoan palace (Callaghan 1978)). Deposits of Archaic (with the C6 gap) and Classical material, but no architecture, have been found in the Stratigraphical Museum excavations (Warren 1984–85)), above the Unexplored Mansion (Sackett 1992 6–8), to the south-west of the Minoan palace (Coldstream and Macdonald 1997), and on both sides of the Royal Road (Coldstream 1973). There is almost no burial evidence from Knosos later than c.630 (Coldstream and Huxley 1999) 294–96.

Knosos struck coins on the Aiginetan standard from c.C5m (Price 1981), c.450–425; Le Rider (1966) 175–80, 195, c.425. The earliest (c.C5m–C4m) coins (staters, drachms, hemidrachms) have *obv* Minotaur; *rev* labyrinth (cruci-form), or rarely the head of a youth (Svoronos (1890) 66 no. 11: Theseus or Apollo?); obols have *obv* Minotaur; *rev* star; legend (on staters only): none at first, later ΚΝΩΣ written retrograde in the epichoric alphabet (Svoronos (1890) pl. IV.23–32, with Le Rider (1966) 175; SNG Cop. Aeg.Isl. 368). The next series of staters (c.340/330–320) has *obv* female head (Le Rider (1966) 15 n. 5: Pasiphaë, Britomartis or Ariadne?); *rev* seated male figure (Zeus or Minos), or a bull’s head within the labyrinth; legend: ΚΝΩΣΙΩΝ, or in one case ΜΙΝΩΣ (Svoronos (1890) pls. IV.33–35, VI, with Le Rider (1966) 175–76). Staters struck during the period c.320–280/270 have: *obv* head of Hera; *rev* labyrinth. Drachms of this period have (i) *obv* head of Hera; *rev* labyrinth; (ii) head of Apollo; *rev* Zeus Nikephoros seated inside the labyrinth. Hemidrachms and obols have *obv* head of Apollo; *rev* labyrinth (Svoronos (1890) pls. V.2–22, VI.1–9, 15–16, with Le Rider (1966) 176–80; SN Cop. Aeg.Isl. 369–70, 373).

968. Kydonia (Kydoniatis) Map 60. Lat. 35.30, long. 24.00. Size of territory: 4. Type: A. The toponym is Κυδωνία, ἦ (Thuc. 2.85.5; IG ii² 399 (C45)), in Linear B, ku-do-ni-ja (McArthur 1993) 175. The city-ethnic is Κυδωνιάτας (IG iv 683 (C5m); Thuc. 2.85.5). On the assertion of Stephanos that Κυδωνία was formerly called Ἀπολλωνία (Steph. Byz. 390.17), see Guarducci (1939) 105.

The term πόλις occurs in a dedication to Apollo, Artemis and Lato from Chania (SEG 33.735; cf. SEG 40.775 = CEG 9846 (C4f)). The *polis* in question is probably Kydonia, and the use of the term is probably political. *Polis* in the urban sense is attested in Ephor. fr. 29, in Ps.-Sklax 47 (πόλις implied; see Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 142), and in Diod. 16.63.3 (r143).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form on coins C4s–C3e (infra), and externally in Thucydides’ account of the Athenian expedition to Crete in 429 (Thuc. 2.85.5) and in the list of recipients of grain from Kyrene during the grain crisis of the 320s (SEG 9 2.26). For the individual use of the city-ethnic there are the two signatures of sculptors, Ἀριστοκλῆς Κυδωνιάτης from Olympia (Paus. 5.25.11 (rC6, not properly retrospective if Pausanias here quotes the inscription)) and Κρησίλας Κυδωνιάτας from Hermione (IG iv 683 (C5m)) and the graffito of Ὀνάσανδρος Κυδωνιάτας from Abydos (IGA 3 405 (C4)).

According to legend, Kydonia was founded by Minos or Kydas (IG xii.5 104.21–22; Diod. 5.78.2; Paus. 8.53.4). In light of the continuous settlement of Chania from C8s (infra), the story told by Herodotos about the foundation of Kydonia by Samian exiles (αὐτοὶ [Samians] δὲ Κυδωνίων τὴν ἐν Κρήτῃ ἐκτίσεν) probably refers to a refoundation or resettlement of the *polis* (Hdt. 3.44.1, 59.1–3 (1524); for the
meaning of κτιζως in Herodotos, see Casewitz (1985)). The Samians remained there for five years, but in the sixth year (519), Aiginetans and Cretans defeated them in a sea battle, and the Aiginetans resettled Kydonia as a colony (Strabo 8.6.16; for the possible economic motives behind Samian and Aiginetan interest in Kydonia, see Stefanakis (1999) 250–57; for the identification of the Κυδώνες as the descendants of the pre-Greek inhabitants of west Crete and for their fate following Aigina’s colonisation of Kydonia, see Sekunda (2000) 330–37). In 429 the Athenians responded to the request of Nikias, the Gortyanian proxenos of Athens, and ravaged the territory of Kydonia (Thuc. 2.85.5–86.1). The attack may have been motivated in part by pro-Spartan sympathies if not outright support for Sparta on the part of the descendants of the Aiginetan settlers, together perhaps with more recent arrivals from Aigina following the Athenian expulsions in 457/6 and 431 (Figueira (1988) 538–42). Phalaikos was killed during his unsuccessful siege of Kydonia in 434 (Diod. 16.63; Paus. 10.2.7).

The list of leases of land and houses to seven proxenoi (I.Cret. II.1.11 (C3)) provides precious information about the organisation of the territory of Kydonia. Combined with the archaeological evidence, it can be used retrospectively for the Archaic and Classical periods. The leases refer to vineyards ἐμι Μολοχάντι ἐν τῶι πεδίωι, ἐν τῶι πεδίωι κατὰ Βάθειαν, ἐν Μινώιαι ποὶ τῶι πόρωι ἑσχάτωι, ἐν ταῖς νάσωι (Marangou-Lerat (1995) 11–13: Akrotiri peninsula), ἐπὶ Λίπαραι, and ἐν Σχινούρι; houses ἐν ταῖς Ἡραίοι and ἐν ταῖς Λαχανίαι κ(ω)μαι; and fallow land ποὶ ταὶ Κομείκου. The κώµη Laxania has been identified with the substantial fortified site (Archaic through Byzantine) on Kastellos Varypetro about 7 km south-west of Chania (Faure (1988) 90; Erickson (2000) 260). Minoa has been identified with the remain (Archaic through Roman) of a large coastal settlement at modern Marathi on Akrotiri peninsula (Blackman (1976d)). The settlement possessed an important cult (of Δικτύννας) at Marathospelios (Faure (1964) 186–87) and territory extending north-west to the isthmus of the peninsula (Marangou-Lerat (1995) 10–13). Lipara has been identified with one of the small islands located in Souda Bay opposite Marathi (Guarducci (1939) 117). For a discussion of these toponyms, see Perlman (1996) 234–44, where I distinguish between two types of sub-unit of the polis: (i) villages like Laxania and Heraí which were not political units, and (ii) a second category of community of which Minoa, Molokas, Vatheia, Lipara and Schinouris are examples. These latter consisted of a settlement and agricultural lands, including some state-owned parcels, and may have been political units dependent upon or part of Kydonia.

The continuous occupation of the city of Chania since C8, coupled with the building activity of the Venetians, who dismantled many of the earlier structures for building material to reuse in their own buildings, has made it difficult to reconstruct the organisation of the Greek polis. Rescue excavations have provided most of what is known archaeologically about the Archaic and Classical periods (see e.g. KrEst 7 (1999) 143–66, describing eighteen rescue excavations conducted in Chania during the period 1995–97). Late Geometric material from Kastelli Hill suggests that the Greek settlement was established there in C8 (Andreadaki-Vlasaki (1997) 239; for Archaic and Classical deposits on Kastelli, see Hallager et al. (1997) 202–4; Hahn (1997) 209; ArchDelt 45 (1999) Chron. 433–35). Kastelli perhaps served as the acropolis for the community. Literary testimony indicate that the urban centre was fortified during the late Classical and Hellenistic periods (Diod. 16.63.3 (1343); Polyb. 4.55.4 (1220–21)). It is likely, though not certain, that these fortifications protected the acropolis. The extent of the Classical and Hellenistic urban centre is suggested by the location of graves dating to these periods within the limits of the modern city in the areas of Ag. Ioannis, the law courts, the public park and the stadium (Polologiori (1985)). No public buildings of the Greek polis have been discovered, although it seems likely that there was a temple near Plataia in 1866, where the fragment of an Archaic limestone frieze now on display in the Archaeological Museum of Chania (Inv. no. 92) was found (Theophonides (1956)). Herodotos records that the Samian exiles who refounded or resettled Kydonia built the temples which were still there in his day, as well as the temple of Θησείου on Rhodopou Peninsula (τὰ ἱρὰ τὰ ἐν Κυδωνί/τὰς ΧιΞταη θήσεως καὶ τῶν τῆς Δικτύννας νηδόν, Hdt. 3.59.1–3 (1524)). Onorio Belli reported having seen a temple with a Doric portico, a theatre and an aqueduct, although both the locations and the dates of these structures are today unknown ( Falkener (1854) 27–28). It seems likely that the ancient harbour was in the same place as the Venetian harbour to the north of Kastelli, and that the Venetian mole was built on an earlier mole. Skylax reports that the harbour of Kydonia could be closed (Ps.-Skylax 47).

Kydonia struck pseudo-Aiginetan hemidrachms and obols (c.475–280), distinguished from Aiginetan coins by fabric, style and the frequent representation of a crescent on either obverse or reverse. Types: obv. tortoise; rev. incuse square (Robinson (1928); Le Rider (1966) 173; SNG Cop. Aeg.Isl. 402–5). During the period c.320–280/270, Kydonia
struck coins (staters, drachms, obols), also on the Aiginetan
standard but with different types (Le Rider (1966) 194).
Staters have obv. head of a nymph or goddess (Frost (1996):
Akakallis?); rev. youthful naked archer stringing his bow, or
hound suckling an infant (Kydon). Drachms have (i) obv.
head of a nymph or goddess; rev. naked hunter, or dog feeding
Kydon; (ii) obv. head of Athene; rev. dog feeding Kydon.
Obols have (i) obv. head of a youth with horns; rev. dog; (ii)
obv. head of a nymph or goddess; rev. head of a bull, or K, or
dot within three crescent moons, or dot within three dotted
crescent moons; (iii) obv. head of nymph or goddess; rev.
amphora. Legend (on some coins of all denominations): KΥΔΩΝ or further abbreviations down to K (Svoronos

969. Kytain

Map 60. Lat. 35.25, long. 24.55. Size of territ-
ory: 1. Type: B. The toponym is Κύταιον, τό (Ptol. Geog.
3.17.6; Steph. Byz. 399.3). The collective use of the city-ethnic
is attested internally in abbreviated form on the coins of
C4m (infra). Ancient Kytain has not been securely located.
The ancient geographers place Kytain to the west of Apollonia (Plin.
HN 4.59; Ptol. Geog. 3.17.6). Stefanakis sug-
figures a location on the small bay just north of the modern
city of Sisses at Almyrida, where remains dating to the
Neolithic, Minoan, Hellenistic and Roman periods have
been identified as well as traces of an ancient harbour
from the north coast to the south coast, as suggested by Ps.-
Skylax 47: εἶτα η Λαμππαία (sc. χώρα) καὶ διήκει αὕτη
καὶ διήκει αὕτη Λαμππαία already in C4 (Ps.-Skylax 47; Theophr. Hist. pl. 2.6.9).

The territory of Lappa, the only polis situated at the nar-
row isthmus (18 km wide) of west Crete, may have extended from
the north coast to the south coast, as suggested by Ps.-
Skylax 47: εἶτα η Λαμππαία (sc. χώρα) καὶ διήκει αὕτη
Λαμππαία already in C4 (Ps.-Skylax 47; Theophr. Hist. pl. 2.6.9).

The only ancient source to identify Kytain as a polis is
Stephanos (Steph. Byz. 399.3). Nonnos Dion. 13.238 calls
Kytain a town, ἄσπεα καλὰ Κύταιον. A small issue (only
three known examples) of overstruck silver staters dating to
the period c.350–325 has been attributed to Kytain (Hill
(1927) 46 pl. VI.4, with Stefanakis (1998)). Types: obv.
wreathed male head facing r.; rev. tripod; legend: KY (Hill
(1927) 46 pl. VI.4). The coins, which may begin as early as
c.350, suggest that Kytain was a polis in the late Classical peri-
od and so recommend her inclusion in the Inventory as a
probable polis (type B). They share the obverse and reverse
types of Axos. Stefanakis interprets this as evidence of an
alliance between the two poleis (ibid.). Almyrida provides the
most convenient coastal access for Axos. If Kytain was indeed
located at Almyrida, it seems likely that not long after the
minting of these coins Axos absorbed this small polis (ibid.).

970. Lappa (Lappaios)

Map 60. Lat. 35.15; long. 24.20. Size of territory: 3. Type: B. The toponym is Λάμππα, ἡ (BCH
45 (1921) 111.15 (c.230–210); I.Cret. iv 1868 + 187 (C3l/C3e)).
For the spelling Λάμππα, ἡ (infra 30–187). The city-ethnic is
Λαμππαίος (coins, Κασ–C3f, infra; I.Cret. ii.11.2 (C3f)).

The earliest attestation of Lappa as a polis in the political
sense occurs in an asylia decree of Lappa for Teos (I.Cret.
ii.11.3 (C3l)). For the earliest reference to Lappa as a polis in
the topographical sense, see Polyb. 4.54.4–5 (1221–219).
Lappa is included in the Inventory as a probable polis (type
B) because (i) the earliest coins of Lappa may date to c.330
(infra), and (ii) there was a territory called Λαμππαία
already in C4 (Ps.-Skylax 47; Theophr. Hist. pl. 2.6.9).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally
on the coins (infra), and externally in the asylia decree for
Tenos (I.Cret. ii.11.2 (C3f)). For the individual use, there is
the decree of Tenos honouring Αρτεμίδης Αρμικλώνου
Λαμππαίοις and other Cretans (IG xi.5 suppl. 304 (C3m)).

A fragment of an Archaic inscription from Lappa may
preserve the only documentary evidence from Crete for the
basileus, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΑΣ [---] (I.Cret. ii.11.1 (C3e)). Otherwise all
evidence for the political institutions of Lappa is Hellenistic.

The territory of Lappa, the only polis situated at the nar-
row isthmus (18 km wide) of west Crete, may have extended from
the north coast to the south coast, as suggested by Ps.-
Skylax 47: εἶτα η Λαμππαία (sc. χώρα) καὶ διήκει αὕτη
Λαμππαία already in C4 (Ps.-Skylax 47; Theophr. Hist. pl. 2.6.9).

The only ancient source to identify Kytain as a polis is
Stephanos (Steph. Byz. 399.3). Nonnos Dion. 13.238 calls
Kytain a town, ἄσπεα καλὰ Κύταιον. A small issue (only
three known examples) of overstruck silver staters dating to
the period c.350–325 has been attributed to Kytain (Hill
(1927) 46 pl. VI.4, with Stefanakis (1998)). Types: obv.
wreathed male head facing r.; rev. tripod; legend: KY (Hill
(1927) 46 pl. VI.4). The coins, which may begin as early as
c.350, suggest that Kytain was a polis in the late Classical peri-
od and so recommend her inclusion in the Inventory as a
probable polis (type B). They share the obverse and reverse
types of Axos. Stefanakis interprets this as evidence of an
alliance between the two poleis (ibid.). Almyrida provides the
most convenient coastal access for Axos. If Kytain was indeed
located at Almyrida, it seems likely that not long after the
minting of these coins Axos absorbed this small polis (ibid.).

The territory of Lappa, the only polis situated at the nar-
row isthmus (18 km wide) of west Crete, may have extended from
the north coast to the south coast, as suggested by Ps.-
Skylax 47: εἶτα η Λαμππαία (sc. χώρα) καὶ διήκει αὕτη
Λαμππαία already in C4 (Ps.-Skylax 47; Theophr. Hist. pl. 2.6.9).

The only ancient source to identify Kytain as a polis is
Stephanos (Steph. Byz. 399.3). Nonnos Dion. 13.238 calls
Kytain a town, ἄσπεα καλὰ Κύταιον. A small issue (only
three known examples) of overstruck silver staters dating to
the period c.350–325 has been attributed to Kytain (Hill
(1927) 46 pl. VI.4, with Stefanakis (1998)). Types: obv.
wreathed male head facing r.; rev. tripod; legend: KY (Hill
(1927) 46 pl. VI.4). The coins, which may begin as early as
c.350, suggest that Kytain was a polis in the late Classical peri-
od and so recommend her inclusion in the Inventory as a
probable polis (type B). They share the obverse and reverse
types of Axos. Stefanakis interprets this as evidence of an
alliance between the two poleis (ibid.). Almyrida provides the
most convenient coastal access for Axos. If Kytain was indeed
located at Almyrida, it seems likely that not long after the
minting of these coins Axos absorbed this small polis (ibid.).

According to Strabo, Phoinix was located within the territ-
ory of Lappa as a polis (infra). Otherwise all evidence for the political institutions of Lappa is Hellenistic.

The only ancient source to identify Kytain as a polis is
Stephanos (Steph. Byz. 399.3). Nonnos Dion. 13.238 calls
Kytain a town, ἄσπεα καλὰ Κύταιον. A small issue (only
three known examples) of overstruck silver staters dating to
the period c.350–325 has been attributed to Kytain (Hill
(1927) 46 pl. VI.4, with Stefanakis (1998)). Types: obv.
wreathed male head facing r.; rev. tripod; legend: KY (Hill
(1927) 46 pl. VI.4). The coins, which may begin as early as
c.350, suggest that Kytain was a polis in the late Classical peri-
od and so recommend her inclusion in the Inventory as a
probable polis (type B). They share the obverse and reverse
types of Axos. Stefanakis interprets this as evidence of an
alliance between the two poleis (ibid.). Almyrida provides the
most convenient coastal access for Axos. If Kytain was indeed
located at Almyrida, it seems likely that not long after the
minting of these coins Axos absorbed this small polis (ibid.).
evidence of habitation dates to the early Geometric period. Apart from stretches of the pseudo-isodomic Hellenistic fortification walls, very little of the ancient settlement is visible today (Sanders (1982) 163 (14/1)). The agora may have been located at “Lephou”, where three marble statues of the Roman period were found (ArchDelt 15 (1933–35) 66–70).

Lappa struck coins (staters, drachms, obols) on the Aiginetan standard during the period c. 330–280/270. Types (stater): obv. head of a nymph or goddess (Guarducci (1939) 194, Artemis?); legend: ΛΑΠΠΑΙΟΝ written retrograde; rev. Apollo kitharodos, seated; legend: ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝ (Brett (1974) no. 1282, with Le Rider (1966) 190, 198). Types (drachm and obol): obv. same as stater, or frontal bull’s head with one horn curling down; rev. frontal bull’s head with one horn curling down, or Λ (Svoronos (1890) pl. XIX.28–30, 33; SNG Cop. Aeg. Isl. 479). Early travellers to Crete noted the existence of silver mines (and gold and lead?) in the vicinity of Lappa, from which probably derives the name of the modern village on the site of ancient Lappa, Argyropoli or “Silverado” (Le Rider (1966) 260; cf. Markoe (1998) 238).

971. Lato (Latios) Map 60. Lat. 35.10, long. 25.40. Size of territory: 2. Type: B. The toponym is Λατίω (I.Cret. i.xvi.1 (C3l); Λατίος on the coins is genitive (Svoronos (1890) 220.5, 7). The city-ethnic Λατίος (Milet. 1.3 140.38 (c.259–250)) suggests an alternative thematic stem for the toponym (Bile (1988) 202 n. 185). A second community of Latioi, called Λατιοί ο’ι πρός/ἐπί Καμάρα, was established on the coast in the vicinity of Ag. Nikolaos by C3l (I.Cret. i.xvi.15 (C3l), 19 (C2e)). The precise political nature of this community and its relationship to “upper” Lato, 5 km to the south-west, remain uncertain (Perlman (1995b) 133–35; Chaniotis (1996) 104–8, 428–29: sympolitía). I.Cret. i.xvi.15 and i.xvi.2 seem to preserve identical asyla decrees for Teos save that the former has as its heading Λατιῶν τῶν πρὸς Καμάρα while the latter has Λατίων. I.Cret. i.xvi.19 is too fragmentary to draw any conclusions about its contents. All other inscriptions pertaining to Lato refer only to ο’ι Λατίοι without drawing any distinction between two different groups of Latios. Stephanos provides an entry for Καμάρα but not for Λατίω (Steph. Byz. 351.1–2). Xenion, Stephanos’ source, identifies Καμάρα as a Cretan polis which was also called Lato, ητίς Λατώ ἐλεγέτα (Xenion (ForHist 460) fr. 7).

The earliest reference to Lato as a polis in the political sense occurs in the first line of the agreement of Miletos πρὸς τάς πόλεις τάς ἐγ’ Κρήτης (Milet. 1.3 140.1, 38 (259–250)). The prytnesion has been dated to C4s (infra), as have several other public buildings at Lato. This suggests that Lato should be numbered among the Classical, if not the Archaic, poleis (type B) of Crete despite the fact that the evidence for the political status of the community dates no earlier than C3.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in the treaty between Lato and Hierapytina (I.Cret. i.xvi.16 (C3l)) and externally in Milet. 1.3 140.38 (c.259–250). It is worth noting that the individual use of the city-ethnic is not attested for Lato, with the possible exception of an entry of Stephanos, who adduces Νέαρχος Ἀηταῖος, Alexander’s commander, as an example of the ethnic of Makedonian Ἀρητή (Steph. Byz. 413.21). Nearcho was a Cretan (Arr. Ind. 10, 18.4), perhaps from Lato if we may so interpret the passage from Stephanos.

Although the phylai appear only in Hellenistic sources, they are likely to be early and so are mentioned here. Four tribal names are attested (all in inscriptions of C2s): (i) Αλεξείος (BCH 62 (1938) 405–8 no. 4; I.Cret. i.xvi.29, 30); (ii) Ευχανορείος (I.Cret. i.xvi.25, 31, 34); (iii) Συνανείος (BCH 62 (1938) 390 no. 1); (iv) Υλλείος (I.Cret. i.xvi.26, 32; SEG 32 895).

Several treaties (all C2l) describe the Hellenistic borders (a circuit of c.66 km) of Lato and her neighbours (I.Cret. i.xvi.18; REA 44 (1942) 35–36C.49–56; SEG 26 1049.52–82; I.Cret. i.xvi.5,51–72; for discussion, see Faure (1972); van Effenterre and Bougrat (1969); for the context, see Chaniotis (1996) 318–32). The borders are twice described as “old” (SEG 26 1049.60–62: [κα]θ’ήκα τινα καὶ π[α]λαί επιγεγραμμέναι; REA 44 (1942) 35–36C.51–52: ἀποτελεί το[ι]ς αυτο[ίς] τινα ἀρχαίοι ἀρχαίοι). One of the landmarks on the border between Lato and Olous was τὸ ἅρχαίον Ἀφροδίσιον (I.Cret. i.xvi.18, 7–8; SEG 26 1049.63–64; I.Cret. i.xvi.5,70), identified with the early sanctuary (Protogeometric?, Geometric?) at Sta Lenika (Bousquet (1938); Mazarakis Ainian (1997) 215–16).

The polis town of Lato was built on a double acropolis (300–400 m). Residential areas were located on the terraced slopes of both hills. The public buildings were located in the saddle between the two. This area has come to be called the agora, although the term is not attested epigraphically at Lato. In the centre of the agora at the lowest point of the saddle there is a cistern and a small shrine. A Doric stoa delimits the agora to the west, and a rectangular exedra marks the boundary to the south. A broad flight of steps to the north leads up to the prytnesion complex (Ducrey and Picard (1972)). The steps accommodate c.180 standing or c.80
seated persons and may have been used as, e.g., a dikasterion (Hansen and Fischer-Hansen (1994) 63). To the south-east of the central area and at a higher elevation there is a theatre or theatrical area (Ducrey and Picard (1971)) accommodating c.350 persons and sometimes interpreted as an ekklesiasterion (cf. Hansen and Fischer-Hansen (1994) 65). The main temple of the polis town is located on a terrace above the theatrical area (Ducrey and Picard (1970)). The identity of the deity worshipped there is not known. The protecting deity of Lato seems to have been Eleuthya, in whose sanctuary public documents were displayed (e.g. I.Cret. i.xvi.2, 15 (C3l)). The location of her sanctuary is not known. The polis town was defended by the terrain, by defence walls and by “fortress-houses” (J. Demargne (1901); Hadjimichali (1971); Ducrey and Picard (1996)). Water was supplied by public and private cisterns (Hadjimichali (1971)). The principal entrance to the polis town was from the south-west, where a road passes through the main gate and then branches to the west and to the east. The eastern branch leads to the agora and then continues along the edge of the saddle to the north-east (Tiré and van Effenterre (1978))). The buildings described above appear to date to C4s–C3e. Evidence for earlier occupation includes the east terrace of the agora (C7), Archaic figurines from beneath the shrine in the agora, and a potter’s workshop (c.650–625) located beneath the terrace of the main temple (Ducrey and Picard (1969)). Also Archaic is the extra-urban sanctuary (C8m–C3) on Mt. Thilakas, located 1.5 km south-east of the polis town (Reinach (1913)). For general descriptions, see Tiré and van Effenterre (1978) 98–105; Ducrey and Picard (1976); Picard (1992); for a plan of the remains, see J. Demargne (1901) pl. XX. The settlement of Λάσιος πρώτος/κέποι Καμάρας at Ag. Nikolaos remains largely unknown archaeologically save for its cemeteries (Davaras (1978))).


973. Lisios (Lisios) Map 60. Lat. 35.15, long. 23.50. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Λισίος (I.Cret. i.xvii.1 (C3f); BCH 45 (1921) iv.8 (c.230–210)). The city-ethnic is Λισίατος (I.Cret. iv 63 (C6l/C5e)), later Λισιαταῖος (I.Cret. ii.xvii.7 (C2)).

No ancient source identifies Lebena as a polis. According to Strabo 10.4.11, Lebena was the emporion of Gortyn, and we should perhaps understand Lebena as the limen held by the Gortynian νεώτερος during the stasis which erupted in Gortyn at the time of the Lyktian War (Polyb. 4.55.6 (r221–219)). However, an Archaic inscription seems to preserve an agreement, perhaps a commercial agreement, between οἱ Γορτύνοι and οἱ Αλεββαίοι (I.Cret. iv 63 (C6l/C5e)). Not only is the collective use of the ethnic good evidence for polis status on Crete (Perlman (1996) 246–52), but there is no indication from what survives of the text that οἱ Αλεββαίοι was politically or legally inferior to οἱ Γορτύνοι. On the basis of this text, it seems possible that Lebena was a polis (type C) in the political sense in the late Archaic period.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in a lex sacra (I.Cret. i.xvii.7 (C2)) and externally in the agreement between Gortyn and Lebena (I.Cret. iv 63 (C6l/C5e)). Lebena is the only Cretan community where the individual use of the city-ethnic occurs internally, in three cure inscriptions from the sanctuary of Asklepios (I.Cret. i.xvii.8, 9, 15 (C2–C1)). For the individual use of the city-ethnic externally, there is the Hellenistic graffiti of the Cretan mercenary Σωτάδας Αλεββαίος, who scratched his name on a noble’s tomb in the Thebaid (Syringes 816 (=Baillot (1920–26))).

Lebena is best known for her Asklepieion, the excavated remains of which are principally late Hellenistic and Roman (Bultrighini (1993) 81–99; Kritzas (1992–93)).

Apart from the theoreodokos appointed by Lebena c.230–210 to entertain the Delphic theoroi (BCH 45 (1921) iv.8; Riggsby (1986) 353 n. 13), there is no evidence that after c.C5m Lebena had her own officials or the authority to pass public enactments. When and under what circumstances this came about and the nature of her political status and relationship with Gortyn thereafter remain uncertain. The personal use of the city-ethnic is a good indication of polis status on Crete (Perlman (1996) 250–52), and Lebena should perhaps be regarded as one of the dependent poleis of Gortyn during the late Classical and Hellenistic periods (ibid. 269–70).

Ps.-Skylax 47 provides the earliest reference to Lisos as a polis, in this case in the urban sense. The earliest secure references to Lisos as a polis in the political sense occur in enactment formulas of the Hellenistic period (SEG 45 1314).

The collective use of the city-ethnic occurs internally on the C45–C5f coins (infra) and in the enactment formulas of Hellenistic inscriptions (SEG 45 1314). For a possible example of the collective use externally (\([\text{I.\text{Cret.i}v.179.8 (c.183)}\), see I.Cret. iv 387 (C2)).

Lisos formed an alliance with Hyrtakina (coins, infra) and was a member of the C4l–C3f federation of όρεων (van Effenterre 1948a:119–27; Chaniotis 1996:106–8, 421–22; cf. Sekunda 2000:337–38: league founded C3f). Lisos may have been at one time the federation’s capital (Guarducci 1939:211) or its religious centre (Bultrighini 1993:107–13).

The remains of the politis town of Lisos occupy the floor and slopes of a small valley on Ag. Kyrrkos Bay. The earliest remains appear to date to C5l or C4f. Rock cuttings on the slopes to the east of the valley floor indicate the presence there of a residential quarter (personal observation). Terraces on these same slopes may be ancient. The Roman cemetery with its barrel-vaulted tombs was located on the western slopes above the valley floor (Sanders 1982:42). The location of the earlier cemetery is unknown. The valley floor was most likely the location of the harbour. Tectonic uplift, probably in AD 438 (Thommeret et al. 1981), raised this part of the Cretan coast. A sea wall protected the shore from marine erosion (observation of E. Hadjidaki). The protecting deity of Lisos was probably Diktytna (coins, C45–C5f, infra; I.Cret. xi.vii.1 (C3f)). Her sanctuary is attested epigraphically, but has not been located (I.Cret. xi.vii.1 (C3f)). A sanctuary in honour of Asklepios and Hygieia (peribolos wall, Doric limestone temple and auxiliary buildings) was located near a spring below the cliffs to the north of the valley floor. The sanctuary was excavated during the period 1957–60 and appears to date primarily to the Hellenistic and Roman periods. For a brief overview with references to the interim excavation reports, see Platon (1992); for the cult, see Bultrighini (1993:102–13). A small theatre (internal diameter of the cavea approximately 15 m) was located in the valley to the south-west of the sanctuary of Asklepios and Hygieia (Sanders 1982:171–72 (19/18)). The visible remains are Roman. Traces of an ancient road (communicating with Hyrtakina?) are visible on the western slopes above the valley floor (Niniou-Kindeli 1990).


974. Lyktos (Lyktos) Map 60. Lat. 35.15, long. 25.20. Size of territory: 4. Type: [A]. The toponym is Λύκτος (Hom. II. 2.647, 17.611; Hes. Th. 477). The city-ethnic is Λύκτος (I.Cret. i.xviii.14 (C6); SEG 35 991 (C6)). The earliest coins have ΛΥΤΙΩΝ (C5s, infra). Later issues have at first ΛΥΤΙΩΝ and later the assimilated form ΛΥΤΙΩΝ (infra). Assimilated forms of both the toponym Λύττος and the city-ethnic Λύττος begin to appear in the inscriptions from Crete in C3m (e.g. I.Cret. n.ni.xxi.11–12; I.Cret. i.xviii.8) and outside Crete already in C5s (I.Lindos 13; cf. Bile 1988:156 n. 345); but the unassimilated forms continue in use (e.g. Arist. Pol. 1271b28).

Polybios claimed that Lyktos was the oldest of the Cretan poleis (Polyb. 4.54.6), but the earliest unquestionable attestations of Lyktos as a polis occur in the enactment formula of the alliance of Lyktos with Antiochos II (I.Cret. i.xvi.8.5 (C3m)) and in the agreement of Miletos πρὸς τὰς πόλεις τός ἐν Κρήτῃ including Lyktos (Milet. 1.3 140.1 (c.259–250)). The use in both is political. For polis in the urban sense, see Ps.-Skylax 47, where Lyktos is listed under the heading πόλεις πολλαὶ ἐν Κρήτῃ. Diodoros calls Lyktos a polis in the urban sense in his account of the destruction of Lyktos in C4m (Diod. 16.62.3). There is no question that Lyktos was an Archaic and Classical polis, but without an early attestation of the term in reference to the community, Lyktos is included in the Inventory as a probable polis (type B).

The collective use of the city-ethnic occurs internally in three Archaic laws, once in an uncertain context in the singular (I.Cret.i.xviii.3–4 (C6l)) and twice in enactment formulas (SEG 35 999.A.1 and B.1 (C6l/C5s)). It occurs externally in the treaty between Lyktos and Lindos (I.Lindos 13.1–2 (C5s)). For the individual use there are, e.g., the proxesos of Gortyn, Δαμάκαρης Φαλακρία Λύττος (I.Cret. i.n 206 (C3/C2)) and the mercenary Ανδροκόκος Χαριονίδος Κρής Λύττος who died at Pagasai (IG II 2 365 (C3)).

In Greek epic, Lyktos was the home of Koíranos, the charioteer of Meriones (Hom. II. 17.611). Later tradition, first
attested in Ephorus and Aristotle, maintained that the Spartans had colonised Lyktos (Ephor. fr. 147–49; Arist. Pol. 1271b28–30; Malkin (1994) 73–85). Plutarch preserved a story which synchronised the colonisation of Lyktos with that of Melos in C8, and identified the Spartan oecist of Lyktos as Pollis (Plut. Mor. 247E). Archers from Lyktos fought with the Spartans in the Second Messenian War (Paus. 4.19.4 (rC7)). According to Spartan tradition, Kyourgos modelled his reforms on the laws of Minos, which were still used by the descendants of the pre-Spartan inhabitants of the region (Arist. Pol. 1271b28–30; cf. Ephor. fr. 147–49; Perlm (1992)). Several Archaic public inscriptions of Lyktos (all laws) survive (I.Cret. i.xviii.1–6; SEG 35 991A, B (C6m–C5e)). According to Strabo, Lyktos and Gortyn for a time superseded Knosos as the foremost cities of Crete (Strabo 10.4.7). Both the late Archaic period (Viviers (1994) 252–59; Coldstream and Huxley (1999) 301–4) and C4e (Erickson (2000) 331–65) have been proposed as periods of Lyktian expansion. In C3 Lyktos and Lindos concluded a treaty, perhaps ending a period of hostilities (I.Lindos 13 (C5e)). Knosos twice conquered Lyktos: in C4m the Lyktians were expelled with the aid of the Phokian general Phalaikos (Diod. 16.66.2–3 (rC4m)); and the city was destroyed during the Lyktian War (Polyb. 4.53–54 (r221–219)). Lyktos was resettled both times, in the first instance with the help of King Archidamos of Sparta (Diod. 16.62.4).

Two of the Archaic laws of Lyktos preserve the enactment formula Εἰγαδε Λυκτίωνι (SEG 35 991A.1 and B.1 (C6l/C5e)). SEG 35 991A concerns the exclusion of ἀλοπολιάται, non-citizens, foreigners, or expatriates (van Effenterre and van Effenterre (1985) 179–88), and assesses fines against those who harbour them. The same term may be restored in another of the Archaic laws (ι[α]λο[πο]λιάταν in I.Cret. i.xviii.2 (C6l)); on the other hand, this text may preserve the term for citizen, πολιάτας. The only social status term that occurs in the early inscriptions from Lyktos is Φωλάς (I.Cret. i.xviii.5 (C6l)). The occurrence of the terms μαντιρ[---] (“witness”) and [---]δ[μο]μασα (“co-swearer”) in the lines immediately preceding Φωλάς indicate that the context of the reference is a law concerning judicial procedure. The kosmate is referred to in two laws (I.Cret. i.xviii.2 (C6l); SEG 35 991A4–5 (C6l/C5e)); in neither case is the context certain. The term πόλιν καὶ παλαι ἕπιγέγραπται (SEG 26 1049,60–62 (C3/C2)). *Chersonasos and Lyktos are known to have joined in a sympoliteia some time after c.183 (Chaniotis (1996) 104–8, 430–32). Henceforth the official name of *Chersonasos was “Lyktos by the sea”, to distinguish it from the upper (άνω) polis (e.g. I.Cret. i.xix.3A (c.183)). A reference to “those up above” (α'[ζο]ι ανόθεν) in an Archaic law from Lyktos (I.Cret. i.xviii.1 (c.550–525)) has been understood to distinguish the upper city (Lyktos) from the coastal city (*Chersonasos) and so to indicate that the sympoliteia (or some other form of political arrangement) was much earlier (Viviers (1994) 252–54).

Lyktos is largely unknown archaeologically. The polis town occupied the summit of a ridge overlooking the upland plain of Pediadoa (cf. van Effenterre and Gondicas (1999): the Archaic and Classical polis did not have an urban centre but was settled κωμηδίου). The ridge has three peaks,
the tallest of which should perhaps be regarded as the acropolis. The earliest evidence for occupation seems to date to the late Geometric or early Archaic period. Buildings of the Archaic (C7–C6e: CretChron 11 (1957) 336) and Classical (C5s: CretChron 23 (1971) 496–97) periods have been excavated, although later phases (Hellenistic and Roman) of Lyktos are better attested archaeologically. A substantial building, perhaps a temple, once occupied the summit of the acropolis. The protecting deity of Lyktos was probably Athene Polias (I.Cret. iii.iii.3B (C3l/C2e); SEG 33 618 (C2l)). The earlier of these two texts was to be displayed in the sanctuary of Athena ξύ μ. πολίς, perhaps a reference to the temple on the acropolis. A choros [(---|oi] ὁροι, dat. sing. or nom. pl.? is attested epigraphically (I.Cret. 1.xviii.4 (C6l); Bile (1988) 344 n. 84; agora; Kritzas (1992–93) 282–89; dance floor). The theatre (date?), which was described and drawn by Onorio Belli in 1586, was probably located at the foot of the acropolis (Falkener (1854) 17–19; Branigan (1979c)). An Archaic cemetery has been partly excavated at “these Alonas” near the village of Xida (ArchDelt 41 (1986) Chron. 407). The extent of the polis town is estimated to have been c.100 ha (Rhethemiotaki (1984)).


975. Malla (Mallaios) Map 60. Lat. 35.05, long. 25.35. Size of territory: 2. Type: C. The toponym is Μάλλα (I.Cret. 1.xix.1 (C3m)). The city-ethnic is Μαλλαίος (I.Cret. 1.xix.1 (C3m)); IG xii suppl. 304 (C3m)). It is worth noting that none of the ancient geographers or lexicographers mentions Malla.

The earliest attestation of Malla as a polis in the political sense occurs in the agreement between Malla and Lyktos, which provides that fines are to be paid to the polis, which provides that fines are to be paid to the polis (I.Cret. 1.xix.1 (C3m)). There is no doubt that Malla was a polis in the political sense during the Hellenistic period. Moreover, although the polis town of Malla has not been identified with certainty, it seems likely that it was located in the vicinity of modern Malles on the eastern slopes of Mt. Dikte, either “under the now deserted lower village... around the church of Ay. Georgios” (Sanders (1982) 138 (2/2)) or between the villages of Malles and Christos, close to the spring of Ag. Paraskevi, with its rocky acropolis “Skistra” (Nowicki (2000) 134–35 no. 55; surface remains include Archaic and Classical (and earlier) material). Malla was thus an inland and upland settlement, and such settlements were for the most part established well before the end of C5. For these reasons, Malla is included in the Inventory as a possible polis (type C).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in the agreement between Malla and Lyktos (I.Cret. 1.xix.1.6 (C3m)) and externally in the renewal of asylia for Teos (I.Cret. 1.xix.2.1 (C2f)). For the individual use of the city-ethnic there is the honorand of Teos, Πόθεος Ἀθήνικος Μαλλαίος (IG xii suppl. 304 (C3m)).

Although the phylai are attested only in Hellenistic sources, they are likely to be early and so are mentioned here. The tribal name Αἴθαλεῖς is preserved in the dating formula of a public enactment (I.Cret. 1.xix.3A (c.183)). Hellenistic inscriptions refer to the prytaneion (I.Cret. 1.xix.3A38 (c.183)) and the agora (I.Cret. 1.xix.3A 50–51 (c.183)). In so far as both are attested elsewhere on Crete during the Archaic and Classical periods (prytaneion: see Lato, supra; agora: see Gortyn, supra; Phaistos, infra), it is possible that also at Malla they are pre-Hellenistic.

The protecting deity of Malla was perhaps Zeus Monnitios (public enactments displayed in his sanctuary (I.Cret. 1.xix.2 (C2m)); coin types, infra). The location of his temple (I.Cret. 1.xix.1 (C3m)) is not known.

Malla struck a very limited bronze coinage during C3–C2. Types: obv. head of Zeus; rev. eagle or thunderbolt; legend: ΜΑΛΛ (Svoronos (1890) pl. XXII.18–19).

976. Matala (Matalios) Map 60. Lat. 35.00; long. 24.45. Size of territory: 1. Type: C. The toponym was Μάταλα, τά (BCH 45 (1921) 14.14 (c.230–210); Stadiasmus 332). Cf. Μάταλος (Strabo 10.4.11). The city-ethnic was Ματάλιος (Milet. 1.3 140.67 (259–250)).

The only reference to Matala as a polis in the political sense occurs in the agreement of Miletans προς τάς πόλεις τάς ἐγ. Κρήτης (Milet. 1.3 140.1, 67 (c.259–250)). Matala probably served as the harbour of Phaistos during the Hellenistic period (Polyb. 4.55.6 (221–219); Cucuzzia (1997) 85), although the political ramifications, if any, of this are unclear (Perlman (1995b) 132–35, 138).

Matala was clearly a polis in the political sense in the early Hellenistic period when it co-signed the treaty between Phaistos and Miletos (Milet. 1.3 140.1 (c.259–250)) and appointed at least one theorodokos to host theoroi from Delphi (BCH 45 (1921) 14.14 (c.230–210)). The archaeological evidence
indicates that settlement on Kastri was established during the Classical period (infra). Although no public buildings of the Classical period have been identified, the combined evidence of her Classical foundation and early Hellenistic political status warrants her inclusion in the Inventory as a possible polis (type C).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in Milet. 1.3.140.67 (c.259–250). For the individual use there is the grave stele from Harda, Egypt, of Ἀρτέμις Ματάλιος (SB 5860 + ZPE 14 (1974) 182 (C3)).

The polis town of ancient Matala was located on a small bay of the Gulf of Matala where the modern village of Matala is situated. The earliest evidence for occupation in the vicinity of the polis town, as well as in its hinterland, is Classical, although it is not until C3 that the ceramic evidence is plentiful (Simpson et al. (1995) 397–99). No public buildings of the Classical (or even Hellenistic) period have yet been identified in the polis town, which is estimated to have covered an area of at least 1 ha. A high limestone promontory (Kastri) to the south of the modern village served as the acropolis. It was fortified during the early Byzantine period. Ashlar blocks visible beneath the rubble and concrete construction of the Byzantine wall may belong to an earlier phase (ibid. 329, 335). Rock-cut cisterns (at least thirteen) and traces of walls on the acropolis may attest the presence of houses (ibid. 335–37). The discovery of a kiln (possibly one of several) on the acropolis, which produced good-quality trade amphorae, indicates commercial activity there as well (ibid. 336). A ship shed (38 m × 5.85 m), fish tanks and houses were carved into the cliffs on the south side of Matala Bay (Blackman (1973)). Sea-level changes indicate a terminus ante quem of C1 for the ship shed (Gifford (1995) 75–79). A large structure (21.40 m × 13.80 m) located c. 3 km south-east of Matala at Orthes Petres may be a heroon of C4–C2 (Simpson et al. (1995) 342–43).

977. Milatos (Milatios) Map 59. Lat. 35.20; long. 25.35. Size of territory: 2. Type: C. The toponym is not attested epigraphically and not at all in Doric. In literary sources it is Μίλητος (Hom. II. 2.647; Ephor. fr. 127). The city-ethnic was Μιλάτιος (BCH 70 (1946) 588–90 no. 1 (C61); I.Cret. 1.i.x.1.144–52 (C61); cf. Chaniotis (1996) 200: c.220).

The earliest reference to Milatos as a polis in the political sense occurs in the first line of the agreement of Ionian Milletes πρὸς τὰς πόλεις τὰς ἐν Κρήτηι (Milet. 1.3.140.1.36 (c.259–250)). Strabo 10.4.14 described Milatos as a polis found in Homer (II. 2.647) which no longer existed because Lykto destroyed the polis (κατασκάψαντες τὴν πόλιν) and occupied its chora (τὴν χώραν ἐνείμαντο) (Strabo 10.4.14). Here the use is probably urban.

Milatos is included in the Inventory as a possible polis (type C) principally on the strength of a (possibly) Archaic text embedded in the Hellenistic Drerian “oath of the 180 panazostoi agelai” that describes οἱ Μιλάτιοι as having waged war against Deros (I.Cret. 1.i.x.1.137–64 (C61) = Nomima 1148; cf. Chaniotis (1996) 200). For an earlier attestation of the collective use of the city-ethnic, also external, see BCH 70 (1946) 588–90 no. 1 (C61). Both the context (border war) and the collective use of the city-ethnic suggest that Milatos was a polis (but cf. Perlman (1996) 252–58).

The polis town of Milatos was located on the peak and the steeply terraced west slopes of Kastellos, directly on the north coast 1.5 km north-east of the modern village of Milatos (Nowicki (2000) 170–71). According to a legend first attested in Ephor. fr. 127, colonists from Milatos founded Mileto in Asia Minor. During the Archaic period Milatos most likely shared a border with Dreros, with whom she perhaps contended for the possession of some territory (I.Cret. 1.i.x.1.137–64 = Nomima 1 48 (C61); cf. Chaniotis (1996) 200 (c.220)).

978. Olous (Olontios) Map 60. Lat. 35.15; long. 25.45. Size of territory: 3. Type: B. The toponym is ‘Ολοῦς (Ps.-Skylax 47; I.Cret. 1.i.xvi.3.3 (C2)). The city-ethnic is ‘Ολοντιός (coins, C45–C51, infra; I.Cret. 1.xxii.4A.21–22 (C3m)). Forms with an initial Β- (for Ψ-) are common (e.g. I.Cret. 1.xviii.9.6 (C21)); for the retention of Ψ- before a short -ο- on Crete, see Bile (1988) 115–16.

Ps.-Skylax 47 identifies Olous as a λιμήν. Two inscriptions of C3m provide the earliest references to Olous as a polis in the political sense (Milet. 1.3.140.1.38 (c.259–250); I.Cret. 1.xxii.4A ii, vii). The earliest attestation of the term in the urban sense occurs in SEG 23.547 (C3l/C2e). There is no doubt that Olous was a polis in the political sense by the early Hellenistic period. The archaeological evidence indicates that settlement on the isthmus of Poros was established perhaps as early as the Archaic period (infra). Although no public buildings of the Classical period have been identified, the combined evidence of her Archaic foundation, the possibility that her mint began to strike coins as early as c.330 and her status as a polis at the beginning of the Hellenistic period warrants her inclusion in the Inventory as a probable polis (type B).

The collective use of the city-ethnic occurs internally on the coins (infra) and in proxeny decrees (e.g. I.Cret.
The earliest attestation of the collective use of the city-ethnic externally occurs in *Milet. 1.3 140.38* (c.250–250). For the individual use of the city-ethnic there is the graffito of Δεῖνις Τιµαγένους (‘O)λόντιος from the Memnonion at Abydos (*Memnonion* 125, 298 (C3))

...
80. Phaistos (Phaistios) Map. 60. Lat. 35.05, long. 24.50. 
Size of territory: 2. Type: [A]. The toponym is Φαίστιος (Hom. II. 2.648; Ps.-Skylax 47; Milet. 1.3 140 (c.259–250)), in Linear B, pa-i-t0 (McArthur (1993) 21–23). The city-ethnic is Φαίστιος (coins, from C3m, infra, the ketikon ΠΑΙΣΤΙΚΩΝ, written retrograde in epichoric script, occurs on staters of C4s (Le Rider (1966) 195 pl. XXI.7–10).

For polis in the urban sense, see Ps.-Skylax 47, where Phaistos is listed under the heading πόλεις πολεσί έν Κρήτη. The earliest reference to Phaistos as a polis in the political sense occurs in the agreement of Miletos προς τάς πόλεις ἐγ γάρ Κρήτης (Milet. 1.3 140.51 (c.259–250)). An Archaic law concerning the renunciation of an adoption (SEG 32 908 (C6)) and the mint, which commences C3i (infra), provide the best evidence that Phaistos was a polis in the political sense already in the Archaic and Classical periods.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on the coins (infra) and externally in the agreement of Miletos προς τάς πόλεις τάς ἐγ γάρ Κρήτης (Milet. 1.3 140.51 (c.259–250)). For the individual use there are the two benefactors of Kydonia, Θαμακλής Φαίστιος and Φαίνουκλης Φαίστιος (I.Cret. 1.11.1 (C3)).

Phaistos shared a border with Gortyn to the east. The Asterousia mountains formed the frontier between Phaistos and the coastal community of Lassoia, probably a polis during the Hellenistic period (see Introduction), to the south. To the west, Kommos (perhaps ancient Amyklaion, see Introduction; s.v. Gortyn (no. 960)) may have served as a harbour for Phaistos, as did Mataia (no. 976), at least during the Hellenistic period (Cucuzza (1997) 85). To the north lay Mt. Ida.

The earliest coinage of Phaistos and Gortyn indicates that the two poleis had arranged a sympoliteia by C3m (infra), as do Hellenistic references to Phaistos as the κάτω πόλις and Gortyn as the ἄνω πόλις (I.Cret. iv 165; SEG 23 563 (both C3s); Chaniotis (1996) 104–8, 422–28). I.Cret. iv 165, a law enacted by Phaistos and Gortyn (τάδ ἐαυτοὺς πόλεις), refers to Phaistos both by name and by the phrase κάτω πόλεις. SEG 23 563, an alliance with Axios, refers to the two communities as οἱ Γορτύνων ἄνω πόλιν καὶ κάτω (Phaistos is not referred to by name in what survives of the text). Gortyn destroyed Phaistos and incorporated her territory c.150 (Strabo 10.4.14; Cucuzza (1997) 87–90).

Apart from the Archaic law which requires that the renunciation of an adoption take place ἐν ἀγορῇ [καὶ... (SEG 32 908 (C6))), the remaining evidence for the political institutions of the polis is Hellenistic.

During C8–C7 a substantial settlement occupied the same ridge with its three low hills (from west to east: Christos Efendis, Middle Hill and Palace Hill) as the Minoan palace and town (Cucuzza (1998); La Rosa (1992); Levi (1964), (1967–68); Palermo (1992)). Remains of the Archaic and Classical periods are scanty (for the Archaic period, see La Rosa (1996)). It may be that early in C6 the settlement moved down from the hills on to the plain where no excavations have taken place. If so, Middle Hill, the highest of the three hills (altitude 110 m) and fortified during the Subminoan/Protoplegant–Geometric periods, probably served as the acropolis of the polis town. The only public building securely identified as Archaic is the C7–C6 temple located near a Geometric residential district west of the Palace (La Rosa (1996) 68–82). The temple, traditionally assigned to Rhea or the”Magna Mater”, may have belonged to Leto (Cucuzza (1993)). The identification of a second C7–C6 building, located at Phalanda, 300 m to the west of the Minoan palace, as a temple remains uncertain (Levi (1961–62) 462–67; cf. Mazarakis Ainian (1997) 229–30). The phrase ἐν ἀγορῇ [καὶ... occurs in an Archaic law inscribed on a building block (SEG 32 908 (C6))). If it refers to the meeting place, and not to the meeting, the location of its discovery in the plain 80 m west of Chalara may indicate where the public centre of the Archaic polis lay. For other Archaic remains from Phaistos (architectural fragments in poros, walls and deposits), see La Rosa (1996). A Hellenistic inscription mentions τὸ δικαστήριον τὸ πολιτικὸν (the adjective suggesting more than one court at Phaistos?) and the pryteineion (Milet. 1.3 140.61–62, 66 (c.259–250); for the pryteineion, see Viviers (1994) 244). In so far as both terms are attested elsewhere on Crete during the Archaic and Classical periods (dikasterion: see Biannos? (no. 952) and Gortyn (no. 960), supra; pryteineion: see Lato, supra) it is possible that also at Phaistos they were pre-Hellenistic.

Phaistos struck coins on the Aiginetan standard from c.470 (Price (1981)). Types on the earliest staters (C5f–C4m) attest a sympoliteia or alliance with Gortyn (Le Rider (1966) 161). Types: obv. Europa riding a bull, facing L; rev. lion’s scalp (Le Rider (1966) pl. XX.19–24). The beginning of local coinage at Phaistos (stater with same types as above) is indicated by the legend (rev.) ΠΑΙΣΤΙΟΝΤΟΠΑΙΜΑ (Φαίστιων τὸ παῖµα) written retrograde in the epichoric alphabet (Svoronos (1890) pl. XXII.34; Wroth and Poole (1961) pl. XIV.14). Ararer early stater has obv. Europa riding a bull; rev. head of Hermes (Le Rider (1966) pl. XX.23). In the next phase (c.360–340/30) Phaistos adopts new types for its staters (no legend): (i) obv. seated Europa with bull; rev.
seated Hermes; (ii) obv. head of Europa; rev. bull protome (drachms also, Svoronos (1890) pl. XXIII.1); (iii) obv. winged Talos; rev. head of Europa; (iv) obv. winged Talos; rev. bull protome (Le Rider (1966) pls. XX.25–29, XXI.1–6). Staters of the following period (340/330–322) have obv. Herakles standing, holding his bow and club; rev. bull or a frontal bull’s head; legend: ΠΑΙΣΤΙΚΟΝ written retrograde in the epichoric alphabet on some (Le Rider (1966) pls. XXI.7–25, XXII.1–19; SNG Cap. Aeg. Isl. 510–12). At the end of C4 (c.322–300) new types for the stater appear: (i) obv. Zeus Welchanos seated, with the legend ἘΛΧΑΝΟΣ, or Herakles (seated, or with a serpent, or attacking the hydra); rev. bull; legend (obv. or rev.): ΦΑΙΣΤΙ, ΦΑΙΣΙΣΤΩΝ or ΦΑΙΣΙΣΤΙΩΝ (Le Rider (1966) pls. XXII.20–31, XXIII.1–22; SNG Cap. Aeg. Isl. 515–18). Fractions (drachm, hemidrachm) of this period have obv. head of Herakles; rev. frontal bull’s head (Le Rider (1966) pl. XXIV.5–23; SNG Cap. Aeg. Isl. 513–14, 519).

981. Phalasarna (Phalasarnios) Map 60. Lat. 35.30; long. 23.35. Size of territory: 3. Type: A. The toponym is Φαλάσαρνα, ἦ (Ps.-Skylax 47: BCH 45 (1921) i.11.102 (c.230–210)). The city-ethnic is Φαλασάρνιος (I.Cret. ii.11.1 (C3e)).

Ps.-Skylax 47 provides the earliest reference to Phalasarna as a polis, in this case in the urban sense. The earliest reference to Phalasarna as a polis in the political sense occurs in the agreement of Miletos πρὸς τὰς πόλεις τὰς ἐγι στοὺς Κρήτεις (Milet. i.3 140.3, 39 (c.259–250)). The Stadiasmus describes Phalasarna as a πόλις παλαιά (336).

Phalasarna was clearly a polis in the early Hellenistic period. Ps.-Skylax’s attestation of polis status in the urban sense is confirmed by the Archaic and Classical remains of the town (especially the temples and fortifications, infra), and that Phalasarna was a polis in the political sense as well can be inferred from her mint, which may have commenced as early as c.330 (infra).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in a dedication of ἦ πόλις Φαλασάρνιον (I.Cret. ii.11.xi.2 (C3s)), and externally in an enactment formula of the alliance between Phalasarna and Polyrhen (I.Cret. ii.11.xi.1 (C3e); Markoulaki (2000)). For the individual use of the city-ethnic there is the prokexos of Epidauros and theodorokos of Apollo and Asklepios Ανδροκλῆς Ἐπιγένειος Φαλασάρνιος (IG iv² 196.12–13 and SB 1368 (C3m)).

The territory of Phalasarna, Δ' γά Φαλασάρνια (Markoulaki (2000) l. 21 (C3e)), included the Grambousa peninsula and the coastal plain known today as Livadhia. The polis shared a border with Polyrhen, with whom she fought in C4l or C3e. Copies of the C3e treaty of peace and alliance that concluded these hostilities were found at the sanctuary of Dikynna on the Rhodopou peninsula (I.Cret. ii.xi.1) and at a sanctuary at Τόλφος near Kaliviani (Markoulaki (2000)); the latter was perhaps located on the frontier between Phalasarna and Polyrhen.

The polis town of Phalasarna was located on Cape Koutri (90 m) and in the plain to its east. The total area occupied by the polis town is estimated to have been c.60 ha (E. Hadjidjaki (1992)). The east and north flanks of the acropolis were fortified, C3–C4 (Gondiccas (1988) 86–92; E. Hadjidjaki (1992), (1996)). Public buildings, including at least two temples, were located on the summit of the acropolis (Gondiccas (1988) 86–92; E. Hadjidjaki (1992), (1996)). One of the two temples probably belonged to the protecting deity of the polis, Artemis Dikynna (Dion. Calliphon., GGM 119–22). Cisterns and house platforms cut into the rock on the slopes of the acropolis indicate the location of residential areas (Gondiccas (1988) 86–92; E. Hadjidjaki (1992)). The fortifications of the closed harbour, λιµὴν κλειστός (Ps.-Skylax 47; Dion. Calliphon., GGM 118–21), located at the foot of the acropolis to the south-east, date to C4s (Frost and Hadjidjaki (1990); E. Hadjidjaki (1992), (1996)). An industrial area of the late Hellenistic period has been identified near the north-west corner of the harbour (E. Hadjidjaki (1996)). The cemetery with pithos burials of C6e–C5m and Hellenistic cist graves has been partially excavated to the south-east of the harbour (Gondiccas (1988) 97–116). Quarries were located along the shore to the south of the cemetery (Gondiccas (1988) 95). Three rock-cut “thrones” (C5–C3e) located near the cemetery and the quarries may be Phoenician (or Punic); if so, they attest the participation of Phalasarna in the east–west trade of Phoenician mariners (Di Vita (1992–93)).


982. Polichnité (Polichnites) Map 60. Lat. 35.30, long. 23.55. Size of territory: 2. Type: C. Stephanos (532.4–5) lists a Cretan Πολιχνίτης, ἦ, but there may have been two Cretan communities with this name (Faure (1993) 67–68), and it cannot be
determined to which community the entry in Stephanos refers. The city-ethnic was Πολυχνίτης (Thuc. 2.85.5; cf. Sekunda (2000) 330–37; the term Polichnitai is not a city-ethnic but rather the name of a league of small communities of west Crete whose population consisted largely of the descendants of the pre-Greek Κοδώνες). The identification of the toponym Polichne with the ancient remains near the modern village of Vryses, Kydonia (Faure (1988) 91; cf. Guarducci (1939) 233: Polichna was located at Meskla) is supported by (i) bronze coins with reverse types similar to those of Kydonia which bear the legend ΠΟ (infra), and (ii) the story related by Thucydides which suggests that Polichne and Kydonia were neighbours (Thuc. 2.85.5).

Polichne is included in the Inventory as a possible polis (type C) chiefly on the evidence of Thucydides (2.85.5–86.1). In 429 the Athenians responded to a request of Nikias, the Gortynian proxenus of Athens, and ravaged the territory of Kydonia. Nikias hoped in this way to win for Gortyn the gratitude of the Polichniti (Figueira (1988) 538–42). The context and the collective use of the city-ethnic suggest that Polichne was a political community, rather than a sub-unit of another polis (cf. Perlman (1996) 252–58). The passage further suggests that the relations between Polichne and Kydonia were at times hostile and that other Cretan poleis, in this case Gortyn, took advantage of this. The reverse type (dog) on the bronze coins of Polichne which resembles the reverse type of a series of bronze fractions from Kydonia suggests that Kydonia and Polichne were allies at the time (Stefanakis (1996)).

The ancient settlement south of the modern village of Vryses, Kydonia, extends across the two peaks of Ag. Giorgios to the west and Kastellos to the east. Excavations on a modest scale and chance finds suggest that the area was continuously occupied since the Middle Minoan period. The ancient road up to the double acropolis followed a ravine from the north. A wall along the saddle between the two peaks protected the community from the south (Faure (1958) 499–501, (1965) 21–22, (1988) 91; Zois (1976); Nowicki (2000) 214–15). An Archaic–Classical sanctuary (of Demeter?, Diktynna?, a nymph?) was located on the southern slope of Kastellos (Mortzos (1985)).

Polichne produced a small issue of bronze fractions (Svoronos (1896) pl. II.7, with Stefanakis (1996) (C2e)). Types: obv. head of a woman (Diktynna?); rev. dog; legend: ΠΟ.

983. Polyrrhen (Polyrhenios) Map 60. Lat. 35.30, long. 23.40. Size of territory: 3. Type: [A]. The toponym is either Πολυρήν or Πολυρήνια. The athematic form (in -νια) is attested epigraphically (BCH 45 (1921) 111.103 (c.230–210); I.Cret. ii.xxii.2 (C3); IG ii 844 (C35)); the thematic form (in -α) occurs in the geographers (e.g. Ps.-Skylax 47). On the athematic toponyms in -νια and their recharacterisation as feminine nouns in -α, see Bile (1988) 167–68. The city-ethnic was Πολυρήνιος (coins, C4ς–C3ς, infra; I.Cret. ii.xi.1 (C3ς)) or Πολυρήνιος (SEG 11 414.8 (C35); I.Cret. ii.xxiii.4 (C2)). As was recognised in Antiquity, the name means “rich in lambs” (Steph. Byz. 532.13–14).

The earliest reference to Polyrrhen as a polis in the political sense occurs in the dedication of a πόλις Πολυρήνιος to King Areus of Sparta (I.Cret. ii.xxiii.12A (C3>). Cf. the agreement of Miletos πός τάς πόλεις τάς ἐν Κρήτη (Milet. i.3 140.1, 67 (c.259–250)). For polis in the urban sense, see Ps.-Skylax 47, where Polyrrhen is listed under the heading πόλεις πολλαὶ ἐν Κρήτῃ. Polyrrhen was certainly a polis in the political sense by the early Hellenistic period. That it was a polis in the late Classical period too is indicated by the mint, which may be as early as c.330 (infra).

The collective use of the city-ethnic occurs internally on the coins (infra) and in the dedication in honour of King Areus of Sparta (I.Cret. ii.xxiii.12A (C3)), and externally in the agreement with Miletos (Milet. i.3 140.67 (c.259–250)). For the individual use there is the proxenos of Oropos Παύλον (Θρ[ας]νυτος Πολυρήνιος (IG vii 307 (C3)).

Little is known about the history of the polis prior to the Hellenistic period. According to Strabo 10.4.13, Polyrrhen was originally settled in villages (κοινωφλήσ δ’ ὤκουν); Achaians and Lakonians subsequently fortified the acropolis at Polyrrhen and synoecised the villages (Gondiccas (1988) 222–24). Malkin, who does not dismiss a priori the tradition of Spartan involvement in the foundation of Polyrrhen, argues for a period of Spartan colonisation in C8 (Malkin (1994) 73–83). Apart from traces of LHIII pottery, the earliest material at Polyrrhen appears to be C6l/C5e (Blackman (1976c); Gondiccas (1988) 208).

Ps.-Skylax recorded that the territory of Polyrrhen extended from the north toward the south, διήκει ἀπὸ βορέων πρὸς νότον (Ps.-Skylax 47). Gondiccas defines the territory of Polyrrhen, ἀ γά δ’ Πολυρήνια (Markoulaiki (2000) l. 20 (C3e)) as follows: west to the Mesogheia mountains, north to the coast and the port at Kissamos (itself a dependency of Polyrrhen, Gondiccas (1988) 169–70), south to the mountains Ky트roules and Kolymbos (with the small communities beyond the Typhlos gorge—Kantanos, Katre, Pelkis—friendly, but politically insignificant and geographically
remote), and east to the Rhodopou peninsula including Pergamon (ibid. 277–85) and the sanctuary of Diktynna on Rhodopou peninsula (ibid. 224–31). Polyrhen shared borders with Kydonia to the east and Phalasarna to the west (Strabo 10.4.13) and fought with the latter in C41 or C3e. Copies of the treaty of peace and alliance that concluded these hostilities were found at the sanctuary of Diktynna (I.Cret. ii.11.1 (C3e)) and at a sanctuary at Τύλιφος, near Kaliviani (Markoulaki (2000)); the latter was perhaps located on the frontier between Polyrhen and Phalasarna.

The polis town of Polyrhen was built on the summit and slopes of a steep hill in the mountain range of Prophitis Elias, with the lower town to the south-west of the acropolis (418 m). The remains of the polis town cover an area of roughly 30 ha, including the cemetery (C4 and later) to the north-west (Niniou-Kindeli (1992)). Both the lower town and the acropolis were fortified. Ancient walls (C41/C3e) are traceable on the north and north-west sides of the acropolis and on the north-west (with two towers) and south-east (with gate) sides of the lower town (Blackman (1976c); Gondicas (1988) 175–77; Markoulaki (1988)). Two rock-cut aqueducts supplied water to the city (Blackman (1976c)). Cisterns on the acropolis and in the lower city may be no earlier than the second Byzantine period (ibid.). Apart from a small extra-mural temple (C3) located at sto Yero Kolymo in the gorge to the east of the polis town (Gondicas (1988) 183–85) and the cemetery, all remaining traces of the community are intramural (ibid. 173–83). Walls of the early Hellenistic period attributed to a monumental temple with an altar or stoa along its north side were excavated within the fortification walls in the centre of the lower town, just north of the Church of the Ninety-nine Fathers (Theophanides (1942–44a); Gondicas (1988) 178–82). Traces of walls and rock cuttings on the south and south-east slopes of the hill and in the village indicate the location of residential areas (Gondicas (1988) 182–83; Markoulaki (1996)).


984. Polyrhoe (Polyrhen) Map 60. Lat. 35.10, long. 26.05. Size of territory: 3. Type: [A]. The toponym is Πρασίος (I.Cret. iii.iv.1 (C3e)). The city-ethnic is Πράσινος (coins, C48–C55, infrar. I.Cret. iii.iv.1 (C3e)). For Πράσιος/Πράσινος, see Guarducci (1942) 135.

In Ps.-Skylax 47, where polis is used in the urban sense, Prairos is one of the toponyms listed under the heading πόλεις πολλαὶ ἐν Κρήτῃ. The earliest explicit uses of the term πόλις for Prairos occur in Hellenistic documents (I.Cret. iii.iv.1 (C3e), vi.7 (C4f)). Although there is no explicit Archaic or Classical reference to Prairos as a polis, her mint, which perhaps began as early as C350, strongly suggests her inclusion in the Inventory as a polis.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on the coins (infra) and in a decree of Prairos for the Stalitai (I.Cret. iii.vi.7 (C45–C5f)). The collective use is attested externally in Herodotos’ account of the expedition of Minos to Sicily (Hdt. 7.170.1).

The Prairoi maintained that they were descendants of the autochthonous Eteocretans (Hdt. 7.170–71; Staphylus (FGHist 269) fr. 12; Whitley (1998)). The tradition is supported by the discovery at Prairos of five Eteocretan inscriptions, the earliest of which (I.Cret. iii.vi.1; cf. 4) may date to C6 (Jeffery (1990) 316 nos. 19a and b (350–525f)). If so, it considerably antedates the earliest identifiable Greek inscription from Prairos (I.Cret. iii.vi.7 (C3e); Guarducci (1942) 137; Duhoux (1982) 63–85). Apart from the role of the Prairoi in the Cretan refusal to join the Greek cause against Xerxes, which is suggested by the narrative of Herodotos (Hdt. 7.170–71), our evidence for the history of the polis is Hellenistic.

The phrase ὁς κα ἡ ἔνφυλους was used to denote a citizen (I.Cret. iii.iv.1 (C3e)). The name of one phyle, Φαρκαρίς, preserved in the dating formula of an honorary decree (I.Cret. iii.vi.8 (C3a)), is a rare feminine adjectival form of unknown derivation (Jones, POAG 231).

The territory of Prairos was called ἡ Πραισία (χώρα) (Theophr. Hist. pl. 3.3.4; I.Cret. iii.iv.1 (C3e)). The statement of Ps.-Skylax 47 that “Prairos reached in both directions” (Πραισίου διῆκει ἄμφοτέρωθι) has been understood to mean to the north and the south coasts (e.g. Whitley (1998)). Such an interpretation is supported by the decree of Prairos for the Stalitai (and Stalitai) which suggests that these two coastal communities (the Stalitai on the south coast and Stalitai on the north coast) were dependencies of Prairos during the Hellenistic period (I.Cret. iii.vi.7 (C3f); Channing (1996) 385–94; Perlman (1996) 55–58).

The polis town of Prairos was built on three acropolises (First Acropolis, Second Acropolis and Third Acropolis or Altar Hill) and covered an area of roughly 24 ha. Settlement began there (on First and Second Acropolises) already in
LM11C and continued through C2s. The main period of occupation was C3l–C2m (Whitley et al. 1995: 428). An early shrine (Geometric–Hellenistic) was located on the summit of Third Acropolis, and a temple (Classical–Hellenistic) on the summit of First Acropolis. Staphyllos records the existence of a temple of Zeus Diktaios at Praisos (Staphyllos EGrHist 269 fr. 12). The question remains open whether this temple should be identified with the one on First Acropolis or with the temple and sanctuary of Zeus Diktaios at Palaikastro on the east coast of Crete (Perlman 1995a). Extra-urban spring sanctuaries were located to the south of the urban centre at Vavelli (Orientalising–Hellenistic) and Mesamvrysi (Geometric–Archaic and possibly later). A third extra-urban sanctuary (Orientalising–Hellenistic) with an associated C6s kiln has been identified on the summit of Prophitis Elias, 2.5 km south-east of the polis town (Whitley et al. 1999: 249–51; cf. Erickson 2000: 318–27). Residential areas are indicated by rock-cut features on the slopes of First and Second Acropolises. A multi-room structure of the Hellenistic period identified as a house or an andreion was located in the saddle between First and Second Acropolises. If this structure was an andreion (for the identification of the structure as a public building, see Bosanquet 1902: 259–70), the organisation of Praisos paralleled that of other Cretan poleis whose public buildings occupied the saddle connecting a double acropolis. The main cemetery (Late Geometric–Hellenistic) was located on the south-eastern slopes of Third Akropolis. For a description of the remains, see Whitley et al. (1995), (1999).

Praisos struck coins (staters, drachms, hemidrachms) on the Aiginetan standard from C4m (Le Rider 1966: 197 (c.350–251)). Staters have types: obv. Gorgoneion, or quadruiped suckling a human infant, or Herakles kneeling; rev. (with Gorgoneion and quadruiped): Herakles kneeling; rev. (with Herakles): eagle; legend: ΠΡΑΙ, ΠΡΑΙΣ or ΠΡΑΙΣΙ. Drachms have: obv. male figure; rev. Herakles kneeling. Hemidrachms have obv. Herakles kneeling; rev. eagle (Svoronos 1890: pl. XXVII.1–10; SNG Cop. Aeg.Isl. 539). Staters of C4l–C3e (Le Rider 1966: 197) have: (i) obv. head of a goddess (Guarducci 1942: 137: Demeter or Persephone?); rev. bull; (ii) obv. Zeus aetophoros; rev. Herakles standing, or goat protome; (iii) obv. head of Apollo; rev. goat protome (Svoronos 1890: pls. XXVII.11–28; XXVIII.1–19; SNG Cop. Aeg.Isl. 540). Drachms, hemidrachms and obols of C4l–C3e have (i) obv. head of a goddess; rev. bull’s head (Svoronos 1890: pl. XXVII.13–20); or (ii) obv. head of Apollo; rev. Herakles standing, or a goat

985. Praisos (Praisieus) Map. 60. Lat. 35.05, long. 25.15. Size of territory: 3. Type: B. The toponym is Πρίανσος, ὤ (I.Cret. iv 174 (C3l/C2e)). The city-ethnic is either Πρίανσιος (coins, C4s–C3f, infra I.Cret. iii.i.4 (C3l/C2e)) or Πρίανσιος (I.Cret. iii.iii.4 (C3l/C2e)). For the extra-Cretan form of the toponym Πραμάφως (Delphi, BCH 45 (1921) iv.6 (c.230–210)) and of the city-ethnic Πράσιασ (Miletos, Milet. 1.3 38 0, q (C3s)), see Bile (1988) 153 n. 328. Another extra-Cretan inscription preserves the city-ethnic Πράνιασ (Pagasaï, Thess. Mnem. no. 83 (C3l/C2f)).

The earliest reference to Praisos as a polis (in the political sense) occurs in the agreement of Miletos ποις τας πόλεις τὰς ἐγ Κρήτηι (infra I.Cret. iv 210 c., l l .), see Faure (1902: 174). The city-ethnic is either Πρίανσιος (coins, C4s–C3f, infra I.Cret. iii.i.4 (C3l/C2e)) or Πρίανσιος (I.Cret. iii.iii.4 (C3l/C2e)). The description of Praisos in the political sense already in the late Classical period.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on the coins (infra) and externally in Hellenistic treaties (I.Cret. iii.i.4 (C3l/C2e); I.Cret. iv 174 (C3l/C2e)). For the individual use of the city-ethnic there are the immigrants from Praisos to Miletos, Ὑθροκλῆς Ἀρίστων Πρίανσος, Ἀϊτίῳ Αἰαῖμῳ Πρίανσιος and Πυργίας Πρίανσος (Milet. 1.3 38 0, q (C3s)) and Ερασιππόλεμος (Πρ)επάνδρω Πρίανσιος προξενος of Gortyn (no. 960) (I.Cret. iv 208 (C3/C2)) and theodorokos for Delphi (BCH 45 (1921) iv.6 (c.230–210)).

The territory is called ἡ Πρίανσαί (I.Cret. iii.i.4, ll. 18–21 (C3l/C2e)). The Hellenistic borders of Praisos are described in the alliance of Praisos with Hierapytana and Gortyn (I.Cret. iv 174, ll. 16–30 (C3l/C2e)). The description of the border with Gortyn begins at the south coast, so it seems likely that the Geometric–Roman cave sanctuary of Εὐλείθυα Βασιλία at Tsoutsouros (ancient Einafos) was located within her territory (I.Cret. iv 174.60–61, 76; Faure (1996) 75–77). Einatos (in Linear B wi-na-to, McArthur (1993) 152) may have served as a port for Praisos. Coin types (infra) suggest that Praisos was oriented to the sea. The mouth of the river Mintris would seem the likely place to look for an ancient harbour, but no ancient harbour facil-
ities are visible today. This may be due to several geological factors, including coastal uplift and riverine silting (personal observation).

Nothing is known about the urban centre of Priansos, which was probably located in the vicinity of Kastelliana. A Hellenistic inscription refers to an andreion at Priansos (I.Cret. iii.iii.4,38–40 (C37/C6)). In so far as andreae are attested elsewhere on Crete during the Archaic and Classical periods (see Axios, Datala and Eltyina, supra), it is possible that also at Priansos it was pre-Hellenistic. Athena Polias, in whose sanctuary public enactments were displayed, was probably the protecting deity of the polis (I.Cret. iii.iii.4,79–80 (C37/C6)).

Priansos struck coins (staters, drachms, hemidrachms) on the Aiginetan standard during the period c.330–280/270 (Le Rider (1966) 190, 198; IGCH no. 109). Staters have obv. seated goddess with serpent (Svoronos (1890) 295: Hygieia?); rev. Poseidon standing holding his trident, or goat protome (Svoronos (1890) pl. XXVIII.21–23; SNG Cop. Aeg.Isl 544–45). Drachms and hemidrachms have obv. head of a goddess (Guarducci (1955) 280: Artemis?); rev. trident (drachms only), or palm (Svoronos (1890) pl. XXVI-II.24–28; SNG Cop. Aeg.Isl. 546–47). Legend (all denominations): ΠΙΡΙΑΝΣΙΕΩΝ or abbreviations down to ΠΙ.

The polis town of Rhaukos (modern Ag. Myronas) is almost unknown archaeologically (Pendlebury et al. (1932–33) 91–92; Sanders (1982) 154 (9/12)), but a Hellenistic inscription recording the border of Gortyn and Knosos most likely refers to the agora of Rhaukos and to the prytaneion in the agora (I.Cret. iv.182.3–4 (c.167/6); Chaniotis (1996) 296–300). In so far as both terms are attested elsewhere on Crete during the Archaic and Classical periods (agora: see Gortyn (no. 960) and Phaistos (no. 980); prytaneion: see Lato (no. 971), it is possible that also at Rhaukos the agora and the prytaneion are pre-Hellenistic.

Rhaukos struck coins (staters, drachms, hemidrachms) on the Aiginetan standard during the period c.330–280/270 (Le Rider (1966) 197; IGCH no. 109). Staters have obv. Poseidon hippos; rev. trident-head, within an incuse square on the earliest issues (Svoronos (1890) pl. XXIX.6–7, 11–16, 23–24; SNG Cop. Aeg.Isl. 551). Drachms and hemidrachms have (i) obv. head of Poseidon; (ii) rev. two dolphins (drachm); trident (hemidrachm) (Svoronos (1890) pl. XXIX.8–9; SNG Cop. Aeg.Isl. 552–53); (iii) obv. head of Poseidon; rev. trident (drachm), or two dolphins (hemidrachm) (Svoronos (1890) pl. XXIX.17, 25–26). Obols have obv. head of a goddess; rev. trident (Svoronos (1890) pl. XXIX.27). Legend (all denominations): PAYKION.

986. Rhaukos (Rhaukios) Map 60. Lat. 35.15, long. 25.00. Size of territory: 2. Type: [A]. The toponym is ‘Ραύκος (Ps.-Skylax 47; Polyb. 30.23.1). The city-ethnic is ‘Ραύκος (coins, C4–C5, infra; Milet. 1.3 140.36 (c.259–250)). For ‘Ροκίοισ (acc. pl.), which occurs in the asylia decree of Rhaukos for Teos (I.Cret. i.xxvii.1 (C31)), see Bile (1988) 111.

In Ps.-Skylax 47, where polis is used in the urban sense, Rhaukos is one of the toponyms listed under the heading πόλεις πολείαν ἐν Κρήτῃ. The earliest explicit reference to Rhaukos as a polis, and here in the political sense, occurs in the agreement of Miletos πρὸς τὰς πόλεις τὰς ἐν Κρήτῃ (Milet. 1.3 140.1, 36 (c.259–250)). Rhaukos was certainly a polis in the political sense during the early Hellenistic period. The coins, which perhaps began as early as c.330 (infra), suggest that this was already the case in the late Classical period.

The collective use of the city-ethnic occurs internally on the C4–C5 coins (infra), and externally in the agreement of Miletos πρὸς τὰς πόλεις τὰς ἐν Κρήτῃ (Milet. 1.3 140.36 (c.259–250)). For the individual use of the city-ethnic, there are the procemia of Iasos, Θεόδωρος Σωτάδα Κρής ‘Ραύκος (I.lasos 53 (C4/C3e)), and of Gortyn, Λύγδζαμος Μεττυρίωνος ‘Ραύκος (I.Cret. iv.206 (C3/C2)).

987. Rhithynnos (Rhithynmios) Map 60. Lat. 35.20, long. 24.30. Size of territory: 3. Type: C. The toponym is not attested in the inscriptions from Crete. Inscriptions from elsewhere and literary sources spell the toponym Ρηθύμιος (Arkesine, IG xxi.7.7a.3 (C4–C3e)), Ρηθύμια (Delphi, BCH 45 (1921) iii.116 (c.230–210)), and Ρηθύμια (Steph. Byz. 545.7). Rhithynnos may have been renamed Arsinoë during the period C3–C2e (Le Rider (1966) 242–45: reign of Ptolemy IV). The city-ethnic is ‘Ρηθύμιοι (I.Cret. i.xxi.4a (C3f)).

Steph. Byz. 545.7 is the only source to identify Rhithynnos as a polis. Aelian called Rhithynmos a κώμη (Ael. NA 14.20). That Rhithynnos was a polis in the political sense during the late Classical and early Hellenistic periods is suggested by her mint, which may have begun as early as c.330 (infra), by a proxeny decree of C4–C3e in which a citizen of Rhithynmos is granted procemia by Arkesine (IG xxi.7 7a (C4–C3e)), and by the personal use of the city-ethnic (Perlman (1996) 246–52; infra).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is not attested, but is undoubtedly to be recognised in the legend PI which appears on the reverse of the coins (infra). For the individual and external use there is the funerary column Σωτάδος Δαμαρέτου ‘Ρηθύμια (IG ii.1 10135 (C4/C3)) and the
proxenoi of Olous, Kleovainos [Δα]μοκρατους 'Ριττένουs (I.Cret.1.xxii.4 A (C3f)), and of Gortyn, [---, son of ---]οδόκου 'Ριθύμνουs (I.Cret. IV 207 (C3)).

The evidence for the history and institutions of Rhithymnos dates to the Hellenistic period. The remains of ancient Rhithymnos lie concealed beneath those of the Venetian city. For a brief survey of ancient remains in the modern city, see Stratidakis (1995) 326–27. The acropolis was more than likely located on the high promontory where the Venetians later built their fort (Fortetza). The town and harbour were probably to the east of the promontory; rock-cut slipways and a fish tank have been identified to the west of Fortetza (Blackman (1976d)). Onorio Belli describes the remains of a square temple with a portico upon a hill in the vicinity of Rhithymnos, but the location of this building is unknown (Falkener (1854) 25).

Rhithymnos struck coins (staters, drachms, hemidrachms, and drachmae) on the Aiginetan standard during the period c. 280 drachms) on the Aiginetan standard during the period 330–280/270 (Le Rider (1966) 190, 198). Her output was small. Staters have obv. head of Apollo; rev. Apollo lithophoros (Svoronos (1890) pl. XX.XI.1). Drachms and hemidrachms have obv. head of Athena; rev. trident-head and dolphins (Svoronos (1890) pls. XXXIX.33, XXX.3; SNG Cop. Aeg.Isl. 555). Legend (all denominations): PI.

988. *Rhitten* (Rhittenios) Map 60.Lat. 35.00, long. 24.55. Size of territory: 1. Type: B. The adverbial *Πρττενάδε*, which occurs in the agreement between the *Rhittenioi* and Gortyn (I.Cret. IV 80 (C5e)), indicates that the toponym was either *Πρττέν* or *Πρτζέν* (Bile (1988) 145, 168). The form *Πρζηνία* occurs in Stephanos (Steph. Byz. 544,20) and has been restored in two inscriptions: (i) a fragment of an Archaic epichoric inscription from Patela Prinias (I.Cret. I.xxxviii.2 (C6)) and (ii) an agreement between Gortyn and Knosos (I.Cret. IV 182 (C2)). In both cases, the restorations of the toponym are problematic (Faure (1993) 70). The city-ethnic was *Ριττένοι* (I.Cret. IV 80 (C5e)).

Only Stephanos refers to *Rhitten* (Rhzenia) as a polis (Steph. Byz. 544,21). The agreement of Gortyn for *Rhitten* recognised that the *Rhittenioi* were autoypomoi and autodikoi (I.Cret. IV 80 (C5e)). From this same text we learn further that the *Rhittenioi* enjoyed their own assembly (τὸ κοινὸ οἱ *Ριττένοι, ἀγορὰ Ἐψυχεια*) council (πρεῖγιστος; for the meaning of the term, see Davaras (1980)); Bile (1988) 341), and public officials (κόσμοι, κάρωκα). On the other hand, certain delicts fell under the joint jurisdiction of Gortyn and *Rhitten* (4–12), and certain complaints against Gortyn and individual Gortynioi were heard in Gortyn (12–15). Furthermore, Gortyn owned at least some territory which was occupied by Rhittenioi, and it was within the jurisdiction of Gortyn to determine the rights of those occupants to its use (3–4). On balance the evidence suggests that *Rhitten* was a polis with her own laws, courts, magistrates, council and assembly, but a dependent polis of Gortyn (which controlled land within the territory of *Rhitten* and could under certain circumstances abrogate the judicial and executive authority of the state (Perlman (1996) 265–66)).

The collective use of the city-ethnic occurs externally in the agreement of Gortyn and *Rhitten* (I.Cret. IV 80 (C5e)).

The location of ancient *Rhitten* has been the subject of controversy. Guarducci identified ancient *Rhitten* with the remains of the important settlement at Patela Prinias c.11 km north of Gortyn, and the majority of scholars have followed her lead (Guarducci (1933) 294; van Effenterre (1993); cf. Nomina I 7). Faure has long championed an alternative location for ancient *Rhitten* south of the Mesara in the Asterousia mountains near Apesokari at the foot of a chain of hills called η Κάτω Πίζα (Faure (1965) 22–24, (1993) 70). Faure’s arguments against the opinio communis are convincing. His arguments in favour of η Κάτω Πίζα are something less compelling (Perlman (1996) 262–63). The ancient site near Apesokari has not been explored, and all that may be said about it is that the surface remains date to the Classical and Hellenistic periods (Faure (1963) 24). The settlement on Patela Prinias, a high triangular-shaped plateau, c.11.5 ha in area, located at the junction of two valleys which connect the northern and southern coasts, was established in C13 and continued until C6m. Defensive walls have been identified below Patela Prinias restricting access through the valleys and up to the plateau. Residential districts that attest a degree of town-planning have been excavated at the northern edge of the plateau and to the south-east in the vicinity of the two large buildings, Temple A (C7) and “Temple B” (Subminoan/Protogeometric–C7l). Mazarakis Ainian suggests that “Temple B” was not, in fact, a temple but a public building with some other function, perhaps e.g. a prytyaneion, during its final (C7) phase (Mazarakis Ainian (1997) 224–26). The cemetery (also C13–C6m) was 500 m north-west of Patela at Sideropilia. A potters’ quarter (C8l/C7e–C6m) was located near Mandra di Gipari on a hillock opposite the west side of the plateau. During the late Classical and Hellenistic periods Patela Prinias served as a fortified guard-post. For the remains of the settlement at Patela Prinias, see Rizza (1978), (1991), (1995), (2000); Rizza and Rizzo (1985); Rizza et al. (1994).
989. Stalai (Stalites)  Map 60. Lat. 35.05, long. 26.00. Size of territory: 1. Type: C. The toponym is attested only in the late form Στάλια (Steph. Byz. 585.12). The city-ethnic is Σταλιόνες (I.Cret. iii.vi.7 (C3f); cf. Σταλιόνες, I.Cret. iii.iv.9, l. 123 (C2l)).

Stalai is identified as a polis in two ancient sources: (i) the decree of Praisos concerning the Stalitai, which secures for the Stalitai the enjoyment of their chora and polis (I.Cret. iii.vi.7 (C3f)); and (ii) Stephanos (Steph. Byz. 585.12). The meaning of the term in the decree of Praisos is urban. This decree indicates that the Stalitai possessed several of the defining characteristics of the polis, viz. an urban centre (πόλις), a hinterland (χώρα) with recognised borders, the authority to levy harbour taxes (ἐλλαμβάνεισ) and perhaps to tax the purple-dye and fishing industries, and so, presumably, the public officials required to levy the taxes and spend or distribute the proceeds. We do not know whether or not in other respects the Stalitai were self-governing and self-regulating, autonomoi and autokrati. On present evidence, Stalai appears to have been a dependent community of Praisos, perhaps a dependent polis, at the time of the decree (Chaniotis (1996) 161–68, 383–93; Perlman (1996) 257–58; cf. Gschneitler (1975)). The decree dates to C3f, and one of its provisions specifies that the Stalitai shall give to Praisos a share of the revenue from the fishing industry as they did in the past (καθάπερ καὶ πρότεραν). If this revenue was indeed the product of taxation, we may infer that for some time the community exercised public authority in this area. It is not possible to fix precisely for how long this had been the case, but the surface remains of the ancient settlement on Dasonari, which is the most likely location of Stalai (Schachermeyer (1938) 479; Chaniotis (1996) 386), date to the Archaic and Classical periods (autopsy). The evidence suggests that Stalai may have been a polis, albeit perhaps a dependent polis, in the late Classical period, so it is included in the Inventory as a possible polis (type C).

The collective use of the city-ethnic occurs externally in the decree of Praisos for the Stalitai (I.Cret. iii.vi.7 (C3f)) and in the arbitration of Magnesia for Itanos and Hierapytta (I.Cret. iii.iv.9,123 (C2l)).

990. Sybrita (Sybritios)  Map 60. Lat. 35.15, long. 24.40. Size of territory: 2. Type: [A]. The toponym is Σύβρητα (Ps.-Skylax 47) and is probably attested in Linear A and B as su-ki-ri-ta (Scafa (1994)). The toponym means “town of the wild boar” (ibid.). Non-Cretan and late sources transpose υλί, Σύβρητος (BCH 45 (1921) 111.118 (c.205–210); Guarducci (1939) 289). The city-ethnic is Σύβρητιος (coins, C4f, infra; I.Cret. IV 183 (C3l/C2e)).

In Ps.-Skylax 47, where polis is used in the urban sense, Sybrita is one of the toponyms listed under the heading πόλεις πολλαί ἐν Κρήτῃ. The asylia decree of Sybrita for Teos provides the earliest reference to Sybrita as a polis in the political sense (I.Cret. ii.xxv.1 (C3l)).

The collective use of the city-ethnic occurs internally on the coins (C4s, infra) and externally in a treaty with Gortyn (I.Cret. iv 183 (C3l/C2e)) and in the asylia decree for Teos (I.Cret. ii.xxv.1 (C3l)). For the individual use there is [---]ποιν Ἀριστοφόω Συβρήτιος, proxenos of Aptara (I.Cret. ii.iii.5B (C2f)).

Very little is known about the history of Sybrita. During the Hellenistic period Sybrita and Gortyn arranged an alliance (I.Cret. iv 183; Chaniotis (1996) 267–70 (C3l/C2e)). Shared coin types have been understood to indicate that these two poleis may have earlier (C4s) joined together in a sympoliteia (infra).

The acropolis of the polis town of Sybrita, Kephala (500–618 m), appears to have been continuously inhabited from LMIIIC (Prokopiou (1991); D’Agata (1999); Rocchetti and D’Agata (1999)). Its commanding position dominated the Amari valley, a principal line of communication between the Mesara and the north coast of the island. The construction in C9s of a monumental building (Edificio A1, c.7 m × 7 m) on the southern plateau of Kephala has been understood to reflect a new political organisation of the community, and perhaps the emergence of the polis (Rocchetti and D’Agata (1999); D’Agata (2000)). At its greatest extent (in the Hellenistic period) the polis town of Sybrita extended from the acropolis south-west to the villages of Yenna and Ag. Photini and north-east towards the village of Klisidhi. Stretches of defence walls of the Archaic, Hellenistic and later periods have been identified on the summit and slopes of the acropolis (Kirsten (1951); Belgiorno (1994)), with gates located on its north-eastern slope (Belgiorno (1994) 217.13) and on the south-western slope at Lagou Kharakou (ibid. 218.17). A temple (Hellenistic?), perhaps of Dionysos, may be located beneath the small chapel Ekklesia tou Christou on the south-western slope of the acropolis (ibid. 215.8). The principal residential districts appear to have been situated on the southern and south-western slopes of the acropolis. Three cemeteries have been located: two to the south-west of Kephala near Yenna and a third to the north of Kephala at ta Ellenika. A sanctuary of Hermes Kranaios (LMI–Roman, with gaps) located at Patos c.5 km to the south-west of Kephala probably lay within the territory of Sybrita (Kourou and Karetou (1994)). The Amari valley is very well watered, and there are
many springs, cisterns and artesian wells in the vicinity of ancient Sybrita (Belgiorno (1994) 224–25). For a survey of material remains in the vicinity of Sybrita, see Belgiorno (1994); for the Greek–Italian excavations at Thronos Kephala (1987–99), see Rocchetti (1994a); D’Agata (1999); Rocchetti and D’Agata (1999); D’Agata (forthcoming, non vidi).

Sybrita struck coins (all denominations) on the Aiginetan standard intermittently during the period c.380–280/270 (Le Rider (1966) 196; Kraay (1976) 53). The earliest coins (staters, c.380) have obv. Hermes seated; rev. hippocamp within an incuse square; legend: ΣΥΒΠΙΤΙΩΝ written retrograde in the epigraphic alphabet (Le Rider (1966) pl. XXXIV.19 with p. 196). For a short time (c.360/350–340/330) Sybrita minted coins (staters, drachms, hemidrachms) with Gortynian types, perhaps reflecting a Sybrita minted coins (staters, drachms, obols) have obv. Dionysus (full or head only); rev. Hermes (full or head only); legend (stater): ΣΥΒΠΙΩΝ or ΣΥΒΠΙΤΙΩΝ (Svoronos (1890) pl. XXX.12–18; SNG Cop. Aeg.Isl. 560). See SNG Cop. Aeg.Isl. 559 for an obol (date?) with obv. goat’s head; rev. bunch of grapes; legend: ΣΥ.

991. Tarrha (Tarrhaios) Map 60. Lat. 35.15. long. 24.00. Size of territory: 2. Type: B. The toponym is Τάρρα (BCH.45 (1921) 111.117 (c.230–210)). The city-ethnic is Ταρράιοι (I.Cret.iv 179 (c.185)).

Although Tarrha is called a polis in late sources only (Paus. 10.16.5; Steph. Byz. 604.6–8), it clearly was a polis in the political sense during the Hellenistic period, and there is little doubt that the same was true during the Classical period and perhaps even the Archaic. The evidence for this, which includes (i) participation in the C4l–C3 federation of Τραφαί (van Effenterre (1948a) 119–27; Chaniotis (1996) 106–8, 421–22; cf. Sekunda (2000) 337–38: league founded C3f), (ii) striking coins as early as c.330 (infra), and (iii) the individual use of the city-ethnic (Perlman (1996) 246–52), recommends its inclusion in the Inventory as a probable polis (type B).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form on coins (infra), and externally in the alliance of the members of the Cretan koinon with Eumenes II (I.Cret.iv 179.8 (c.185)). For the individual use there is the dedication of Πανθέων Ταρράιων (from the sanctuary of Orthia in Sparta (IG v.1 252 (C6); but cf. BSA 12 (1906) 353.1). Tarrha was a member of the C4l–C3 federation of Τραφαί (supra).

The hillside west of upper Ag. Roumeli at the mouth of the river Tarrhais and the Samaria Gorge was the site of the main Classical–Hellenistic settlement of Tarrha (Nixon et al. (1990) 217). The location afforded Tarrha little arable land (Rackham (1990) 108–9), and it is likely that her inhabitants relied for their livelihood upon the mountains and the sea (for the economic exploitation of Crete’s mountains, see Chaniotis (1999); for bee-keeping and shepherding at Tarrha, see the coin types, infra; for cedar forests in the mountains around Tarrha, see Theophr. Hist. pl. ii.ii.2; for their exploitation, Perlman (1999) 146). The Church of the Panaghia west of the river is very likely the site of a temple, perhaps that of Apollo, who was probably the protecting deity of the polis (Guarducci (1939) 305–6; Weinberg (1960)). Archaic (and earlier?) and Classical burials have been found to the west of the river near the modern village (Tzedakis (1971)). On the coast to the east of the river are the remains of a cemetery (C5l and later) and of a Roman seawall (Nixon et al. (1990) 218).

Tarrha struck coins (drachms) during the period c.330–280/270. Types: obv. head of a goat; legend: ΤΑΡ; rev. bee (Svoronos (1890) pl. XXX.27, with Le Rider (1966) 197–98).

992. Tylos (Tylisios) Map 60. Lat. 35.20, long. 25.00. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is Τύλισιος (ML 42 (C5m)), in Linear B tu-ri-so (McArthur (1993) 21–23). The city-ethnic is Τύλισιοι (ML 42 (C5m); coins, C4s–C3f, infra; Milet. 1.3 140.36 (c.250–250)).

The agreement of Knosos, Tylos and Argos provides for the division of booty αἱ δὲ συμπλέονες πόλεις . . . ἔλοιν (ML 42B.31–33 (C5m) = Nomima 1 54.11). It is likely that Tylos should be understood as one of the poleis. The term is used in its political sense. The earliest certain reference to Tylos as a polis occurs in the agreement of Miletos πολὶς τῶν πόλεων τὰς ἐν Ἐγκριτῇ (Milet. 1.3 140.36 (c.250–250)).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on the coins (C4s–C3f, infra), and externally in the agreement of Knosos, Tylos and Argos (ML 42 (C5m); ML 42A (from Tylos) and B (from Argos) are written in Argolic, and so are treated here as external). For the individual use of the city-ethnic there are Ὀρθότιµος Κέλανθος Τύλισιοι, proxenos of Phokis (Daulis?) and Atrax, Thessaly (IG ix.1,
33.3 (C3s); SEG 29 502 (C3s), and Εμμον Τυλίσιος, proxenos of Kydonia (I.Cret. 11.1 (C3s)).

The neighbours of Tylisios were Knosos to the east and Axos to the west. During the Classical period Tylisios and Knosos formed an alliance (ML 42 (C5m)). The assembly of Argos (τὸ πλῆθος) served as the mediator in the resolution of disputes between the two poleis concerning questions of war and peace (ML 42A.6–17; Merrill 1991); cf. ML 42: the text implies a federal structure with a federal assembly called τὸ πλῆθος which decided questions of war and peace; members included Tylisios, Knosos and Argos and perhaps other states as well (συμπλέονες πολίες, ML 42B.31–32); cf. Gschnitzer (1958) 44–47: ML 42 is an alliance between Knosos and Tylisios; Argos is a dependency of Argos. The border between Knosos and Tylisios (δροι τάς γας) is described in this alliance (B26–29), and regulations concerning property and trade are provided: (i) both poleis are prohibited from absorbing territory (χώρα) belonging to the other (B25–26); (ii) Knosioi are prohibited from owning land in Tylisios (με ἵπποινκέσθο), although a Tylisioi may own land in Knosos (B23–25); (iii) export from Tylisios to Knosos and from Knosos to Tylisios is tax-free; (iv) Tylisioi pay the same taxes as citizens of Knosos for trans-shipment from Knosos (B11–14). The κόσμοι appear as the chief magistrates of the poleis and were responsible for providing foreign envoys with ἔξεια. The βολά oversaw the κόσμοι (ML 42B.40–42 (C5m)).

The poleis of Tylisios was presumably in the vicinity of the Minoan town, but all that remain of the later settlement are a monumental altar and temenos wall north-west of Building Γ (J. Hadjidakis 1934) 66–68.

Tylisios struck coins (staters) on the Aiginetan standard during the period c. 330–280/270 (Le Rider 1966) 197; IGCH no. 109). obv. head of Hera; rev. Apollo standing, holding in one hand a goat’s head or a phiale and in the other his bow; legend: ΤΥΛΙΣΙΟΝ/TΥΛΙΣΙΩΝ retrograde on some (Svoronos 1890) pls. XXX.29–32, XXXI.1–4, 6; SNG Cop. Aeg. Isl. 562).
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I. The Island

The name of the island was 'Ῥόδος, ἕ (Hom. Il 2.655; Pind. Ol. 7.56; Hdt. 1.174.3; Thuc. 8.44.1; SEG 27 481 (450–400); IG 11 1454.11 (430/29)), and a rose appears as the rev. type of coins struck by the united state of Rhodos (no. 1000) from C5 onwards, on C5f coins of Ialysos (no. 995) and as the obv. on some coins struck by Kamiros (no. 996). From the foundation of the city of Rhodos in 408/7 (Diod. 13.75.1), the toponym serves also to designate this city (Ps.-Skylax 99: ‘Ῥόδος . . νήσος καὶ πόλις). The corresponding ethnic is ‘Ῥόδιος (Hom. Il. 2.654; Simon. 37, Page; Thuc. 3.8.2; IG 11 1454A.30 (445–430)). The internal collective use of the ethnic is found in I.Lindos 16 (traditionally dated 431–408, though it could be slightly earlier or later: Gabrielsen (2000b) 179–80); the external collective use is found in IG 11 1454A.30 (445–430) and Thuc. 8.44.2–3; the external individual use is found in Bernard, Le Delta égyptien 707, 659.1 (C6–C5); ΙνΟ151–52 (C5); and Thuc. 3.8.1.

In the Homeric Catalogue of Ships (Il. 2.654–56), the Rhodians are described as inhabiting three cities: Lindos, Ialysos and Kamiros; Pind. Ol. 7.18 describes Rhodos as a tripolis nasos, thus confirming the existence of the three cities; and Ps.-Skylax 99 states that the tripolis archaia consisted of the poleis Ialysos (no. 995), Lindos (no. 997) and Kamiros (no. 996). These three cities are all described in the Inventory below. In addition, the Athenian tribute lists register four other Rhodian contributors of phoros the Brikindarioi (Βρικινδάριοι), the Diakrioi on Rhodos (Διάκριοι ἐν Ῥόδωι), the Lindian Oiiatai (Λινδιῶν Οἰιαται) and the Pedieis in Lindos (Πεδιείς ἐν Λινδῶι); exactly what status these communities had is unknown, but brief descriptions of each are given below. In 408/7, according to Diod. 13.75.1, the three old major poleis created a new city, Rhodos, by metoeconomic of population, a process described as synoecism by Strabo 14.2.10; this, however, did not mean that the three old major poleis ceased to exist: they continued to function as poleis (Gabrielsen (2000b) 192–95), and it has been aptly pointed out that “the synoikism of Rhodes was unusual in the degree to which the synoikised cities had a continued physical and political existence” (Demand (1990) 93; cf. Papachristodoulou (1999b) 30). But Rhodos was itself a polis and is described in the Inventory below, which, accordingly, describes eight communities that were certainly or possibly poleis throughout the Archaic and Classical periods or at least for some time within this period.¹

In C4 and the Hellenistic period, Rhodos acted on the international scene as a single polis (e.g. IG 11 43.82; Gabrielsen (2000b) 190–91), and it is widely assumed that this unified state was created by the synoecism of 408/7 (Berthold (1980) 32; Demand (1990) 89–94; Papachristodoulou (1999b) 27, 29). However, as pointed out by Gabrielsen (2000b) 188–87, there are various indications of Rhodian unity prior to 408/7: (1) even prior to 408/7, references to Rhodos and Rhodians are more numerous than references to the three major poleis; (2) the three poleis were connected by a common myth of origin which traced their foundations back to eponymous heroes who were grandsons of Helios, thus indicating a pan-Rhodian importance for this divinity even prior to 408/7 (cf. SEG 27 481 (C5s)); (3) the sanctuary of Athena Lindia had an island-wide significance (cf. Momigliano (1936) 49–51); (4) at least one tradition made the foundation of Gela (no. 17) in C7e a pan-Rhodian collaboration with Cretans (cf. Momigliano (1936) 49–50, suggesting pan-Rhodian reinforcement of Kyrene (no. 1028) in C6f; on foundations claimed to be Rhodian, see further van Gelder (1900) 66–69; (5) the

¹ The present chapter does not consider the Rhodian peraia, though it was established before the end of the Classical period (cf. Ps.-Skylax 99 with Gabrielsen (2000b) 149); the communities situated in the peraia are treated in the chapters dealing with the regions of their geographical positions; the Rhodian islands are treated by Reger in 732–93.

The chapter is by Thomas Heine Nielsen with the assistance of Vincent Gabrielsen. The authors would like to thank Prof. T. Buttrey and Prof. M. Amandry for numismatic assistance, and the staff of the Archaeological Institute of the Dodecanese at Rhodos for their hospitality and archaeological assistance during a week of work in the splendid library there. Special thanks are due to Rune Frederiksen for discussions of fortifications.
obverses of some coins struck by the three major poleis after 479 share a type depicting the forepart of a horse (cf. entries); (6) Olympic victors from the island were invariably described by the ethnic Rhodos and not by their local city-ethnic; (7) Hdt. 2.178 lists Rhodos, not the individual cities, among the poleis which founded the Hellenion at Naukratis, and this suggests two things: that some kind of Rhodian unity may go back to C6f, and that at the time he was writing Herodotos found it appropriate to include Rhodos under the label of poleis (8) an inscription of 445–430 refers to the Rhodioi, not, as the tribute lists do, to the individual cities, as allies of Athens (IG i¹ 1454); the same document, moreover, describes an individual by the city-ethnic Lindios (9) a decree (I.Lindos 16) appointing a man proxenos “of all Rhodians” (Πολις Δοι (ἐν πάντων πρόνεος) may predate 411–408/7, in which case it is of the utmost importance that it attests to the existence of a pan-Rhodian council and magistrates.

This evidence clearly proves that throughout C6 and C5 there was a general development in the direction of pan-Rhodian (political) unity. The synoecism in 408/7 may reasonably be seen as a decisive step in this unifying development. Though there are problems of interpretation, nos. (7) and (8) above render it probable that a unified state existed prior to the foundation of the city of Rhodos. The polis of Rhodos (no.1000) came to monopolise such important functions as, e.g., foreign policy, military organisation and minting. However, the three old major poleis continued to function as poleis, and although they primarily fulfilled internal and cultic functions (Papachristodoulou 1999b) and constituted subsections of the polis of Rhodos, they must be regarded as poleis, i.e. as dependent poleis inside the polis of Rhodos. For example, in C5m, when Herodotos composed the first book of his Histories, the Dorian pentapolis consisted of Lindos (no. 997), Ialysos (no. 995), Kamiros (no. 996), Kos (no. 499) and Knidos (no. 903), and there is no mention in this connection of a Rhodian polis (Hdt. 1.144.1 and 3). It is, moreover, apparent from Thuc. 8.44.2 that in 411 the poleis of Kamiros, Lindos and Ialysos were still important political units of the island.

The Rhodians may possibly have been subjects of Persia prior to their entry into the Delian League: Aesch. Pers. 888 mentions Rhodos among the islands overpowered by Dareios, and Diod. 11.3.8 (r48o) mentions Rhodian ships in Xerxes’ navy (cf. van Gelder 1900) 71–72 and Berthold (1984) 19. However, the historicity of Rhodos’ subjection is seriously questioned by the fact that Herodotos does not refer to Rhodian involvement in the invasion of Greece.

In addition to the poleis described in the Inventory below, there were on Archaic and Classical Rhodos the following settlements.

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements
not Attested as Poleis

*Kattabia (Κατάβια) In the territory of Lindos (no. 997). RE suppl. iv. 881; Sørensen (1992) 100. Barr. AC.


Kyrbe (Κυρβή) Unlocated settlement mentioned by Diod. 5.57.8 in a mythological context and possibly not historical. RE xii. 134. Barr. A.

Netteia (Νέττεια) Settlement with a sanctuary of Zeus (IG xii.1 890.24 (C2)), in the territory of Lindos (no. 997). RE suppl. v. 746–47. Barr. C.

Phagai (Φαγαί) In the territory of Ialysos (no. 995) (I.Lindos 860.4 (c.200)). Papachristodoulou (1989) 142–44. Barr. C.

2. Unidentified Settlements


Daphne Hill (near Ialysos) A Classical settlement is surmised on the basis of ceramic surface evidence (Inglieri 1936) II 27 no. 20; ASAtene 6–7 (1923–24) 326. The site may have formed a part of Ialysos (no. 995) proper. Not in Barr.


Makri Longoni (near Kamiros) A coastal settlement is inferred from 260 graves of C7 to C6; see Jacopi (1929–30) esp. 10 and fig. 3; Gates (1983) 21–22. This site may have formed a part of Kamiros (no. 996) proper. Not in Barr.

**Mitropoli** Settlement in the territory of Ialysos (no. 995). Papachristodoulou (1989) 120. Barr. A, though the Dodecanesian ephorate has informed us that there are no certain Archaic or Classical remains.

**Phanes** In the territory of Kamiros (no. 996). Hope Simpson and Lazenby (1973) 141. Barr. C.

**Steno** Settlement in the territory of Lindos (no. 997). Sørensen (1992) 100–5. Barr. AC.

**Syra** Settlement in the territory of Ialysos (no. 995). Papachristodoulou (1989) 134. Barr. AC.

**Vroulia** Settlement in the territory of Lindos (no. 997), abandoned Cēe (Kinch 1914); Drerup (1969) 51–52; Melander (1988); Morris (1992) 174–99; Sørensen (2002)). Barr. A.

Nothing at all is known about the status which such settlements enjoyed; if the deme structures of the three old major poleis existed prior to their first appearance c.325 (IG xii.1 671; i.Lindos 51), they may possibly have been demes, but this is conjectural.

---

II. The Poleis

**993. Brikinda (Brikindarios)** Map 60. Lat. 36.20, long. 28.10. Size of territory: ? Type: C. The toponym is Βρικινδαρια, τα (Herod. 2.57); on the basis of Rhodian Hellenistic inscriptions such as e.g. SEG 39 808 (C2) giving the demotic Βριγινδαριος, the toponym Βριγινδαρια may be assumed. The city-ethnic is Βρικινδαριας (IG i³ 280.1.15 (415/14)). Our only source for this community are the Athenian tribute lists in which the Βρικινδαρια are recorded thrice: in 429/8 (IG i³ 282.iv.13), amount lost, in 421/20 (IG i³ 285.1.103–4), 1 tal., and in 415/14 (IG i³ 290.1.15), amount lost. The Brikindarioi must have been the inhabitants of Βριγινδαρια, a place in the territory of Ialysos (no. 995) (Papachristodoulou 1989) 124–31, (1999b) 37). The fact that it paid individually may suggest that it was a dependent polis inside the territory of Ialysos (cf. Hansen (1997) 31), or—considering the sporadic nature of its payments—may suggest civic disorder at Ialysos. Alternatively, the appearance of the Brikindarioi may indicate an arrangement imposed by the Athenians in order to weaken a powerful ally, as all three major poleis must have been. See also Diakrioi (no. 994), Oiai (no. 998) and Pedies (no. 999).

994. (Diakrioi) Map 60. Unlocated. Type: C. The Athenian tribute lists from 430/29 to 415/14 four times register a payment by a group called Διακριοι επ Ροδον (IG i³ 281.1.11, 284.22–23, 285.1.101–2, 290.1.16); in the two cases where the amount paid is (partly) preserved, it is 2 tal. (IG i³ 285.1.101–2, 290.1.16, partly restored). The Diakrioi are known only from these lists, and it is not known to which part of the island they belonged (RE suppl. vii. 126–27). The fact that they paid individually may suggest that they formed a (dependent) polis (inside the territory of one of the major poleis; cf. Hansen (1997) 31), or—considering the sporadic nature of their payments—may suggest civic disorder in one of the major poleis (cf. Schuller (1995) 166–67). Alternatively, the appearance of the Diakrioi may indicate an arrangement imposed by the Athenians in order to weaken a powerful ally, as all three major poleis must have been. See also Brikinda (no. 993), Oiai (no. 998) and Pedies (no. 999).

995. Ialysos (Ialysios) Map 60. Lat. 36.25, long. 28.10. Size of territory: 4 (c.345 km²). Type: C. The Doric for the toponym is Ίλυσος or Ίλυσιος, ἤ (Timocreon fr. 1.7; Ps.-Skylax 99; Ergias (FGHist 513) fr. 1); Ionic has Ἰλυσος or Ἰλυσιος (Hdt. 1.144.3; Hom. Il. 2.656). The city-ethnic is Ίλυσιος (ML 7c and g (591); Σις coins (infra)) or Ίλυσιος (IG i³ 71.1.128 (425/4)) or Ἰλυσιος (Anakreon fr. 4.1, Page; SEG 28 48.6 (c.394)).

Ialysos is called a polis both in the urban sense (Thuc. 8.44.2; Ps.-Skylax 99; IG xii.1 677.15 (c.300)) and in the political sense (Hdt. 1.144.3).

At IG xii.1 677.18 and Ergias (FGHist 513) fr. 1, polis refers to the acropolis. Patris is found in Timocreon fr. 1.7.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is found internally on Σις coins (infra), and externally in Anakreon fr. 4, Page, and IG i³ 71.1.128 (425/4); the individual and external use is found as early as 591 (ML 7 c and g).

Ialysos occupied the northernmost part of the island; its territory measured c.345 km². Several second-order settlements within the territory have been surmised on the basis of ceramic surface evidence (Papachristodoulou (1989) 83–146). Of these, the most significant is located at the foot of the Daphne Hill, a little to the north-west of the acropolis (Inglieri (1936) foglio nord p. 27 no. 20); here rich finds of Classical pottery have been made (ASAtene 6–7 (1923–24) 326); it is not impossible that this site was in fact part of Ialysos proper. Another settlement of moderate size seems to have been situated within that part of Ialysian territory on which later the city of Rhodos (no.1000) was built (Drelissi-
power. replaced by an oligarchy and that the following presumption is that in Ialysos (and Kamiros and Lindos) exile Dorieus (Diod. 261). To undo the new alliance with the Lakedaimonians shortly.

提7.8 × 13.10 m; a well in the temenos contained C5 pottery (CIRh2 1932) 77–116. Near the temple are remains of a C4 theatre with a horseshoe-shaped koilon (ibid.; TGR ii. 281).

With Halikarnassos (no. 886), Kos (no. 499), Knidos (no. 903), Kamiros (no. 996) and Lindos (no. 997), Ialysos formed the so-called Dorian hexapolis, later pentapolis, a cultic association centred on the sanctuary of Apollo at Triopion near Knidos (Hdt. 1.14.4).

Anakreon fr. 4, Page, has been interpreted as indicating that Polykrates of Samos incorporated Ialysos in his “empire” (Weiss and Hurter 1998) 13. Ialysos was a member of the Delian League, and was probably among the original members (ATL iii. 213). Ialysos belonged to the Karian district (IG t1 271.11.66), and is registered in the tribute lists from 452/1 (IG t1 261.14.13) to 415/14 (IG t3 290.11.1) a total of sixteen times, four times completely restored. Ialysos initially paid a phoros of 10 tal. (IG t3 263.11.265.1.27; cf. 261.14.13, 262.1.2, 264.11.37 where this amount is completely restored); in 443/2, the phoros had dropped to 6 tal. (IG t3 269.1.10, partly restored) and remained so until 432/1 (IG t3 270.11.11, 271.11.66, 272.11.89, 279.1.45, 280.1.49); in 428/7, 10 tal. was again paid (IG t3 283.11.1.9; cf. 284.10), but in 421/20 only 5 tal. was paid (IG t3 285.1.100). Ialysos was assessed for tribute in 424/3 (IG t3 71.1.128). In addition, the tribute lists thrice register the Brikindarioi (no. 993), the inhabitants of Brikinderena, a place in the territory of Ialysos (Papachristodoulou 1989) 124–31.

In 412/11 a Peloponnesian squadron arrived at Rhodes invited by some wealthy Rhodians (Thuc. 8.44.1); as a result, Ialysos (with Kamiros and Lindos) defected from the Athenians and joined the Peloponnesians in the war against Athens (Thuc. 8.44.2). Thuc. 8.44.4 records a payment by the Rhodians to the Peloponnesians of 32 tal., but the share contributed by Ialysos to this amount is unknown. An attempt to undo the new alliance with the Lakedaimonians shortly after was quelled by a squadron commanded by the Ialysian exile Dorieus (Diod. 13.38.5, 45.1; Gehrke, Stasis 133–34). The presumption is that in 411 a democratic constitution was replaced by an oligarchy and that the following neoterismos (Diod.) was an attempt to bring the democrats back into power.

According to Diod. 13.75.1, in 408 the inhabitants of Ialysos (and Kamiros and Lindos) μετέσχθησαν έις μιάν πόλιν τήν νῦν καλουµένην 'Ρόδον, a process which Strabo 14.2.10 refers to by the verb συνοικίζειν. As in numerous other cases, only part of the population was transferred to the new urban centre, and it is clear that a wholesale relocation of the Ialysian population was not carried out (Gabrielsen 2000b) 188–89). Furthermore, there appears to be no good reason for the idea that the foundation of Rhodos town was accompanied by a fundamental restructuring of the political organisation of the island (ibid. 189–90); the move towards pan-Rhodian unity had begun long before 408 (ibid. 180–87), and the three old poleis continued to exist (Xen. Hell. 4.8.25; Ps.-Skylax 99) and function as poleis after 408 (Gabrielsen 2000b) 192–95): e. 394, citizens of Ialysos were appointed proxenoi by Athens as their father had been (Walc. 1978) 72; SEG 28 48; cf. Gabrielsen 2000b 192 with n. 91), and Hellenistic and later inscriptions describe Ialysos as a polis both in the urban (IG xii.1 677.16 (c.300)) and the political (IG xii.1.1 58.21 (Roman)) senses, and the former inscription attests to the existence of a council (οἱ µαστροί) and an assembly (Εδόξει . . . ʾΙαλυσίωις). However, Ialysos was now a subordinate polis inside the polis of Rhodos, and constituted a phyle (ʾΙαλυσία; Maiuri, Nuova silloge 19.16 (c.200); cf. BCH 92 (1975) p. 97 col. B.26–27 (C3)) of the Rhodian polis see Jones, POAG 243–44. In the Hellenistic period, a system of Ialysian demes is attested, as is the employment of demotics as the third part of personal names (IG xii.1.166). By analogy with Kamiros and Lindos, where such systems are known to have existed in C4l, it may be assumed that it existed in Ialysos by that time as well.

The existence of a Ialysian navy may be inferred from Diod. 13.70.2 (1408) (Gabrielsen 2000b) 182).

The acropolis, presumably located outside the city proper, was called Achaïa polis (IG xii.1 677.14 (c.300); Ergias FGrHist 513) fr. 1; Diod. 5.57.6. It was situated on the summit of Mt. Phileremos. The main architectural structure was the temple of Athena Polias and Zeus Polieus (Suppl. Epigr. Rh. 1 no. 54 (no date)). In their present form the remains of the Doric temple are C4l, but a limited number of architectural members and roof-tiles attest to the existence of a C6 predecessor (Livadiotti and Rocco (1999)); a rich deposit to the south of the temple contained votive offerings dating from C9 to C5 (Maiuri (1928)).

The location of the urban centre of Ialysos can be inferred from IG xii.1 677.15 (c.300), from which it appears that it was situated near the acropolis (Gabrielsen 2000b) 204 n. 87). However, the archaeological evidence for the city is scarce, and the urban history of the polis thus poorly known.

In C5f the Diagonids of Ialysos (cf. Paus. 4.24.2) and Diogoras himself won several Olympic victories (e.g.
Olympionikai 252, 287, 299, 300); Diogoras himself was peri-
odonikes (Knab (1934) no. 9); the victors are described, how-
ever, not as lalysians but as Rhodians (IvO151–52; Gabrielsen 
(2000b) 184); but some Diagordis participated as citizens of 
their new polis, Thourioi (Olympionikai 322, 356), where 
Dorieus settled after his exile (Xen. Hell. 1.5.19).

Attested cults include those of Athena Polias and Zeus 
Polieus (Suppl. Epigr. Rh. 54,5 t (undated)) and Alektrona 
(Michel 434 (C4–C3)).

Ialysos began issuing coins in C6s and struck in both 
electrum and silver. The earliest silver coins are possibly the 
so-called palmette staters (aneigrapic) on the "lalysian 
standard" and their fractions (on the Aiginetan standard: 
Bresson (1981) 221), which have been attributed to Ialysos 
and dated c.540–530: obv. palmette; rev. two incuse rectan-
gles separated by a broad band, a type used also at Kamiros 
(no. 996) and Lindos (no. 997) (Bresson (1981); Weiss and 
Hurter (1998) 13–14). The main issue is a series of electrum 
fracti ons and silver staters with thirds and minor fractions, 
beginning c.520 and continuing into C5, and apparently 
struck to the same individual, lalysian, standard as the 
palmette coins: obv. forepart of winged boar sometimes 
with symbol beneath; rev. eagle’s head in dotted and incuse 
square with floral ornament in corner; legend: ΠΙΛΑΥΣΙΩΝ or ΠΙΛΑΥΣΙΩΝ (sometimes on both obv. 
and rev.; sometimes retrograde), sometimes no legend. 
Minor silver fractions struck after 479 depict (1) obv. 
forepart of winged boar to r.; rev. helmented head of goddess 
(Athena?); anepigraphic but “Gef. in Rhodos” (SNG von 
Aulock 2777–78); weight 1.37 g, 1.40 g = diobol; (2) obv. 
forepart of winged horse; rev. rose in dotted and incuse 
square; legend: ΙΑ (retrograde); a similar obv. occurs on 
contemporary coins of Kamiros and Lindos (Gabrielsen 
(2000b) 182). Head, HNΠ 603–367; Babelon, Traité iii.i. 467–74 
and ii.2. 1007–10; SNG Cop. Caria 716–19; Weiss and Hurter 
(1998); Bresson (1981). (Babelon, Traitéii.1 no. 105 catalogue 
an Archaic electrum coin of Ialysos which he interprets as an 
obol on the Aiginetan standard; but this coin is now 
considered a forgery (information kindly provided by 
M. Amandry.).

Pind. Ol. 7.73ff relates the foundation myth of the three 
Rhodian poleis (they were founded by descendants of 
Helios) and names the eponymous hero of Ialysos.

Kάμειρος is found in Hom. Il. 2.656 and Thuc. 8.44,2. 
Κάμειρισ, ἦ is found in Dieuchidas (FGrHist 485fr.7, possibly 
as the name of the territory. The city-ethnic is 
Καμειρεύς (C5 coins (infra); IG i3 269.iv.11 (443/2)) or 
Καμειρεύς (IG i3 290.1.10 (415/14)); Καμειρεύς is found in 
Diod. 5.55.2.

Kamiros is called a polis both in the urban sense (Thuc. 
8.44,2; Ps.-Skylax 99) and in the political sense (Hdt. 
1.144,3). The collective use of the city-ethnic is found inter-
nally on C5 coins (infra) and in Tit. Cam. 105.7 (C4f), and 
externally in IG i3 269.iv.11 (443/2). For the individual and 
external use, see Peisandros, an epic poet of C7–C6, men-
tioned by schol. Pind. Ol. 3.50b and Paus. 2.37,4.

The name of the territory was Καμειρίς (Dieuchidas 
(FGrHist 485fr.7); it measured c.265 km². Apart from the 
Classical settlement at Kymisala in the western extremity of 
the territory (Maiuri (1916); Hope Simpson and Lazenby 
(1973) 146), no second-order settlement has been located, 
but various cemeteries are dispersed in the vicinity of 
Kamiros town, and they suggest that such settlements may 
have existed. The most significant of these cemeteries is at 
the locality Makri Longoni by the sea; here 260 tombs dating 
from C7 to C6 have been excavated (Jacopi (1929–30) esp.10 
and fig. 3; Gates (1983) 21–22); this site may have formed a 
part of the city of Kamiros proper. Kamiran authority 
extended beyond the territory on the island itself: (1) in 
addition to the islets near the coast, Kamiros had by C4f 
icorporated the island of Chalke; in C4m, Chalke appears 
as a community, probably a polis (no. 477), concluding what 
was presumably a treaty of isopolitelia with Knidos (no. 903) 
(IG Knidos 609; cf. Gawantka (1975) 209 n. 11 and 38 n. 79), 
whereas in Theophr. Hist. pl. 8.2.9 it is called a νόσον 
’Ποβίων and had become a Kamiran deme, though appar-
ently one with a certain degree of independence (Tit. Cam. 
109 (C4f)); (2) Kamiran territory, subdivided into demes, 
existed by C4f in the peria (Tit. Cam. 109.1–5).

With Halikarnassos (no. 886), Kos (no. 499), Knidos (no. 
903), Ialysos (no. 995) and Lindos (no. 997), Kamiros formed 
the so-called Dorian hexapolis, later pentapolis, a cultic 
society centred on the sanctuary of Apollo at Triopion near 
Knidos (Hdt. 1.144).

Kamiros was a member of the Delian League, and was 
probably among the original members (ATL iii. 213). 
Kamiros belonged to the Karian district (IG i3 271.11.69) 
and is registered in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG i3 259,1.11.8) to 
415/4 IG i3 290.1.10) a total of sixteen times, twice com-
pletely restored. Kamiros initially paid a phoros of 9 tal. (IG 
i3 259,1.11.8, 262.ii.15, 263.iii.1, 265.1.9); in 443/2 the phoros paid
was 6 tal. (IG 13 269.iv.11), and so it remained (cf. IG 13 271.11.69, 280.1.48) until 10 tal. was paid in 416/15 (IG 13 289.1.34). Kamiros was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG 13 71.1.123).

In 412/11 a Peloponnesian squadron arrived at Rhodes invited by some wealthy Rhodians (Thuc. 8.44.1); as a result, Kamiros (with Ialysos and Lindos) defected from the Athenians and joined the Peloponnesians in the war against Athens (Thuc. 8.44.2). Thuc. 8.44.4 records a payment by the Rhodians to the Peloponnesians of 32 tal., but the share contributed by Kamiros to this amount is not known. An attempt to undo the new alliance with the Lakedaimonians shortly after was quelled by a squadron commanded by the Ialysian exile Dorieus (Diod. 13.38.5, 45.1; Gehrke, *Stasis* 133–34). The presumption is that in 411 a democratic constitution was replaced by an oligarchy and that the following *neotermos* (Diod.) was an attempt to bring the democrats back into power.

According to Diod. 13.75.1, in 408 the inhabitants of Kamiros (and Ialysos and Lindos) μετενωκίσθησαν εἰς μίαν πόλιν τὴν τὴν καλουμένην Ῥόδου, a process which Strabo 14.2.10 refers to by the verb συνοικίζειν. As in numerous other cases, only part of the population was transferred to the new urban centre, and it is clear that a wholesale relocation of the Kamiran population was not carried out (Gabrielsen 2000b 188–89). Furthermore, there appears to be no good reason for the idea that the foundation of Rhodos town was accompanied by a fundamental restructuring of the political organisation of the island (ibid. 189–90): the move towards pan-Rhodian unity had begun long before 408 (ibid. 180–87), and the three old *poleis* continued to exist (Xen. *Hell.* 4.8.25; Ps.-Skylax 99) and function as *poleis* after 408: council, assembly and officials are attested in Kamiros in C4f (Tit. *Cam.* 106; cf. Gabrielsen 2000b 192–95), and the civic mint may have continued to function somewhat beyond 408 (Babelon, *Traité* ii.2. 1008 ad no. 1681). However, Kamiros was now a subordinate *polis* inside the *polis* of Rhodos (no. 1000), and constituted a *phyle* (*Καµιρίς*; Tit. *Cam.* 21.6 (C2)) of the Rhodian *polis*; see Jones, *POAG* 243–44.

The existence of a Kamiran navy may be inferred from Diod. 13.70.2 (1408) (Gabrielsen 2000b 182).

By C4f, Kamiros had a system of territorial demes subdivided into *koinai*, and demotics were used as the third part of a citizen’s name (Tit. *Cam.* 110.1–2 (C2); see further Gabrielsen (1997) 29–31, 151–54); a system of *patrai* may also go back to C4 (ibid. 146–49). A number of local Kamiran *phylai* (of which the name of one (Althaimenis) is attested in C3e) in all likelihood also go back to the Classical period (Tit. *Cam.* 1b.10; Gabrielsen (1997) 146). However, nothing is known about the functions of these various divisions.

The eponymous official was a *damouros* (Tit. *Cam.* 105 (C4f); Sherk (1990) 280). The council, called οἱ μαστροί, is attested in Tit. *Cam.* 105.5 (C4f), restored. The office of *prytanis* is attested in a C5 inscription (Tit. *Cam.* 103); it seems *inter al.* to have been in charge of the construction of a public building (*ἐπεστέγασε*). A board of *hieropoioi* and a *tamias* are attested by Tit. *Cam.* 104 (C4); a board of *epistatai* is attested by Tit. *Cam.* 105.6 (C4f). The assembly, called *ἐκκλησία*, is attested in Tit. *Cam.* 105.26–27 (C4a). A C5 enactment records a grant of *ateleia* (Tit. *Cam.* 103.3). A public loan contracted by the *polis* possibly as early as C5m is attested by Tit. *Cam.* 105 (C4f).

According to Thuc. 8.44.2, Kamiros was unwalled (ατείχητος) in 412/11, and it may have remained unfortified until the Hellenistic period (cf. Tit. *Cam.* 110.19ff (C2)). The town of Kamiros has been partially excavated. The areas known consist of three parts: a public area (agora), the residential area and the acropolis. In its present form, almost the entire public area dates to the Hellenistic period or later; however, the monumental fountain house in the midst of the agora may have a Classical predecessor; a sanctuary of Apollo Pythios has produced Archaic and Classical finds (Konstantinopoulos (1986) 173, 175–76). The few pre-Hellenistic remains of the residential area indicate a rather unplanned urban area (ibid. 172–73). Right above the residential area is the Kamiran acropolis, on which the temple of Athena Polias and Zeus Polieus was situated: in its present form the temple (a Doric tetrastyle with east–west orientation) is of Hellenistic date; however, the existence of a predecessor is indicated by various remains of the Archaic and Classical periods (Jacopi (1932–33) 223–29). A large rectangular cistern (17.40 × 10.20 × 3.2 m) from the Archaic period was positioned in an east–west orientation immediately to the south of the temple; its capacity was 600 m³ (ibid. 229). At a distance of c. 300 m from the city is a small coastal settlement whose origin dates to the Archaic period and which is believed to have been the port of Kamiros; it is situated at the promontory Mylantia Akra in the area of modern Ag. Menas; about halfway between this site and the town are the remains of a possibly Archaic temple and other buildings (Konstantinopoulos (1971) 42).

Attested cults include those of Athena (Tit. *Cam.* 104.3, 109.10 (C4)), Athena Polias (Tit. *Cam.* 148 (C3)), Zeus Polieus (Tit. *Cam.* 15.8 (C3f)) and Apollo (Suppl. Tit. *Cam.* 115a (C6)).
Kamiros began striking anepigraphic electrum and silver coins on the Aiginetan standard in C6. Denominations: 1/24 stater (electrum); stater, drachm, hemidrachm, tritremorion, hemiobol (silver). Types: obv. fig leaf; rev. incuse square, on silver issues divided into two compartments (a type used also at Lindos (no. 997) and Ialysos (no. 995), if the attribution of the palmette coins to Ialysos is accepted, cf. supra 1200). In C5, silver and bronze coins were struck. Denominations: stater, trihemiobol, obol. Silver types: obv. fig leaf; rev. two oblong incuses, on staters separated by a broad band; legends: KA, KAMIPÆΩN (stater, trihemiobol); or obv. rose; rev. griffin’s head in incuse square; legend: KA (obol). Bronze types: obv. fig leaf; rev. KA in two quarters of a wheel. Some minor silver fractions struck after 479 depict obv. forepart of horse; rev. fig leaf in incuse square; legends: KA, KAMI; a similar obv. occurs on contemporary coins of Ialysos and Lindos (Gabrielsen (2000b) 182). A tetramorion (Babelon, Traité ii.2 no. 1681) shows obv. head of Helios, radiate; rev. head of griffin; legend: KA, and is on the Chian–Rhodian standard, which suggests that “l’atelier de Camiros ne fut pas fermé tout de suite après la fondation de Rhodes”. Head, HN² 536; Babelon, Traité ii.1. 459–68, ii.2. 1005–8; SNG Cap. Caria 710–15; Fried (1987) 7–8. 

Pind. Ol. 7.73ff relates the foundation myth of the three Rhodian polesi (they were founded by descendants of Helios) and names the eponymous hero of Kamiros.

997. Lindos (Lindios) Map 60. Lat. 36.05, long. 28.05. Size of territory: 5 (c.790 km²). Type: A. The toponym is Λίνδος (Hom. II.2.656; IG¹ 171.1120 (425/4); I.Lindos 13 (before 411 or later)), Τάλα (Callim. Act. fr. 7.20). The city-ethnic is Λίνδιος (C6–C5 coins (infra); IG¹ 71.1120 (425/4); I.Lindos 13).

Lindos is called a polis both in the urban sense (Thuc. 8.44.2; Ps.-Skyxai 99) and in the political sense (Hdt. 1.144.3); akropolis is found in FGrHist 532 D.1 (r.940). Damosios is found in I.Rhod.Per. 251.6–7 (440–420). Politai is found in FGrHist 532 D.1 (r.940).

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on C6–C5 coins (infra) and in I.Lindos 13 and 15–16 App. (all before 411?). The external collective use of the ethnic is found in IG¹ 71.1120 (425/4), 269.IV.12 (443/2) and Hdt. 7.153.1 (r.689/8); the external individual use is found in PL.Prt. 343A; IG¹ 1454A.38 (445–430); and possibly I.Knidos 623 (Caf).

The territory of Lindos on Rhodes itself measured c.790 km². In it were situated several second-order settlements, among which the following are worth noting. At Kattabia, in the south-western part of the territory, an inland settlement is indicated by an Archaic (and later) burial ground (Ingler (1936) foglio sud p. 69 no. 87). On the coast south of Lindos, remains of two Archaic settlements have been located, one at Kiotari and another, at Plimmiti further south, at Germatas, where the settlement seems to have been fortified; neither of these sites has been excavated (Konstantinopoulos (1972) 24–25). Finally, and most conspicuously, there is Vroulia, at the southernmost tip of the island. The settlement there was founded ab novo c.700; parts of the settlement have fallen into the sea, but the preserved remains consist of a fortification wall separating the settlement from a cemetery to the north-east; inside the settlement are remains of two rows of houses and a small sanctuary with a naiskos; to the west is an unbuilt area. The settlement was abandoned in C6e. See further Kinch (1914); Drerup (1969); and Melander (1988). Furthermore, Lindian territory extended to parts of the peraia already in C4: this is shown by I.Lindos 51.11.17 (c.325), a catalogue of donors arranged by demes and including the deme of the Φύσικοι known to have been located at Physkos in the peraia (Fraser and Bean (1954) 57, 66–67).

With Halikarnassos (no. 886), Kos (no. 499), Knidos (no. 903), Ialysos (no. 995) and Kamiros (no. 996), Lindos formed the so-called Dorian hexapolis, later pentapolis, a cultic association centred on the sanctuary of Apollo at Triopion near Knidos (Hdt. 1.144).

According to the Lindian Temple Chronicle (FGrHist 532 D.1), Lindos was besieged in 490 by a Persian force under Datis; the siege was unsuccessful and ended in the conclusion of a treaty of philia. Lindos was a member of the Delian League, and was probably among the original members (ATL iii. 213). Lindos belonged to the Karian district (IG¹ 271.11.74), and is registered in the tribute lists from 454/3 (IG¹ 259.11.6) to 415/4 (IG¹ 290.1.8) a total of fifteen times, once completely restored. Lindos initially paid a phoros of 8 tal., 2,700 dr. (IG¹ 259.11.6; cf. 261.14 where this amount is completely restored); in 448/7 it paid 10 tal. (IG¹ 264.11.11; cf. 265.1.53, where this amount is restored); in 445/4–440/39 it paid 6 tal. (IG¹ 267.11.21, 269.IV.12, 270.IV.25, 271.11.74, 272.11.68); in 433/2 and 432/1 it paid 10 tal. (IG¹ 279.1.19, 280.1.51), but in 421/0 and again in 415/4.15 tal. (IG¹ 285.1.97, 290.1.8). Lindos was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG¹ 71.11.120), and there was a speech by Antiphon περὶ τοῦ Λινδίου φόρου (fr. 25–33, Thalheim). In addition, the tribute lists registered two other groups connected with Lindos: (i) the Λινδίου Οἰλαται (no. 998) and (ii) the Πεδιες (no. 999).

In 412/11 a Peloponnesian squadron arrived at Rhodes invited by some wealthy Rhodians (Thuc. 8.44.1); as a result,
Lindos (with Ialysos (no. 995) and Kamiros (no. 996)) defected from the Athenians and joined the Peloponnesians in the war against Athens (Thuc. 8.44.2). Thuc. 8.44.4 records a payment by the Rhodians to the Peloponnesians of 32 tal., but the share contributed by Lindos to this amount is unknown. An attempt to undo the new alliance with the Lakedaimonians shortly after was quelled by a squadron commanded by the Ialysian exile Dorieus (Diod. 13.38.5, 45.1; Gehrke, Stasis 133–34). The presumption is that in 411 a democratic constitution was replaced by an oligarchy and that the following neoterismos (Diod.) was an attempt to bring the democrats back into power. I.Lindos 13 is a treaty of unknown nature between Lindos and Cretan Lykto (no. 974), traditionally dated prior to 411, though it could well be later.

According to Diod. 13.75.1, in 408 the inhabitants of Lindos (and Ialysos and Kamiros) μετερωκισθησαν εις μιαν πολιν την νυν καλωμενην Ροδον, a process which Strabo 14.2.10 refers to by the verb συνωκιζεσθαι. As in numerous other cases, only part of the population was transferred to the new urban centre, and it is clear that a wholesale relocation of the Lindian population was not carried out (Gabrielsen (2000b) 188–89). Furthermore, there appears to be no good reason for the idea that the foundation of Rhodos town was accompanied by a fundamental restructuring of the political organisation of the island (ibid. 189–90): the move towards pan-Rhodian unity had begun long before 408 (ibid. 180–87), and the three old poleis continued to exist (Xen. Hell. 4.8.25; Ps.-Skylax 99) and function as poleis after 408 (for Lindos, see Gabrielsen (2000b) 192 with n. 87), although Lindos was now a dependent polis inside the polis of Rhodos (no. 1000) and constituted a phyle, Λυδια (BCH 99 (1975) p. 97 col. A.8–9 (C3); Suppl. Epigr. Rh. 1 18.8 (C2f)) of the Rhodian polis; see Jones, POAG 243–44.

The existence of a Lindian navy may be inferred from Diod. 13.70.2 (r408) (Gabrielsen (2000b) 182). Hoplites are attested by I.Rhod.Per. 251.33 (440–420); they seem to have received misthos for service (II. 4–9). Stratagoi are attested in I.Rhod.Per. 251.40 (440–420).

I.Lindos 15 (before 411) is a grant of proxeny (with ateletia, etc.) by Lindos to a man of unknown origin; I.Lindos 16 App. is a similar grant of similar date to a man described as “living in Aigytos”, presumably in Naukratis (no. 1023) (cf. ἐν τῷ Ἑλλάδι, ll. 17–18).

A C6 tyranny by Kleoboulos is reported in later sources; he is known to have waged war in Lykia (FGrHist 532.23), but apart from that nothing substantial is known of his rule (Berve (1967) 119–20, 588–89). Democracy seems implied by C5s enactment formulas (infra).

The existence of a system of demes and the practice of using demotics as the third part of personal names is attested by two inscriptions dating from c.325 (I.Lindos 51; IG xii.1 761). The demes were territorial divisions and probably subdivided into koinai (Gabrielsen (1997) 29–31, 151–54). About the functions of these units nothing is known.

The eponymous official was the priest of Athena Lindia (Sherk (1990) 281–83). The assembly (damos) is attested by I.Lindos 16 App. 2 (before 411; cf. I.Lindos 23.3: γαθά[ὶ] ζωνταί Λινκωνιαῖοι (c.400)). The council, βουλή, is securely attested by I.Rhod. Per. 251.16–17, 35 (440–420) and I.Lindos 16 App. 1 (before 411); it was probouletic (ἐδοξε ταί βουλαί καὶ ταί δάμων: I.Lindos 16 App. 1–2; cf. I.Rhod.Per. 251 of 440–420, where the same enactment formula has been restored). I.Rhod.Per. 251.26–27 (440–420) attests to the existence of Prytaneis holding office for a month, and so presumably a committee of the council. A grammateus (I.Lindos 16 App. 3, before 411) and a board of epistatai (I.Rhod.Per. 251.2 and 20 (440–420)), of the council or of the assembly, are also attested. The earliest surviving public enactment is I.Rhod.Per. 251 (440–420), an enactment by the council and assembly concerning the cult of Enyalios.

The city of Lindos was situated by the southern peninsula delineating the bay of Megalos Gialos on the western coast of the island. The ancient town lies beneath its modern successor and is thus virtually unknown, with the exception of a small rock-cut theatre, possibly of C4 date, which occupies part of the south-eastern slope of the acropolis and has an estimated capacity of c.1,800–2,000 (Dyggve (1960) 406–7; see also TGR ii. 279). On the plateau of the steep rock formation rising above the city was the Lindian acropolis (called ἀκρότοραῖος in (FGrHist 532) D1 (r490)). It served as a place of refuge in 490 and was besieged by the Persians under Datis ((FGrHist 532) D1: cf. Dyggve (1960) 51–52). The most important feature of the acropolis was the temple of Athena Lindia, whose cult is assumed to have been instituted by C8 (Konstantinopoulos (1972) 32). The earliest known temple is C6, but in its present form the structure is Hellenistic (Dyggve (1960)). The Archaic temple was a Doric amphiprostyle (or prostyle: Gruben (1986) 414) with four columns at each end and situated within a walled temenos approached by a long staircase (Dyggve (1960) 112–26, 365, 461 with fig. II.1 at 44; Konstantinopoulos (1986) 180 fig. 203). Having been destroyed by fire (cf. Blinkenberg, I.Lindos cols. 198–200), the temple was rebuilt in C4 on a similar plan but with the addition of monumental propylaia
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entered by a 21 m-wide staircase (Dyggve (1960) 126–30; Konstantinopoulos (1986) fig. 205). North-east of the acropolis, on the rocky plateau of Vigli, clearly visible from the acropolis, was the Boukopion, an Archaic sanctuary consisting of a grotto on top of which was a small temple whose dedicatee divinity is unknown; the temple is Archaic, but its precise date is disputed (Dyggve (1960) 459–63); rock-cut inscriptions at the sanctuary date from C6 onwards (I.Lindos 580–612).

In the Hellenistic period, a group of citizens described as ματρόξενοι (or as being ματρός ξένας) is commonly encountered in inscriptions; matroxeños were full citizens though their mothers were of foreign extraction (Morelli (1955); Hannick (1976); Gabrielsen (1992) 48 n. 7). An inscription of c.325 shows that the group of matroxeños existed already in C4 (I.Lindos 51.ca.26–27: [Σ]ωσίες[λ]ῆς Κοσμοκλέους ματρός δὲ ἡγεμόνας, in a list of donors arranged by demes); the implication is that a group of free foreign women married to Lindian citizens resided in the community.

I.Rhod.Per. 251.26 (440–420), refers to the month Artamitos, and, prior to the synoecism of Rhodos city, existed already in C4 (I.Lindos 51.ca.26–27: [Σ]ωσίες[λ]ῆς Κοσμοκλέους ματρός δὲ ἡγεμόνας, in a list of donors arranged by demes); the implication is that a group of free foreign women married to Lindian citizens resided in the community.

The chief divinity of Lindos was Athena Lindia, in whose sanctuary state documents were published (I.Lindos 16 App. 9–10 (before 411)); the sanctuary was also of wider, pan-Rhodian importance: documents of Kamiros were deposited there (Tit. Cam. 105.16 (C4e)) and a copy—inscribed in golden letters—of Pind. Ol.7, celebrating an Olympic victory by Diagoras of Ialysos, was deposited there as well (Gorgon of Rhodos (FGHist 515) fr. 18; on Athena Lindia, see Morelli (1959) 80–86). Zeus Polieus is attested by I.Lindos 56.B (313–275); Apollo Pythios by I.Lindos 61a.3 (c.308); a cult of Enyalios is attested by I.Rhod.Per. 251 (440–420). Other attested cults include those of Athena Aptotropia (Nuovo Supplemento Epigr. Rh. 20 (C4)), Zeus (I.Lindos 26.2 (c.400)), Zeus Polieus (I.Lindos 56 (c.315)), Apollo (I.Lindos 57C (c.313)), Enyalios (I.Rhod.Per. 251 (440–420)), and Hermes (I.Lindos 20 (c.400)).

Lindos began issuing coins in C6 and continued minting down to at least 408; the earliest issues included small electrum coins (Head, HN² 657; cf. J. Hirsch Auct. xiii 4002–3) and silver already in C6. The types are obv. lion’s head with open jaws and tuft of hair on forehead; rev. incuse square divided into two oblong halves by broad band (a type used also at Kamiros (no.996) and Ialysos (no.995); if the attribution of the palmette coins to Ialysos is accepted; cf. supra 1200); some coins are anepigraphic, but when present the legend is Λ, ΛΙΝΔΙ (sometimes retrograde: Babelon, Traité ii.1 no. 779; Fried (1987) no. 46) or ΛΙΝΔΙΟΝ (Babelon, Traité ii.1 no. 781; Cahn (1957) 22). The silver coins were struck, according to Babelon, first on the Milesian standard (Traité ii.1. 475–78: stater and diobol; cf. Cahn (1957) 25), later on the Aiginetan (Traité ii.2. 1011–12: diobols and hemiobols). After 479, Lindos struck minor silver fractions with types: obv. forepart of a horse; rev. lion’s head within incuse square; legend: ΛΙΝΔΙ; similar obverse types were employed by lalysos and Kamiros (Gabrielsen (2006) 182). Head, HNP; Babelon, Traité ii.1. 473–78 and ii.2. 1011–12; SNG Cap. Caria 720–22, Suppl. 356; Cahn (1957).

According to Hdt. 7.153.1, Lindos founded the colony Gela (no.17) in Sicily (see also Thuc. 6.4.3, reporting that the original site of Gela town was called Λιθιδία; cf. Fischer-Hansen (1996) 321–22); Thuc. 6.4.3 reports that Cretans also participated in the foundation of Gela in 689/8 (see further Gela (no.17)). In addition, Lindos is claimed by later authors to have been the founder of Phaselis (no.942) in Lykia in 691/0 (Philostephanos, FHG ii 29; Aristainetos (FGHist 771) fr. 1); but this tradition is not beyond suspicion. The oecist was supposedly Lakios (Aristainetos (FGHist 771) fr. 1; Ath. 297E–298A), a native of either Lindos or Argos (Philostephanos, FHG ii 29), but he is possibly mythical; Phaselis is described as Dorian by Hdt. 2.178.2, but is not called a πόλις Ελληνική by Ps.-Skylax. According to Strabo 14.5.8, Lindians and Achaians founded Kilikian Soloi (no. 1021).

Pind. Ol. 7.73ff relates the foundation myth of the three Rhodian poleis (they were founded by descendants of Helios) and names the eponymous hero of Lindos (a votive to whom survives as I.Lindos 56Ab (c.313)).

998. Οίαι (Oiai) of Oiai) Map 60. Unlocated. Type: C. The toponym is Οίαι, αἱ (Maiuri, Nuova saggio 18.22 (C1)). The city-ethnic is Οίατης (IG i3 259.11126). Our only source for this community are the Athenian tribute lists in which the Λιθιδίων Οίαται are listed twice: in 454/3 (IG i3 259.11126), paying 3,300 dr., and in 452/1 (IG i3 262.1128), same amount restored. In the same two years Lindos (no.997) itself paid 8 tal., 2,700 dr. The Λιθιδίων Οίαται must have been the inhabitants of Οίαi, a town in the territory of Lindos (RE xvii.2. 2085; suppl. v. 764–47). The fact that it paid individually may suggest that it was a dependent polis inside the territory of Lindos (cf. Hansen (1997) 31), or—considering the
sporadic nature of its payments—suggest civic disorder at Lindos (cf. Schuller (1995) 166–67). Alternatively, the appearance of the Oiaiatai may indicate an arrangement serving primarily the interests of Athens by weakening a powerful ally. See further Brikinder (no. 993), Diakrioi (no. 994) and Pedies (no. 999).

999. (Pediæis) Map 60. Unlocated. Type: C. No toponym is attested. The ethnic is Πεδιεῖσ (IG i² 269,iv.18). Our only source for this community are the Athenian tribute lists in which the Πεδιεῖς are further qualified by the prepositional group ἐλ Λίνδοι (IG i² 269,iv.18) or ἐν Λίνδο (IG i² 280,1.52–53), but twice appear simply as Pedies (IG i² 264,1.12, 265,1.54, partly restored); this group is listed no fewer than thirteen times (twice completely restored) from 448/7 (IG i² 264,1.12) to 415/14 (IG i² 290,1.13), and was presumably assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i² 71,11,91). In 448/7 and 447/6, the phoros of the Pedies was 2,000 dr.; in 445/4, a mere 100 dr. (IG i² 267,111,20, partly restored; cf. 269,iv.18, 270,1.15–76, 272,1.87); in 433/2–432/1, 5,000 dr. was paid (IG i² 279,1.20–21, 280,1.52–53), and in 421, 1 tal. (IG i² 285,1.98–99). The fact that the Pedies paid individually may suggest that they constituted a dependent polis inside the territory of Lindos (no. 997) (cf. Hansen (1997) 31), or it may suggest civic disorder at Lindos (cf. Schuller (1995) 166–67). Alternatively, the appearance of the Pedies may indicate an arrangement serving primarily the interests of Athens by weakening a powerful ally. See further Brikinder (no. 993), Diakrioi (no. 994) and Oiai (no. 998).

1000. Rhodos (Rhodios) Map 60. Lat. 36.25, long. 28.15. Size of territory: 5 (= size of island: 1,400 km² + peraiâ)). Type: A. The toponym is the same as that of the island, Ῥόδος, Ἡ (Hell. Oxy. 20,6; Aeschini. Epist. 3,1; Ps.-Skylax 99; Diod. 13,75,1). The city-ethnic is Ῥόδιος (Csl coins, infra; Des. 15,3; Lycurg. 1,15; IG xii,6 194,9 (Csl)).

Rhodos is called a polis in the urban sense at Ps.-Skylax 99 (νῆσος καὶ πόλις); Lycurg. 1,14 (τὴν ἀπαγγελίαν ... πρὸς τὴν πόλιν τὴν τῶν Ῥοδίων καὶ τῶν ἐμπόρων τοῖς ἐπιθυμούσιν ἐκεί); Des. 15,14 (ἐξοικετικές οἱ νῦν συνεντεύξεις ἐν αὐτῇ Ῥόδιοι); and Kalithinesis (FGrHist 124) fr. 5,31; cf. Diod. 13,75,1 (4087) (μετηκεκολοθής εἰς μίαν πόλιν) and 14,99,5 (1390); Maiuri restored Nuova Silloge 1,6 (Csl) to read πῶς κατοποίησεν ἐν Ῥόδιοι πόλις, ἐν τῇ ἐπιμέλειαν, but Hallof in IG xii,6 149 proposed: τῶν κατοποίησεν ἐν Ῥόδιοι πόλις ἐν ἐπιμέλειαν, a restoration that eliminates the term polis. The political sense is found in Theopomp. fr. 121; Aeschin. 3,42; Lycurg. 1,143; and in IG ii² 43,82 (378,7), where Ῥόδιοι are listed under the heading Ἀθηναίων πόλεως αἰτεύσεις (Dem. 15,13 and 27 seem to combine the urban and territorial senses with the political sense: ἀντίστοιχη τῆς πόλεως τῆς Ῥόδιων; 27, λαμβάνειν Κων καὶ Ῥόδιων καὶ ἄλλας ἑτέρας πόλεως Ἐλληνίδας). Politai is found in Hell. Oxy. 18,3; Des. 15,14; and Theopomp. fr. 121; πολιτεία is found in Hell. Oxy. 18,3. Patris is found in Ergias (FGrHist 513) fr. 1.

The internal collective use of the city-ethnic is found on Csl coins (infra); the internal individual use is found in L.Lindos 42 (c.340); the external collective use is found in IG ii² 43,80; Des. 15,13; Lycurg. 1,15; Theopomp. fr. 121; and on a Csl block found at Nemea (Miller (1990) 70–71); the external individual use is found in IG ii² 19 (394/3) and 1039–42 (C4 epitaphs); IG xii,6 149 (Csl) and Aen. Tact. 18,13.

According to Diod. 13,75,1, the inhabitants of the three old major poleis in 408/7 relocated to the city of Rhodos (μετεκεκολοθής εἰς μίαν πόλιν τὴν νῦν καλομένην Ῥόδων), a process which Strabo 14,2,10 describes as synoecism. As in numerous other cases, only part of the population was transferred to the new urban centre, and it is clear that the synoecising cities continued to exist (Gabrielsen (2000b) 188; cf. nos. 995–97). It is as yet unresolved to what extent the building of the town of Rhodos was “immediately followed by a significant demographic event” (Gabrielsen (2000b) 189); however, three things are worth noting. (1) It is apparent from Thuc. 8,44,2 that in 411 no city of Rhodos was yet in existence. (2) The democratic revolution in 395 took place in Rhodos town (Diod. 14,79,6: πόλεις), which by the time already had harbours capable of sheltering large fleets (Hell. Oxy. 18,2; Diod. 14,79,6) and an agora (Hell. Oxy.), and was the place where officials resided (Hell. Oxy.) and assemblies were held (Hell. Oxy.). (3) At the time of the floods in 316 the city had a whole range of public buildings (Diod. 19,45,6–8), and during the siege in 305 by Demetrios Poliorcetes, Rhodos was a populous city (Diod. 20,84,3).

The territory of Rhodos corresponded to those of Ialysos, Kamiros and Lindos (c.1,400 km²), and included a peraiâ already by C4 (Ps.-Skylax 99; Gabrielsen (2000a) 149). The population of Rhodos consisted of the populations of the three synoecising poleis, which were constituted as phylai (subdivided into demes: Papachristodoulou (1999)) of the new poleis (‘Ἰαλυσία: BCH 99 (1975) p. 97 col. B.26–27 (C3); Καμιρία: TIt. Cam. 21,6 (C2); Λαδία: BCH 99 (1975) p. 97 col. A.8–9 (C3); see Jones, POAG 243–44). According to Diod. 20,84,3, during the siege of 305 there were 6,000 able-bodied politai in the city of Rhodos.

At its foundation, Rhodos presumably became an ally of Sparta (no. 345), as were the three synoecising cities (Thuc.
Philip II of Makedon, a supporter described as forces, presumably naval, to support Byzantion against SEG attested by an Argive decree (poleis 347 of embassies with Argos (no. 347)), a text that refers also to an earlier grant. A grant of c. 550 to citizens of Rhodos is by an unknown Ionian polis (cf. Diod. 20.16.22.2, and in Stroud (1984) 45–46). In 332, Rhodos submitted to Alexander the Great (Arr. Anab. 2.20.2), but the Macedonian garrison installed probably on this occasion was expelled in 323 (Diod. 18.8.1).

Oligarchic exiles are attested at Hell. Oxy. 18.3, and in 391/0, οἱ ἐκπεπτωκότες Ἄρχοντες τοῦ Ἱλίου arrived in Sparta. A navy is attested in Xen. Hell. 4.8.22 (at least sixteen triremes) and Lycurg. 1.18 (cf. Diod. 16.7.2 (1340)); Arist. Pol. 1304b29 attests to the existence of trierarchoi (cf. Diod. 20.88.6 (1305)).

Reception of an Athenian embassy is recorded by Plut. Mor. 850α (r45s). Sending of an embassy to submission to Alexander is recorded in Arr. Anab. 2.20.2 (1332). Exchange of embassies with Argos (no. 347)—and presumably other poleis of mainland Greece—at the time of the Lamian War is attested by an Argive decree (SEG 19 317 (325–300) with Stroud (1984) 215–16). During the grain crisis of 330–326, Rhodos received 30,000 mediomnoi from Kyrene (no. 1028) (Tod 196.11).

A grant of proxeny by Athens to a citizen of Rhodos is attested by IG II² 19a (394/3), and one to three men by Arkesine (no. 472) by IG XII.7 8 (C4l–C3e); a grant of proxeny by an unknown Ionian polis to citizens of Rhodos is found in Peek, Inschriften von den dorischen Inseln no. 1 (c.300), a text that refers also to an earlier grant. A grant of citizenship by Athens to a citizen of Rhodos is attested by IG II² 19b (394/3) and one by Chios in SEG 39 1151 (320s); special honours, including the right to address the assembly, were voted by Argos to citizens of Rhodos c.320 (Stroud (1984) 215–16).

Rhodos must initially have been an oligarchy (Papachristodoulou (1999b) 29) since the revolution in 395 brought a democracy to power (Hell. Oxy. 18.3). However, in the years 391/0–390/89 there was a new outbreak of stasis, oligarchs and democrats had the opposing faction expelled, possibly twice; the oligarchs were supported by Lakedaimonian squadrons, and the democrats by ships from Athens (Xen. Hell. 4.8.20–25, 30; Diod. 14.97.1–4, 99.4–5; cf. Westlake (1983); Gehrze, Stasis 137–39, pace Berthold (1980) 39–40). Aristotle’s mention of severe civic disorder arising from dikai is commonly connected with this series of revolutions, and the stasis was perhaps triggered by the democrats’ introduction of political pay (Pol. 1302b23–4, 32–33 and 1304b27–31). In the end the democrats must have expelled the oligarchs: Rhodos was among the founding members of the Second Athenian Naval League, and shortly after the Social War the democracy was overthrown and an oligarchy established with the support of the Karian satrap Mausolos (Dem. 15.3, 14–15, 19, 27–28; Theopomp. fr. 121); a Karian garrison was installed (Dem. 15.14–15), a democratic appeal for assistance in 351 fell on deaf ears in Athens (cf. Dem. 15), and Rhodos remained oligarchic and under Karian domination until the time of Alexander the Great (Berthold (1980) 43–44), to whom the Rhodians submitted in 332 (Arr. Anab. 2.20.2). Alexander presumably restored democracy (Berthold (1980) 47; Bosworth (1980) 243); he certainly installed a garrison, whose expulsion is attested for 323 by Diod. 18.8.1. For the democratic institutions, see Gabrielsen (1997) 24–31.

The eponymous official was the priest of Helios (SEG 12 360 (C4) with Sherk (1990) 283–85 and Gabrielsen (2000b) 202 n. 49); ἀρχωντες are mentioned in Hell. Oxy. 18.2, and πρυτάνεις at Diod. 20.88.3; a council (βουλή) is referred to by SEG 19 317.31 (325–300) (cf. Diod. 20.93.5 (1304); ἡ βουλή). Arist. Pol. 1304b27–31 attests to the existence of mischief during a democratic period, but whether for office-holding or assembly attendance vel sim. is left unexplained. A meeting of the ekklesia is attested in Hell. Oxy. 18.2 (cf. SEG 18 317.31 (325–300)). The earliest preserved public enactment is the extremely fragmentary decree SEG 15 496 (C4). Dem 56.47 refers to a dikasterion at Rhodos.

Residence of free foreigners at Rhodos is implied by Lycurg. 1.55 (ἀπεδήµησεν εἰς Ἱλίον)”; according to Diod. 20.84.3, 1,000 able-bodied foreigners (κατοικοῦντες
πάροικοι καὶ ἕνοι) participated in the defence of the city during the siege of 305/4; this number, however, includes only those who remained behind after disabled foreigners and foreigners unwilling to serve in the defensive forces had left the city.

The acropolis is situated on the terraced hill of Ag. Stephanos (Monte Smith), which dominates the amphitheatre-like shape of the city (cf. Diod. 19.45.3, 20.83.2). The acropolis was included within the circuit of the city wall (cf. infra). On the acropolis are remains of several monumental structures, but in their present form these are all Hellenistic or later. The only buildings assumed to have had Classical predecessors are the temple of Athena Polias and Zeus Polieus and the temple of Apollo Pythios. However, very little is known about the acropolis, since no systematic excavations have been conducted there so far (see further Konstantinopoulos (1973); Livadiotti and Rocco (1996) 12–26). Also of Hellenistic date is the reconstructed stadion east of the temple of Apollo; however, it has now been demonstrated that it had a C4 predecessor with opposite, i.e. east–west, orientation (Valavanis (1999) esp. 99 with fig. 4).

Recent archaeological discoveries prove that the city wall built in 407 was both of a smaller circumference and of lesser width than its C3 successor. To date, only a section of some 20 m of the early wall is known; it is constructed of orthogonal blocks in isodomic technique, and its width (0.60 m) indicates that this can have been only the outer face of the wall of whose inner face and central and inner constructions (probably in wood) nothing remains (Filimonos in Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994) 53). This type of construction may perhaps explain Diodorus’ description of a particular stretch of this wall as ἀθένεις καὶ ταπεινών (20.86.2). The area enclosed by the early wall (c.300 ha) was much smaller than the area enclosed by its C3e successor (c.430 ha; see Philimonos-Tsotopou (1998) fig. 10); a much stronger and enlarged circuit was constructed in C3e, which at certain points shows a width of 3.50 m and even 4.10 m (see further Philimonos-Tsotopou (1998), (1999)).

The site chosen for the new city of Rhodes was not entirely virgin ground, as various finds indicate (Dreliosi-Herakleidou (1999)). The city was laid out on an orthogonal grid plan at its foundation, but the direct participation of Hippodamos himself is reported only by Strabo 14.2.9 (see Wycherley (1964); Burns (1976)). On average, each street was 5.50 m wide, with the exception of two conspicuously broad main streets, one in the western, the other in the eastern part of the town, which were 16 m and 16.5 m wide respectively (Kondis (1958) 151; ArchDelt 35 (1980) Chron. 534). In general, see Konstantinopoulos (1970), (1988); and Philimonos (1996).

Archaeologically, the Classical city is poorly known. However, some impression of the C4 city may be gained from Diodorus’ description of the great flood of 316 (19.45.6–8). The description refers to (1) private houses built in stone: such houses have been found but are mostly of the Hellenistic period (Philimonos (1996) 87); (2) drains (ὁχετοί): the course of the main drain is known for a stretch of 200 m (Kondis (1954) 11; Philimonos (1996) 85 fig. 12; see also Owens (1991) 59–60); (3) the deigma, which may or may not be part of the agora mentioned at Hell. Oxy. 18.2: the agora is assumed to have been situated in the centre of the town near the great harbour and within the mediaeval town (Kondis (1958) 152); (4) a Dionysion: this sanctuary is believed to have been situated in the neighbourhood of the agora (Philimonos (1996) 82); (5) an Asklepieion: this sanctuary has been located by recent finds in the south-western outskirts of the mediaeval town (Papachristodoulou (1999a) with fig. 1); (6) a theatre: the theatre has not been located, but it seems a reasonable hypothesis that it was situated in the southernmost section of the acropolis (Philimonos (1996) 76). In addition, a C3–C4 sanctuary of Demeter Thesmophoros has been identified in the northern part of the city; it consists of eight orthogonal structures and a subterranean room (Zervoudaki (1988); Yannikouri (1999) with fig. 2). Finally, for what it is worth, it may be noted that Vitruv. De arch. 6 intr. 1 mentions a gymnasion in reference to the Classical period (cf. Delorme (1960) 82).

As early as the 390s, the city was equipped with several harbours (Diod. 14.79.7 (1396): εἶς τοὺς Λιμένας; cf. 20.82.3). Archaeologically, a total of five harbours—all outside the circuit—are known, one of which is described as ὁ μικρός Λιμὴν by Diod. 20.85.4 and is commonly identified with the modern Mandraki harbour. Here, remains of neosoikoi dating from before and after 227 have been found (Blackman et al. (1996)). Immediately south of Mandraki are the great harbour, the Akantia harbour and, further south, the southern harbour. The fifth harbour was situated in the north-western part of the city; this harbour, however, was filled up when the city expanded in C3. Archaeological remains associated with naval facilities have been discovered in the vicinity of these harbours, especially by the western harbour and the Mandraki harbour (Blackman (1999); Philimonos-Tsotopou (1998) fig. 10).

In terms of architectural splendour and topographical extent, the C4 cemetery complexes stretching out south of the city are far more modest in scale than those of the
Hellenistic period, the early graves being characterised by simplicity. The C4 graves are situated not only by the city wall but also at a considerable distance from it, perhaps an indication of awareness of the need for future expansion of the urban area. On the cemetery complexes, see Fraser (1977) 1–11; Salta (1999); Patsiada (2001) esp. 34 and fig. 1.

The patron divinity was Helios, depicted on the obverse of Rhodian coins (infra), whose priest was eponymous (supra) and in whose honour pentaeteric festivals were celebrated (Morelli (1959) 94–99); note, however, that the usual identification of his sanctuary (Kontorini (1989) 129–84) is now disputed by the excavator herself (Michalaki-Kollia (1999)), and the question of the location of Helios’ sanctuary must be considered unresolved. A festival of Dionysos is attested by SEG 19 317 (325–300); cf. Diod. 20.84.3. See further Morelli (1959).

The Rhodian calendar is known only from C3m onwards (Trümpy, Monat 167–85).

C.330–300, the Rhodians dedicated at Delphi a sculptural group depicting the chariot of Helios (Jacquemin and Laroche (1986)).

Mikinas of Rhodes won the Olympic stadion in 324 (Diod. 17.113.1; Olympionikai 469); a Rhodian was victorious in the Lykaian Games (Arkadia) in C4d (IG v.2 550.v1.27).

Beginning shortly after the synoecism, Rhodes struck coins in silver, bronze and gold. Silver: Ashton (2001) divides the Classical period silver issues of Rhodes (struck initially on the Chian–Rhodian standard, later on a reduced standard termed “Rhodian” by Ashton) into three chronologically distinct periods.

(1) 408–c.385: the issues in this period fall into two groups: (a) standard Rhodian issues, and (b) a special series of the so-called ΣYN coins with which is associated a group of conventional Rhodian coins related to the ΣYN coins by their weight. Re (a), this group includes tetradrachms, hemidrachms and obols. Types: obv. head of Helios facing; rev. rose (on tetradrachms between two bunches of grapes) in incuse square, with or without symbols below, or head of nymph Rhodos to r. in incuse square; legend: PO, POΔΙΟΝ, POΔΙΟΙ (Babelon, Traité ii.2 nos. 1693–94). Re (b), Rhodes was one of eight poleis producing the so-called ΣYN coinage in C5l–C4e (though the Rhodian coins in fact do not use the legend ΣYN on the obverse; cf. Karwiese (1980) 20 n.151); just over twenty silver specimens are known (Aiginetan didrachms, or Chian–Rhodian tridrachms, or double sigloi). Types: obv. infant Herakles strangling serpents; rev. rose; legend: PO (Karwiese (1980); Ashton (1993) 13). With these coins are associated a series of triple sigloi of conventional Helios/rose types (Ashton (2001) nos. 7–10).

(2) C.385–late 340s: this group includes tetradrachms, didrachms, drachms, hemidrachms and diobols. The types are generally similar to the earlier issues: obv. head of Helios facing; rev. rose in incuse square, beside which are various symbols and letters; legend: PO, POΔΙΟΝ; however, the obv. of the diobols in this group depict for the first time the radiate profile head of Helios. During this period tetradrachms ceased to be struck (except for an exceptional issue struck in the next period) and were replaced by didrachms as the main denomination; the didrachms were struck to a reduced weight standard (the “Rhodian” standard proper of Ashton (2001)) which became established as the usual standard of Rhodes.

(3) Late 340s–305/4: this group includes primarily didrachms, but also an exceptional issue of tetradrachms on the Chian–Rhodian standard. Types as earlier; legend: PO, POΔΙΟΝ.

Bronze: the Rhodian mint struck bronze chalœi immediately after it began to function, and again in C4s: obv. rose, or head of nymph Rhodos; rev. rose; legend: PO, POΔΙΟΝ. Gold: in C4s, Rhodes struck gold stater; four specimens are known, all from the same pair of dies: obv. head of Helios facing; rev. rose with bud to r. and grapes to l., all in incuse square; legend: POΔΙΟΝ. Head, HN² 657–40; Babelon, Traité ii.2 1011–28; SNG Cap. Caria 723–51; Ashton (1993), (2001).
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THE SOUTH COAST OF ASIA MINOR
(PAMPHYLIA, KILIKIA)

ANTONY G. KEEN, TOBIAS FISCHER-HANSEN

I. The Regions

The name of Pamphylia is Παμφυλία, ἕ (Thuc. 1.100.1; Theopomp. fr. 103.15–16; Arist. De ventis 973 ὑ’). The ethnic is Πάμφυλος, used collectively and externally in Hdt. 1.28, 7.91, and internally on an inscription from Aspendos (SEG 17 639.6–7 (c.300)). It bordered on Lykia in the west (Ps.-Skylax 100) and Kilikia in the east (Ps.-Skylax 102). The border with Lykia was west of Phellos, according to Hecat. fr. 258 apud Steph. Byz. 661.19, which locates that settlement in Pamphylia. Ps.-Skylax 100, however, includes the area as far east as Perge in Lykia. By Strabo’s time (14.4.1) the border between Lykia and Pamphylia was set around Phaselis (no. 942), which is variously allocated to either region in the sources. The account of Ps.-Skylax may reflect extensions to the satrapy of Lykia in the 330s (cf. Keen (1997) 117 n. 50). A foundation myth for Pamphylia, that it was settled by Greeks, can be found in Hdt. 7.91 and Theopomp. fr. 103.15.

The border between Pamphylia and Kilikia was placed variously (RE xviiiA. 358) at Nagidos (Hecat. fr. 266), at Korakesion (Ps.-Skylax 101; Strabo 14.4.2), at Kelenderis (Artemidoros apud Strabo 14.5.3; Strabo 16.2.33), at Side (Pompon. 1.78; Plin. HN 5.96) or at Syedra (Ptol. Geog. 5.7.1). According to Herodotos, Kilikia bordered on Armenia (1.72, 5.49.6, 5.52.3), the border being marked by the Euphrates, Kappadokia (5.49.6, 5.52.1), where the border was marked by the “Kilikian Gates”, and Syria, the border being at Poseidon (no. 1022) (Hdt. 3.91.1). Diod. 14.21.1 (1401) places the eastern border beyond Issos (no. 1007). According to Strabo 14.5.1, Kilikia bordered to the north on Isauria, Pisidia and Kappadokia, and to the east on Syria (16.2.33). Kilikia itself was later divided into “rough” Kilikia in the west, and “smooth” Kilikia in the east; the border between the two was placed at Soloi (no. 1011) (Strabo 14.5.8).

The name of Kilikia was Κιλικία, ἕ, in Attic Κιλικια (Hdt. 2.17.1, 3.90.3; Xen. An. 1.4.1; Strabo 14.5.1) or ἕ Κιλικία χώρα (Trag. Adesp. 162). The ethnic is Κιλικια; the external collective use is attested in Hom. Il. 6.397, 415; Hdt. 1.28, 3.90.3, etc.; and Xen. An. 1.2.17. For the individual external use, note Σνένεσος ὁ Κιλικια (Hdt. 7.98.2). A foundation myth for Kilikia, that the people took their name from Kilix, a Phoenician, is found in Hdt. 7.91. Callisthenes (FGrHist 124) fr. 32 reports the myth that settlements on the western edge of Pamphylia were founded by Kilikians; he names Lyrnateia and Thebe. Strabo cites a number of sources for general south Anatolian foundation myths, including Sophokles, Reclaiming of Helen (14.1.28, 5.16) and Callisthenes (14.4.3; cf. West, IEG, ii, Callinus [8]). He also records that Kilikia was founded by Rhodians from Lindos (no. 997), together with Achaia (14.5.8; cf. Roebuck (1959) 25, 65). Both Pamphylia and Kilikia paid tribute to the Persian king (Hdt. 3.90).

North of Pamphylia was Pisidia. A number of sites in that areas are described as poleis, largely in the context of Alexander’s invasion—e.g. Termessos (Arr. Anab. 1.27.5) and Sagalassos (Arr. Anab. 1.28.2)—but they were not Hellenic, and lie outside the scope of the present work. Selge, however, has been included among the non-poleis sites listed in the introduction, even though it is regularly described as Pisidian (Arr. Anab. 1.28.1; Strabo 12.7.3), because of the Graeco–Pamphylian dialect found there.

The Kilikians and Pamphylians are both considered barbaroi by Xen. An. 1.2.15–19, by Ephor. fr. 162, and by Arr. Anab. 1.26.1–28.1, 2.4.4–7.2. A mixed Graeco–Anatolian dialect was spoken in some cities in Pamphylia (Robert (1963)). The regions were generally barbarian ones. There were, as already noted, tales told in the Classical period by Greeks ascribing the origins of these regions to Achaean settlement after the Trojan War; these stories were later taken up by the inhabitants of the cities themselves. Pace Bing (1969) 213–15 (who views the tales relating to Kilikia as originating from a wave of significant Greek colonisation in C.7), it seems best to view such myths as largely a Hellenistic invention (Desideri and Jasink (1990)
30–36, 161–62). No ancient source prior to the Hellenistic period asserts a Greek colonial presence in Pamphylia and Kilikia. Thus, the regions were principally non-Greek, though some settlements (e.g. Side, Soloi) may well have had Greek origins, and in Ps.-Skylax 102 Holmoi (no. 1006) and Soloi (no. 1011) are explicitly classified as polis Hellenis. Also the widespread striking of coins with Greek types and Greek legends indicates a certain degree of Hellenisation before Alexander’s conquest of Asia Minor; for a recent acute analysis of the problems see Salmeri (2003). The following sites, listed in early investigations by Gjerstad (1934) and Seton-Williams (1954), have yielded important finds which testify to Greek C8–C7 contacts though not necessarily to Greek settlers: Hesigin (Kilikia); Kazantli (Kilikia) (see Garstang (1953) 254); Mersin (Kilikia) see Zephyrion (for Greek finds cf. Garstang (1953)); Dunbabin (1957) 31–32; Roebuck (1959) 64; and Bing (1969) 110—with the suggestion that Mersin was a Greek colony; Sirkeği (Kilikia) (TIB 5: 321), a Hittite settlement; Soyali (Kilikia), a Hittite site; Tilan (Kilikia), a Hittite site; Karatepe (Kilikia)—the site is the Late Hittite seat of the dynast Asitawanda, but is of some interest as the findspot of the bilingual inscription naming Mopsos (Landsberger (1948); Bossert (1950–51); Barnett (1953); Erzen (1973) 396) for evidence of Greek contacts cf. Gjerstad (1934) 199; Dunbabin (1957) 32.

The lack of evidence about the areas, especially internal evidence, is an obstacle to reaching conclusions on this matter; but when Aspendos (no. 1001) emerges out of such shadows, with the honorific inscription of 301/298 (SEG 17 639), it already possesses many of the features of a typical Greek polis. Until more evidence (especially epigraphic) emerges, however, one can make only preliminary suggestions about the evolution of polis identity in Pamphylia and Kilikia (cf. Keen (2002)).

The site list below comprises partly non-polis settlements of the Archaic and Classical periods and partly some settlements explicitly described as poleis, but at the time probably non-Greek poleis which became Hellenised in the course of the Hellenistic period.

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements
   not Attested as Hellenic Poleis

   A. Pamphylia

   Kibyra (Κίβυρα) Ps.-Skylax 101 (πόλις); Strabo 14.4.2 (ἡ Κιβυρατῶν παραλία τῶν μικρῶν). So far no urban remains are attested from the Greek history of the city, and there is no evidence of Hellenisation. Barr. 65, H, but Ps.-Skylax testifies to C.

   Korakesion (Κορακήσιον) Ps.-Skylax 101 (πόλις); Strabo 14.4.2, 5.2 (φρούριον). The extant urban remains are no earlier than the Hellenistic period, and probably no earlier than 144–141 (Lloyd and Storm Rice (1958) 1, 24–25). Barr. 65, H, but Ps.-Skylax testifies to C.


   Lyrnateia (Λυρνάτεια) Ps.-Skylax 100 (νήσος, conj. of Ms άυρατέας); Arist. De ventis 973a8 (Λυρνατείς οί κατά Φασηλίδα); Alex. Polyh. (FGrHist 273) fr. 59 = Steph. Byz. 423.4 (Λυρνατία χερρόνησος καὶ χωριόν Λυκίας); Hecat. fr. 261 = Steph. Byz. 418.11 (Λυρνύτεια); Strabo 14.4.1 (Λυρνησάος). Ruge (1927) suggests that the different names may refer to the same locality, possibly the small island of Rashat between Phaselis (no. 942) and Attaleia. There is no archaeological or epigraphic evidence. Barr. 65, C.

   Magydos (Μάγυδος) SEG 39 1180.26 (first century AD); Ps.-Skylax 100 (conj. of MSS Μάσηδος); Arist. De ventis 973b5–6 (conj. of MS Μάγιλος). The settlement is not classified by Ps.-Skylax. The archaeological remains are late Hellenistic or Roman. Barr. 65, R, but if the conjecture is accepted, Ps.-Skylax testifies to C.

   *Marmara (Μάρμαρεις) Diod. 17.28.1 (χωρίον). In Barr. 65, following Anti (1923) 668–711, identified with Kavak Daği (TAVO BV 15, 15.2); but see Arr. Anab. 1.24.5 with Bosworth (1980) 158. Not mentioned by Ruge in RE xviii.3, 397–402. The settlement at Kavak Daği is situated on a high, irregular plateau with habitation areas and public buildings grouped along the outer edges (Anti (1923) 669 fig. 3). A sanctuary, perhaps of Apollo (ibid. 669), has three temples delimited by a temenos wall. It is dated C4–Hellenistic, but a supporting polygonal terrace wall may be earlier. Bordering on the temenos are the remains of a stoa, a row of structures interpreted as thesauroi, and a large structure of C4–C2 identified as a bouleuterion by Anti (1923) 669–700. The fortress (petra) of the Marmareis near the border of Lykia was besieged by Alexander (Diod. 17.28.1–5 (1334/3) with Anti (1923) 709–12). Barr. 65, H, but, if correctly identified, C should be added.

   Olbia (’Ολβια) Ps.-Skylax 100; Arist. De ventis 973b5; Strabo 14.4.1; Steph. Byz. 346.11 (Καθημέα πόλις Λυκίας ἄστεικος ’Ολβιών). The urban remains are few and undated (Bean (1979) 84–86). Barr. 65, C.
Selge (Σέλγη) Strabo 12.7.2 (πόλις); Steph. Byz. 560.1 (πόλις), from Graeco–Pamphylian Selga. The city-ethnic is Σέλγεων, with variations (coins before 300, see Brixhe (1991)) or Σέλγεως (Arr. Anab. 1.26.5 (1333); coins (after 300)). Arr. Anab. 1.28.1 calls Selge a large polis (Σελγεύς πόλιν μεγάλην), but he describes the inhabitants as Pisidian barbaroi. There is little evidence of a C4 Hellenisation, apart from the coinage (infra), and the myth that Selge was founded by the Lakedaimonians is probably C4-C3e (Strabo 12.7.3; Steph. Byz. 560.1). The ambition of Selge to present itself as Greek is reflected in the change of ἐγερμούμνην πόλις (Strabo 12.7.2) to present its self as Greek is reflected in the change of ἐγερμούμνη (Strabo 12.7.2). That Selge was founded by the Lakedaimonians is probably C4-C3e (Strabo 12.7.3; Steph. Byz. 560.1). The ambition of Selge to present itself as Greek is reflected in the change of the ethnic in coin legends from the Pamphylian Σελγεύς to Greek Σελγεύς c.300 (Brixhe 1976) 289; I.Selge 6 with comm.; cf. Osborne and Byrne (1996) no.6603). For a survey of late Classical/early Hellenistic history, see I.Selge p. 14. Selge struck silver staters (and smaller denominations) on the Persian standard c.450–333, imitating the types of Aspendos (no.1001). Obv. two wrestlers; rev. sling; legend: ΣΤΛΕΓΕΙΥΣ or ΣΤΛΕΓΕΙΟΥΣ or related forms (SNG Cop. Pisidia 232–45, Suppl. 530; SNG von Aulock 5243–65). Barr. 65, H., but the coins testify to C.

Sillyon (Σύλλυον) IG v 71.11.14; Ps.-Skylax 101 (πόλις Σύλλυον); Arr. Anab. 1.26.5 (1333) (Σύλλυον χωρίον ἀχυρόν). Graeco–Pamphylian Selyvis appears on C3 coinage (SNG Cop. Pamphylia 437–38). Sillyon was a member of the Delian League; at least it was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG v 71.11.114). It was a fortified settlement and was besieged by Alexander the Great (Arr. Anab. 1.26.5). The site has habitation structures from C5 (Bean (1979) 39–45; Küpper (1996)). The fortifications were quite sophisticated for such a small site (Winter (1971) 91,137,170, passim). The C5–C4 stater SNG Cop. Pamphylia 436, erroneously attributed to Sillyon, belongs to Aspendos (no. 1001) (SNG von Aulock 4503; Brixhe (1976) 165 n. 1). Arrian calls the inhabitants barbaroi, and a Graeco–Pamphylian dialect was spoken (SGDI 1270 (Πόλις Κατοικευόμενην ὑπὸ Φώικων, ἐμπόρων); Ps.-Skylax 102.

B. Kilikia

Adana (Ἀδάνα) Ps.-Skylax 102 (Ἀδάνα, conj. of Ἀδάνη, ἐμπόρων); Steph. Byz. 24.19 (πόλις); cf. App. Mith. 96; Ptol. Geog. 5.7.7, 8.17.46. Barr. 66, C?

Anchiala (Ἀγγχαλά) Aristoboulos (FGrHist 139) fr. 9a–b; Arr. Anab. 2.5.2 (1333) (πόλις); Steph. Byz. 23.22 (πόλις). Bing (1969) 110 suggests that it was a Greek colony, but the evidence for a Greek settlement at Anchiala is wholly circumstantial. Barr. 66, H, but Arr. Anab. testifies to C.

Anemourion (Ἀνεμούριον) Ps.-Skylax 102 (ἄκρα καὶ πόλις); Strabo 14.5.3 (ἄκρα). The history of the city is unknown before the late Hellenistic period. Public buildings and other urban remains are Roman, but there is evidence for a Hellenistic origin of the circuit wall (TIB 5:189). Barr. 66, C.

Charadrous (Χαράδρους) Ps.-Skylax 102 (πόλις καὶ λιμήν); Strabo 14.5.3 (ἄρμα πυρφόρων ἄχων); Steph. Byz. 687.7 (λιμῆν καὶ ἐπίτευκοι); Stadiasmus 200 (Χωρίον Χάραδρος); Hecat. fr. 265 (Χάραδρος ποταμός). There are no urban remains from the Greek history of the city (TIB 5:226), and we have no information about the degree of Hellenisation in the Archaic and Classical periods. Barr. 66, H, but Ps.-Skylax testifies to C.

Hyria (Ὑρία) Steph. Byz. 560.3 (πόλις). Seleukeia Tracheia was earlier named Hermia (Plin. HN 5,93) or Hyria (Steph. Byz. 560.5). Holmoi, also mentioned in connection with Seleukeia, is normally seen as a separate settlement (Strabo 14.5.4; Steph. Byz. 490.5–6; infra no. 1006). Strangely, Hermia is identified with Holmoi by Barr. 66, and Hyria is not mentioned at all. However, Hyria = Hermia seems to be an earlier name for Seleukeia. Gjerstad (1934) 157 refers to pre-Hellenistic finds at “Seleukeia at Kalykadnos . . . the foundation therefore to be understood as a re-foundation of an already existing site”. Not in Barr.

Magarsos (Μάγαρσος) Arr. Anab. 2.5.9 (1333); Lycoh. Alex. 444; Steph. Byz. 424.6 (ἄχως); Strabo 14.5.16 (Μάγαρσα). The harbour town of Mallos (no. 1009). Arrian mentions a sanctuary of Athena Magarsis, whose cult statue was used as a coin type on the Seleucid coinage of Mallos (Houghton (1984)). Barr. 66, H, but Arrian testifies to C.

Mopsuestia (Μοψοευστία) Theopomp. fr. 103.15; Strabo 14.5.39 (Μόψου ἐστία); App. Syn. 69.365 (Ἠστία Μόψου τῆς Κιλικίας). According to Ruge (1935), there are at least fifty variants of the toponym. Supposedly the oldest of the foundations of Mopsos (Theopomp. fr. 103.15). A C2 coin legend is the earliest attestation of an ethnic: Μοψοεὐστία (Imhoof-Blumer (1901–2) 475.9). Barr. 66, C?

Myous (Μυοῦς) Ps.-Skylax 102. Some scholars believe that Myous is the Melania of Strabo 14.5.3 (TIB 5:363). There are no extant urban remains from the Greek history of the city, if the location is Crionaro. Barr. 66, R, but Ps.-Skylax testifies to C.

Myriandos (Μυριάνδος) Xen. An. 1.4.6 (πόλιν οἰκουμένην ὑπὸ Φώικων, ἐμπόρων); Ps.-Skylax 102.
Selinous (Σελινοῦς) Ps.-Skylax 102. Unlocated. Barr. 66, C.

Sarpedon (Σαρπηδών) Ps.-Skylax 102 (πόλις ἐρημῶς); Strabo 13.4.6, 14.5.4 (ἄκρα). A sanctuary of Apollo Sarpedonios was situated on the promontory of Sarpedon (Diod. 32.10.2 (1145)); for the few remains, see TIB 5: 399; MacKay (1990) 2122: C4 origin. No urban remains have been connected with a city of Sarpedon. Barr. 66, C.

Setos (Σητός) Ps.-Skylax 102 (λιμήν, but the text is corrupt). The site is assumed by some scholars to be identical with the polis Sykai which is now identified with the fortified ruins on the high plateau of Softa Kalesi in the plain of Nagidos (Steph. Byz. 591.2; cf. TIB 5: 421). The urban remains are all Roman or later (TIB 5: 422–23). Barr. has C, but only Ps.-Skylax 102 points to such an early date.

Tarsos (Ταρσός) Xen. An. 1.2.23 (Ταρσοῖς τῆς Κιλκίας πόλιν μεγάλην); Diod. 14.20.2 (Ταρσόν, μεγίστην τῶν ἐν Κιλκίᾳ πόλεων); Arr. Anab. 2.4.5 (Ταρσόν . . . πόλιν). Walls of a temple may have been noted by Goldman ((1963) 8), though the evidence is equivocal (cf. Desideri and Jasink (1990) 156–57). Coin types with head of Dionysos or Ares (infra) may attest Greek influence in C4e. Evidence of C8–C7 Greek settlers at Tarsos is tenuous and does not support the idea of Rhodian colonisation suggested by Bing ((1971); cf. Boardman (1980) 46 n. 37; Desideri and Jasink (1990) 151, 158, 162). Urban remains from the Greek history of the settlement are scant and mainly Hellenistic. The tradition found in Strabo (14.5.12, 16.2.5) that the city was founded by a group of Argives led by Triptolemos is probably Hellenistic. Tarsos struck coins on the Persian standard from C5m with Aramaic legends (Kraay (1976) 280–84). Coins of Pharnabazos (379–373) have the Greek kletic ΤΑΡΣΙΚΟΣ or ΤΕΡΣΙΚΟΝ (SNG Cop. Cilicia 272; cf. Suppl. 606–10). Barr. AC.

Zephyrion (Ζεφύριον) Ps.-Skylax 102 (πόλις); Did. 18.62.1; Strabo 14.5.9 (κτίσμα Σαρδαναπάλλου). Architectural features and finds reveal a settlement comparable to that of Al-Mina. However, the material has revealed greater similarity to that known from Vroulia, and the site may have been within the influence of Rhodes (Garstang (1953) 253–55). We have no information about the degree of Hellenisation in the Archaic and Classical periods, and Zephyrion seems to have been a barbarian rather than a Hellenic polis. Barr. 66, C.

II. The Poleis

A. Pamphylia

1001. Aspendos (Aspendios) Map 65. Long. 36.55, lat. 31.10. Size of territory: ? Type: Αιβ. The toponym is Ἀσπενδος, ᾧ (Thuc. 8.87.3; Xen. Hell. 4.8.30; Ps.-Skylax 101; Theopomp. fr. 9 = Steph. Byz. 134.10; Strabo 14.4.2; Αςενδος is restored at IG 13 71.11.156 (425/4)). The city-ethnic is Άσπενδιος (Xen. An. 1.12.2; Hell. 4.8.30; Theopomp. fr. 9 (rC5)); Arr. Anab. 1.2.62 (333); SEG 17 639.3–4, 6 (301–298)); Graeco–Pamphylian ΕΣΤΙΕΔΙΙΥΣ is found on C5 coinage (SGDI 1259).

Aspendos is called a polis in the urban sense (Ps.-Skylax 101), in the territorial sense with the political sense as a connotation (Xen. Hell. 4.8.30), and in the political sense (SEG 17 639.6, 10.18 (a citizenship decree of C4l/C3e)). The collective use of the city-ethnic is found internally on Hellenistic coins (infra) and in the citizenship decree SEG 17 639.3–4 (C4l/C3e); externally it is found in an Argive decree in honour of Aspendos (SEG 34 282.4 (c.330–300)) as well as in literary sources (Theopomp. fr. 103.13; Xen. Hell. 4.8.30). For the individual and external use, see the Argive decree (SEG 34 282.18 (330–300)).

Aspendos is placed in Pamphylia by Ps.-Skylax 101 and Steph. Byz. 134.10. The territory is called Άσπενδα in Theopomp. fr. 9 and is termed χώρα by Diod. 14.99.4 (r388) and Arr. Anab. 1.26.5 (333). Its extent was disputed by its neighbours (Arr. Anab. 1.27.4); the dispute may have been with Side (no. 1004) (Bean (1979) 47 n. 1), with whom relations were bad (Polyb. 5.73.4).

According to Hellan. fr. 15, Aspendos was founded by the hero Aspendos. Other versions of the foundation myth are found in later sources: e.g. that it was an Argive foundation (Strabo 14.4.2). However, Mopsos, the legendary founder of Pamphylian cities (cf. Hereward (1958) 58 with refs.), has been suggested as the eocist of Aspendos too (Robert (1960) 177–78, who connects the coin types of a horseman hurling a spear and of a bow (infra) with the tradition of Mopsos’ sacrifice of a boar to Aphrodite Kastnietis in Aspendos; cf. Strabo 9.5.17; Callim. Dieg. viii.41–ix.1–11, Pfeiffer).
The tradition of an Argive foundation of Aspendos (and Soloi (no. 101)) is the background for the decree of c.330–300 (from Nemea) in which Argos (no. 347) bestowed citizenship on the Aspendians (who are described as ἀντικείμενοι καὶ ἀποικοί) and granted the privilege of access to the Argive assembly (Stroud (1984) 200–1, 206). Aspendian theoroi were sent to Nemea and to Argos to participate in offerings to Zeus and Hera; the Aspendians were possibly granted prohedria (the reading is uncertain: Stroud (1984) 203–4).

It has been suggested that Aspendos became a member of the Delian League in the 450s (Meiggs (1972) 58, 102); but the only evidence of League membership is the restoration Ασπανδιόν Ἐμπρείᾳ in the assessment decree of 425/4 (IG i 7.11.115–56). Aspendos was possibly under Kilikian control c.401 (Xen. An. 1.2.12), a passage which distinguishes between Kilikians and Aspendians. In 388 the Aspendians were forced to pay a contribution to the Athenian commander Thrasyboulos, but later killed him in revenge for the conduct of his soldiers (Xen. Hell. 4.8.30). In 333 Aspendos sent πρεσβείας αὐτοκράτορας to Alexander the Great (Arr. Anab. 1.26.2) and was a subordinate party to a treaty with him (Staatsverträge 405).

The earliest evidence for public enactments is a decree of C4l/C3e granting citizenship to mercenaries (SEG 17 639). This decree attests a number of institutions indicative of polis status. Apart from those already mentioned are an eponymous δημιουργός (1), an ἐκκλησία (2), and a ιερὸν τῆς Αρτέμιδος (13–14). A citizen of Aspendos was granted proxenia by Anaphe (no. 474) (IG xi 1.3 250; cf. SEG 41 1788 (C4l/C3e)).

Aphrodite Kastnietis, named after the mountain on which Aspendos was founded, had a cult in the city (Brandt (1988) 241 with refs.; cf. supra). The C4l–C3e citizenship decree (supra) mentions a sanctuary of Artemis (SEG 17 639.13–14; Brandt (1988) 241). C4–C3 coins (infra) testify to a cult of Athena (Brandt (1988) 242), and a cult of Zeus and Hera had been surmised on the basis of a late dedication (SEG 17 641; Robert (1960) 187–88; Brandt (1988) 243). The kerykeion of Hermes on C5–C1 coins may indicate a cult of this divinity as well (Brandt (1988) 247).

Aspendos was situated in the plain below the foothills of the Taurus mountains; it was on the river Eurymedon and in Antiquity was accessible for trade by sea (Xen. Hell. 4.8.30; Ps.-Skylax 101). In 333 it had a walled acropolis (Ἄκρα) and a defence circuit enclosing the lower city (Arr. Anab. 1.26.5–27.3). There are no urban remains from the Greek history of the city.

Aspendos struck silver coins on the Persian standard from C3e. (1) Staters. Types: obv. naked warrior helmeted and armed with sword and shield fighting to r.; rev. triskeles, in field abbreviations of ethnic (Estwediiys) E, EΣ, ΕΣΤ, ΕΣΠΙ or ΕΣΤΠΕ (cf. SGI 1259; Brixhe (1976) 194–99), and various symbols, all within incuse square. Lower denominations are obols and hemiobols: obv. vase; rev. triskeles. (2) C3–C4: staters. Obv. wrestlers; rev. slinger, in field ethnic legend ΕΣΤΦΕΔΙΙΘΕ or various abbreviations, small triskeles and sometimes other symbols such as an eagle, in later issues a standing Eros; also various countermarks, all within incuse square. (3) C.420–360. Drachms: obv. galloping horseman hurling spear (Mopsoi); cf. LIMC 6: 653.4); rev. standing or running boar in circular incuse, legends as above. Obols: obv. Gorgoneion; rev. head of Athena. Hemiobols: obv. Gorgoneion; rev. lion's head. (4) Bronze coinage from C4. Types: obv. head of Athena, or bridled horse, or shield; rev. slinger, or head of Athena, or triskeles. The legend ΑΣΠΕΝΑΙΟΝ is found only after c.300 (Brixhe (1976) 191–200; SNG Cop. Pamphylia 153–235, 247–61, 436, erroneously attributed to Sillyon, SNG Cop. Suppl. 516–17; SNG von Aulock 4477–503).

Though it was already an Argive foundation (Strabo 14.4.2), dialect inscriptions (SGDI 1259–64; SEG 38 1364–94, 41 1304–21) indicate a substantial indigenous Pamphylian population.

1002. Ιδυρός Map 65. Long. 36.35, lat. 30.35. Size of territory: ? Type: Αγ. The toponym is Ιδύρος (Hecat. fr. 260; Ps.-Skylax 100) or Ιτυρίς (Steph. Byz. 327.2) or Ιτυρία (IG i 3 71.1.147 (425/4): the identification with Idyros is suggested by ATL i. 493). There is no cogent reason to accept Meineke’s conjectures Ιτυρέιος and Ιτυρία for MSS Γαυρέιας and Γαυρίας at Arist. De ventis 9736–7. The only source to record a city-ethnic is Steph. Byz., who suggests Ιτυρίτης (327.2).

Idyros is called a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 100 (cf. Steph. Byz. 327.2, who may quote Hekataios for the site-classification and not just for the toponym (Hecat. fr. 260)). If the identification of Ityra with Idyros is accepted, the presumption is that it was a member of the Delian League and a polis in the political sense too: at least, it was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i 3 71.1.147 (4,000 dr.')). It belonged to the Ionian district, which by then included the members of the former Karian district.

Idyros is placed in Pamphylia by Steph. Byz. 327.1, possibly citing Hekataios (fr. 260); Ps.-Skylax 100 places it in Lydia. Idyros’ location is uncertain (Ruge (1916); cf. TAVO BV 15.15.2 and Barr. 65). It is normally identified with the ruins

**1003. Perge (Pergaioi)** Map 65. Lat. 37.00, long. 30.50. Size of territory: probably 5. Type: A/β. The toponym is Πέργγη, ἦ (Ps.-Skylax 100, MSS πελτίπολις, conj. Salmassius; Arr. Anab. 1.26.1 (1333); Strabo 14.4.2; IG iii 71.11.113 (425/4)). The city-ethnic is Πέργαιος (Arr. Anab. 1.25.9 (1333)); possibly Graeco–Pamphylian Πρειών on inscriptions (Merkelbach and Şahin (1988) no. 1 (C5l/C4e)). Perge is called a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 100. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in Arr. Anab. 1.25.9 (1333) (Pergaian guides used by Alexander).

Perge may have been one of the cities allegedly founded by a mixed contingent of people, led by Amphilochos, Mopsos and Kalchas, in the aftermath of the fall of Troy, but the city is not specifically mentioned in the sources (cf. Hdt. 7.91; Strabo 14.4.3). Statues of mythical founders, including Mopsos and Kalchas, stood at the main gates of Roman Perge, as revealed by inscriptions on bases (Merkelbach and Şahin (1988) nos. 24, 27, imp.; Şahin (1999) 140–45; for Mopsos, see Hanfmann (1958)). Olshauser (1972) suggests that Perge was in fact founded in the Mycenaean period from the Argolid and Sparta. A Graeco-Pamphylian dialect was spoken in Perge (SGDI 1265; Ramsay (1880) 246; Blumenthal (1963) 46; Brixhe (1976)).

Perge was probably an indigenous community gradually Hellenised from C7 onwards (Martin (2000) 562).

Perge was probably a member of the Delian League; at least, it was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG i 71.11.113). In 333 Alexander sent part of his force inland to Perge, whereas he himself took the route along the coast (Arr. Anab. 1.26.1).

Perge is placed in Lykia by Ps.-Skylax (see supra, introduction), and in Pamphylia by Strabo. The territory of Perge may have extended westwards to Telmessos and eastwards to the river Kastros, according to the distribution of inscriptions honouring Artemis Pergaia and coin finds (Jameson (1974) 376).

The city of Perge lay on a 50 m-high, flat plateau bordering upon the plain of Pamphylia, at modern Murtana; the city could be reached by the river Kastros (Strabo 14.4.2). The size of the Roman settlement area was c.61 ha (Jameson (1974) 375), but the original Greek settlement probably comprised only the northern part of the site, the so-called Acropolis Hill. The earliest extant urban remains are the C3 city walls and the Hellenistic Doric temple outside the southern gate (Bean (1979) 25–38; MacKay (1990) 207).

A temple and a cult of Artemis Pergaia (Vatanasa Preia) is known from Ps.-Skylax 100 and Strabo 14.4.2 (cf. Brandt (1992)). According to Strabo, the location of the sanctuary was extra-urban (14.4.2) (such a location is probably also to be inferred from Ps.-Skylax 100; cf. Jameson (1974) 381 for further refs.). Remains of the Classical sanctuary have not been identified, but remains of a C3–C2 Doric temple and fragments from a large Ionic temple outside the south gate of the city have revealed a major sanctuary (MacKay (1990) 2066–67), possibly that of Artemis Pergaia. The cult with its annual festival (Strabo 14.4.2) is at least as old as the C5e–C4e dedication of Μαναψαι Πρειαι (Merkelbach and Şahin (1988) no. 1; Ps.-Skylax 100; Strabo 14.4.2; Brandt (1992); Lebrun (1992); MacKay (1990) 2048; cf. also the C4 inscription from Naukratis (SGDI 5772); full survey: MacKay (1990) 2048–58). The goddess was honoured by Pamphylians in general.

**1004. Side (Sidetes)** Map 65. Lat. 36.45, long. 31.25. Size of territory: 4. Type: A/β. The toponym is Σίδης, ἦ (Hecat. fr. 262 = Steph. Byz. 565.10; Ps.-Skylax 101; Arr. Anab. 1.26.4 (1333); Strabo 14.4.2), from Graeco-Pamphylian Sīdē. The city-ethnic is Σίδητις (Arr. Anab. 1.26.4) or Σίδατας (Nollé (1993) 225, TEP 22). It is called a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 101 (who adds καὶ λιµήν). The collective use of the city-ethnic may be attested internally in abbreviated form on a unique coin of C5m (infra). It is attested externally in an Attic list of mercenaries (IG ii 1956.132 (c.300)) and in literary sources (Arr. Anab. 1.26.4–5). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in C4 sepulchral monuments from Rhodos (ISP 225, TEP 22) and Attica (IG ii 12600a), and internally on a marble base inscribed with the artist’s name (ISP 1 (C3e)).

Ps.-Skylax 101 and Steph. Byz. 565.10 place Side in Pamphylia. However, according to a story concerning the musician Stratonikos (Ath. 350a), Side was not situated in Pamphylia, but, presumably, in Kilikia. Side was probably the most important harbour in Pamphylia (if that is where it was), at least in Hellenistic times, with a large territory bordering on the territories of Aspendos (no. 1001), Etenna (Nollé (1984)), and Karallia (Nollé (1993) 12–15). Bean ((1979) 47 n. 1) suggests a border dispute with Aspendos, with whom relations were bad (Polyb. 5.73.4 (r28)).

Side was supposed colonised from Kyme (no. 817) (Ps.-Skylax 101; Arr. Anab. 1.26.4; Strabo 14.4.2), possibly in C7l (Martin (2001) 517). The foundation myth was that Side was
named after Side, the daughter of Tauros and wife of Kimolos; it is reported by Steph. Byz. 565.10–12, perhaps quoting Hekataios (cf. Hecat. fr. 262). The tradition—found in Strabo, Ps.-Skylax and Arrian—that Side was a foundation of Aiolian Kyme probably has its origin in the age of Alexander the Great, but there may be a kernel of truth, reflecting early Kymaian colonisation in Pamphylia. An influx of C8–C7 Greek, possibly Aiolian, settlers at Side is conceivable, given the background of the traditions and the archaeological evidence of Greek influence in other Pamphylian and Kilikian cities; cf. Aspendos (no. 1001) and Soloi (no. 1011). However, the degree of Hellenisation cannot be determined by archaeology, and no Archaic Greek finds are mentioned by Mansel ([1965] 881) or by Nollé ([1993] 37; cf. also 45–47 for the linguistic evidence).

During the reign of Kroisos, Side lay within the Lydian sphere of influence (Hdt. 1.28), but after the fall of Lydia the region came under the rule of Persian satraps, and the city is absent from the Athenian tribute lists (historical survey: Nollé ([1993] 47ff)). According to tradition, the Sidetans gave up speaking their native Hellenic tongue (Ἑλλάς γλῶσσα, Arr. Anab. 1.26.4) and adopted a barbarian language (Ἐβαρβάριζον, Arr. Anab. 1.26.4) which was spoken until the late Hellenistic period (C3 or C2). It has a non-Greek name (Mansel in Mansel and Neumann (1975) 171). On the Sidetan language and Greek–Sidetan bilinguals, see Neumann (1968); Brixhe (1969a); Nollé (1988).

The Greek history of Side commenced—or recommenced—in the early Hellenistic period with the occupation of the city by Alexander the Great, and with the growing Hellenisation reflected, for instance, in the Greek-sounding names of officials recorded on C4 coins (infra).

The city had a sanctuary of Athena (Strabo 14.4.2), and the head of this goddess is the most common coin type (infra), which testifies to the importance of her cult at Side (cf. Nollé [1993] 107–8). A late source (ibid. 262.4) gives Apollo as ktistes, and Apollo was depicted already on C5 coins (infra). The cults of Athena and Apollo undoubtedly took over from indigenous divinities (Mansel [1965] 880; Nollé [1993] 107), though Bing (1969) 111 suggests a connection with Athena Lindia.

The city is situated on a low coastal promontory c.9 km west of the estuary of the river Melas. There was direct access to a sandy bay which served as the only—not very convenient—harbour of the city (Mansel [1965] 899). The city encompassed the whole promontory, c.45 ha, in Hellenistic and Roman times, but probably comprised only the outermost peninsula in the Archaic and Classical periods. However, pre-Hellenistic urban remains are sparse; the impressive fortifications go back no earlier than C2m (Mansel [1965] 881, 897–99).

Side struck silver coins on the Persic standard from c.450/430 to 330; for the mint within Persian suzerainty, see Nollé ([1993] 49–50. The initial date of minting has been disputed, but is now placed after 450 (Kraay [1976] 275; Nollé [1993] 37, 49; for the coinage of Side: Atl. [1967]; Kraay [1969]); Brixhe (1969b)). (1) A unique stater of C5m has obv. pomegranate; legend: ΣΙ∆Η (retr.); rev. raven. Uncertain legend in Sidetan–Pamphylian alphabet (Destrooper-Georgiades [1995]). (2) Staters, C5$: obv. pomegranate resting on dolphin; rev. head of Athena in Corinthian helmet, in incuse square. Lower denominations are tetrobols and obols, types as above. (3) Rare early issues have two dolphins and a sprig of olive or a head of Apollo as rev. types. (4) Staters with obv. pomegranate and rev. head of Athena continue in later issues. Lower denominations are tetrobols and obols, types as above: obv. Lion's head, or Gorgoneion; rev. head of Athena in Corinthian helmet, in incuse square. (5) C.C4e–300 new types were introduced: staters: obv. standing Athena resting on shield or spear, holding owl or Nike, in field a pomegranate; rev. Apollo wearing only chlamys standing before an altar holding patera and laurel branch, in field legends naming officials in the Sidetan alphabet. For the stereotypically statue-based renderings of the divinities, see Nollé ([1993] 51, 112. (SNG Cop. Pamphylia 369–78; Suppl. 520).

B. Kilikia

1005. Aphrodisias Map 66. Lat. 36.10, long. 33.40. Size of territory: ? Type: C.: The toponym is Ἀφροδίσιος (Ps.-Skylax 102) or Ἀφροδισίας, -άδος, ἦ (Alex. Polyn. (FGrHist 273) fr. 29 (= Steph. Byz. 150.11), citing Zopyros; Diod. 19.64.5 (1315)). Ps.-Skylax describes it as a λιμήν; Diodorus, Ps.-Skylax and Alexander Polyhistor place it in Kilikia. Alexander Polyhistor relates a foundation myth.

The territory of Aphrodisias must have comprised the coastal lowland of the river Melas, later, with the foundation of Seleukeia, probably annexed by this city. Aphrodisias is situated on the eastern side of the isthmus joining the promontory of Zephyron with its hinterland, c.31 km south-west of Seleukeia. The city had harbours on the western and eastern sides of the peninsula (Ps.-Skylax 102; cf. Hellenkemper and Hild [1986] 28 n. 12 for the suggestion that the eastern harbour is the limen heteros of Holmoi (no. 1006)). The early remains are on two hills to the south-west of the isthmus (Bean and Mitford [1970] 193–94 fig. 8).
These, separated by a gully, were fortified by C5–C4 walls raised in cyclopean and in polygonal masonry, strengthened with square towers and a curtain-wall. The settlement area on the small plateau above the eastern harbour comprised 0.15 ha, but no extant remains are Greek (TIB 5:194).

A cult of Aphrodite is suggested partly by the name of the city (cf. the foundation myth (Steph. Byz. 150.13)) and partly by the evidence of the coin types (infra).

Aphrodisias struck silver coins on the Aiginetan standard from C520 (Imhoof-Blumer (1901–2) 433–36). Obv. female(?) figure in Knielauf holding uncertain object; rev. baetyl in incuse square (Head, HN² 717). From c.485: obv. winged female figure in Knielauf holding kerykeion or staff or wreath; rev. baetyl in incuse legend: letters of uncertain meaning (Head, HN² 717). From c.379–374, the time of Pharmabazos(?), coins were perhaps struck at this mint on the Persic standard. Staters: obv. bearded Baal holding sceptre releases bird; rev. Ahiramazda with human upper body and winged lower body. On some the obv. legend is ΙΣΣΙΕΝΩΝ (information from Peter Franke) or ΙΣΣΙΚΩΝ and Teribazu in Aramaic (Head HN² 722; SNG von Aulock 560; Brindley (1993) 4–5). (2) Coins struck in the period of the Satrap’s Revolt c.380–370 are very similar to contemporary issues of Side (no. 1009), Nagidos (no. 1010) and Holmoi (no. 1006). Staters: obv. naked Apollo standing l. holding patera; legend: ΑΠΙΑΤΡΙΟΥ and ΙΣΣΙ, or variants; rev. naked Herakles standing r. holding club, bow and arrow, and lion skin (SNG Cop. Cilicia 153–55; Brindley (1993) 7–8). (3) Another issue from the same period has obv. head of Athena, in style of Athena Parthenos; legend: ΙΣΣΙ (Brindley (1993) 8).

The coinage is the only evidence for Hellenisation in the Classical period; there is no tradition of Greek colonisation, and Issos may well have been a barbarian rather than a Hellenic polis.

1007. Issos (Isseus) Map 67. Lat. 36.50, long. 36.10. Size of territory: ? Type: Άγ. The toponym is Ισσοίς, ἦ (Diod. 17.32.4; Arr. Anab. 2.7.1 (1333)) or Ισσος, ὦ (Strabo 14.5.8; Ael. HA 6.48) or Ισσοί (Xen. An. 1.2.24, 1.4.1). It was renamed Νικόπολις by Alexander the Great (Steph. Byz. 340.2; however, Strabo 14.5.19 distinguishes the two). The city-ethnic is Ισσαῖος on some coins of c.400 (infra); Steph. Byz. 340.3 suggests Ισσάιος. Issos is called a polis, in the urban sense, by Xen. An. 1.4.1 and Diod. 14.21.1 (1401).

Issos was situated on a c.6,000 m²-wide coastal plateau near the estuary of the river Pinaros, on the western border of Kilikia Pedia (cf. Diod. 14.21.1; Strabo 14.5.1; for the identification of the site with Yeşil Hüyük, see Hellenkemper (1984)). TIB 5:278 refers to Hellenistic pottery, but no Greek urban remains have been recorded.

A silver coinage struck by local officials on the Persian standard from c.400 has been attributed to Issos (the most recent survey is Brindley (1993)). (1) Staters: obv. bearded Baal holding sceptre releases bird; rev. Ahiramazda with human upper body and winged lower body. On some the obv. legend is ΙΣΣΕΝΩΝ (information from Peter Franke) or ΙΣΣΙΚΩΝ and Teribazu in Aramaic (Head HN² 722; SNG von Aulock 560; Brindley (1993) 4–5). (2) Coins struck in the period of the Satrap’s Revolt c.380–370 are very similar to contemporary issues of Side (no. 1009), Nagidos (no. 1010) and Holmoi (no. 1006). Staters: obv. naked Apollo standing l. holding patera; legend: ΑΠΙΑΤΡΙΟΥ and ΙΣΣΙ, or variants; rev. naked Herakles standing r. holding club, bow and arrow, and lion skin (SNG Cop. Cilicia 153–55; Brindley (1993) 7–8). (3) Another issue from the same period has obv. head of Athena, in style of Athena Parthenos; legend: ΙΣΣΙ (Brindley (1993) 8).

The coinage is the only evidence for Hellenisation in the Classical period; there is no tradition of Greek colonisation, and Issos may well have been a barbarian rather than a Hellenic polis.

1008. Kelenderis Map 66. Lat. 36.10, long. 33.20. Size of territory: ? Type: άσ. The toponym is Κελένδερης, -έως (IG 11 71.146; Strabo 14.5.3; Stadiasmus 192). The MSS of Ps.-Skylax 102 have Κελένδηρες, emended in GGM. Kelenderis is called a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 102. That it was a polis in the political sense too is indicated by its membership of the Delian League. At least, it was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (IG 11 71.146), 2 tal.

Kelenderis was a Greek colony founded by Samos (no. 864) (Pompon. 1.177 (with Nagidos); Hdn. 111.2 925.7). The
Mallos is tentatively dated before 700 (Shipley 1987: 41–42). A cult of Hera was taken over from the metropolis Samos (Hdn. Pepei μυον. λέξ. 925.7, Lentz). C8l Greek sherds from Tarsos attest Greek presence in Kilikia from this period (Braun 1982: 15).

Ps.-Skylax 102 places Kelenderis in Kilikia. It lay on a coastal promontory, protecting the natural harbour below; a larger harbour was situated 1.6 km to the west. Strabo 14.5.3 describes it as having a λιμήν. Urban remains from the Greek history of the site are sparse; some stretches of the circuit wall are probably Greek, though no chronology is offered (TIB 5: 298).

Kelenderis struck silver coins on the Persic standard from C5m. (1) Staters: obv. nude horseman with whip riding to l.; rev. goat kneeling l. head reverted, at times symbols in field, all within incuse circle; legends on either obv. or rev. ΚΕΛ, ΚΕΛΕΝ (SGN Cap. Cilicia 76–78; Kraay 1962: 2–6); one issue has ΚΕΛΕΝΔΕΡΙΤΙΚΟΝ (Head, HN 719). (2) Lower denominations: thirds with types as above (SGN von Aulock 5333–34), obols, hemiobols: obv. forepart of Pegasos; rev. forepart of goat; legend: ΚΕΛ (SGN Cap. Cilicia 79–80); or Gorgoneion, or head of Athena or other types (SGN von Aulock 5614–16). (3) From c. 400–333, staters: types and legends as above, but obv. horseman riding r. (SGN Cap. Cilicia 81–84, 90–91; SNG von Aulock 5630–38); obols, types as above and obv. horse prancing, or head of Herakles (SGN Cap. Cilicia 85–89, 92–94).

1009. Mallos (Marlotas, Mallotes) Map 66. Lat. 36.45, lat. 35.30. Size of territory: ? Type: Α:β. The toponym is Μαλλός, ί (Arist. De ventis 973; Ps.-Skylax 102; Arr. Anab. 2.5.9; Eust. Comm. Dionys. Per. 875) or Μάλος (Diod. 19.56.5). The city-ethnic is Μαλλότης on C3l/C4e coins (infra) or Μαλλώτης (Arr. Anab. 2.5.9). Mallos is called a polis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 102. The collective use of the city-ethnic is found internally on coinage (infra), and externally in Arr. Anab. 2.5.9 (T333).

The Mallotai were supposedly δετοικοι of Argos (no. 347) (Arr. Anab. 2.5.9; cf. Bing (1969) 110). A foundation myth involved the Argive hero Amphilochos and Mopsos (Strabo 14.5.16; cf. supra 1216). There was a cult of Amphilochos in Mallos (Arr. Anab. 2.5.9 (T333)), and his famous oracle in Mallos is attested in late sources (Bosworth 1980: 197). The Aramaic coin legends, however, should be noted, and it has been suggested that the name indicates a Phoenician origin (Triedler (1969)). Alexander the Great conquered Mallos in 333 and put an end to an ongoing stasis between the citizens (Arr. Anab. 2.5.9).

Mallos is placed in Kilikia by Ps.-Skylax 102 and Diod. 19.56.5. It has been identified with the urban remains on a hill above the river Ceyhan (ancient Pyramos), near the present-day village of Kızıltıhta. According to local inhabitants, an inscription mentioning the city was found in the vicinity (AnatSt (1974) 28). Mallos’ harbour was Magarsos (see supra 1213), and the two cities became Antiocheia on the Pyramos during the reign of Antiochos IV. The extant urban remains are Roman (TIB 5: 337).

Mallos struck coins from C5s on the Persian standard. (1) Staters: obv. semi-nude male winged figure in Knielauf to r., holding disk with star on it, at times Aramaic legend; rev. swan, in field various symbols; legend: ΜΑΡΙΟΤΑΝ, ΜΑΡΙΑΟ, ΜΑΡΠΟ or other abbreviations. Other types are obv. bearded winged figure in Knielauf holding disk, various symbols in field; rev. as above. An issue attested by a single specimen has obv. Hermes riding l. on a ram; rev. male winged figure in Knielauf to l. carrying disk; legend: MAP. Minor denominations have obv. bearded head of Herakles, or head of Athena, or head of Aphrodite and rev. types as above; legend: ΜΑΛΛ. (2) C385–333 Mallos issued a rich coinage with a great variety of types. Staters: obv. Diosyosos; rev. male figure ploughing. Or obv. head of Kronos; rev. Demeter. Or obv. Baal standing resting on sceptre; rev. Ahuramazda (issue of Tiribazos, 386–380)). Or obv. Athena seated; rev. Hermes and Aphrodite standing. Or obv. head of Herakles; rev. bearded satrap; head of Aphrodite. Or obv. head of satrap; rev. legend: ΜΑΛΛ or ΜΑΛΛΩΤΗΣ (Imhoof-Blumer (1901–2) 467–68; Kraay (1962) 7–8; SNG Cap. Cilicia 164–65, Suppl. 580–81; SNG von Aulock, 5705–6, 5708–10).

1010. Nagidos (Nagideus) Map 66. Lat. 36.05, long. 33.00. Size of territory: ? Type: Α:α. The toponym is Ναγιδος, ή (Hecat. fr. 266; Ps.-Skylax 102; Strabo 14.6.3, conj. Corais; SEG 39 1426.46 (after 238)). The city-ethnic is Ναγιδεος (SEG 39 1426.4 (after 238); C4e coins (infra)). It is called a polis in the urban sense by Hecat. fr. 266 (Hansen (1997) 24) and Ps.-Skylax 102. It is placed between Pamphylia and Kilikia by Steph. Byz. 466.24, possibly citing Hecat. fr. 266, and in Kilikia by Ps.-Skylax 102. The metropolis was supposedly Samos (no. 864) (Pompon. 1.77; cf. Shipley (1987) 41–42), and Hecat. fr. 266 identifies an eponymous founder, Nagis.

On the basis of Strabo, who mentions Nagidos as the first city after Anemourion (14.5.3, cf. 14.6.3), the city has been identified with the ruins of Bozyazi, c.18 km east of Anemourion. Nagidos was situated on a coastal plateau,
Nagidos struck silver coins from C5 on the Persian standard. Staters: *obv.* Aphrodite seated l. on throne holding phiale, crowned by Eros; *rev.* bearded Dionysos, in *himation*, standing l. holding *thyrsos* and grapes; legend: ΝΑΓΙΔΙΚΟΝ or ΝΑΓΙΔΑ, all in incuse circle. Variant types have *rev.* Dionysos in *chalimus* holding kantharos; legend: ΝΑΓΙΔΕΩΝ. Or *obv.* of bearded Dionysos with ivy wreath; *rev.* head of Athena, legends as above. Smaller denominations are tetrobols: types as above, and obols: *obv.* head of Aphrodite; *rev.* head of Dionysos, or standing Dionysos, or head of Pan, or kantharos. The mint produced coins until c.333, with variations of the above types. Nagidos also issued a bronze coinage in the same period (SN *Cop. Cilicia* 174–84; *Suppl.* 588; *SNG von Aulock* 5748–52).

1011. Soloi (Solaeus) Map 66. Lat. 36.45, long. 34.30. Size of territory: ? Type: Ασ. The toponym is Σολεί, οἱ ( *Hecat.* fr. 268 = *Steph.* *Byz.* 581.12; *Xen.* *An.* 1.2.24; *Ps.-Skylax* 102; *Strabo* 14.5.8, 17 (rC4); *Eust.* *Comm.* *Dionys.* *Per.* 875) or Σολείω, ἦ ( *Dion.* Epic. fr. 5, *Müller*, *GGM* 11, xxvii (undated)). The city-ethnic is Σολείοι (C5 coins *infra*); *Lind. Temp. Chron.* (*FGrHist* 532) C,33; *Polyb.* 21.24.11 (190/89) or, exceptionally, Σόλοι (some C5 coins *infra*); cf. *Stroud* (1984) 201 n. 24. Soloi is called a *polis Hellenis* in the urban sense by *Ps.-Skylax* 102. The earliest attestation of the political sense is *Polyb.* 21.24.10. The collective use of the city-ethnic is found internally on Classical coins *infra*, and externally in *Lind. Temp. Chron.* (*FGrHist* 532) C,33 (rC6 or rC5) and at *Polyb.* 21.24.11.

*Hes.* fr. 279, MW, associates Soloi with the death of Amphilocchos; *Euphorion* fr. 1 ( *Scheidweiler*) and *Diog.* *Laert.* 1.51 report that the name originally derived from Solon and believe it to be an Athenian colony. Soloi was allegedly founded by Lindos (no. 997) on Rhodos and by Achaians ( *Strabo* 14.5.8, 17). *Bing* (1971) suggests a foundation date of 700–600; *Boardman* (1980) 50 suggests C7e (but notes that there is no archaeological evidence). For a pre-C7 colonisation by Argos (no. 347), see *Pompon.* 1.13; *Polyb.* 21.24.11; *Livy* 37.56.7 (with *Blumenthal* (1963) 106). *Ps.-Skylax* 102 describes Soloi as a *polis Hellenis*, and inscriptions in Doric Greek are known from the site ( *Erzen* (1940) 71 n. 118), though the term σολικίζειν, “speaking incorrectly”, is supposed to derive from Kilikian Soloi ( *Strabo* 14.2.28; cf. *Diog.* *Laert.* 1.51). It has been suggested that originally it was a Phoenician colony settled by Rhodians in C8 ( *Olshausen* (1975)).

The Argive foundation of Soloi and kinship between Argos (no. 347) and Soloi are reflected in the Argive decree (*SEG* 34.282) which grants citizenship to the Aspendians and access to the Argive *aliaia* (cf. Aspendos (no. 1001)) and refers to similar rights as granted previously, i.e. before c.330, to Soloi (*Stroud* (1984) 201–2, 208).

In 333 Alexander the Great fined the city for its support for Persia (*Arr. Anab.* 2.5.5) and gave it a democratic constitution (*Anab.* 2.5.8). A dedication was made to Athana Lindia, prior to C3, possibly in C5 or even in C6 according to *Blinkenberg* (*FGHist* 532) C,33. Soloi was situated on a coastal plateau on the estuary of the river Liparis. The urban remains of the c.35 ha settlement site are no earlier than the late Hellenistic period (*TIB* 5: 382). An acropolis is mentioned by *Curt.* 3.7.2.

Soloi struck silver coins from c.480 to 333. (1) Sigloi of the royal Persian type, c.480: *obv.* Amazon examining bow; *rev.* rough rectangular incuse. (2) In c.460 followed a first issue of staters on the Persic standard: *obv.* type as above; *rev.* bunch of grapes, no legend. (3) From c.440 staters: *obv.* Amazon kneeling l. wearing pointed cap, holding bow, in field bow case and quiver; *rev.* bunch of grapes; legend: ΣΟ or ΣΟΛΕΩΝ, at times letters, possibly magistrates’ initials, all within incuse square. Lower denominations are tetrobols (types as above), obols and hemiobols: *obv.* head of Amazon; *rev.* as above. (4) Later issues have *obv.* head of Athena in Athenian helmet; *rev.* bunch of grapes; legend: ΣΟΛΙ, or ΣΟΛΙΟ, or ΣΟΛΙΟΝ, or the ketic ΣΟΛΙΚΟΝ. Lesser denominations are obols and hemiobols (types as above). (5) From 386 to 333, staters: *obv.* head of Herakles; *rev.* bearded head of satrap in Persian tiara; legend: ΣΟΛΕΩΝ or ΣΟΛΙΚΟΝ. Also staters with types as above, but on *rev.* owl in field. (6) In C4 also an issue of bronze coins: *obv.* head of Athena; *rev.* bunch of grapes; legend: ΣΟΛΕΩΝ and magistrates’ names ( *Head*, *HN* 216–9; *Brindley* (1994) 264–65, groups 1–7; *SNG Cap. Cilicia* 223–38; *SNG von Aulock* 5857–65).
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I. The Island

The name of the island is Κύπρος, ἕ (Hom. Od. 4.83; Hdt. 1.199.5); the ethnic is Κύπριος (Pind. Pyth. 2.16; Hdt. 1.105.3). During the Archaic and Classical periods (c.750–c.325) Cyprus was divided into local kingdoms—relatively small political units whose rulers were vassals first of Assyria (C81–c.663 (c.612?)), then of Egypt (c.570–526/5), and finally of Achaemenid Persia (526/5–332). Our information about the history of Cyprus in these times is unfortunately scanty and often confused. Extant contemporary written sources are confined to Herodotos, Isokrates, Ps.-Skylax, some fragments of authors such as Solon, Aristotle and Klearchos of Soloi, and to syllabic inscriptions. The archaeological evidence is uneven, to say the least: “While the major settlements remain largely unexcavated, it is the cemeteries which provide most of our available information.”

Hellenistic and Roman inscriptions and literary texts also refer to cities in the island as πόλεις. From a methodological point of view, however, this later evidence cannot be used retrospectively in order to determine whether a Cypriot city was a polis (or was considered as such) in Archaic or Classical times. After the abolition of the kingdoms between 313 and 306, the cities began to evolve institutions modelled on the traditional Greek polis. A digraphic inscription from Amathous, in which he polis he Amathusion honours a citizen, attests the beginnings of this process. Later writers such as Diodorus may be fairly reliable witnesses for political and military events in Cyprus, or for the cults of the cities; but their designation of a city as a polis reflects more likely than not its status in the Hellenistic or Roman period.

The earliest evidence for the kingdoms of Cyprus are inscriptions of Sargon II (709) which mention seven kings of Yadvana (Kypros) paying tribute. A prism of Esharhadon (673/2) and an identical list of Ashurbanipal (664) name ten kingdoms of Cyprus. Of these, eight can be identified: Idalion, Chytroi, Salamis, Paphos, Soloi, Kourion, Tamassos, Ledroi. Qartihadast very likely equals Kition, while Νάρια defies identification, although it is sometimes equated with Amathous.

From C6 to C4, when Cyprus formed part of the Fifth Satrapy (Hdt. 3.91.1), twelve local kingdoms are securely attested in contemporary literary and epigraphical sources: Salamis, Lapethos, Soloi, Marion, Tamassos, Idalion, Amathous, Kourion, Paphos, Karpasia, Keryneia and Kition. Diodorus confirms the continuing political division of Cyprus when he reports that by C4 the island had nine πόλεις ἀξιόλογοι, ruled by a king who was in turn a vassal of the Great King (16.42.4); he probably no longer counted Idalion and Tamassos. The numbers of kingdoms given by the various ancient authors never tally exactly, but as it is obvious that critical caution has to be exercised with regard to the reliability of such lists, there seems no point in arguing too finely about the differences. There can be no doubt, however, that the number of kingdoms did vary to a certain extent.

The Cypriot kingdoms are often called “city kingdoms”, but this term seems somehow incongruous. The kings of Cyprus ruled over fairly large territories which comprised, besides the city which served both as residence and residence and...
administrative centre, small towns and villages. Diodorus hints at this state of affairs when he refers to μικρὰ πολισμάτα dependent on the πόλεις αξιόλογοι (16.42.4 (rC4m)). Most of these smaller settlements are known from archaeological evidence only. The settlement patterns, and especially the relations between centre and periphery, are now being investigated by a number of survey projects in various parts of the island. The size of the kingdoms cannot be determined with any accuracy at present. The attempts made so far are, in view of the evidence available, at best inspired guesswork. There can be little doubt, however, that all the Cypriot poleis had territories of over 500 km² and thus belong in the largest of the categories used in this Inventory.

How far do these Cypriot kingdoms and their cities fit into an inventory of Archaic and Classical Greek poleis? Their political institutions are difficult to reconstruct. The contemporary sources unequivocally record the rule of kings in the cities of Cyprus. The conditions of their vassalage and the resulting restrictions of sovereignty are not known in great detail. The basic structure common to all kingdoms—whether they were ruled by Greek or Phoenician dynasties—seems to have been a hereditary autocratic monarchy. This political system survived until the kingdoms were abolished by Ptolemy I at the end of C4.

The contemporary sources do not often designate the cities that formed the capitals of the Greek kingdoms in Cyprus as poleis. The term is applied in its urban meaning e.g. when Herodotos, describing the Persian siege operations and reconquest in 498/7, refers to τάς πόλεις τῶν Κυπρίων, viz τῶν δὲ ἐν Κύπρῳ πολίων (5.115). When Solon wishes King Philokypros of Soloi to rule long τήνδε πόλιν, polis might be taken to mean the state; the οἰκισµός context of these distics, on the other hand, could suggest an urban meaning.

In hundreds of contemporary syllabic inscriptions the term polis occurs in one text only: in the C5 bronze tablet from Idalion (no. 1013) (ICS 217) πόλις seems to be used in a restricted political sense. It is indeed extremely doubtful whether poleis in the traditional Greek sense existed in Archaic and Classical Cyprus. There is no positive evidence either for the inhabitants of the cities being citizens and not subjects, or for the development of representative institutions before the end of C4.

If we confine ourselves to the facts that are based on reliable contemporary evidence or can be inferred from it with a sufficient degree of plausibility, ten out of the fourteen settlements mentioned so far can be included in the Inventory of Archaic and Classical Greek poleis in Cyprus: Amathous (no. 1012), Idalion (no. 1013), Karpasia (no. 1014), Keryneia (no. 1015), Kourion (no. 1016), Lapethos (no. 1017), Marion (no. 1018), Paphos (no. 1019), Salamis (no. 1020) and Soloi (no. 1021).

Kition possibly appears in the Assyrian kingdom lists, but was and remained a Phoenician foundation. Chytroi, named in the Assyrian lists as a kingdom, is not mentioned again before C2e. For Ledroi, also named in the Assyrian lists, the ethnic Λέδριος is attested in a C4l inscription and in C3 inscriptions and graffiti. In the first century AD, however, Ledrai appears as a κόμη (Acta Barnabae 25). Neither town obviously was any longer autonomous at the beginning of Persian rule. Their listing as kingdoms in the Assyrian texts cannot be regarded as an equivalent for the term polis, and Chytroi and Ledroi therefore are not included in the Inventory.

Tamassos does not appear as a polis in contemporary sources, although it is named as “Tamesi” in the lists of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal. After that, “history has nothing to say about Tamassos”, until around 350–340 the bankrupt King Pasikypros sells τὸ χωριόν καὶ τὴν αὐτὸν βασιλείαν to King Pumiathon of Kition for 50 tal. (Douris FGrHist 76) fr. 4. Here again the Assyrian texts cannot provide an equivalent for the term polis. The existence of C6 built “royal tombs”, of remains of a C5–C4 fortification wall, and of Archaic/Classical sanctuaries (of Aphrodite-Astarte

12 Herodotos describes the rulers sometimes as basileis, sometimes (even in the same chapter) as τυραννοί (5.109, 110, 111); both terms denote autocratic rule. Isokrates’ description of the ruling methods of Euagoras conforms, despite its openly eulogistic tendencies (9.20–23, 46, 48, 72, 3.8), in principle with Herodotos.
13 Col. fr. 7.2, Diehl; Phl. Sol. 26: Solon counselled Philokypros to transfer the city from a hill-top to the coastal plain.
14 The hypothesis of an “essentially aristocratic government” in the kingdoms, suggested (in the wake of R. S. Merrillees, H. van Effenterre and W. D. Rupp) recently by Demand (1996), is based on a speculative (and slightly preconceived) reading of the archaeological evidence; it tends to create another factoid.
16 Borger (1956) no. 60. 64.
17 Save for a reference to τῶν Χυτρούς in a fragment of Lysias, preserved by Harpokration, s.v. Chytroi. Chytroi in a Delphic list of theonokoloi from Cyprus (C2e); Plassart (1922) 4 col. 1, 3; the restoration of the ethnic in Kafizin (C3l) by Mitford (1986) nos. 46, 221, 226, is open to doubt.
18 Borger (1956) no. 60. 71.
22 Borger (1956) no. 60. 69.
23 Maier (1994) 327.
and Apollo) do not warrant inclusion of Tamassos in the list of Archaic and Classical poleis.

Golgoi presents a slightly different case. It does not appear in contemporary sources; no coins of Golgoi are known. The archaeological evidence points to a fortified town in C5–C4, but this does not seem reason enough to list Golgoi as a polis (not even as a weak type C)—especially as it appears as a χωρίον in Paus. 8.5.2. Golgoi seems to have been, however, a relatively important cult centre “en dehors des capitales”, comparable to places such as Ag. Irini. Settlements of this type might represent the dependent mikra polismata to which Diodorus refers (16.42.4 (rC4m)).

During the Archaic and Classical periods the acropolis and the lower town were defended by a city wall with rectangular towers (Hermay (1993) 174–75; Aupert and Hermay (1995) 95; Aupert (2000) 47–52); the defences enclosed c.8 ha. The main architectural remains on the acropolis consist of a large public building (a palace?), rebuilt several times between C8m and c.300, and the open court sanctuary of Aphrodite, C8m to first century AD (Hermay (1993) 175–76, 183–87, (1997) 88; Aupert and Hermay (1995) 90–93; Aupert (2000) 52–55, 59–63).

The “goddess of Amathous” was Aphrodite, often called “Kypria” or “Aphrodite Kypria” (Catal. 36.11–14, 68.51; Verg. Aen. 10.51; Ov. Met. 10.220–42; Paus. 9.41.2 mentions an “ancient sanctuary of Adonis and Aphrodite”). The eponymous hero Amathos, son of Aërias, the founder of the Paphian shrine of Aphrodite, is said to have founded the sanctuary of the Amathousian Venus, one of the three oldest shrines in Cyprus (Tac. Ann. 3.62.4). Another tradition makes the Amathousians descendants of “companions of Kinyras, who had been put to flight by the Greeks who accompanied Agamemnon” (Theopomp. fr. 103).

The kings of Amathous struck coins on the Persian standard, from C4e on the Rhodian standard, c.460/430–c.350 (Rhoikos). Denominations: stater and fractions down to hemiobol. Principal types: obv. recumbent lion, sometimes with eagle flying above, or lion’s head; rev. forepart of lion in incuse square or circle; legend: name of king in syllabic script (Babelon, Traité ii.2 nos. 1254–77; Head, HN2 737; Masson (1983) 209–12; Amandry (1984); SNG Cop. Cyprus 1–4).

II. The Poleis

1012. Amathous (Amathousios) Map 72. Lat. 34.15, long. 33.10. Size of territory: 5. Type: Aβ. The toponym is Ἀμαθοῦσιος, ντος, ἦ (Hdt. 5.105.1; Epiph. De xii Gemmis i.6). The city-ethnic is Ἀμαθοῦσιος (Hdt. 5.104.2). Amathous possibly appears as a kingdom in the inscriptions of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal (Borger (1956) no. 60.71; Baurain (1981); Collombier (1991) 27–28). It is called a polis in the urban sense at Ps.-Skylax 103, where Amathous, with the comment αὐτῶνθενείς εἶσιν, is listed as one of the toponyms after the heading πόλεις . . . αἰῶνε. Polis in the political sense is found in SEG 16 789 (C4f/C5e). The syllabic inscriptions of Amathous show indeed that a thus far undeciphered language (“Eteokyprian”) was written (and spoken?) there (Masson (1983) 203–6; but see Reyes (1994) 13–17); a Phoenician element is also attested, especially in the Archaic period (Hermay (1997)). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in Hdt. 5.104.2.

Amathous sided with the Persians in the Ionian Revolt. The city must have been fortified by then, as it was besieged by Onesilos of Salamis and successfully defended (Hdt. 5.104–8, 114). In 391 it was allied with Soloi (no. 1021) and Kition against Euagoras I (Ephor. fr. 76; Diod. 14.98.2). King Androkles joined Alexander the Great during the siege of Tyros in 332 and lost his quinquireme (Arr. Anab. 2.22.2).

collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins (infra) and in inscriptions (ICS 217, 220, 228).

Idalion joined the Ionian Revolt and was besieged and taken by the Persians (Hdt. 5.151–2). The inscription ICS 217 records a siege of Idalion by “Medes and Kitians” (its date is disputed, between c.478 and c.445, if not later); but the siege was unsuccessful, as King Stasikypros still ruled when the inscription was set up. Thus these operations cannot have been connected with the conquest of Idalion by the Phoenicians during the reign of King Ozbaal of Kition, who seems to have ruled shortly after the middle of C5 (the precise chronology of these events and of the kings of Kition is still disputed: Collombier (1991) 34–35; Maier (1994) 310). It is also open to debate whether Idalion was incorporated into the kingdom of Kition or ruled in personal union only. In any case, Phoenician influence followed political conquest: Phoenicians lived at Idalion, as their tomb inscriptions testify; Phoenician deities were worshipped in the city. The city seems to have suffered a major destruction at the end of C4 (Stager and Walker (1989) 466; Hadjicosti (1993)), but survived into Hellenistic and Roman times.

The principal (western) acropolis was fortified already in the Archaic period, and thus was possibly affected by the Persian siege of 498/7. At the end of C6 the whole city, including both citadels (an area of c.40 ha), was enclosed by a fortification wall with rectangular bastions (stone foundation with mudbrick superstructure), which was rebuilt at least twice and remained in use until c.300 (Stager and Walker (1978), (1979), (1989) 13–57, 462–64; Hadjicosti (1994), (1995)). A large building on the western acropolis may have served in the Archaic period as a palace, and in the Classical period as the administrative centre of Idalion with archives (C4 ostraka, with mainly Phoenician, but also some syllabic and alphabetic Greek texts; Masson (1992); Hadjicosti (1994), (1995); Stager and Walker (1989) 5–13, 462–64). It remains to be seen whether the “alignments suggestive of an overall building plan” observed so far do constitute “evidence for town-planning” in C5 (Stager and Walker (1989) 463).

The main cult of Idalion was that of Aphrodite (Theoc. Id. 15.100–3; Verg. Aen. 1.681, 692–93, 10.51–52; Catal. 36.11–12, 64.96). A court sanctuary of the “Great Mother”, identified by the Greeks with Aphrodite, and a C8–C4 open-air sanctuary of Apollo Amyklos, the Phoenician “Reshef Mikal”, were situated on the eastern acropolis (Masson (1968a); Senff (1993); Gaber (1997) 137). The western acropolis housed a temenos of Athena (identified with “Anat” by the Phoenicians), C8m(?)–c.475.

The kings of Idalion struck coins on the Persian standard Cel–c.450 (Stasikypros). Denominations: stater and fractions down to twelfth. Principal types: obv. sphinx seated, or head of Aphrodite; legend: name of king in syllabic script; e-ta-li on a series of Stasikypros; rev. incuse square, or lotus flower in incuse circle (Babelon, Traité 11.2 nos. 1245–53; Head, HN3 738–39; Masson (1983) 250–52; SNG Cop. Cyprus 22).

1014. Karpasia (Karpaseus) Map 72. Lat. 35.40, long. 34.25. Size of territory: 5. Type: [A]:α. The toponym is Καρπασία, η (Hellan. fr. 57) or Καρπάσεια (Ps.-Skylax 103) or Καρπάσεια (Dion. Epic. fr. 2, Heitsch). The city-ethnic is Καρπάσειος (Hell. Oxy. 15.3; Theopomp. fr. 20). Karpasia is called a polis in the urban sense at Ps.-Skylax 103, where it is listed as one of the toponyms after the heading πόλεις...αἰδε; it was, however, possibly never the capital of a kingdom (Hadjioannou (1983) no. 197; Collombier (1993) 145). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in Theopomp. fr. 20; in Hell. Oxy. 15.2–4 an individual is repeatedly referred to as ὁ Καρπάσειος (e.g. 23.2, 3, Chambers), but the individual use proper is not attested before C3 (I.Cal. 227.A.17).

In 398 a Καρπάσειος, elected strategos of Cypriot troops in Konon’s force, led a mutiny at Kaunos (Hell. Oxy. 15.1–3). There is no further mention of the city until the siege by Demetrios in 307/6 (Diod. 20.47.2). Thus Karpasia must have been fortified at least in C4; but so far the only traces of the Archaic and Classical town are remains of a few C5–C4 houses (du Plat Taylor (1980) 160–82; see also Hogarth (1889) 88–90) and a Classical cemetery (Dray and du Plat Taylor (1957–39)). According to a fragment of Hellanikos’ Kypriaka, the town was founded by Pygmalion, king of Sidon (Hellan. fr. 57 apud Steph. Byz. 361.13–14), but there is no evidence of Phoenician presence thus far (see also Gjerstad (1948) 441–42).

1015. Keryneia (Kerynites) Map 72. Lat. 35.20, long. 33.20. Size of territory: 5. Type: [A]:α. The toponym is Κέρυνεια, η (Ps.-Skylax 103; Diod. 19.62.6). The city-ethnic is Κέρυνητης (Diod. 19.59.1 (315); a restored [Κέρυ]νητής in Mitford (1980) no. 317 (225/4) is doubtful). Keryneia is called a polis in the urban sense at Ps.-Skylax 103, where it is listed as one of the toponyms after the heading πόλεις...αἰδε. It was ruled by kings (Diod. 19.59.1 (315): basileus, 19.79.4 (313/12): dynastes). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in Diod. 19.59.1 (315) and possibly at Kafzin (Mitford (1980) no. 307).

No remains of Archaic or Classical architecture have been discovered so far; Archaic–Hellenistic terracotta and lime-
stone statuettes come from the sanctuary of an unknown deity.

From Strabo’s reference to an Achaion akte (14.6.3) on the north coast of Cyprus, it has sometimes been inferred, not very convincingly, that Keryneia was colonised from Achaia.

1016. Kourion (Kouries) Map 72. Lat. 34.40, long. 32.50. Size of territory: 5. Type: Bα. The toponym is Κουρίον (Hdt. 5.113.1). The city-ethnic is Kourieus (Hdt. 5.113.1; Arr. Anab. 22.22.2 (r322); Aupert (1982) no. 265.5). Kourion appears as a kingdom, “Kuri”, in the inscriptions of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal (Borger (1956) no. 60.68) and may have been one of the unnamed poleis mentioned in the urban sense at Hdt. 5.115. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in Hdt. 5.113.1 (cf. Aupert (1982) no. 265.5 (C2e)), its individual use externally in Arr. Anab. 22.22.2 (r322).

According to Hdt. 5.113.1, the Kouries were Αἱρείεσιν ἀποικοί (cf. Strabo 14.6.3: Argeion ktimia). Kourion joined the Ionian Revolt (Hdt. 5.113.1, by implication), but King Stas anos deserted the Cypriot army in the battle of Salamis in 498 (Hdt. 5.113.1). Thus we cannot be certain that Hdt. 5.115 implies a siege and conquest of Kourion by the Persians in 498/7; no remains of city defences of this period have been discovered so far. In 332 King Pasikrates joined Alexander the Great at the siege of Tyros and lost his quinquirem (Arr. Anab. 22.22.2); in 323/2 he was appointed theodorokos to host theoroi from Nemea (Miller (1988) 148.6–7).

The protecting god of Kourion was Apollo Hylates (I.Kourion 41, 104, etc.; Strabo 14.6.3). The remains of his sanctuary outside the walls date from C7 to the fourth century AD (Scranton (1967); Christou (1986) 50–57; Soren (1997) 305).

No coins can be securely attributed thus far to the kings of Kourion (Babelon, Traité ii.2 nos. 827–31; Head, HN² 745; Cox (1959); Masson (1983) 200–1; Collombier (1991) 30).

1017. Lapethos (Lapithios) Map 72. Lat. 35.20, long. 33.10. Size of territory: 5. Type: [Α]β. The toponym is Λῆπηθοις (Ps.-Skylax 103) or Λάπηθος (Diod. 19.62.6 (r315)) or Λάπηθος (BCH 45 (1921) 4.15 (230–220)). The city-ethnic is Λαπηθοῖς (Diod. 19.59.1 (r315)) or Λαπηθοῖς (Traunecker et al. (1981) no. 38 (c.385; Ομαθόλος Λαπηθοῖς) and Diod. 19.59.1 (r315).

Ps.-Skylax 103 calls the city Λῆπηθοις Φουίκων. In the Archaic and Classical periods Lapethos seems indeed to have represented a kind of Graeco-Phoenician community—despite a Greek foundation legend (Lakonians under Praxandros: Strabo 14.6.3) and its undoubtedly Greek character in the subsequent Hellenistic period (Lapethos in a Delphic list of theodoroikoi in Cyprus: Plassart (1921) 4.15 (230–220))). Greek and Phoenician names occur side by side in the list of kings; their coin legends uniformly use Phoenician script (except for the last king, Praxippus, who ruled when Lapethos was involved in the Successors’ struggle for Cyprus (Diod. 19.59.1, 62.6 (r315); Maier (1994) 306); no syllabic inscriptions have been found thus far.

The kings of Lapethos struck silver staters on the Persian standard Csf–c.312 (Praxippus). Principal types: obv. helmeted head of Athena; rev. helmeted head of Athena, or obv. head of Aphrodite; rev. helmeted head of Athena, or obv. head of Apollo; rev. Krater (Praxippus). Legends are: name of king in Phoenician script; Praxippos’ in Greek letters (Babelon, Traité ii.2 nos. 1356–64; Head, HN² 739; Schwabacher (1947) 79–84, 100–1 nos. 206–222; Robinson (1948) 45–47, 60–65; Kraay (1976) 302–3; SNG Cop. Cyprus 23, Suppl. 627).

1018. Marion (Marieus) Map 72. Lat. 35.05, long. 32.25. Size of territory: 5. Type: Αα. The toponym is Μάριον, τό (Ps.-Skylax 103). The city-ethnic is Μαριεύς (syllabic ma-ri-e-u-se on coins of King Sasmas (C5e), Timocharis (C5l), Stasioikos II (C4l); cf. ICS 168, 170c, 171c; Diod. 19.59.1 (r315)). Marion is called a (polis) Hellenis in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 103 (cf. Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 142). It is also likely to be one of the unnamed poleis mentioned in the urban sense by Hdt. 5.115. The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in Diod. 19.59.1 (r315), internally on the coins of Sasmas (C5e), Timocharis (C5l), Stasioikos II (C4l); cf. ICS 168, 170c, 171e.

Marion joined the Ionian Revolt and was besieged and taken by the Persians (Hdt. 5.115.1–2). Kimon laid siege to Marion in 449 (Diod. 12.3.3; Hill (1949) 123). The city was destroyed by order of Ptolemy I in 312 (Diod. 19.79.4).

Whether and when the kings of Marion were lords of the palace of Vouni and dominated Soloi (no. 1021) from there is still open to debate (Hill (1949) 123; Nicolau (1976d); Maier (1985) 36–37; Collombier (1991) 31–32; Reyes (1994) 92–94; Nielsen (1994) 54–61). Marion must have been a walled city, most likely already in 498/7, and certainly in 449, when it was besieged by the Athenians. The only remains of public architecture known so far consist of a sanctuary founded in
C8–C7 and abandoned or destroyed in C5, and of (possible) traces of ramparts (Childs (1990), (1992), (1995), (1999)). Rich cemeteries of the Archaic and Classical periods have also been excavated.

The kings of Marion struck coins of silver and later also of gold and bronze on the Persian standard from C5e (Sasmas) to C4.312 (Stasioikos II, who used the Rhodian standard for some of his coins). Denominations (silver): stater and fractions down to twelfth. Principal types: obv. recumbent lion; rev. boar with Phrixos, or obv. head of Apollo; rev. female deity (Aphrodite?) on bull, or obv. head of Aphrodite; rev. thunderbolt, or ankh. Legends are basileus and name of king in syllabic script; sometimes Marieu is added in syllabic script, in Greek letters on coins of Stasioikos II (Babelon, Traité ii.2 nos. 1328–47; Head, HN² 739–40; Schwabacher (1947) 72–78, 92–97 nos. 5–154; Masson (1983) 181–85; SNG Cap. Cyprus 24).

Ps.-Skylax 103 classifies Marion as a (polis) ‘Ελληνις. To judge from the archaeological evidence and from the epitaphs (Mitford (1960) 178–98; Masson (1983) 154–81), Marion was definitely a Greek city, despite King Sasmas (c.470/60–450?), whose name is Phoenician and who uses the Phoenician MLK for “king” on some of his coins (Gjerstad (1946); Mehl (1996b) 381 assumes a Phoenician ruling family using Greek names).

1019. Paphos (Paphios) Map 72. Lat. 34.40, long. 32.35. Size of territory: 5. Type: Α. The toponym is Πάφος, η (Alcm. fr. 55, PMG; Hdt. 7.195). The city-ethnic is Πάφος (Hdt. 7.195). Paphos appears as a kingdom, “Pappa”, in the lists of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal (Borger (1956) no. 60.66); whether the men from “Pappa” (or “Papa”) mentioned in the annals of Sargon are Paphians, Anatolians or Urartians is still uncertain: see Reyes (1994) 56. It is called a polis, possibly in the political sense, at Aesch. Pers. 892. It must also be one of the unnamed Cypriot poleis mentioned in the urban sense at Hdt. 5.115. Paphos also appears as a polis in the urban sense in an inscription (c.321–309) of the last king, Nikokles, which refers to the defences of the εὐρύχορος πόλις (Maier (1959) 207 no. 58; Mitford (1960) 203; CEG 11 869). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in Hdt. 7.195, the collective use internally on coins of King Timarchos c.350–325 (Πα[φίων]: ICS 29) and Nikokles (Παφίων: Masson (1968b)).

Paphos took part in the Ionian Revolt and was besieged and taken by the Persians (Hdt. 5.115.1–2). Elaborate siege and counter-siege works recovered by excavation allow a detailed reconstruction of the operations (Maier and Karageorghis (1984) 194–203; Maier (1996) 125–27). A Paphian contingent of twelve ships, commanded by Penthylos, fought in the Persian fleet of 480 (Hdt. 7.195). Paphos became an ally of Alexander the Great in 332 (Arr. Anab. 2.20.3, by implication).

The kings of Paphos traced their origin to the legendary founder-king Kinyras; they alone in Cyprus combined political power with the cult functions of high priest of Aphrodite (Maier (1989b)). Two syllabic inscriptions of King Nikokles (IC8; AAP4, 237) are fragments of oaths, but do not (as suggested by Mehl (1996a) 141) represent a kind of treaty between the king and his subjects.

Paphos was defended by a circuit of walls with rectangular towers, built in C81 and maintained until about 300 (remodelled C6, repaired C4: Maier and Karageorghis (1984) 128–70, 209–12; Maier and von Wartburg (1985) 153–55; cf. CEG 11 869 (C41)); it enclosed an area of c.45 ha. A large C6–C5 ashlar building, reminiscent of Achaemenid prototypes, seems to have been a royal palace; a large C4S peristyle mansion may have served public functions (Schäfer (1960); Maier (1989a) 17). An imposing chamber tomb was the burial place of two C4S kings of Paphos, Timocharis and Echetimos (Maier and von Wartburg (1998) 105–10; AAP 5).


The kings of Paphos struck silver coins on the Persian standard C6–L, c.325; Nikokles (c.325–c.309) used the Attic standard. Denominations: stater and fractions down to 1/24th. Principal types: obv. human-headed bull; rev. astragalos, or head of eagle, or obv. bull walking or standing; rev. eagle standing or flying, or obv. Zeus(?) seated on throne; rev. Aphrodite(?) sacrificing, or obv. head or bust of Aphrodite wearing crown; rev. Apollo seated on omphalos. Legends are name of king in syllabic script, except for Nikokleos Paphion in alphabetic Greek (Babelon, Traité ii.2 nos. 1278–1327; Head, HN² 740–41; Schwabacher (1947) 85–87, 101–2 nos. 224–43; May (1952); Masson (1983) 115–23; Gesche (1970) 169, 191–93; SNG Cap. Cyprus 25–30, Suppl. 628).
The traditional founder of sanctuary and town was the Arkadian king Agapenor of Tegea (Paus. 8.5.2; cf. Roy (1987); Strabo 14.6.3); but another tradition names the indigenous King Kinyras as the mythical founder (Pind. Pyth. 2.15–17; Nem. 8.16–18). The cult of Aphrodite and the Archaic sculpture of Paphos show definite Phoenician influences, but traces of Phoenician presence are lacking so far (Masson and Sznycer (1972) 81–86).

1020. Salamis (Salaminios) Map 72. Lat. 35.10, long. 33.55. Size of territory: 5. Type: Α. The toponym is Σαλαμίς, ἦ (Hdt. 4.162; Thuc. 1.112.4). The city-ethnic is Σαλαμίνιος (Hdt. 5.104.1–2) or Σελαµίνιος (ICS 323 (Cs)). Salamis appears as a kingdom,"Silli", in the lists of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal (Borger (1956) no. 60.67). It is called a polis in the political sense at Aesch. Pers. 893 and Isoc. Paneg. 141.9.19 and 3.32. Salamis is mentioned as a polis in the urban sense by Hdt. 5.104.3, 115.1; Isoc. 9.20, 47 and 3.28; Ps.-Skylax 103.70 ἄστυ τὸ Σαλαµινίων is found at Hdt. 5.104.2. The term Polites is found in Isoc. 9.30–31.

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested externally in Hdt. 5.104.1–2 and internally on coins of King Nikokreon (C5+); syllabic se-la-mi-ni (C5) in ICS 323; the individual use is found externally in Hdt. 5.108.1 and SEG 29 296 (Cs). The Greek dynasty of Salamis traced its ancestry back to the legendary hero Teukros, son of Telamon, king of the Greek Salamis (Pind. Nem. 4.46–48; Paus. 1.3.2, 2.29.4; Pouilloux (1975) 111–15). Salamis joined the Ionian Revolt (Hdt. 5.104–15) after King Gorgos had been expelled by a faction (stasiotai) led by his younger brother Onesiros (Hdt. 5.104). The desertion of its war chariots led to the defeat of the Cypriots in the battle of the πεδίον τῷ Σαλαµινίῳ (Hdt. 5.110), but Salamis was granted exemption from the retaliatory measures of the Persian army (Hdt. 5.115.1). At the end of the Athenian operations in the eastern Mediterranean in 450/49, a combined action on land and sea was fought off Salamis (Thuc. 1.112.4; Isoc. 8.86). King Euagorais I (410–374/3) strengthened the fortifications, enlarged the harbour and built a fleet of triremes (Isoc. 9.47). In 351/0–350/49 Salamis was besieged by Persian forces (Diod. 16.42.3–9, 46.1–3). King Pyttagoras joined Alexander the Great in the siege of Tyros in 332 and lost his quinquennium (Arr. Anab. 2.22.2); in 331 he acted as chorēgos at Alexander’s victory celebrations (Plut. Alex. 29.1). His son Nitaphon served as τιεριαρχος on the Indian expedition (Arr. Ind. 18.1–2.8 (1326)). In 323/2 King Nikokreon was appointed theorodokos to host theevoi from Nemea (Miller (1988) 148.3–4). King Euagorais I was given Athenian citizenship in 410 or 409; he was made proxenos in 393/2 (Pouilloux (1975) 117–18; Maier (1994) 313–14).

The monumental remains of Archaic and Classical Salamis, besides the sumptuous “princely” C8–C7 dromos tombs (Karageorghis (1969) 23–150 and (1967–71)), are scanty. They consist mainly of a short section of the southern defences which possibly included a gate. The stone and mudbrick wall was erected in the Archaic period on Proteogeometric foundations (C1?), and destroyed by fire in C6 (Jehasse (1980)). Inside the wall the remains of a sanctuary of the “Great God of Salamis”, dating to the same period, were discovered; a C5–C4 rural sanctuary of the Great Goddess was situated outside the walls to the west of the city (Yon (1993) 144–46).

The most important cult of Salamis was that of Zeus Salaminios, said to have been founded by Teukros and regarded by Tacitus as nearly as prominent as that of the Paphian Aphrodite (Ann. 3.62.4). The kings of Salamis struck silver coins in the Persian standard from c.530/20 (Euelthon) to c.310 (Nikokreon, who also used the Rhodian standard). Denominations: stater and fractions down to twelfth. From 411 coins of gold and bronze were struck too. Principal types: obv. recumbent ram, or ram’s head; rev. ank, or smooth; or obv. head of bearded Herakles in lion skin; rev. forepart of recumbent goat, or goat’s head; or obv. bust or head of crowned Aphrodite; rev. hemelmed head of Athena, or head of crowned Aphrodite; or obv. forepart of galloping horse; rev. ram’s head; or obv. ram’s head; rev. lion’s head; or obv. hemelmed head of Athena; rev. lion walking, or lion’s head; or obv. head of Aphrodite; rev. head or bust of Euagoras II; or obv. head of Artemis; rev. head of Aphrodite; or obv. head of Aphrodite in turreted crown; rev. head of Apollo. Legends are name of king in syllabic script; from C4m in alphabetic Greek (Babelon, Traité ii.2 nos. 1129–95; Head, HN² 742–44; Masson (1983) 318–23; Gesche (1970) 169, 193–96; Helly (1970); SNG Cop. Cyprus 31–62).

Ps.-Skylax 103 calls Salamis a (polis) Ἑλληνις; its society and culture were basically Greek, although there existed a small Phoenician colony there (Karageorghis (1969) 12, 149; Masson and Sznycer (1972) 123–28; Pouilloux et al. (1987) 9).

1021. Soloi (Solios) Map 72. Lat. 35.10, long. 32.50. Size of territory: 5. Type: Α. The toponym is Σόλος, αἱ (Aesch. Pers. 892 with schol.; Hdt. 5.115.2). The city-ethnic is Σόλοιος (Solon fr. 7.1, Diehl; Hdt. 5.110, 113.2). Soloi appears as a
Soloi was founded, according to Strabo 14.6.3, by the Athenians Phaleros and Akamas. Soloi took part in the Ionian Revolt, and King Aristkypros was killed in the battle of Salamis (Hdt. 5.104.1, by implication); the city was besieged and taken by the Persians in 498/7 (Hdt. 5.115.1–2).

That the city was afterwards for a time controlled by a “Persophile king” of Marion remains an unproved hypothesis (Maier 1985) 36–37, (1989a) 18; Collombier (1991) 31–32. In 391 it was allied with Amathus (no. 1012) and Kition against Euagoras I of Salamis (Ephor. fr. 76; Diod. 14.98.2; Maier 1994) 314–15: after the Cypriot rulers had sided with Alexander the Great in 332 (Arr. Anab. 2.20.3; Plut. Alex. 24.2), King Pasikrates acted as choregos at Alexander’s victory celebrations in 331 (Plut. Alex. 29.2); his son Nikokles served as trierarchos on the Indian expedition (Arr. Ind. 18.1–2.8 (1326)). In 323/2 King Stasikrates was appointed theodorodokos to host theoroi from Nemea (Miller 1988) 148.9–10.

Solon is said to have counselled King Philokypros to transfer the city from the hill-top position of Aipeia down into the coastal plain (Plut. Sol. 26; cf. Hdt. 5.113.2). The city must have been walled before 499/8, since it took the Persian army five months to defeat it (Hdt. 5.115.2), but no remains of the fortifications have been discovered thus far. A large, well-constructed C3–C4 building on a prominent site above the Roman theatre has been identified tentatively as a royal palace (de Gagniers and Tam Tinh 1985; Maier 1989a) 16). Remains of Archaic and Classical buildings have been traced in the lower city (Nicolaou 1976b) 851; an Archaic temple has been excavated on the acropolis (Gjerstad 1937) 412–15.

The kings of Soloi struck silver coins on the Persian standard (Strakos–χρυσοχόου) (Eunostos). Principal types: obv. head or forepart of lion; rev. Gorgoneion, or octopus; or obv. lion’s head; rev. forepart of bull; or obv. Herakles; rev. Athena; or obv. head of Apollo; rev. tripod; or obv. head of Apollo; rev. head of Aphrodite. Legends are name of king in syllabic script; in alphabetic Greek for Pasikrates and Eunostos, after c.311 (Babelon, Traite ii.2 nos. 1348–53; Head, HN2 745; Masson 1983) 220–22.
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I. The Regions

The area considered here includes the lands stretching from the mouth of the river Orontes in Syria to the Pillars of Herakles in the far west. This is a vast and diverse area, but the common element is that, apart from the Libyan plateau and its coastline, and the special case of Egypt, it was characterised by the absence of large-scale Greek implantation in the period before Alexander and the scarcity of definite or probable poleis. In Syria, while Greek contacts are attested archaeologically from an early date, only one polis receives a casual mention in C5—Posideion (no. 1022) in north Syria—and it has little recorded history. In Egypt significant Greek presence started in C7, but only two Greek settlements—Naukratis (no. 1023) in the west of the Nile Delta and the Samian settlement Oasis (no. 1024)—may have been poleis in Archaic and Classical times, though in both cases polis status is debatable. It was only in Libya that several Greek poleis were founded in the Archaic period: Kyrene (no. 1028), Barke (no. 1025), Taucheira (no. 1029) and Eu(h)esperides (no. 1026). Further to the south and west beyond Eu(h)esperides there was no lasting Greek settlement, and evidence for Greek poleis is almost completely missing.

The reason for this is probably that in this period, and with the exception of Libya, the Greeks were not in a position to establish themselves on their own terms, as they were elsewhere. If they settled at all, it was on conditions regulated by the local powers: the empires of the Middle East in Syria (the Assyrians, later the Babylonians, then the Persians), the Phoenician cities, the pharaohs in Egypt, and to the west of the Libyan plateau the Carthaginians (cf. Strabo 17.1.19 on their hostility).

1. Syria

The name “Syria” designated a large but ill-defined area, and there were different ancient views of its boundaries (cf. Honigmann (1932) 1552–53). For Herodotos Syria started at Posideion (no. 1022) (modern Bassit), which he described as lying on the boundaries between the Kilikians and the Syrions—in other words, some 25 km to the south of the river Orontes (which he does not mention). Strabo, on the other hand, defined Syria as bounded on the north by Kilikia and Mt. Amanos (16.2.1), with Pylai as the boundary between the Kilikians and the Syrions (14.5.19; cf. 20 on Seleukia in Pieria). In this chapter the dividing line is taken as the river Orontes. Syria comprised both Phoinike (Hdt. 2.116.6) and Palestine (Hdt. 3.5.1), and Herodotos drew the boundary between Syria in the south and Egypt at Mt. Kasios (modern Ras el Kasroun) and Lake Serbonis, where Egypt started (2.6.1, 158.4, 3.5.2; cf. 2.141.4 on Pelousion).

After the breakdown of relations between the Greek world and the Levant at the end of the Bronze Age, contacts were eventually resumed. The earliest evidence of Greek finds from coastal Levantine sites comes now from some Protogeometric amphoras of C10m found at Bassit and at Tyre in Phoinike (Courbin (1993)), and 103–4 on Tyre). At Al Mina at the northern mouth of the Orontes, Greek pottery was arriving not later than C8s and possibly earlier (the date is disputed), while at Tell Sukas some 30 km to the south of Lattakiye, Greek material began to arrive from C9s. The interpretation of this evidence is disputed, and there are conflicting estimates of the relative roles played by Greeks and easterners, notably the Phoinikians, in the renewal of links between the Greeks and the eastern world (for contrasting views see e.g. Riis (1970) 126–75; Graham (1986); Boardman (1990); Perreault (1993); Courbin (1993)).

It is clear, however, that even on the most favourable estimate of the role played by Greeks, Greek settlement in Syria was limited. Even where there is most evidence of Greek presence, the sites have a Levantine history that precedes the arrival of the Greeks, and any resident Greeks represented only a part of the total population (Riis (1970) 129; Perreault (1993) 82). In practice, with one exception (Posideion (no.
1022)), the whole of Syria was empty of Greek poleis down to the time of Alexander.

Neither Al Mina nor Tell Sukas are mentioned in any Classical source, and there is no evidence to show that either had the status of a polis. The excavations at Al Mina uncovered only part of the town and the warehouses, and there is no evidence for any sanctuaries there. At Tell Sukas remains have been found of a sanctuary of C7 and C6, which has been identified as Greek and possibly dedicated to Apollo (Riis (1970)), but the identification has been questioned (Perreault (1993) 71–79, esp. 75–77). In any case, this does not by itself say anything about the institutional status of the Greek community there.

Bassit, however, is almost certainly identical with Posideion (Ποσίδιον) (no. 1022), the one Greek settlement in Syria that can be considered a polis in the Classical period.

In Phoinike further south there is nothing to suggest the existence of any Greek polis through the Archaic and Classical periods. A few Protogeometric Greek amphoras reached Tyre as early as C10m, and there are finds of Greek pottery subsequently (Courbin (1993) 103–4). There is evidence in the Old Testament of the presence of Greek traders at Tyre in the Archaic period (Ezekiel 27; cf. Bunnens (1979) 79–90; Diakonoff (1992)). Sources of the Classical period attest commercial relations between the Greek world and the Phoinikian cities (e.g. Thuc. 2.69.1; Xen. Hell. 3.4.1; Tod 139 (C4f); cf. Perreault (1986)). But there were no Greek settlements in Phoinikian territory.

Further south at Mezad Hashavyahu in Palestine, halfway between Jaffa and Ashdod, remains have been found of a fortress with a substantial amount of east Greek pottery dated to the last third of C7, and sufficient to imply the presence of Greeks on the spot at that time. It is most likely that they were mercenaries in the service of Psammetichos I of Egypt (664–610), who established the fort during his campaigns in Palestine and Syria in the latter part of his reign. There is nothing to suggest that this temporary settlement was ever a polis (Naveh (1962); Austin (1970) 16 and n. 1; Haider (1988) 204–6).

2. Egypt

According to Herodotos, the boundaries of Egypt along the sea in the north stretched from the Gulf of Plinthinetes in the west of the Nile Delta to Mt. Kasios (modern Ras al Kasroun) and Lake Serbonis in the east (2.6.1; cf. 2.7–9 for a description of the land). The Cataracts and Elephantine formed the southern boundary, beyond which lay Ethiopia (2.17–18).

Egypt attracted Greeks from an early period. Stories in the Odyssey (14.245–86, 17.224–44) imply raiding by Greeks on the Nile Delta as a contemporary phenomenon. Strabo relates how the rulers placed a guard at Rhakotis, the site of the later Alexandria, to keep out Greek raiders (17.1.6; cf. 17.1.19 on Egyptian hostility to foreigners). Under Psammetichos I (664–610) Egypt was brought under the control of a strong central government, partly with the help of Ionian and Carian pirates enlisted by Psammetichos as mercenaries. It is to his reign that Hdt. 2.152 dates the first settlement of Greeks in Egypt and the beginnings of a more accurate knowledge by them of Egyptian affairs. The rulers of Egypt needed the services of Greeks as well as other foreigners, but they regulated the terms on which they were admitted to the land (cf. Austin (1970); Lloyd (1975) 1–60; Boardman (1980) 111–53; Braun (1982); Haider (1988) 153–223).

Greek settlement was concentrated for the most part in Lower Egypt, i.e. the Nile Delta and as far as Memphis. Known Greek settlements of the Archaic and Classical periods include the following (in alphabetical order).

Daphnai (Δαφναί) Hdt. 2.30 mentions the establishment of three principal garrison posts in Egypt by Psammetichos I, one of them at Daphnai on the Pelusian (eastern) branch of the Nile, against the Arabs and the Assyrians. There is no mention of Greeks (or Carians) in this context, though the settlement is very likely to have included them. At a site called Tell Defenneh evidence of Greek (and Carian) presence in C6 in the reign of Amasis (570–526) has been found, and the identification with Daphnai is probable. The recovered pottery finds end around 525, though this need not mean that the settlement came to an end then (Austin (1970) 20; Boardman (1980) 133–34). 1 On a C5 graffito from Abydos a certain Timarchos describes himself as Δαφναίτης, which could imply continuity of the Greek community at Daphnai. The use of the ethnic does not mean, however, that the Greeks at Daphnai ever formed a polis with its own citizenship (Bresson (1980) 316; Hansen (1996) 185). Barr. 74, AC.

Memphis (Μέμφις) Hdt. 2.154 mentions the transfer of the Greek and Carian mercenaries from Stratopeda (infra) to Memphis during the reign of Amasis. Archaeological

1 Evidence has also been discovered of another large fort some 20 km from Tell Defenneh, with C6 Greek pottery and cremations (Boardman (1980) 134–35; Haider (1988) 203–41).
evidence further suggests the presence of Greeks in Memphis from C7 onwards, and it is likely that the Greek community there had a continuous existence through to Hellenistic times. In C3 a body of ‘Ελληνομεµφίται was established there, with a sanctuary called the ‘Ελλήνων and representatives known as περιόχοι, both of which recall Naukratis (no. 1023), and which may have originated in C6 (Austin (1970) 20–22; Boardman (1980) 134–35; Thompson (1988) 95–97; cf. too Gallo and Masson (1993)). On a C5 graffito from Abydos a certain Chariandros describes himself as Μεµφίτης, but as with the case of Timarchos from Daphnai, this does not imply that the Greeks at Memphis formed a polis with its own citizenship (Bresson (1980) 316; Hansen (1996a) 185).

Milestone Teichos (Μηλησίων τείχος) This settlement near the Bolbitine mouth of the Nile is mentioned by Strabo 17.1.18, who relates its fortification by the Milesians in the time of Psammethicos I, before they went on to found Naukratis not far above Sedia. Nothing further is known about the site, and the role credited to the Milesians will be discussed below in relation to Naukratis (no. 1023). Barr. 74 lists it as unlocated and dates it HR.

Naukratis (Ναύκρατις) See the Inventory (no. 1023).

Oasis (Οασίς) See the Inventory (no. 1024).

Stratopeda (Στρατόπεδα) Hdt. 2.154 mentions the settlement by Psammethichos I of his Greek and Carian mercenaries in opposite camps (στρατόπεδα), with the Nile flowing between them, on the eastern (Pelusian) branch of the Nile, near the sea and a little below Bubastis. He relates that they stayed there until Amasis moved them to Memphis to use them as a bodyguard against the Egyptians, and according to Herodotos traces of the settlement at Stratopeda were still to be seen in his time. There is no evidence to suggest that these settlements (not to be identified with Tell Defenneh (supra)) constituted a polis.

Beyond these settlements attested by literary and/or archaeological evidence, there are indications in Herodotos of Greeks present elsewhere in Egypt in the Classical period (2.39.2, 41.3, 91, 180.2; cf. Austin (1970) 33).

3. Libya

Libya was commonly reckoned to begin at the Nile valley, which for most writers formed the boundary between Asia and Libya (Hdt. 2.15–17; cf. 4.45.2). Herodotos, however, argued that the whole of Egypt should be reckoned as part of Asia, and Libya proper therefore lay to the west of Egypt (cf. also 2.8, 18, 19.1, 30.2, 124.2; 4.41, 197). Strabo reasserted the standard view, without any mention of Herodotos on this point (2.5.26; cf. 2.5.33, 17.1.30, 53). Knowledge of the western and southern extremities of Libya was extremely vague in the Classical period (cf. Hdt. 4.181, 185), as the area of Greek settlement and influence was confined to a small part of the continent. The name “Libya” was therefore often used to designate that area specifically (cf. frequently in the account of the foundation of Kyrene, Hdt. 4.150–51; Pind. Pyth. 4.6), though no a priori limits were established to Greek settlement (cf. Malkin (1994) 169–74).

Under the Roman Empire the area constituted the province of Cyrenaica, but the term “Cyrenaica” is not found until the time of Augustus. Though convenient and commonly used, it is therefore anachronistic for the Classical and Hellenistic periods (Chamoux (1953) 35–36; Laronde (1987) 44–45, 418, 488). The term “Cyrenaica” is frequently used by the Elder Pliny, for example (e.g. HN 2.115, 5.28, 6.209). Strabo, on the other hand, avoids it and applies instead η Κυρηναία to distinguish the area of Greek settlement from Carthaginian territory in the west and Egyptian territory in the east (e.g. 2.5.20, 33; 17.3.20). The word and concept are attested first in late Classical and early Hellenistic times (SEG 23 189 1.116 (c.330); Arist. Hist. an. 556b; Theophr. Hist. pl. 4.3.1, 4. 5.3.7). The phrase η Κυρηναίη χώρη is used by Hdt. 4.199.1, but only to refer to the territory of Kyrene proper, not to the whole area of Greek influence.

Kyrene (no. 1028), the earliest Greek foundation in Libya, became rapidly the largest and most conspicuous of the Greek poleis there. A wide sphere of potential Kyrenaian influence was recognised by C4, as appears from the diagramma of Ptolemy I for Kyrene (SEG 9 1 and 18 726 (322/1); Laronde (1987) chs. 4–5), where Kyrenaian citizenship is defined as including, among others, men born from (Kyrenaian fathers and) the Libyan women between the Great Katabathmos and Authamalax (SEG 9 1.3). The Great Katabathmos lies to the east and corresponds to the modern Gulf of Solloum, east of Tobruk and at the western limit of modern Egypt (Laronde (1987) 220–28). Since, according to Ps.-Skylax 108, Kyrenaian influence started only at Cape Chersonese (modern Ras et Tin; Laronde (1987) 219) it is likely that Kyrene’s control was extended eastward during

² An exception is Diod. 40.4.1, citing an inscription set up by Pompey in the late 60s to celebrate his achievements.

³ As frequently by Malkin (1994).
C₄S (ibid. 228). Authamalax lies west in the Great Syrits, to the east of Arae Philaenorum, and is identified with modern Bu Sceefa (Goodchild (1952a); Laronde (1987) 199–200, 206–7, 350; testimonia in Purcaro Pagano (1976) 328–29). This wide area is much larger than the territory proper of Kyrene, or even the area of Greek settlement, which extended from Kyrene on the Libyan plateau in the east to Eu(h)esperides in the west.

A. The area of Greek settlement as far as Eu(h)esperides

The fertile and well-watered Libyan plateau, within easy reach of the Aegean Greek world, was a natural target for Greek settlement, not least because of the lack of strong organisation on the part of the indigenous Libyan tribes, which allowed the Greeks to maintain the initiative. The known Greek settlements in Libya in the Archaic and Classical period are as follows (alphabetically).

**Apollonia (Ἀπολλωνία)** Archaeological evidence indicates that the site of the harbour of Kyrene (no. 1028), some 12.5 km inland in a straight line, was occupied from c.600, soon after Kyrene herself (Boardman (1966) 152–53; testimonia on Apollonia in Purcaro Pagano (1976) 327–28). After the Classical period the site was known as Apollonia, and it eventually became a *polis* in its own right, though the precise date and circumstances are uncertain (Goodchild et al. (1976); Laronde (1987) 457–61, (1996), who sets the change in C1e). The earliest mention of the name of Apollonia appears to be in the Aristotelian *Περὶ σηµείων* (Arist. fr. 363). The earliest epigraphic mention of Apollonia is in an inscription of the year 67, though the name is restored (SEG 20 709.4; cf. Laronde (1987) 457, 459, 461). The first reference to Apollonia as a *polis* is in Strabo, where it is described as the “naval station” (ἐπίνειον) of the Kyrenaians and a large *polis* (17.3.20), and also as one of several *πολίς* that were *περιπόλια* of Kyrene (17.3.21). During the Classical period references to the harbour of Kyrene do not give it a name, and it is very unlikely that it was a *polis* at this time (Chamoux (1953) 221 n. 21; cf. Hdt. 5.47.1, where it is referred to by implication; Ps.-Skylax 108; Diod. 18.20.1–2). It was fortified in 322, as the siege by Thibron in 322 shows (Diod. loc. cit.).

**Aziris (Ἄζηρις)** Aziris was the site on the Libyan coast opposite the island of Platea which the early colonists settled first and occupied for 6 years before they moved to Kyrene (no. 1028) inland (Hdt. 4.151.2–52.2, 156.3, 157.1, 3). The island is to be sought in the Gulf of Bomba, but the precise identification is disputed (Chamoux (1953) 115–17; Boardman (1966) 149–50; Laronde (1987) 223–24; testimonia in Purcaro Pagano (1976) 344–45).

**Barke (Βάρκη)** See the Inventory (no. 1025).

**Eu(h)esperides (Εὐεσπερίδες)** See the Inventory (no. 1026).

**Kinyps (Κίνυψ)** See the Inventory (no. 1027).

**Kyrene (Κυρήνη)** See the Inventory (no. 1028).

**Platea (Πλατέα)** This was the island off the coast of Libya where the early colonists from Thera (no. 527) established themselves for 2 years, before they eventually moved to the mainland and settled, first at Aziris (*supra*) and then at Kyrene (no. 1028) (Hdt. 4.151.2–52.2, 156.3, 157.1, 3). The island is to be sought in the Gulf of Bomba, but the precise identification is disputed (Chamoux (1953) 115–17; Boardman (1966) 149–50; Laronde (1987) 223–24; testimonia in Purcaro Pagano (1976) 344–45).

**Taucheria (Ταύχειρα)** See the Inventory (no. 1029).

**Tolmeita** Modern Tolmeita, the site of the harbour of Barke (no. 1025) some 30 km away, has produced pottery fragments dating from C71 onwards (Boardman (1966) 153). According to Hdt. 4.160.1, Barke itself was founded only in the reign of Arkesilas II (c.603bc). It seems therefore possible that there was a town on the site before the foundation of Barke. The harbour of Barke is first mentioned in Ps.-Skylax 108 (Laronde (1987) 61–65), who says simply λιµὴν ὁ κατὰ Βάρκην and does not name it. There is no evidence to show that it was a *polis* in the Classical period (cf. Apollonia (*supra*) and Kyrene (no. 1028)). In the reign of Ptolemy III, the harbour town was built up somewhat artificially at royal instigation to become a major city, with large fortifications and a new urban layout on a regular grid plan. Barke was deliberately demoted in status, while the new city received the name of Ptolemais (Πτολεμαίς), which has survived in

---

4 There is no mention in the story of the foundation and growth of Kyrene of any presence or intervention on the part of the Phoinikians.

the modern place-name Tolmeita (Strabo 17.3.20; Laronde 1987) 382–83, 396–401, 460; testimonia in Purcaro Pagano (1976) 345–46).

B. To the west of Eu(h)esperides as far as the Pillars of Heracles

To the south and west of Eu(h)esperides there was no long-term Greek settlement in the period before Alexander, though there is evidence of continued Greek interest in the possibility of further expansion in this direction. Legends associated with the voyages of the Argonauts connected them not just with the part of Libya settled by the Greeks but with lands further to the west. Thera (no. 527), the mother city of Kyrene (no. 1028), was reportedly founded by a band of Minyans from Sparta (no. 345), descendants of the Argonauts (Hdt. 4.145–49). Pindar elaborated at length the connection between Kyrene and the Argonauts: the Battiaeid themselves were of Argonaut descent through Euphemos, and the Greek settlement in Libya was presented as the long-delayed fulfilment of a prophecy once made by Medea, who was herself recalling an earlier prophecy made to Euphemos at (the mysterious) Lake Tritonis (Pyth. 4.9–69).\(^6\) Herodotus mentions elsewhere (4.178) a prophecy that the island of Phla in Lake Tritonis was to be settled by the Lakedaimonians, and goes on to relate a prophecy made by the sea-god Triton to Jason that 100 Greek cities would have to be founded around Lake Tritonis, a prophecy which the Libyans contrived to frustrate (4.179).

The unsuccessful attempt of the Spartan Dorieus in around 512 to found a settlement at Kinyps (Kýrpsi) (no. 1027) fits such legends, and illustrates the long Spartan connection with Libya (Chamoux 1953) 88, 242; Nafissi (1985); Schaus (1985); Schaus in White (1984–93) ii. 98–102; Malkin (1994)). On the settlement, which may have been a short-lived polis, see the Inventory.

No further Greek attempt at settlement along the west coast of Libya is known until the time after Alexander (the expedition of Ophellas from Kyrene to Carthage), but there are indications of moves in C4 by the Greeks of Libya to push the Greek sphere of influence further westward in opposition to the Carthaginians (Laronde 1987), 200, 202, 487).

The colonisation of Libya was carried out by Dorian Greeks. It has been claimed, however, that it was preceded by an earlier colonisation, by Ionian Greeks, who were the first to settle in the west in Italy and Sicily. This alleged colonisation was not in the region of the Syrtis (unlike the attempt of Dorieus), but much further, to the west of Carthage, and was eventually stifled by Carthaginian opposition (Mazzarino (1947) 117–20; at length, Treidler (1959)). This is a possibility, but the evidence for it is limited to two passages in literary sources, and there is as yet no archaeological or other confirmation.

(1) Hecat. fr. 343 = Steph. Byz. 389.13–14 mentions a place called Kybos on the coast of North Africa which he describes as a polis of the Ionians: Κύβος· πόλις Ἐκάταυς-ΧιΞτάω Εὔβοια Φανίκων. ‘Εκάταυος Περιηγήσει αὐτής “καὶ λιμήν ποιν ἄκρη καὶ Κυβό·”. The exact location is unknown. There is no further evidence of its existence, and the accuracy of the information is disputed (in favour: Mazzarino (1947) 119; Treidler (1959) 263; against: Gsell (1914) 344–46).

(2) Ps.-Skylax 111, describing the Libyan coast from east to west, writes Ἀπὸ Ἰτύκης Τππου ἄκρα [ἡ] Τππον πόλες, καὶ λίμην ἑπ’ αὐτῆ ἐστὶ καὶ νῆσοι ἐν τῇ λίμνη· καὶ περὶ τὴν λίμνην πόλεις [ἐν] ταῖς νῆσοις αἰτὶ́· Ψέγας πόλες, καὶ ἐναντίον αὐτῆς Ναξικαὶ πολλαί. Πιθηκοῦνα καὶ λιμῆν· καὶ ἐναντίον αὐτῶν καὶ νῆσος καὶ πόλες ἐν τῇ νήσῳ Εὐβοία. On the strength of the Greek names, the sites have been interpreted as foundations by Ionian Greeks to the west of Carthage (see Treidler (1959)). But the reliability of the information is far from established, and the use of Greek names to describe far-away places is no guarantee of their Greekness. While Ps.-Skylax is generally accurate in his description of the Greek world, his information about countries remote from the Greek world is of uncertain value,\(^7\) and in the absence of supporting evidence the question must remain open.

II. The Poleis

1. Syria

1022. Posideion Map 68. Lat. 35.50, long. 35.50. Size of territory: 1 Type: Αβ. The toponym is Ποσείδης, τό (Hdt. 3.91.1). or Ποσείδον (Strabo 16.2.8); Ποσείδειον at Ps.-Skylax 102 is an emendation of MS Ποσεαθέριον. No city-ethnic is attested in the full form apart from Steph. Byz. 533.12. The identification of Posideion with Bassit has long

\(^6\) There is no agreement among ancient writers as to the exact location in Libya of Lake Tritonis (Malkin 1994) 197–201).

\(^7\) Ps.-Skylax 111 contains a large number of place-names that are unknown from other sources; see the list in Flensted-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 165.
been considered probable from the similarity of name (cf. Riis (1970) 137–38; Courbin (1986) 187–88 and 206–7). Posideon is first mentioned by Hdt. 3.91.1 as a polis founded by Amphilochos, son of Amphiaras, on the borders between the Kilikians and the Syrians—in other words, a foundation that was believed to go back to the Bronze Age, and which Herodotos presented as Greek. Since the C7 poet Kallinos of Ephesos (cited by Strabo 14.4.3) alluded to the settlement of the followers of Amphilochos in Kilikia and Syria as far as Phoinike, it is probable that the story of the foundation of Posideon by them was already in circulation by his time. Courbin (1986) 194 suggests that the story does not reflect an actual Greek settlement of the late Bronze Age, for which there is no archaeological confirmation, but was invented in C8s as a legitimisation for the Greek presence at the site which begins at that time. For Greek heroic legends connected with the Levant cf. Riis (1970) 137–42. Strabo mentions Posideon at 16.2.8 and 12, where it is called a πολικήνων, while Steph. Byz. 533.12 refers to it as a polis for which he gives the ethnic Ποσειδειείων, though this information may be merely constructed from Herodotos.

Archaeological evidence has shown that Ras el Bassit had a continuous existence through to Hellenistic and Roman times, but it clearly was in origin a Levantine site to which the Greeks came late (C8s), and which in the Archaic and Classical periods was not purely Greek, though it became a Greek polis (Courbin (1986); Perreault (1993) 69–71, though he obscures the character of Posideon as a Greek polis). Archaeology has not revealed for this time any public buildings, cultic places or city walls (Courbin (1986) 203). The settlement developed in the Hellenistic period, and there is now evidence of fortifications (Courbin (1986) 206–9). In C3m it is referred to in the Gurob papyrus (FGrHis160i §1), where it is described as a φρούριον. It is also mentioned by Diod. 34/35.28.1, 2 (1123), though without indication of its character.

Posideon struck coins of silver (drachm on the Attic standard) and bronze in C4s. Only a few are known, identified by the legend ΠΟΣΙΔ or ΠΟΣΙΔΕ on the reverse. The types are: obv. seated deity (Baal of Tarsos); rev. head of a Kabeiros or Poseidon with trident (Head, HN2 785; Courbin (1986) 205–6; Le Rider (1986) 400–3).

2. Egypt

1238. Naukratis (Naukratites) Map 74. Lat. 30.55, long. 30.35. Size of territory: unknown. Type: Ai/B. The toponym is Ναύκρατις, ἦ, attested on dedications at Naukratis of C6 (Bernard (1970), 683 no. 439, 744–45 no. 5; Lazzarini (1976), nos.175,177c), in Herodotos (2.97.2, 135.5, 178.1, 179) and on a Rhodian proxeny decree (Lindos ii no.16.4–5 (C51)), and frequently thereafter. The city-ethnic is Ναυκρατίτης, doubtfully restored on a C6 vase dedication (Bernard (1970), 708 no. 670), and first securely attested on an Attic tombstone dated to C5 (IG ii² 9984). There are further examples on inscriptions of C4, at Athens (IG ii² 1631, C4f), 206.7–8, 20 (C4m), 9985–87 (C4f), at Delphi (CID ii 4.1.37, 111, 24, 11 10 fr. B.1, 3, 5), and at Ephesos (I.Eph 1424.1 (323–321)). The form [Ν]αυκρατίτης is also found (I.Eph 1425.1 (323–321); on the date, cf. Keil (1923) 238–39, 244). Steph. Byz. 470.12–15 also mentions the form Ναυκρατίώτης, but there is no attestation of this.

The external use of the city-ethnic is found collectively in the Delphic ναυροίoi accounts (CID ii 4.1.37 (360s)) and individually in Attic sepulchral inscriptions (IG iii² 9587–89 (C4f)). An early literary example of the non-political use of Ναυκρατίτης is in Anacreon (fr. 89, Page PMG; Campbell, Greek Lyric ii (1988) 106 no. 434). Literary examples of the city-ethnic in the political sense are all post-Classical. For example, Plutarch introduces ὁ Ναυκρατίτης Νειλόξενος in a C6 context (Mor. 146E), allegedly an intimate of Solon and Thales in Egypt (cf. also repeatedly in Athenaios, himself a Naukrateitē, e.g. 3.73A, 4.149D).

Naukratis was without doubt a polis in the period after Alexander: an honorific decree of probably C2f was passed by ἦ πόλις ἦ Ναυκρατίτι[ῶν] (OGIS 120; Bernard (1970) 751–72 no. 15), and later writers assume that it was a polis that had been founded in the same way as others in the Archaic period (Strabo 17.1.18; Steph. Byz. 470.12–15 citing Strabo; Suda s.v. ἩΝαύκρατις). But whether it can be reckoned to have been a polis in the Archaic and Classical periods continues to be debated (for Naukratis as a polis cf. Roebuck (1951), followed by Sherk (1992) 259–60 and 268–69; Austin (1970) 29–33; Hansen (1997a) 91–94, (1997b) 29, 32–33; against: Bresson (1980); Bowden (1996) 29–30).

Herodotos is the earliest author to call Naukratis a polis already in C6 (2.178.1): Φιλέλλην δὲ γενόμενος ὁ Ἀμαίας ἀλλὰ τε ἐς Ἐλλήνων μετετέθηκαν ἀπεδέχατο καὶ δὴ καὶ τοῖς ἀπήκοαν ἐς Αἴγυπτον ἔδωκε Ναύκρατις πόλιν ἐνοικήσασα. There may be a very indirect reference to Naukratis as a polis in 2.180.2, where the Delphians visit the polis and receive contributions from Amasis and from "the Greeks living in Egypt", a reference which must include Naukratis (compare the same phrase in the Rhodian decree Lindos ii cols. 212–14, referring to Naukratis). It has been questioned whether Herodotos is
using the word polis strictly (Bresson (1980) 292–93; Bowden (1996) 29–30), but he is otherwise consistent in applying the word to Greek communities that were polis in the political as well as the urban sense (Hansen (1996b) 23–34, 39–54). Inscriptions of the Classical period provide conclusive evidence from the use of the city-ethnic Ναυκρατίτης, found on tombstones of metics in Athens (IG 11² 9984–87 (C51–C44)), in a proxeny decree from Delphi for Naukratites (F.Delphes 111.1 419 (C41?) ), from two Athenian proxeny decrees for Naukratites (IG 11² 163.1 (C4f), 206.7–8, 20 (349/8)), and from two decrees from Ephesos granting citizenship to Naukratites (I.Eph 1424, 1425). Furthermore, in the Delphic naopoi accounts the Naukratitai are listed as a community under the heading πόλεις και ἰδιώται (CID 11 4.1.37, 4.111.21, 24, 10 fr. B.1, 3, 5 (369–363)). It has been denied that these ethnics indicate political status as opposed merely to place of origin (Bresson (1980) 316–17, 332 no. 84; Bowden (1996) 30), but this is not consistent with the evidence for ethnics on Attic tombstones or for the institution of the proxeny (Hansen (1996a) 184–85, cf. 177–80; Hansen (1997a) 91–94). Note also the notorious Kleomenes of Naukratis, appointed as financial official in Egypt by Alexander in 332/1 (Berve (1926) no. 431), who is described as Ναυκρατίτης by Ps.-Callisthenes 1.31, though only as ἐκ Ναυκράτως at Att. Anab. 3.5.4.

Naukratis was an unusual community in a special position. Established by a multiplicity of different Greeks as an enclave within Egyptian territory, on the eastern side of the Canopic branch of the Nile, and some 70 km from the sea (cf. Bernard (1970) 615–25 on its position), it was dependent for its existence and prosperity on the continued good will of the rulers of Egypt, from the pharaohs to the Romans. It could not engage in any independent political activity, and if it was a polis already in the Archaic and Classical periods, it belonged to the category of polis that were dependent (Hansen (1997b) 29, 32–33).

Uncertainty also surrounds the exact role of Miletos (no. 854) in the early history of Naukratis. Post-Classical evidence unanimously attributes the “foundation” of Naukratis (if “foundation” is an appropriate concept; cf. Austin (1970) 22; Malkin (1987) 130–31) to Miletos exclusively. This applies not only to the literary sources (Strabo 17.1.18; Eusebios, ed. Schoene, ii. 81; Steph. Byz. 470.12–15; Suda s.v. Ναυκρατίτης), but also to epigraphic evidence from Miletos itself, which reproduces a version of events traceable to the Hellenistic period (Austin (1970) 22 and n. 5). The Milesian origin of Naukratis has often been accepted (Lloyd (1975) 24–25; Braun (1982) 37–38; Ehrhardt (1983) 87–90, 119 (in a qualified form); Haider (1988) 184–99, 211; Sherk (1992) 259–60 and 268–69), but this does not harmonise with the more complex account of Herodotos, which does not give any specially prominent role to Miletos in the origins of Naukratis. There is thus a case for regarding this tradition as a construct of the Hellenistic period (Austin (1970) 23, followed by Bresson (1980) 315–16). Ehrhardt (1983) 89–90 and 119 argues for Milesian participation in the “foundation” of Naukratis from the Milesian calendar of Antinoopolis which derived its laws from Naukratis (Wilcken (1912) no. 27), but it is not certain how far back these date (cf. Bowden (1996) 25–26).

Nothing is known of the territory of Naukratis, if indeed it had a territory of its own beyond the area of urban settlement with its sanctuaries, houses and workshops, to the north of the Egyptian town and covering an area of c.800 m from south to north and 400 m from west to east (Bernard (1970) 857–63; on the question of Naukratis’ territory cf. Bresson (1980) 325 n. 12; Boardman (1994) 140; Bowden (1996) 30–31).

Hdt. 2.178–79 appears to present Naukratis in C6 as a double community, at once a πόλεις and an ἐµπόριον (cf. Austin (1970) 29–30; Malkin (1987) 130–31; Hansen (1997a) 91–94), which comprised a polis of residents on the one hand, and non-resident traders who were not part of the polis on the other. The latter included the founders of the Hellenion: viz. the Ionian cities of Chios (no. 840), Teos (no. 868), Phokaia (no. 859) and Klazomenai (no. 847), the Dorian cities of Rhodes, Knidos (no. 903), Halikarnassos (no. 886) and Phaselis (no. 942), and the Aeolian city of Mytilene (no. 798). According to him, these had the exclusive right of appointing the προσταταί τοῦ ἐµπορίου, whose precise functions cannot be defined (Roebuck (1951); Bresson (1980) 311–15; Sherk (1992) 268–69; Bowden (1996) 32–34). Roebuck (1951) argued that the prostatai must have been appointed by the traders on the spot, and not by the Greek cities at home, as stated by Herodotos; but see Bresson (1980) 311–15.

Late evidence mentions the existence of a προστατεύων where communal festivals were celebrated on the birthday of Hestia Prytanitis, at the Dionysia and at the πανήγυροι for Apollo Komaios (Miller (1978) 11, 12–13, 16, 199–200; Bresson (1980) 344 n. 161), and officials called τιμοῖοι (Gottlieb (1968) 28–30) had the power to inflict fines on offenders (Ath. 4.149D–F, citing Hermeias FHG II 80–81). The identity and date of Hermeias, Athenaios’ source, are uncertain, and he need not be identical with the C4 historian Hermeias of Methymna (FGrHist 558). It is therefore not
clear whether this evidence can be projected back to the Classical or the Archaic periods (as by Sherk (1992) 259–60 and 268–69; Hansen (1997a) 92, (1997b) 33).

According to Herodotos the Hellenion, founded jointly by several Greek cities of Asia Minor, was the largest, best-known and most frequented of the sanctuaries at Naukratis. He also mentions (2.178.2) separate foundations of a sanctuary of Zeus by the Aiginetans (no. 358), one of Hera by the Samians (no. 864), and one of Apollo by the Milesians (no. 854). Excavations have to some extent confirmed and supplemented this evidence, though important areas of uncertainty persist. On the basis of the numerous inscribed dedications on vases (cf. Lazzarini (1976) 177, index p. 326), remains of all the sanctuaries mentioned by Herodotos have been identified, except for that of Zeus founded by the Aiginetans (Bernard (1970) 817–49; Boardman (1980) 118–29; though cf. Bowden (1996) esp. 18–28 for a sceptical view, doubting the identification of the Hellenion and the sanctuary of Hera). Dedications to Apollo are second in importance to those to Apollo, and late evidence tells of the popularity of the cult in early times, allegedly already in the Twenty-third Olympiad, i.e. 688–685 (Ath. 15.675F–76C from Polycharmos (FGrHist 640) fr. 1; Bernard (1970) 772, 774, 829–37). Later evidence (above) also mentions cults of Hestia Prytanitis, Dionysos and Apollo Komaio. The archaeological evidence has thus not revealed the existence of any civic sanctuaries distinct from those set up by the traders themselves, and they seem to have been used by all members of the community on the spot (cf. Burkert (1995) 206). Without exception the remains of all the sanctuaries are poorly preserved. Excavation has not revealed either the existence of any city wall. Civic architecture (a πρωτανείων) is implied by later literary evidence (Ath. 4.149D–F; see supra), but it has not been located (cf. Bernard (1970) 857–63 on Naukratis as a town). Little is known of the Egyptian part of the town to the south, and the archaeological evidence was interpreted in different ways by the excavators themselves (Bernard (1970) 849–57). It has even been argued that the Greeks may have been the first to settle at Naukratis (Boardman (1994) 139; cf. Möller (2000)). The sanctuaries of Naukratis remain the best-known part of a badly known site.

Only a few isolated bronze coins of Naukratis survive (Head, HN2 845). Type: obv. wreathed female head (Aphrodite?), legend underneath ΝΑΥ; rev. unidentified wreathed head, legend underneath ΛΛΕ. The coins thus date from the time of Alexander the Great (not earlier than 332/1).

1024. Oasis Not in Barr. Type: A.a. The toponym is Ὄασις (Hdt. 3.26.1) and the site is classified as a πόλις in the urban sense (ibid.). Herodotos is the only writer to allude to this settlement. He describes Oasis as lying 7 days’ journey from Egyptian Thebes and being occupied by Samians said to be of the “tribe” Aischrione (cf. Chamoux (1953) 63–66; Jones, POAG 195 on Herodotos’ probably non-technical use of the word “tribe”). On the other hand, he may be correct in describing the settlement as a polis.

3. Libya

1025. Barke (Barkaios) Map 38. Lat. 32.30, long. 20.55. Size of territory: 4 or 5. Type: Asa. The toponym is Βάρκη, η (Hdt. 3.91.2, 4.160.1; Ps.-Skylax 108; Diod. 1.68.2 from Hekataios of Abdera (FGrHist 264) fr. 25; testimony in Purcaro Pagano (1976) 330–31). Hrd., De prosodia catholica 3.1 272.16–17 and Steph. Byz. 159.11 both state that it was also called Βάρκαια, though this is not attested otherwise. The city-ethnic is Βαρκαιος (Hdt. 3.13.3, 4.164.4; Ps.-Skylax 108; Polyaen. 7.28.1 (r156e)), sometimes Βαρκαίους (BGU vi 1280.10, x 1943.5, 25 (Ptolemaic)). Steph. Byz. loc. cit. also gives Βαρκαιάτης, for which there is no known example.

In C3, in the reign of Ptolemy III, the harbour of Barke was renamed Ptolemais and elevated to the status of a polis, while Barke itself was subordinated to Ptolemais (see supra). But the use of the name Barke survived, as shown by references in post-Classical authors (e.g. Strabo 17.3.20, 21; Plin. HN 5.32) and by documents (P Lond. vii 1986 r 4, 13, 17 (C3); cf. Laronde (1987) 396–97).

The earliest references to Barke as a polis are in Herodotos, who uses the word in various senses. In 4.160.1 and in 4.202.2 he uses it primarily in the political sense. In 4.200.1–2 and 203.2 he refers to it in the urban sense, emphasising that Barke was a Hellenic polis. Ps.-Skylax 108 uses the word in the urban sense. Strabo, who at 17.3.20 implies that Barke was a polis, describes her at 17.3.21 as one of several πολιχνία that were περιπόλια of Kyrene (no. 1028). Hdt. 4.201.3 refers to the ἀστυν of Barke.
The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins (infra), and externally in Hdt. 3.13.3 (and repeatedly in 4.167.2 and 200–5). For the individual and external use of the city-ethnic see *I.Delos* 1 298 A.61, 313 a.51 (C35).

The territory is called *Barkea* (Hdt. 4.171). Its exact extent is not known, and fluctuated at different periods. It was certainly large and second in size only to that of Kyrene, though less well-watered (cf. Laronde (1987) 49–51 for a comparison with Kyrene, 259–60 on climate and rainfall). It reached to the sea, where its harbour lay some 30 km away to the east, and in C5 its control extended along the coast westward over Taucheira (no. 1029) (Hdt. 4.171 where Taucheira is described as πόλις τῆς Βαρκαίης), though Taucheira seems to have recovered its independence subsequently (Laronde (1987) 62–63). Ps.-Skylax 108 refers to the control exercised by Barke westwards as far as Eu(h)esperides (no. 1026) (cf. Laronde (1987) 200–2).

Founded by brothers of Arkesilas II of Kyrene in conflict with him (Hdt. 4.160.1), Barke was from the start in opposition to Kyrene and frequently followed a different political line (Laronde (1987) 49, 211, 252). C.514 a Persian expedition invited by Pherecydes, mother of Arkesilas III (Hdt. 4.165, 167), captured Barke after a siege and exposed the city to an andrapodismos (Hdt. 4.203.1, 204) in which she executed the opponents of the Battiads and enslaved a large part of the population (Hdt. 4.200–2). They were deported to Bactria by Darius and settled in a village to which they gave the name Barke, which was still inhabited in Herodotos’ time (4.204). The population of Barke must have recovered subsequently, since Barke enjoyed a period of prosperity in C5, as shown by its abundant coinage, though after the second quarter of C4 she was eclipsed by Kyrene (Laronde (1987) 49–50, 162). C.390–386 Barke was in alliance with Evagoras of Salamis (no. 1020) and King Akritos of Egypt against the Persians (Theopomp. fr. 103; *Staatsträger* 237). Together with Eu(h)esperides, Barke was in alliance with Thibron in his war with Kyrene in 322 (Diod. 18.20.3; cf. Laronde (1987) 41, 65). A league of the Greek cities in Libya has been postulated on the basis of a passage in the “Stele of the ΣΥΛΑ” (SEG 20 716.8 (C48); Laronde (1987) 150), but the evidence is not cogent (Laronde (1987) 156–57).

Little is known of the constitution and cults of Barke, though it is likely to have adopted many of the institutions of Kyrene. In the Bacchic period Barke is mentioned as having been under a basileus of the name of Alazetos (Hdt. 4.164.4). The account in Polyaen. 7.28 of the siege of Barke at the time of the Persian Wars (Chamoux (1953) 164–65) mentions the archontes of Barke, but without specific detail. In the Classical period Barke was probably oligarchic in character. An eponymous priest of Apollo is attested at Ptolemais (Barke) in the Roman period, and may have derived from Kyrene in earlier times (Sherk (1992) 271–72).


In his account of the siege of Barke by the Persians, Herodotos mentions the city wall which the Persians tried unsuccessfully to sap before they entered the city by a ruse (4.200–2). In the other Persian siege of Barke at the time of the Persian War the city gates are mentioned again (Polyaen. 7.28; cf. Chamoux (1953) 164–65). Little is known as yet of the archaeology of the site (Boardman (1966) 153).

The coinage of Barke (mostly silver except for a scarce bronze coinage at the end of C4) developed along the same lines as that of Kyrene, and went through three main periods: c.525–480, c.480–435 and c.435–308, (see *BMC Cyrenaica* pp. clxiv–clxxxv and 91–106; cf. also Laronde (1987) 51–52).

At first Barke coined in silver on the Attic standard (tetradrachms, didrachms, fifths, later also tenths). Types: *obv.* silphium plant and/or fruit; *rev.* bull with palm tree, or ram’s head, then head of Ammon as the most frequent type, legends sometimes *BAPKAION* but mostly abbreviated, sometimes down to *B*. In the third period Barke switched to the Asiatic standard (tetradrachms, drachms, hemidrachms and fractional denominations). Types mostly: *obv.* silphium plant; *rev.* head of Ammon, same legends. A number of coins now bear magistrates’ names as well, and a few invert the obverse and reverse types.

Some silver issues of C5 have been described as “alliance” coinages, in that they bear the city-ethnics of Kyrene (no. 1028) on the obverse and Barke on the reverse, or Taucheira (no. 1029) on the obverse and Barke on the reverse. The presence of the city-ethnic of Barke on the reverse suggests that Barke was at the time the predominant partner, which corresponds to the implications of Hdt. 4.171 for Taucheira, but the precise historical circumstances are not known (see *BMC Cyrenaica* pp. xliv–xlv and 107–8).

**1026. Eu(h)esperides (Eu(h)esperites)** Map 38. Lat. 32.07, long. 20.05. Size of territory: 22 Type: *Aσ* (testimonia in Purcaro Pagano (1976) 331, 335). The toponym is Εὐησεπρίδες (Hdt. 4.171; Theophr. *Hist. pl.* 4.3.2, 6.3.3, 8.6.6; SEG 9 76.6 and Tod 203 (C48); Steph. *Byz.* 284.19–21) or Εὔσεπρίδες, α’ (Ps.-Skylax 108–9; Heracl. *Lemb.* 17;
Theo timos of Kyrene (FGrHist 470) fr. 1 (C2); Strabo 10.2.18). Steph. Byz. 282.16–17, who draws attention to the two forms of the name, does not mention the form ‘Εσπερίς, but gives the alternative form as ‘Εσπερίς (cf. SEG 362.7 = CEG 680.6 (C4)). Similarly the city-ethnic is found in both forms, Εὐσπερίτης (Hdt. 4.198.3; Thuc. 7.50.2); Dio. 4.56.8 = Timaios (FGrHist 566) fr. 85; CIG 11264–7; cf. Laronde (1987) 148) and ‘Εσπερίτης (Diod. 18.20.3; BGU x 1946.14, 1956.5, 1958.11 (all C4); SEG 9 362.1 (C4) has the feminine form ‘Εσπερίτις. A C4s proxeny decree has the form Εὐσπερίτης (SEG 18 772.5). Εὐσπερίτις and Εὐσπερίτης are first attested in C5 in literary sources and (in abbreviated form) on the coinage, while ‘Εσπερίς and ‘Εσπερίτης are not found till C4 but become common thereafter.

The earliest reference to Eu(h)esperides as a polis is in Ps.-Skylax 108, where it is described as both a polis and a λιμήν. There is no doubt that it was a polis in C5 and probably from the time of its foundation, as shown by the use of the city-ethnic in Hdt. 4.198.2 and Thuc. 7.50.2 and later writers (Diod. 18.20.3; Paus. 4.26.2–3, 5), the coins it issued, which bear the city-ethnic, and from the historical record which shows it involved in active warfare with its Libyan neighbours (Thuc. 7.50.2; Paus. loc. cit.). It is called patra (= patris) in SEG 9 362.7 (C4).

The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally, mostly in an abbreviated form, by coins of Eu(h)esperides, and externally in literary sources (Hdt. 4.198.3; Thuc. 7.50.2). The external individual use is found in SEG 9 362.1 (C4).

Colonists were sent to Eu(h)esperides by Arkesilas IV, i.e. in C5f (Theo timos of Kyrene (FGrHist 470) fr. 1 (C2); Chamoux (1953) 173–75), but the city had been founded well before this. Pottery dating to C6f has been found (Boardman (1966) 155–56; Vickers and Gill (1986), who leave the chronology open), and Eu(h)esperides is first mentioned c.514 during the Persian expedition to Libya (Hdt. 4.204). Though founded from Kyrene (no. 1028), it was often in conflict with its mother city. In C4s there is a dedication to Apollo at Kyrene by the strategos Aristos for victories won at sea, one of them ἐν Εὐσπεριδεσσα (SEG 9 76.6 and Tod 203; Laronde (1987) 66–69).

In C3 under Ptolemy III the site of Eu(h)esperides was abandoned and moved nearly 3 km to the coast; the new city, fortified from the start, was renamed Berenike, a name which supplanted the original one (Steph. Byz. 164.6–9; Laronde (1987) 382–96). Strabo, who mentions Berenike several times, does not refer to the refoundation and renaming of the old city, which he does not name explicitly (17.3.20, 21).

The exact extent of the territory of Eu(h)esperides is not known, though it was certainly more restricted than that of Kyrene (no. 1028) or even Barke (no. 1025). Hdt. 4.198.3 probably exaggerates the fertility of the land. Eu(h)esperides was frequently in conflict with neighbouring Libyan tribes and welcomed support from Greeks of the mainland (Thuc. 7.50.2; Paus. 4.26.2–3; cf. Chamoux (1953) 226–27, 230; Laronde (1987) 27, 52).

Together with Barke, Eu(h)esperides was in alliance with Thibron in his war with Kyrene in 322 (Diod. 18.20.3; cf. Laronde (1987) 41–42, 49, 63, 211). For the alleged C4 league of Greek cities in Libya, see supra under Barke (no. 1025).

The political institutions of Eu(h)esperides probably reproduced those of her mother city Kyrene, though little detail is known. A proxeny decree for two Syracusans of C4s shows the existence of ephoroi and gerontes who introduce motions to the boule (SEG 18 772.1–2; cf. SEG 41 1693). In the Classical period the constitution was probably oligarchic in character.

Little is known of the cults of Eu(h)esperides, beyond a dedication to Apollo of C4 (Laronde (1987) 394) and a C4 relief in honour of four local heroes (SEG 9 769; Chamoux (1953) 279; Laronde (1987) 390 fig. 141 and 411 n. 101). In the Roman period Eu(h)esperides had an eponymous priest of Apollo (SEG 28 1540 (62–61); cf. Sherk (1992) 271–72), and this was probably derived from the institutions of Kyrene (no. 1028).

It is not clear whether Eu(h)esperides was named in a catalogue of theorodokoi of the Heraia at Argos (no. 347) (SEG 23 189 (c.330) i II. 16–19; Laronde (1987) 161–62; Charnaux in BE (1988) no. 595).

The urban planning seems to fall into two major phases, the first of C6e in the northern part of the site, the second, to the south and more large-scale, completed by C4e. The southern part of the city, unlike the earlier northern part, was laid out on a Hippodamian grid plan with space for an agora in the centre of a residential area. It dates from C4e, as do the extant parts of the city wall. The area enclosed by the city walls has been estimated as c.21 ha at its maximum extent. Eu(h)esperides was besieged by the Libyans in 413, which shows that the city was fortified by then (Thuc. 7.50.2); recent excavations have revealed a stretch of a fortification wall of 1.5 m width and a possible square tower, probably dating to C7l–C6e (Buzanai and Lloyd (1996) 143–46). Because of silting, the harbour had to be moved westward away from the urban settlement by C4, as shown by the distinction drawn by Ps.-Skylax 108 between the city and the port. The site has yielded sherds dating from C6e.
onwards (see Goodchild (1952b) 210–11; Jones and Little (1971) 65–67; Jones (1985) 28–33 with figs. 3.1–3; Lloyd (1985) esp. 51–53 with figs. 5.1 and 5.2; Laronde (1987) 389–90 and fig. 142).

Eu(h)esperides struck coins intermittently from C5e (C3m according to Buttrey (1994) 157), mostly silver on the Asiatic standard except for some bronze issues of C4l, and its coinage follows the same lines as those of Kyrene and Barke, though it was never abundant (see BMC Cyrenaica pp. clxxviii–cxcxxvii and 109–12). Types: obv. silphium plant; rev. dolphin, then head of Ammon, legends ΕΥΕΣΠΕΡΙΤΑΝ. Other denominations: didrachm, drachm and hemidrachm.

Some silver issues of C5s have been described as “alliance” coinages, in that they bear the city-ethnics of Eu(h)esperides on the obverse and that of Kyrene (no. 1028) on the reverse. This suggests that Kyrene was at the time the predominant partner, and contrasts with the apparently subordinate position of Kyrene in relation to Barke (no. 1025) at the same period (see BMC Cyrenaica pp. xli–xlvi).

1027. Kinyps  Map 35. Lat. 32.35, long. 14.30. Size of territory: 156 km². The toponym is Kίνυψ, -υψος or -υψος, ή (Hdt. 4.198.1; Ps.-Sklavon 109). No city-ethnic is attested. Kinyps is called a polis by Ps.-Sklavon 109.

In about 512, Dorieus, half-brother of King Kleomenes of Sparta (no. 347), led a band of followers to found a new settlement. He sailed first to Libya and settled in the land of Kinyps (some 18 km to the east of Lepcis Magna; cf. Hdt. 4.175.2, 198.1–2 on the reported fertility of its territory), though he was expelled after two years by the Libyan Maces and the Carthaginians (Hdt. 5.42.2–3; cf. Chamoux (1953) 162–63; Malkin (1994), 192–203). Ps.-Sklavon 109 refers to Kinyps as a πόλις ἐρημιός, which may simply be a mistake on his part (cf. Flenden-Jensen and Hansen (1996) 151–53, cf. 160). It is possible, however, that he is referring to the ruins of the short-lived settlement by Dorieus, which may still have been extant in C4 (Müller GGM iii pp. 85).

1028. Kyrene (Kyrenaiaos)  Map 38. Lat. 32.50, long. 21.52. Size of territory: 5. Type: Α:α (some literary testimonia in Punico Pagano (1976) 339). The toponym is Кυρήνη, ἡ (Hdt. 2.181.4–5; Thuc. 1.110.1), Doric Κυράνα (Pind. Pyth. 4.2; ML 5.6). The city-ethnic is Κυρηναιος (Hdt. 2.32.11; IG II² 9124 (C4); IG II² 9136 (C4)). The Doric form Κυραναιος seems to be attested only on inscriptions and coins (CIL II 7411.11 (363); BMC Cyrenaica).

Kyrene is first referred to as a polis in Pind. Pyth. 5.81 of 462, then in Hdt. 4.156.3, 164.3, 203.1. Pindar uses the word in the political sense. Herodotos uses the word in the urban sense at 4.164.3 and 4.203.1, and in the territorial sense at 4.156.3. Pindar refers to the αὐτοῦ of Kyrene in Pyth. 4.260–61, as does Hdt. at 2.181.5 and 4.203.1. The first epigraphic attestations of Kyrene as a polis are in C4, all of them in the political sense: ML 5.3; Tit. Cam. 105.10–11; SEG 20 716.6, 15; Tod 196.2 (330–326). Patris is found in CEG 11 850 (c.335) and patria (= patris) in Pind. Pyth. 9.74.

The collective use of the city-ethnic internally is attested by the reverse of coins. The collective use of the city-ethnic externally is attested by several dedications (SDoI 4838) (Archaic); Paus. 10.13.5 (rC5); 10.15.6 (rC5m)). The individual external use is frequently found, e.g. in Attika (IG II² 9124, 9136–39; tombstones (C4)), and at Oropos (no. 214) (IG VII 414.11 (366–338)).

Starting from very modest beginnings (Hdt. 4.153, 156.2), the population of Kyrene grew rapidly to become the largest of the Greek cities of Libya. Hdt. 4.160.3 gives a figure of 7,000 hoplites killed at the battle fought by Arkesilas II against Barke (no. 1025) and the Libyans. The diagramma of Ptolemy I in 322/1 defines a citizen body referred to as the “Ten Thousand”, which was to replace a narrower body of 1,000 (SEG 9 1.6–15, 35 and passim (cf. SEG 18 726)). The total population of Kyrene, city and countryside included, has been estimated for C4 at around 300,000 (Laronde (1987) 340, 342, discussing earlier estimates; lower estimates in Goodchild (1971) 15). Even on a low figure, Kyrene was one of the most populous Greek states of her time. The original colonists came from Thera (no. 537 c.631 (Chamoux (1953) 120–24), though may have included others as well (cf. Paus. 3.14.3; Lindos Temple Chronicle (FGHist 532) §17). In the reign of Battos II they were supplemented by colonists from the Peloponnese and the islands (cf. Hdt. 4.159.2–3, 161.3). Intermarriage with the Libyans was apparently common from the start (cf. Hdt. 4.186.2; Chamoux (1953) 129), and was recognised in the diagramma of Ptolemy I (SEG 9 1.2–3). Libyan influence on the Greek settlers is shown in many ways, though relations were ambivalent and ranged from co-operation to hostility (cf. Hdt. 4.158–60 and numerous Libyan wars subsequently; cf. SEG 9 1.29), but Kyrene maintained her dominant position as well as her Hellenic character (cf. Chamoux (1953) 129, 223–24; Masson (1976) for the evidence of names).

It is likely that the Kyrenaians were divided from the start into the three Dorian tribes, as were the Theraians (Jones, POAG 215–16). Under Battos III, Demonax of Mantinea (no.
Kyrene, the mother city of the other Greek foundations there (Barke of Kyrene was occupied by Libyans (Laronde (1953) 221–24 on the periokoi; Jones, POAG 217–18). Alternatively, Demonax may have made each of the three tribes comprise all three parts (Hölkeskamp (1993)). Arist. Pol. 1319 b1–27 alludes to constitutional changes at Kyrene involving the organisation of the citizen body after the end of the monarchy, but date and details are obscure (Jones, POAG 218–19; Laronde (1987) 249–52). The C4 decree on citizenship for Theraians resident at Kyrene specifies their assignment to phylai, patrai (phratries) and nine hetairai, the latter peculiar to Crete and Thera (ML 5.15–16; Chamoux (1953) 214; Jones, POAG 219; Hölkeskamp (1993) 410–13).

Situated on a well-watered plateau, the territory of Kyrene, called Ἴ Κυρηναϊκή χώρη by Hdt. 4.199.1, was reputed for its fertility and formed the basis of Kyrene’s great wealth (Hdt. 4.199; Laronde (1987) 257–323). The land was previously occupied by Libyan tribes, who were gradually pushed out. From early days, Kyrene showed a continuous tendency to expand, through the invitation to new Greek settlers (Hdt. 4.159.2–4; cf. too 4.163.1) and new foundations, as that of Barke (Hdt. 4.160.1). The C4 decree for Theraians in Kyrene assumes the availability of unoccupied land for settlement (ML 5.33), and the diagramma of Ptolemy I mentions the establishment of new outposts by Kyrene to the east (described as πᾶλαίσ, SEG 9 1.4–5; cf. Laronde (1987) 349). The territory of Kyrene thus grew to become probably one of the largest of any Greek polis, though its precise extension is conjectural (Laronde (1987) 15). The total area available for cultivation in Greek Libya depended on the rainfall (cf. Laronde (1987) 15–17 and figs. 1–3) and has been variously calculated: even a lower estimate of 16,100 km² corresponds to about three-quarters of the area of the Peloponnese or twice that of Crete (Laronde (1987) 15 and 340). The territory under the direct control of Kyrene consisted of a central inner core measuring about 50 × 35 km, i.e. 1,750 km² (Laronde (1987) 285–93 with fig. 87), where a scattered population depended directly on the urban centre, and further away a zone of nucleated villages (Laronde (1987) 293–313 with fig. 108). About a quarter of the territory of Kyrene was occupied by Libyans (Laronde (1987) 313).

Kyrene claimed a pre-eminent position in Libya as the mother city of the other Greek foundations there (Barke (no. 1025), Eu(h)esperides (no. 1026), Taucheira (no. 1029)), though she was frequently in conflict with them. The Battiaids sought to restore control over Barke after its foundation, and eventually invited Persian intervention to punish the rebellious city (Hdt. 4.164.3–65, 167, 200–4). Arkesilas IV is addressed by Pindar as “king of cities” (Pind. Pyth. 5.15); he sent colonists to Eu(h)esperides, which he made into a place of refuge (Theotimos of Kyrene (ForHist 470) fr. 1 (second century AD?); Chamoux (1953) 173–75), and was eventually killed there (Heralc. Lamb. 17 = Arist. fr. 611, Rose). But Kyrene’s relationship with the Greek cities in Libya was not translated into constitutional forms. The political interpretation of the so-called alliance coinages of C5 is unclear (see under Barke, Eu(h)esperides, Taucheira). A federation of Greek cities in Libya in C4 has been postulated on the basis of a passage in the “Stele of the ΣΥΑΑ” (SEG 20 716.8–9; cf. Oliviero et al. (1961–62) 273–80), but this seems doubtful (Laronde (1987) 156).

Kyrene maintained from earliest days close relations with the mainland of Greece and the Aegean world (for C4 cf. Laronde (1987) 137–68). But politically she played no part in the major conflicts and alliances of the mainland.

The political and constitutional history of Kyrene divides into two periods: the monarchy down to the end of the Battiaids c.440, and the establishment of a republican form of government down to Alexander. The Aristotelian collection of politieia included a Kyrenaion Politeia (Heralc. Lamb. 16–17; Arist. frs. 355–38).

Thera (no. 527) at the time of the foundation of Kyrene was herself under a basileus (Hdt. 4.150.2–3; Malkin (1994) 113–14), and Kyrene adopted the institutions of her mother city. Hence Battos, the oikistes, was at the same time basileus, and founded a hereditary dynasty that lasted eight generations (cf. Hdt. 4.163.2; for the designation basileus cf. Hdt. 4.153; Pind. Pyth. 4.2, 62, 5.15). The monarch was probably from the start the priest of Apollo (Chamoux (1953) 217–19). Battos the founder received after his death a heroic cult at his tomb in the agora of Kyrene (Pind. Pyth. 5.93–95; Leschhorn (1984) 60–72; Malkin (1987) 204–16). As Kyrene grew, the monarch’s position was increasingly challenged. In the reign of Battos II a large-scale influx of new settlers changed the political and social balance (Hdt. 4.159). Conflict broke out within the dynasty itself in the reign of Arkesilas II (Hdt. 4.160). This necessitated the intervention in the reign of Battos III of the arbitrator Demonax of

* He is called Aristoteles by Pind. Pyth. 5.87 and other sources, a name unknown to Herodotos; on this problem, cf. Chamoux (1953) 95–98; Malkin (1987) 63.
Mantinea. He handed over the powers of the basileus to the demos, while leaving him only temene and priestesses (Hdt. 4.161.3; Chamoux (1953) 138–42; E. W. Robinson (1997) 105–8). The history of the dynasty thereafter was a long struggle by the rulers (Arkesilas III and his mother Pherezeitē) to restore their lost power against internal opposition, first with support from the Greek world (Hdt. 4.162–64), then thanks to Persian intervention (Hdt. 4.165, 167, 200–5; Austin (1990) 301–2). Arkesilas IV was eventually killed at Eu(h)esperides, and the monarchy came to an end c.440 (Chamoux (1953) 202–9; cf. Bacchielli (1985)).

The government which followed was classified as a “democracy” by Arist. Pol. 1319b15–27 and Heracl. Lemb. 17, Arist. fr. 611, Rose); however, according to Laronde (1987) it was more likely republican in character (27), though dominated by a wealthy aristocracy (129–36). There were further internal conflicts down to the age of Alexander (cf. Diod. 14.34.3–6 (401); Arist. Pol. 1319a1–27; cf. Laronde (1987) 249–56). From the evidence of some inscribed sherds it seems possible that Kyrene used the institution of ostracism in C51 (Bacchielli (1994))). In 331 Kyrene sent an embassy to Alexander to ask for his friendship (Diod. 17.49.3; Curt. 4.7.8; Laronde (1987) 28–30, 35–36). After his death the mercenary captain Thibron intervened at the invitation of exiles (Diod. 18.19–21; App. (FGrHist 156) fr. 9 §816–19; Laronde (1987) 41–84). His defeat and death eventually provoked the intervention of Ptolemy I, who imposed a settlement on Kyrene, recorded in a long inscription (the diagramma) of probably 322/1 (SEG 9 1) which sheds much light on the constitution of Kyrene before this time.

After the end of the monarchy, the priesthood of Apollo became an eponymous magistracy (cf. SEG 9 11–13 etc.; Chamoux (1953) 217, 301–2; Sherk (1992) 270–72). The diagramma of Ptolemy I specifies a minimum age of 50 (SEG 9 1.25; list of known priests in Oliviero et al. (1961–62) 359–75). The temene of the monarchy probably then became public property, administered by a body of three damiergoi whose functions are illustrated by a series of inscriptions of C4–C2 (SEG 9 11–44; Laronde (1987) 156–57, 325–34; Chamoux (1988); Sherk (1992) 270–72). A body of 101 gerontes is first attested in 322/1 (SEG 9 1.20–23). They are found also in a proxeny decree of Eu(h)esperides of C4s (SEG 18 722.1–2; cf. SEG 41 1693), and are likely to have existed in some form since the early history of Kyrene. A building of C4 on the west side of the agora has been identified as the chamber for their meetings (Laronde (1987) 176–77; but see Goodchild (1971) 98). Ephors are likely to have existed from an early date, as part of Kyrene’s Theran–Spartan inheritance (Chamoux (1953) 214–16). Heraclid. Pont. (FHG 11 212; Arist. fr. 611.115–17, Rose) mentions their judicial powers. They were five in number in 322/1 (SEG 9 1.33; cf. 82–84). Strategoi are first attested in C4 by dedications put up by them (SEG 9 76, 77; Laronde (1987) 52–53 with fig. 10, 66–69, 104, 178, 199, 207). Lists of soldiers of C4 also mention lochagoi (SEG 9 46.13, 49.1–2, 50.32, 51; Laronde (1987) 131–34). Kyrene is likely to have had a boule in addition to gerontes and ephors (cf. Eu(h)esperides). Pherezeitē, the mother of Arkesilas III, is presented by Hdt. 4.165.1 as sitting in the boule, but the reference could be to the gerousia (cf. Chamoux (1953) 216). A stoa built in C4 in the north-west corner of the agora has been identified as a chamber for the meetings of the boule (Stucchi (1975) 65; cf. Laronde (1987) 175–76). A boule of 500 men appointed by lot and over the age of 50 is specified in 322/1 (SEG 9 1.16–19, 34–35). An assembly of the people is presupposed as existing already at Thera in C7 in the Oath of the Founders (ML 5.24), but this may be anachronistic. The C4 decree on citizenship for Thera was passed by the demos (ML 5.11; cf. Laronde (1987) 250).

Kyrene was almost certainly named in a C4 list of theodorokoi for the Argive Heraia (SEG 23 189 (c.330) 1 ll. 16–19; Laronde (1987) 161–62; Charneux in BE (1988) no. 595). In C51 a citizen of Kyrene was granted proxenia by Athens (no. 361) (IG II² 174). Competitors from Kyrene were very prominent in the major Panhellenic festivals (Pind. Pyth. 4, 5, 9 for the Pythian Games, with Chamoux (1953) 169–201; Paus. 6.12.7 for the Isthmian Games; Olympionikai 194, 257, 268, 269, 347, 421, 423, 428, 430, 442, 508, 990 for the Olympic Games; and see generally Laronde (1987) 446–47). In C4l, the city dedicated a treasury at Delphi (Bommelaer (1991) 155–58).

The site of Kyrene lies inland some 12.5 km from its harbour (Apollonia) in a straight line.10 It was built on a large hill with two peaks in the west and the east at 620 m, and strong natural defences to the south (the Wadi Bel Gadir) and the north (the Wadi Bu Turkia). The suburban approaches to the city from the north were used as a large necropolis, and other cemeteries were also located around the city (Chamoux (1953) 287–300; Cassels (1955); Goodchild (1971) 165–71). The city consisted of four main areas.

(1) The acropolis on the western peak had no public buildings (Goodchild (1971) 104–8), and it is not clear whether it was used as a residence by the Battadi.11

(2) The civic centre of the agora, slightly below the acropolis to the south-east, grew in time with the addition of new buildings (Stucchi (1965); Goodchild (1971) 91–103 with fig. 7; Vickers and Reynolds (1972) 33–34; Bacchielli (1981); Laronde (1987) 169–78 with fig. 48 for C4). By C4 it had four stoas (Stucchi (1975) 31–34, 63–65; Coulton (1976) 228, 230–31 with fig. 59), but the identification of many of the public buildings and sanctuaries remains disputed, including the location of the heroön of Battos the founder, the bouleuterion, geronteon, prytyaneion (the latter attested in SEG 9 1.44 of 322/1; cf. Miller (1978) 183–84, 227), and the sanctuaries of Apollo and Demeter. In C4 a monumental altar of Apollo was built in the agora, similar to that in front of his temple (Stucchi (1975) 59–60; Laronde (1987) 175).

(3) The eastern peak was chosen as the location for the sanctuary of Zeus Lykaios (plan with site index in Goodchild (1971) facing p. 200). Hdt. 4.203.2 implies that the latter was originally outside the city perimeter. In C6 under Battos IV Zeus Lykaios was identified with the Egyptian god Amon who achieved great status at Kyrene (cf. coin types), from where his cult spread to the Greek world (Chamoux (1953) 320–41 with pls. XIX, XXVII–XXVIII; Goodchild (1971) 149–55; Stucchi (1975) 19–20, 23–29; Bisi (1985)). His temple, made of local limestone, was built at some time during C6–C8, the largest Greek temple in Libya, comparable in size to the Parthenon at Athens and the temple of Zeus at Olympia. Traces of two other sanctuaries have been found on the eastern hill in addition to the temple of Zeus (Stucchi in Goodchild (1971) 155–56).

(4) A paved street led down from the acropolis via the agora to the terrace of the sanctuary of Apollo, to the north-east of the acropolis and on a lower level than the agora (Goodchild (1971) 109–28 with fig. 13). A temple of C6 ascribed to Battos the founder (Pind. Pyth. 5.89; Callim. Hymn 2.75–79; SEG 9 189) was rebuilt in C4 on a larger scale (Chamoux (1953) 203, 304–8; Goodchild (1971) 116–19; Laronde (1987) 104–5, 178–79). A monumental altar in front of the temple was also renovated in C45 (SEG 9 85, 86; Chamoux (1953) 308–9; Goodchild (1971) 116; Stucchi (1975) 29, 58–59; Laronde (1987) 110–13). The sacred spring near the sanctuary was dedicated to the god (Pind. Pyth. 4.294; Hdt. 4.158.3; Chamoux (1953) 77–82, 126–27; Goodchild (1971) 109–12). Artemis was closely associated with Apollo from the start (Chamoux (1953) 311–20 with pls. XVII–XVIII; Goodchild (1971) 127–28; Stucchi (1975) 8–9, 48–49, 58). Her temple, immediately to the north of the temple of Apollo and with a C6 monumental altar in front of it, was also reconstructed in C4. The terrace received substantial additions subsequently, notably in C4 (Laronde (1987) 178–92 with fig. 54). A small treasure was built there by the strategoi in C45 to commemorate victories over the Libyans (SEG 9 89–90; Goodchild (1971) 113–14; Laronde (1987) 104–5 with fig. 29). To the west of the sanctuary of Apollo a theatre (TGR iii. 137) was constructed, partly excavated in the hill, though the date of initial construction is uncertain (Goodchild (1971) 125–27; Stucchi (1975) 34–36, 69–70).

Outside the city, on a terraced site across the Wadi Bel Gadir, lay the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore, in an isolated position opposite the agora and about 75 m south of the city’s wall circuit. It was established by C6e and had a continuous history till Roman times, as shown by numerous votive offerings (White (1981), (1984–93)).

The city wall was gradually developed (detailed description for C4l in Laronde (1987) 71–76 with figs. 19–22), and by the early Hellenistic period enclosed both peaks, with a total length of 5,560 m and an enclosed area of about 750 ha. The acropolis was separately fortified in C4l (Diod. 19.79.1). Kyrene was besieged in 322 (Diod. 18.19.4). Only about one-third of the area enclosed by the city walls was inhabited. Estimates of the size of the urban population depend on the density of settlement assumed, and thus vary considerably from c. 30,000 (Goodchild (1971) 15) to as much as 100,000 or more (Laronde (1987) 342, discussing other estimates). A settlement density of 100–300 per ha (Jameson et al. (1994), 542–43; cf. Hansen (1997c) 28–30) would indicate an urban population in the range 25,000–75,000.

The coinage of Kyrene provided the models for the coinages of the other Greek cities of Libya. It went through three main phases: c. 570–480, c. 480–435 and c. 435–308 (see BMC Cyrenaica; Laronde (1987) 233–48; SNG Cop. Suppl. 1330).

The earliest coinage (BMC Cyrenaica pp. xviii–xxxvi and 1–9) was in silver on the Euboic–Attic standard, at first tetradrachms, didrachms and drachms and later fractional denominations as well. Types: _obv._ silphium plant or fruit, which remained the distinctive obverse type at Kyrene; _rev._ at first incuse, later animals, then anthropomorphic types. In the second period (BMC Cyrenaica pp. xxxvi–xlvi and 10–14) the Asiatic standard mostly took over from the Attic, and types became more standardized, and the head of Amon was introduced as the normal reverse type. In the third period (BMC Cyrenaica pp. xlvi–xcii and 15–47), the names of magistrates appear on a number of gold and silver

---

coins, but are not found on the bronze coins which were introduced in the latter part of the period (C4l). In the latter part of the period there are also numerous gold issues on the Attic standard with a greater variety of types (on these see also Naville (1951); Laronde (1987) 208–11, 239–40). Legends appear late in the first period, with the city-ethnic, which becomes common, mostly abbreviated, sometimes down to KY but occasionally in the full form KYPANAION. On the C3s “alliance” coinage, see under Barke (no. 1025) and Eu(h)esperides (no. 1026).

**1029. Taucheira** (Taucheirites) Map 38. Lat. 32°32′, long. 20°34′. Size of territory: 3? Type: άα. The toponym is Ταύχειρα or Ταύχηρα, and other variants are found (testimonia in Purcaro Pagano (1976) 347–48). Ταύχειρα is the earliest attested form, and it continued to be used in the post-Classical period (Hdt. 4.171; Ps.-Skylax 108). Τεύχειρα appears not to be found till the Roman Empire (Arr. Diadochi (FGrrHist156) fr. 9 §17; Hippol. Chron. §300 1.1 (second century AD)); the letters TE, however, are found on the obverse of some C3s coins issued jointly by Barke and Taucheira (BMC Cyrenaica pp. clxxxvi–clxxxvii and 107–8). This latter form of the toponym is not mentioned anywhere by Steph. Byz. Other forms are also found, as Ταύχηρα, Τεύχηρα and Τεύχερα. The gender of the toponym was treated as either feminine singular (Strabo; Procopius) or neuter plural (Hdt.; Diod. 18.20.6; Hippol.). In C3 under the Ptolemies Taucheira was renamed Arsinoe (Laronde (1987) 382–83), but the original name survived, as shown by references in post-Classical sources (e.g. Strabo 17.3.20; Plin. HN 5.32). The city-ethnic is rarely attested. Steph. Byz. 608.20–609.1 gives several versions: Ταυχέριος, Ταυχέριος, Ταυχείριος, Ταυχείριος. Of these, only Ταυχέριος seems to be attested in a literary source (Parthenius frr. 45.1 and 662.1 (C1)). Not mentioned by Steph. Byz. is the form Τευχείριται found in Arr. Diadochi (FGrrHist156) fr. 9 §18 (1322).

Taucheira is first referred to as a polis (in the urban sense) by Hdt. 4.171. Ps.-Skylax describes it as only a χωρίον, while Strabo, who calls it a polis at 17.3.20, lists it at 17.3.21 among the περιπόλαι of Kyrene (no. 1028), which he describes as πολιτικα. It is also described as a polis in the urban sense by Diod. 18.20.6 and in the political sense by Arrian (FGrrHist156) fr. 9 §17 (both 1322). The collective use of the city-ethnic internally is attested (abbreviated as TE) by some coins of Taucheira issued together with Barke.

Little is heard of Taucheira in the Archaic and Classical periods. It was reportedly founded by Kyrene, at an unspec-ified date (schol. Pind. Pyth. 4.26). Archaeological evidence of Greek presence there goes back to Cyril (Boardman (1966) 153–55; Boardman and Hayes (1966) 12–15, 170; Boardman (1994) 143–46), and its foundation is likely to have preceded that of Barke (no. 1025).

The extent of Taucheira’s territory is unknown, though it was probably much more limited than that of Kyrene or Barke (see Laronde (1987) 59–63, (1994) 25, 27–28 who estimates the arable land potentially available at 250 km², which could sustain a population of more than 20,000). Situated on the coast, Taucheira was overshadowed by Barke inland to the east, and in C5 it was in some sense subordinated to her (cf. Hdt. 4.171 and the evidence of the so-called alliance coinage). To the south-west its possibilities of expansion were restricted by Eu(h)esperides as well as by Libyan tribes.

In the war of Thibron against Kyrene in 322, Taucheira was in alliance with Kyrene (no. 1028), while Barke (no. 1025) and Eu(h)esperides (no. 1026) sided with him; but it was captured by Thibron (Diod. 18.20.6; Laronde (1987) 42, 49, 63).

There is no evidence regarding the political institutions of Taucheira and little regarding its cults. Votive material from a sanctuary of Demeter and Kore has been found (Boardman and Hayes (1966) 11–12, 15; Boardman (1994) 143–46). A temple of Dionysos is reported from the centre of Taucheira, but no further details are available (Laronde (1987) 335).

It is not clear whether Taucheira was named in a catalogue of theorodokoi of the Heraia at Argos (no. 347) (SEG 23 189 (c.330), i ll. 16–19; Laronde (1987) 161–62; Charneux in BE (1988) no. 595).

Traces of what may be a C6e circuit wall have been found (Boardman and Hayes (1966) 9–10, 13; Boardman (1994) 144; cf. Smith and Crow (1998) 37), and Thibron’s siege and capture of Taucheira in 322 implies that it had a wall at the time (Diod. 18.20.6). It is not clear whether the urban remains of Taucheira, with traces of a city wall, can be dated to before the Hellenistic period (Laronde (1987) 59–61). The city perimeter as fixed in C3m enclosed an area of 40 ha and an urban population at the time estimated at a minimum of 6,000 (Laronde (1994) 27–28).

The only known coinage of Taucheira consists of an issue of C3s of silver tetradrachms (Attic standard) and drachmas (Asiatic standard). It has been described as an “alliance” coinage, as the coins bear the city-ethnic of Taucheira (in the form TE) on the obverse and Barke (no. 1025) on the reverse. Types: obv. silphium plant; rev. head of Amon.
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1030. (Astraiosioi) Unlocated. Not in Barr. Type: [A]. The city-ethnic is Ἀστραῖοι (IG ii2 43.B.22). There is no other source. The Astraioi were members of the Second Athenian Naval League, and in the so-called Charter of the League they are recorded under the heading Ἀθηναίων πόλεων οἱ σύμμαχοι (IG ii2 43.A.78 (378/7)).

1031. (Erodioi) Unlocated. Not in Barr. Type: C. The ethnic is Ἐρόδιος, attested in IG i3 263.iv.18, which is the only source we have for this community. The ethnic is almost completely restored in the list of 454/3 (IG i3 259.11.8: Ἐρόδιοι). Thus, the only thing we now know is that the Erodioi were members of the Delian League and that in 450/49 they paid a phoros of 500 dr. (IG i3 263.iv.18). They are listed after Astakos in Propontis and Stolos in Chalkidike (iv.16–17) and before the islands of Tenos and Siphnos (iv.19–20). There is no foundation for the suggestion in ATL i. 485 that the Erodioi should be located somewhere in Thrace.

1032. (Eurymachitai) Unlocated. Not in Barr. Type: C. The ethnic is Εὐρυμαχίτης (IG i3 264.iii.16, 265.11.46). There are no other sources. The Eurymachitai were members of the Delian League and are recorded twice in the tribute lists, in 448/7 (IG i3 264.iii.16) and in 447/6 (IG i3 265.11.46), paying 1,000 dr. In both cases we find the sequence: Dikaia (in Thrace), the Dieis (on Euboia), the Eurymachitai (unlocated), the Brykontioi (on Karpathos, which belonged to the Karian district) and, probably, the Kioi (in the Hellespontine district).

1033. Kystiros (Kystirios) Unlocated. Not in Barr. Type: A. The toponym is Κύστιρος (Hdn. iii.1 198.20; iii.2 449.2). The city-ethnic is Κύστιριοι (IG i3 278.vi.37). Kystiros is called a polis in the political sense in the Athenian tribute list of 434/3, where it is the only community recorded after the heading ἄτακτος πόλις and is put down for a payment of 300 dr. (IG i3 278.vi.36–7, followed by vacat). Since this heading stands apart from the organisation of the members into districts, we have no clue as to where Kystiros was located. ATL i. 509 attempts to identify the Kystirioi with the inhabitants of Pistiros on the coast of Thrace (Hdt. 7.109.2; no. 638). It is true that one family of MSS of Herodotos has Πύστιρος (ABDV) and that K and Π are sometimes mixed up (Cynthia for Pydna at Pompon. 2.35). But Herodian clearly distinguishes between Πύστιρος and Κύστιρος in both the passages cited above (not mentioned in ATL). As the evidence stands, the identification of the two communities should be abandoned, and Kystiros recorded as an unlocated polis.

1034. (Lechoi) Unlocated. Not in Barr. Type: A. The city-ethnic is Λέχωιος, attested in our only source: a C5 dedication from Dodone: Διὶ δῶρον ἀνέθηκε πόλις Λέχωιος (Lazzarini (1976) 897) where the Lechooi are classified as a polis in the political sense.

1035. (Pythai) Unlocated. Not in Barr. Type: C. The city-ethnic is Φύταιος (Head, HN 252). The only source for this polis is one surviving coin dated to C5: obv. bearded head of Dionysos (?); rev. round incuse square with vine. Legend: ΦΥΤΑΙΟΝ. Because of the types, Head believes that this unidentified community was somewhere in the neighbourhood of Maroneia. He may be right, but, to be on the safe side, it is better placed here among the unlocated poleis.
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1. **Toponyms and City-Ethnics in Numerical Order**

1. (Alalie
2. Emporion (Emporites)
3. Massalia (Massaliotes)
4. Rhode (Rhodetes)
5. Abakainon (Abakaininos)
6. Adranon (Adranites)
7. Agyrion (Agyrinaios)
8. Aitna (Aitnaios)
9. Akragas (Akragantinos)
10. Akrai (Akraios)
11. Alaisa (Alaisinos)
12. Alontion (Alontinos)
13. Apollonia (Apolloniates)
14. Engyon (Engyinos)
15. Euboia (Euboceans)
16. Galeria (Galarinos)
17. Gela (Geloios, Geloaios)
18. Heloron (Ailoros)
19. Henna (Hennaios)
20. Herakleia (1) (Herakleotes)
21. Herakleia (2)
22. Herbes(s)os (Herbessinos)
23. Herbita (Herbitaios)
24. Himera (Himeraois)
25. Hippana (Hipanatas)
26. *Imachara (Imacharaios)
27. Kallipolis (Kallipolites)
28. Kamarina (Kamarinaios)
29. Kasmenai (Kasmenaios)
30. Katane (Katanaios)
31. Kentoripa (Kentoripinos)
32. Kephaloidion (Kephaloiditas)
33. Leontinoi (Leontinos)
34. Lipara (Liparaios)
35. *Longane (Longenaios)
36. Megara (Megareus)
37. Morgantina (Morgantinos)
38. Mylai (Mylaioi)
39. Mytistratos (Mytiseratins)
40. Nakone (Nakonaios)
41. Naxos (Naxios)
42. Petra (Petrinos)
43. Piakos (Piakinos)
44. Selinous (Selinousios)
45. (Sileraioi)
46. (Stielanaioi)
47. Syrakousai (Syrakosios)
48. Tauromenion (Tauromenitas)
49. Tyndaris (Tyndarites)
50. (Tyrhenoi)
51. Zankle (Zanklaioi)/Messana (Messanios)
52. Herakleia (Herakleios)
53. Hipponion (Hipponieus)
54. Hyele (Hyeletes)/Ela (Elateis)
55. Kaulonia (Kauloniatis)
56. Kroton (Krotoniatis)
57. Kyme (Kymaios)
58. Laos (La(w)inos)
59. Lokroi (Lokros)
60. Medma (Medmaioi)
61. Metapontion (Metapontinos)
62. Metauros (Mataurinos)
63. Neapolis (Neapolites)
64. Pandosia (Pandosinos)
65. Pithekoussai (Pithekoussaios)
66. Poseidonia (Poseidoniatis)
67. Pyxous
68. Rhegion (Rheginos)
69. Siris (Siritis)
70. Sybaris (Sybaritas)
71. Taras (Tarantinos)
72. Temesa (Temesaios)
73. Terina (Terinaios)
74. Thurioi (Thourios)
75. Adria
76. Ankon (Ankonites)
77. Apollonia (Apolloniates)
78. Brentesion (Brentesinos)
79. Epidamnos (Epidamnios)/Dyrrachion (Dyrrachinos)
80. Herakleia (Herakleotes)
81. Issa (Issaios)
82. Lissos (Lissates)
83. Melaina Korkyra (Korkyraioi)
84. Pharos (Pharios)
85. Spina (Spinites)
86. Amantia (Amantieus)
87. Artichia
88. Batiai
89. [Berenike]
90. Boucheta (Bouchetios)
91. Bouthroton (Bouthrotios)
92. Byllis (Byllion)
93. Dodone (Dodonaios)
94. Elateia
95. Elea (Eleaios)
96. Ephyra (Ephyros)
97. Eurymenai (Eurymenaios)
98. Gitana
99. Horraon (Horraitas)
100. Kassopa (Kassopaios)
101. Nikaia
102. Olimpa (Olympastas)
103. Orikos (Orikios)
104. Pandosia
105. Passaron
106. Phanote (Phanoteus)
107. Phoinike
108. Poionos
109. Tekmon
110. Torone
111. Zmaratha
112. Alyzeia (Alyzaios)
113. Ambrakia (Ambrakiotes)
114. Anaktorion (Anaktorieus)
115. Argos (Argeios)
116. Astakos (Astakenos)
117. Derion (Derieus)
118. Echinosa (Echiniaios)
119. Euripos (Euripios)
120. Herakleia (Herakleotes?)
121. Hyporeiai (Hyporeates)
122. Ithaka (Ithakesios)
123. Korkyra (Korkyraios)
124. Koronta (Korontaioi)
125. Kranioi (Kranios)
126. Leukas (Leukadios)
127. Limnaios (Limnaios)
128. *Matropolis (Matropolites)
129. Medion (Medionios)
130. Oiniadai (Oiniadas)
131. Palaios (Palaireus)
132. Paleis (Paleus)
133. Phara
134. Phoitiai (Phoitieus)
135. Pronnoi (Pronnos)
136. Same (Samaios)
137. Sollion
138. Stratos (Stratios)
139. Thyrreion (Thyrieus)
140. Torybea (Torybeieus)
141. Zakynthos (Zakynthios)
142. Agrinion (Agrinieus)
143. Aigion
144. Akripos
145. Chalkis (Chalkideus)
146. Halikyrna
147. Kallion (Kallieus)/Kallipolis (Kallipolites)
148. Kalydon (Kalydonios)
149. Makynea (Makynaeus)
150. Molykreion (Molykreus)
151. Phoia (Phoiaieus)
152. Phylea
153. Pleuron (Pleuronios)
154. Proschion (Pro scheios)
155. Therminea
156. Trichoneion (Trichonieus)
157. Apa (Alpaios)
158. Amphissa (Amphisceus)
159. Chaleion (Chaleieus)
160. *Hyaia (Hyaiaos)
161. Hypnia (Hypneus)
162. Issioi
163. Messapioi
164. Myania (Myaneus)
165. Naupaktos (Naupaktios)
166. Oianthea (Oiantheus)
167. Tolophon (Tolophonios)
168. Tritea (Triteus)
169. Abai (Abaios)
170. *Aiolidai (Aiolideus)
171. Ambryssos (Ambryssios)
172. Amphikaia (Amphi kleieus)
173. Antikyra (Antikyreus)
174. Boulios (Boulios)
175. Charadra (Charadraios)
176. Daulis (Daulieus)
177. Delphos (Delphos)
178. Drymos (Drymios)
179. Echedameia (Echedamieus)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Toponym</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Elateia (Elateus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Erochos (Erochos)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Hyampolis (Hy AMPOLios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Kirrhia (Kirrhiaios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Ledon (Ledontios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Lilaia (Lilaeus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Medeon (M edeonios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Neon (Ne(-))/Tithorea (Tithoreus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Parapotamioi (Parapotamios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Pedieis (Pedieis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Phanoteus/Panopeus (Phanoteus, Panopeus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Phlygonion (P(h)lygoneus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Po[—— ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Stiris (Stirios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Teithronion (Teithronios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Trachis (Trachinios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Triteis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Troneia (Troneieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Akraiphia,Akraiphnion (Akraiphieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Alalkomenai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Anthedon (Anthedonios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Chaironeia (Chaironeus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Chorsiai (Chorsieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Erythrai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Eteonos/Skaphai (Skaph(l)eus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Eutresis (Eutretidieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Haliartos (Haliartios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Hyetts (Hyettsios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Hysiai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Kopai (Kopaieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Koroneia (Koroneus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Lebadeia (Lebadeus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Mykalessos (Mykalessios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Orchomenos (Orchomenios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Oropos (Oropios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Pharai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Plataiai (Plataieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Potniai (Potnieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Siphai (Siphaieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Skolos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Tanagra (Tanagraios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Thebai (Thebaios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Thespiai (Thespieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Thisbai (Thisbeus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Aigosthena (Aigostenitas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>Megara (Megareus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>Pagai (Pagaios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>Korinthos (Korinthios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276.</td>
<td>Kleitor (Kleitorios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277.</td>
<td>Koila</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278.</td>
<td>Kynaitha (Kynaitheus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279.</td>
<td>Lousoi (Louxiatas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280.</td>
<td>Lykosoura (Lykourasios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281.</td>
<td>Mantinea (Mantineus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282.</td>
<td>Megale polis (Megalopolites)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283.</td>
<td>Methydron (Methdrieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284.</td>
<td>Nestane (Nestanios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285.</td>
<td>Nonakris (Nonakrieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286.</td>
<td>Orchomenos (Orchomenios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287.</td>
<td>Oresthasion (Oresthasios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288.</td>
<td>Paion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289.</td>
<td>Pallantion (Pallanteus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290.</td>
<td>Phara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291.</td>
<td>Pheneos (Pheneeus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292.</td>
<td>Phigaleia (Phigaleus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293.</td>
<td>Phorieia (Phoriaeus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294.</td>
<td>Psophis (Psophidios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295.</td>
<td>Pylai (Parypailaios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296.</td>
<td>Symphalos (Symphalios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297.</td>
<td>Tegea (Tegeatas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298.</td>
<td>Teuthis (Teuthidas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299.</td>
<td>Thaliades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300.</td>
<td>Thelphousa (Thelphousios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301.</td>
<td>Thisoa (Thisoaios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302.</td>
<td>Torthyneion (Torthyneus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303.</td>
<td>Trapezous (Trapezontios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304.</td>
<td>Ep(e)ion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305.</td>
<td>Epitalion (Epitalieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306.</td>
<td>Lepreon (Lepreatas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307.</td>
<td>Makiston (Makistios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308.</td>
<td>Noudion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309.</td>
<td>Phrixat(i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310.</td>
<td>Pyrgos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311.</td>
<td>Skillous (Skillountios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312.</td>
<td>Aithaia (Aithaieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313.</td>
<td>Asine (Asinaios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314.</td>
<td>Aulon (Aulonites)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315.</td>
<td>Kardamyle (Kardamylites)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316.</td>
<td>Korone (Koronaioi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317.</td>
<td>Kyparissos (Kyparissieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318.</td>
<td>Messene (Messenios)/Ithome (Ithomaios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319.</td>
<td>Mothone (Mothonaios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320.</td>
<td>Pharai (Pharaïates)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321.</td>
<td>Thalamai (Thalamates)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322.</td>
<td>Thouria (Thouriates)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323.</td>
<td>Aigys (Aigyeus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324.</td>
<td>Anthana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325.</td>
<td>Aphroditia, Aphrodisia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326.</td>
<td>Belbina (Belbinetes?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327.</td>
<td>Boia (Boiates)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328.</td>
<td>Chen (Cheneus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329.</td>
<td>Epidaurus (Epidaurios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330.</td>
<td>Etis (Eteios?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331.</td>
<td>Eua (Euitas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332.</td>
<td>Geronthrai (Geronthretes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333.</td>
<td>Gytheion (Gytheates)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334.</td>
<td>Kromnos (Kromnites?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335.</td>
<td>Kyphanta (Kyphantaseus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336.</td>
<td>Kythera (Kytherios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337.</td>
<td>Las (Laos)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338.</td>
<td>Oinous (Oinountios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339.</td>
<td>Oios (Oiates)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340.</td>
<td>Oitylos (Oitylios?)/Beitylos (Beityleus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341.</td>
<td>Pellana (Pellaneus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342.</td>
<td>Prasiai (Prasiates)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343.</td>
<td>Sellasia (Sellasieus?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344.</td>
<td>Side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345.</td>
<td>Sparta (Spartiates)/Lakedaimon (Lakedaimonios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346.</td>
<td>Thyrea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347.</td>
<td>Argos (Argeios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348.</td>
<td>Epidaurus (Epidaurios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349.</td>
<td>Halieis (Halikos)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350.</td>
<td>Hermion (Hermioneus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351.</td>
<td>Kleonai (Kleonaios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352.</td>
<td>Methana (Methanaios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353.</td>
<td>Mykenai (Mykenaios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354.</td>
<td>Orneai (Orneates)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355.</td>
<td>Phleious (Phleiaios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356.</td>
<td>Tiryns (Tirynthios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357.</td>
<td>Troizen (Troizenios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358.</td>
<td>Aigina (Aiginetes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359.</td>
<td>Belbina (Belbinites)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360.</td>
<td>Kalaureia (Kalaureates)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361.</td>
<td>Athenai (Athenaios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362.</td>
<td>Eleusis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363.</td>
<td>Salamis (Salaminis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364.</td>
<td>Athenai Diades (Athenites)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365.</td>
<td>Chalkis (Chalkideus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366.</td>
<td>Diakrhoi en Euboia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367.</td>
<td>Diakres apo Chalkideon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368.</td>
<td>Dion (Dieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369.</td>
<td>Dystos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370.</td>
<td>Eretria (Eretrious)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371.</td>
<td>*Grynchais (Grychnheus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372.</td>
<td>Histiaia (Histiaieus) / Oreos (Oreites)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373.</td>
<td>Karystos (Karystios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374.</td>
<td>Orobiai (Orobieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375.</td>
<td>*Peraia (Peraeus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376.</td>
<td>Posideion (Posideites)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377.</td>
<td>Styra (Styreus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378.</td>
<td>Alope (Alpaioi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379.</td>
<td>Alponos (Alponios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380.</td>
<td>Halai (Haleeus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381.</td>
<td>Knemi(de)s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382.</td>
<td>Larymna (Larynaios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383.</td>
<td>Naryka (Naryaioi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384.</td>
<td>Nikaia (Nikaeus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385.</td>
<td>Opous (Opountios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386.</td>
<td>Skarpheia (Skarpheus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387.</td>
<td>Thronion (Thronieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388.</td>
<td>Akyphas / Pindos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389.</td>
<td>Boion (Boaios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390.</td>
<td>Erineos (Erinaioi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391.</td>
<td>Kytinion (Kytinieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392.</td>
<td>Amphanai (Amphanaius)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393.</td>
<td>Argoussa (Argoussios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394.</td>
<td>Atrax (Atragios, Atraktos)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395.</td>
<td>Gomphoi (Gompheus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396.</td>
<td>Gyrtone (Gyronios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397.</td>
<td>Kierion (Kierieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398.</td>
<td>*Kondaia (Kondieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399.</td>
<td>Krannon (Kraunonios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400.</td>
<td>Larisa (Larisaioi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401.</td>
<td>Methilion (Methyleus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402.</td>
<td>Metropolis (Metropolitai)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403.</td>
<td>Mopsion (Mopseus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404.</td>
<td>Orthos (Orthieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405.</td>
<td>Oxynion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406.</td>
<td>Pagasai (Pagasitas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407.</td>
<td>Peirasia (Peiraieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408.</td>
<td>Pelinna (Pelinnaieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409.</td>
<td>Phakion (Phakistas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410.</td>
<td>Phaloria (Phaloriastai)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411.</td>
<td>Pharkadon (Pharkadonios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412.</td>
<td>Pharsalos (Pharsalios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413.</td>
<td>Pherai (Pheraios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414.</td>
<td>Skotoussa (Skotous competitores)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415.</td>
<td>Thetonion (Thetoneus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416.</td>
<td>Trikka (Trikkaioi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417.</td>
<td>Angeia (Angeieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418.</td>
<td>Ktimene (Ktimeneus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419.</td>
<td>Hypata (Hypateus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420.</td>
<td>(Kaphelais)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421.</td>
<td>(Korophaioi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422.</td>
<td>(Phyrhagioi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423.</td>
<td>Talana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424.</td>
<td>Chen (Cheneus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425.</td>
<td>Parasopioi (Parasopieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426.</td>
<td>Anthelion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427.</td>
<td>Antikyre (Antikyratas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428.</td>
<td>Echinos (Echinaioi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429.</td>
<td>Heracleia (Herakleaiotes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430.</td>
<td>Lamia (Lamieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431.</td>
<td>Trachis (Trachinioi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432.</td>
<td>Anthion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433.</td>
<td>*Ekkarre (Ekkarreus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434.</td>
<td>Halos (Haleus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435.</td>
<td>Kypaire (Kypareus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436.</td>
<td>Larisa (Larisaioi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437.</td>
<td>Melitaia (Meliaiteus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438.</td>
<td>Peuma (Peumatis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439.</td>
<td>Phyla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440.</td>
<td>Proerna (Proernioi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441.</td>
<td>Pyrasos (Pyraios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442.</td>
<td>Thaumakoi (Thaumakos)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443.</td>
<td>Thebai (Thebais)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444.</td>
<td>Amyrs (Amyreus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445.</td>
<td>Eureaioi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446.</td>
<td>Eurymenai (Eurymenios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447.</td>
<td>Homolion (Homoleus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448.</td>
<td>Iolkos (Iolkos)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449.</td>
<td>Kasthaniae (Kassanaeus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450.</td>
<td>Kikynethos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451.</td>
<td>Korakai (Koakraioi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452.</td>
<td>Meliboia (Meliboieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453.</td>
<td>Methone (Methonaios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454.</td>
<td>Olizon (Olizionios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455.</td>
<td>(Oxoniaioi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456.</td>
<td>Rhizous (Rhizousios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>457.</td>
<td>Spalathra (Spalathreus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458.</td>
<td>Azoros (Azoriaiastai)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459.</td>
<td>Chyreti (Chyretaios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460.</td>
<td>Doliche (Dolichaios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461.</td>
<td>*Ereikion (Ereikineus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462.</td>
<td>Gonnos (Gonneus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463.</td>
<td>(Molaia(Mollaioi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464.</td>
<td>Mylai (Mylaios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465.</td>
<td>Oloosson (Oloossonios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1258 TOPONYMS AND ETHNICS IN NUMERICAL ORDER

468. Phalanna (Phalannaïos) 516. *Saros (Sarios)
469. Pythoion (Pythoïaïas) 517. Seriphos (Seriphios)
470. Argethia (Argethieus) 518. Sikinos (Sikinetes)
471. Aigiale (Aigialeus) 519. Siphnos (Siphnios)
472. Arkesine (Arkesineus) 520. Skiathos (Skiathios)
473. Minoa (Minoetes) 521. Skyros (Skyrios)
474. Anaphe (Anaphaios) 522. Syme (Symaïos)
475. Andros (Andrios) 523. Syros (Syrios)
476. Astypalaia (Astypaleieus) 524. Telos (Telios)
477. Chalke (Chalkeates) 525. Tenos (Tenios)
478. Delos (Delios) 526. Thasos (Thasios)
479. Helene 527. Thera (Theraios)
480. Oine (Oin(o)aios) 528. Aianes (Aiaïaios?)
481. *Therma (Thermaios) 529. Aigeai (Aigaios)
482. Ikos (Ikios) 530. Alebaia
483. Imbros (Imbrios) 531. Allante (Allantaios)
484. Ios (Ietes) 532. Aloros (Alorites)
485. Kalymna (Kalymnios) 533. Beroia (Beroiaïos)
486. Arke(s)sea (Arkesieus) 534. Dion (Diastes)
487. Brykous (Brykountios) 535. Edessa (Edessaios)
488. Eteokarpathioi 536. Europos (Europaios)
489. Karpathos (Karpathios) 537. Herakleion (Herakleites)
490. Kasos (Kios) 538. Ichnai (Ichnaios)
491. Ioulis (Ioulites) 539. Kyrrhos (Kyrrhestes)
492. Karthaia (Karthaïeus) 540. Leibethra (Leibethrios)
493. Koresia (Koresios) 541. Methone (Methoniïos)
494. Poissa (Poisios) 542. Mieza (Miezaïos/Miezues)
495. Keria (Keraitas) 543. Pella (Pellaios)
496. Kimolos (Kimolios) 544. Pydna (Pydnaïos)
497. Kos (Koos) 545. Apollonia (Apolloniates)
498. Astypalaia 546. Arethousa (Arethousios)
499. Kos Meropis 547. Bormiskoïs
500. Halasarna (Halasarnitas) 548. Chaliste
501. Kythnos (Kytnios) 549. Herakleia (Herakleites)
502. Myrina (Myriaiïos) 550. Lete (Letaïos)
503. Hephaistia (Hephaisteus) 551. Sindos (Sindonaios?)
504. Leros (Lerios) 552. Therme
505. Melos (Melios) 553. Amphipolis (Amphipolites)
506. Mykonos (Mykonios) 554. Argilos (Argilios)
507. Naxos (Naxios) 555. Traïlos (Traïlios)
508. Nisyros (Nisyrios) 556. Aige (Aigantios)
509. Paros (Parios) 557. Aineia (Aineiates)
510. Panormos 558. Aioleion (Aioliïes)
511. Peparethos 559. Akanthos (Akanthios)
512. Seleinous 560. Akrothoïos (Akrothoios)
513. Pholegandros (Pholegandrios) 561. Alapta (Alaptes)
514. Rhenelia (Rhenaeïus, Rhenes) 562. Anthemous (Anthemountios)
515. Samothrake (Samothrax) 563. Aphyta² (Aphytaïos)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Place Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>564.</td>
<td>Assera (Asserites)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565.</td>
<td>Charadrous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>566.</td>
<td>(Chedrolioi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>567.</td>
<td>Chytropolis (Chytropolitai)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>568.</td>
<td>Dikaia (Dikaiopolites)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>569.</td>
<td>Dion (Dieus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570.</td>
<td>Eion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>571.</td>
<td>Galepsos (Galaios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572.</td>
<td>Gigonos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573.</td>
<td>Haisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>574.</td>
<td>Istasos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575.</td>
<td>Kalindoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576.</td>
<td>Kamakai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>577.</td>
<td>Kampsia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578.</td>
<td>Kissos (Kisseites)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579.</td>
<td>Kithas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580.</td>
<td>Kleonai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581.</td>
<td>Kombreia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582.</td>
<td>Lipaxos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>583.</td>
<td>Mekyberna (Mekybernaios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584.</td>
<td>Mende (Mendaioi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585.</td>
<td>Milkoros (Milkorios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586.</td>
<td>Neapolis (Neopolites)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587.</td>
<td>Olophyxos (Olophyxios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>588.</td>
<td>Olythnos (Olythnos)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589.</td>
<td>(Osbaioi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590.</td>
<td>Othoros (Othorios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>591.</td>
<td>Pharbelos (Pharbelios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592.</td>
<td>(Phegontioi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>593.</td>
<td>Piloros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594.</td>
<td>Pistasos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>595.</td>
<td>Pleume (Pleumeus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>596.</td>
<td>(Polichnitai)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>597.</td>
<td>Posideion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>598.</td>
<td>Poteidaia (Poteidaiaetes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599.</td>
<td>Prassilos (Prassilios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600.</td>
<td>Sane (Sanaios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601.</td>
<td>Sane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602.</td>
<td>Sarte (Sartaioi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603.</td>
<td>Serme (Sermiaioi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604.</td>
<td>Sermylvia (Sermylvieus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605.</td>
<td>Singos (Singaios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606.</td>
<td>Sinos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607.</td>
<td>Skabala (Skablaios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608.</td>
<td>(Skapsaioi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609.</td>
<td>Skione (Skionaios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610.</td>
<td>Skithai (Skithaios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611.</td>
<td>Smila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612.</td>
<td>Spartolos (Spartolios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613.</td>
<td>Stagiros (Stagirites)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614.</td>
<td>Stolos (Stolios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615.</td>
<td>Strepsa (Strepsaioi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616.</td>
<td>Therambos (Therambaios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617.</td>
<td>Thestoros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>618.</td>
<td>Thyssos (Thysios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619.</td>
<td>Tinde (Tindaioi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620.</td>
<td>Torone (Toronaios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621.</td>
<td>Tripoiai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622.</td>
<td>Zereia (Zeranios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623.</td>
<td>Aison (Aisonios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624.</td>
<td>Brea (Breaios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625.</td>
<td>Kossaia (Kossaioi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>626.</td>
<td>Okolon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627.</td>
<td>Apollonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628.</td>
<td>Berga (Bergaios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629.</td>
<td>Datos (Datenos)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630.</td>
<td>Eion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631.</td>
<td>Galepsos (Galepsios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632.</td>
<td>Krenides (Krenites)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>633.</td>
<td>Myrkinos (Myrkinios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634.</td>
<td>Neapolis (Neopolites)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635.</td>
<td>Oisyme (Oisymaios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636.</td>
<td>Phagres (Phagresios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637.</td>
<td>Philippoi (Philippeus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638.</td>
<td>Pistyros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>639.</td>
<td>Sirra (Sirraioi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640.</td>
<td>Abdera (Abderites)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>641.</td>
<td>Ainos (Ainios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642.</td>
<td>Bergepolis (Bergepolites)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643.</td>
<td>Dikaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644.</td>
<td>Drys (Dryites)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>645.</td>
<td>Kypselai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>646.</td>
<td>Maroneia (Maronites)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>647.</td>
<td>Mesambrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>648.</td>
<td>Orthagoria (Orthagoreus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>649.</td>
<td>Salle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650.</td>
<td>Stryme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651.</td>
<td>Zone (Zonaios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>652.</td>
<td>Alexandropolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>653.</td>
<td>Apros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>654.</td>
<td>Kabyle (Kabylenos)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655.</td>
<td>Philippopolis (Philippopolites)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>656.</td>
<td>Pistoia (Pistirenos)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>657.</td>
<td>Seuthopolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>658.</td>
<td>Aigos potamoi (Aigos po(-))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>659.</td>
<td>Alopekonnesos (Alopekonnesios)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
660. Araplos
661. Chersonesos/Agora (Chersonesites ap’ Agoras)
662. Deris (Deraios)
663. Elaious (Elaious)
664. Ide
665. Kardia (Kardianos)
666. Kressa
667. Krithote (Krethousios)
668. Limnai (Limnaios)
669. Madytos (Madytios)
670. Paion
671. Paktye
672. Sestos (Sestios)
673. Bisanthe (Bisanthenos)
674. Byzantion (Byzantios)
675. Daminon Teichos (Daminoteichites)
676. Heraion, Heraion Teichos (Heraites)
677. Neapolis (Neopolites)
678. Perinthos (Perinthios)
679. Selymbria (Selymbrianos)
680. Ser(re)ion Teichos (Ser(re)joteichites)
681. Tyrodiza (Tyrodizenos)
682. Apollonia (Apolloniates)
683. Bizone (Bizonites)
684. Dionysopolis (Dionysopolites)
685. Istros (Istrianos)
686. Kallatis (Kallatianos)
687. Mesambria (Mesambrianos)
688. Nikon
689. Odessos (Odess(e)ites)
690. Olbia (Olbiopolites)/Borysthenes (Borysthenites)
691. Ophioussa
692. Orgame
693. Tomis (Tomites)
694. Tyras (Tyrans)
695. Chersonesos (Chersonesites)
696. Gorgipp(e)ia (Gorgippeus)
697. Hermonassa (Hermonaseites)
698. Karkinitis (Kerkinites)
699. Kepoi (Kepites)
700. Kimerikion
701. Kytaia
702. Labrys/Labryta
703. Myrmekeion
704. Nymphaion (Nymphatos)
705. Pantikapaion (Pantikapaites)/Bosporos (Bosporites)
706. Phanagoria (Phanagorites)
707. Theodosia (Theudosieus)

708. Tyritake
709. Dioskouris
710. Gyenos
711. Phasis (Phasianos)
712. Amisos (Amisenos)/Peiraicus (Peiraicus)
713. Becheirias
714. Choirades
715. Herakleia (Herakle(i)otes)
716. Iasonia
717. Karambis
718. Karoussa
719. Kerasous (Kerassountios)
720. Kinolis
721. Koloussa
722. Kotyora (Kotyorites)
723. Kromna (Kromnites)
724. Kytoros
725. Limne
726. Lykastos
727. Odeinos
728. Sesamos (Sesamenos)/Amastris (Amastrianos)
729. Sinope (Sinopeus)
730. Stameneia
731. Tetrakis
732. Themiskyra
733. Tieion (Tianos)
734. Trapezous (Trapezountios)
735. Artaioi Teichos (Artaioteichites)
736. Artak (Artakenos)
737. Astatos (Astatenos)
738. Bysbikos (Bysbikenos)
739. Dar(i)eion
740. Daskyleion (Daskyleianos)
741. *Didymon Teichos (Didymoteichites)
742. Harpagion (Harpagianos)
743. Kalchedon (Kalchedonios)
744. Kallipolis (Kallipolites)
745. Kios (Kianos)
746. Kolonai (Koloneus?)
747. Kyzikos (Kyzikenos)
748. Lampsakos (Lampsakenos)
749. Metropolis
750. Miletoupolis (Miletopolites)
751. Miletoteichos (Miletoteichites)
752. Myrlea (Myleanos)/Brylleion
753. Olbia
754. (Otlenoi)
755. Paisos (Paisenos)
<p>| 756. | Parion (Parianos) | 804. | Autokane (Autokanaios?) |
| 757. | Plakia (Plakianos) | 805. | *Boione |
| 758. | Priapos (Priapenos) | 806. | Chalkis (Chalkideus) |
| 759. | Prokonnesos (Prokonnesios) | 807. | Elaia (Elaiites) |
| 760. | Pythopolis (Pythopolites) | 808. | Gambrion (Gambreiotics) |
| 761. | Skylake | 809. | Gryneion/Gryneia (Gryneieus) |
| 762. | Sombia | 810. | Halisarna |
| 763. | Tereia | 811. | Heraklea? (Herakleotai) |
| 764. | Zelea (Zeleites) | 812. | Iolla (Iolleus) |
| 765. | Abydos (Abydenos) | 813. | Karenaios (Karenaios) |
| 766. | Achilleion | 814. | Killa |
| 767. | Antandros (Antandrios) | 815. | Kisthene |
| 768. | Arisbe (Arisbaios) | 816. | Kylene |
| 769. | Assos (Assios) | 817. | Kyme (Kymeus) |
| 770. | Astyra (Astyrenos) | 818. | Larisa (Larisaios) |
| 771. | Astyra Troika | 819. | Leukai (Leokates) |
| 772. | Azeia (Azeleus) | 820. | Magnesia (Magnes) |
| 773. | Berytis (Berysios) | 821. | *Melanpagos? (Melanpagitas) |
| 774. | Dardanos (Dardaneus) | 822. | Myrina (Myrinaios) |
| 775. | Gargara (Gargareus) | 823. | Nasos (Nasiotas) |
| 776. | Gentinos (Gentinios) | 824. | Neon Teichos |
| 777. | Gergis (Gergithos) | 825. | Notion |
| 778. | Hamaxiotes (Hamaxiteus) | 826. | Palaigambrion |
| 779. | Ilion (Ilieus) | 827. | Parthenion |
| 780. | Kebren (Kebrenios) | 828. | Pergamon (Pergamenos) |
| 781. | *Kokylion (Kokylites) | 829. | Perperene (Perperenios) |
| 782. | Kolonai (Kolonaus) | 830. | Pitane (Pitanaios) |
| 783. | Lamponia (Lamponeus) | 831. | Pordoselene |
| 784. | Larisa (Larisaios) | 832. | Temnos (Temnites) |
| 785. | Neandreia (Neandrieus) | 833. | Teuthrania |
| 786. | Ophryneion (Ophryneus) | 834. | Thebe |
| 787. | *Palaiperkote (Palaiperkosios) | 835. | *Tisna (Tisnaios) |
| 788. | Perkote (Perkoteos) | 836. | Achilleion |
| 789. | Polichna (Polichnaios) | 837. | Airai (Airaios) |
| 790. | Rhoiteion (Rhoiteus) | 838. | Anaia (Anaies) |
| 791. | Sigeion (Sigeieus) | 839. | Boutheia (Boutheieus) |
| 792. | Skepsis (Skapsios) | 840. | Chios (Chios) |
| 793. | Tenedos (Tenedios) | 841. | Chytos |
| 794. | Antissa (Antissaios) | 842. | Dios Hieron (Diosirites) |
| 795. | Arisba | 843. | (Elaiousioi) |
| 796. | Eresos (Eresios) | 844. | Ephesos (Ephesios) |
| 797. | Methymna (Methymnaios) | 845. | Erythrai (Erythraioi) |
| 798. | Mytilene (Mytilenaios) | 846. | Isinda (Isindios) |
| 799. | Pyrrha (Pyrrhaios) | 847. | Klaizomenai (Klaizomenios) |
| 800. | Adramytton (Adramytenos) | 848. | Kolophon (Kolophonios) |
| 801. | Aigai(ai) (Aigaieus) | 849. | Korykos (Korkyraios) |
| 802. | Aigiroessa | 850. | Lebedos (Lebedios) |
| 803. | Atarneus (Artaneites) | 851. | Leukophrys |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Toponym</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Toponym</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>852</td>
<td>Magnesia (Magnes)</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>Keramos (Kerameus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>853</td>
<td>Marathesion (Marathesios)</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>(Killareis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>854</td>
<td>Miletos (Milesios)</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>Kindye (Kindyeus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>855</td>
<td>Myonnesos (Myon(n)esios)</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>Knidos (Knidios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>856</td>
<td>Myous (Myes(s)ios)</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>(Kodapeis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>857</td>
<td>Naulochon</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>(Koliyrges)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>858</td>
<td>Notion (Notieus)</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>Koranza (Koarendeus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>859</td>
<td>Phokaia (Phokaieus)</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>Krya (Kryeus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860</td>
<td>(Polichnitai)</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>Kyllandos (Kyllandios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>861</td>
<td>Priene (Prieneus)</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>Kyrbissos (Kyrbisseus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>862</td>
<td>Pteleon (Pteleousios)</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Latmos (Latmios)/Herakleia (Herakleotes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>Pygela (Pygeleus)</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>Lepsimandos (Lepsimandeus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>864</td>
<td>Samos (Samios)</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>Medmasos (Madnaseus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>865</td>
<td>Samos (the klerouchy of 365–322)</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>Mylase (Mylaseus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>866</td>
<td>Sidousa (Sidousios)</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>Myndos (Myndios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>867</td>
<td>Smyrna (Smyrnaios)</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>(Narisbareis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>868</td>
<td>Teos (Teios)</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>Naryandos (Naryandeus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>869</td>
<td>Thebai (Thebaios)</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>Naxia (Naxiates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>870</td>
<td>Alabanda (Alabandeus)</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>(Olaieis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>871</td>
<td>Alinda (Alindeus)</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>Olymos (Hylineus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>872</td>
<td>Amos (Amios)</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>Ouranion (Ouranietes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>873</td>
<td>(Amynandeis)</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>(Parpariotai)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>874</td>
<td>Amyzon (Amyzoneus)</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>Passanda (Pasandeus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>875</td>
<td>Arlissos (Arlisseus)</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>Pedasa (Pedaseus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>876</td>
<td>(Armelitai)</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>(Peleiatai)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>877</td>
<td>Aulai (Auliates)</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>Pida (Pidadeus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>878</td>
<td>Bargasa (Pargaseus)</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>Plada (Pladaseus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>879</td>
<td>Bargylia (Bargylieus)</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>Pyrondos (Pyrindios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>880</td>
<td>Bolai (Bolbaieis)</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>Pyrno (Pyrnois)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>881</td>
<td>Chalketor (Chalketoreus)</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>Salmakis (Salmakites)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>882</td>
<td>Chersonesos (Chersonesios)</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>(Siloi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>883</td>
<td>Chios (Chios)</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>Syangela (Syangeleus)/Theangela (Theangeleus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>884</td>
<td>(Erineis)</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>Talagres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>885</td>
<td>Euromos (Euromeus)</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>Taramptos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>886</td>
<td>Halikarnassos (Halikarnasseus)</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>(Tarbaneis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>887</td>
<td>(Hybliseis)</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>Telandros (Telandrios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>888</td>
<td>(Hydaieis)</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>Telemessos (Telemesseus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>889</td>
<td>Hydisos (Hydisseus)</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>Termesa (Termereus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>890</td>
<td>(Hymisseeis)</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>(Terssogasseis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>891</td>
<td>Iasos (Iaseus)</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>(Thasthareis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>892</td>
<td>Idrias (Idrieus)</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>Thydonos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>893</td>
<td>Idyma (Idymeus)</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>Tralleis (Traldeus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>Kalynda (Kalyndeus)</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>Phaselis (Phaselites)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>895</td>
<td>*Karbasyanda (Karbasyandeus)</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>Xanthos (Xanthios)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>896</td>
<td>Karyanda (Karyandeus)</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>Allaria (Allariotass)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>897</td>
<td>Kasolaba (Kasolabeus)</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>Anopolis (Anopolites)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>898</td>
<td>Kaunos (Kaunios)</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>Apollon (Apolloniatas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>Kedreal (Kedreates)</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>Aptara (Aptaraios)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
948. Arkades (Arkas)
949. Aulon
950. Axos (Axios)
951. *Biannos (Biannios)
952. Bionnos
953. *Chersonasos (Chersonasios)
954. Datala (Datales)
955. Dragmos (Dragmios)
956. Dreros (Drerios)
957. Eleutherna (Eleuthernaios)
958. *Eltynia (Eltynieus)
959. Elyros (Elvrios)
960. Gortynos (Gortynios)
961. Heralkeion (Heralkleiotas)
962. Hierapytna (Hierapytnios)
963. Hyrtakina (Hyrtakinios)
964. Istron (Istronios)
965. Itanos (Itanios)
966. Keraia (Keraitas)
967. Knosos (Knosios)
968. Kydonia (Kydoniatas)
969. Kytaion
970. Lappa (Lappaios)
971. Lato (Laios)
972. Lebena (Lebenaios)
973. Lisos (Lisios)
974. Lyktos (Lyktios)
975. Malla (Mallaios)
976. Mataiia (Matalios)
977. Milatos (Milaios)
978. Olous (Oloitios)
979. *Petra (Petraiios)
980. Phaiistos (Phaiistios)
981. Phalasarna (Phalasarnios)
982. Polichne (Polichnites)
983. Polyrrhen (Polyrrhenios)
984. Praisos (Praisios)
985. Priansos (Priansieus)
986. Rhaukos (Rhaikos)
987. Rhithymnos (Rhithymnios)
988. *Rhitten (Rhittenioi)
989. Stalai (Stalites)
990. Sybrita (Sybritios)
991. Tarrha (Tarrhaios)
992. Tylisos (Tylisios)
993. Brikkindera (Brikkindarios)
994. (Diakrioi)
995. Ialysoi (Ialysoi)
996. Kamiros (Kamireus)
997. Lindos (Lindos)
998. Oi (Oiataes)
999. (Pedies)
1000. Rhodos (Rhodios)
1001. Aspendos (Aspendios)
1002. Idyros
1003. Perge (Pergaios)
1004. Side (Sidetes)
1005. Aphrodiias
1006. Holmoi (Holmites)
1007. Issos (Isseus)
1008. Kelenderis
1009. Mallos (Marlotas, Mallotes)
1010. Nagidos (Nagideus)
1011. Soloi (Soleus)
1012. Amathous (Amathousioi)
1013. Idalian (Idalios)
1014. Karpasia (Karpaseus)
1015. Keryneia (Kerynites)
1016. Kourion (Kourieus)
1017. Lapethos (Lapithios)
1018. Marion (Marieus)
1019. Paphos (Paphios)
1020. Salamis (Salaminius)
1021. Soloi (Solios)
1022. Posideion
1023. Naukratis (Naukratites)
1024. Oasis
1025. Barke (Barkeaios)
1026. Eu(h)esperides (Eu(h)esperites)
1027. Kynys
1028. Kyrene (Kyrenaios)
1029. Tauchereia (Tauchereirates)
1030. (Astraiousioi)
1031. (Erodioi)
1032. (Eurymachitai)
1033. Kystiros (Kystirios)
1034. (Lechoioi)
1035. (Phytaioi)
# 2. Toponyms and City-Ethnics in Alphabetical Order

The nos. refer to Index 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toponym</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abai (Abaios)</td>
<td>Phokis</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abakainon (Abakaininos)</td>
<td>Sikelia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdera (Abderites)</td>
<td>Thrace: from Nestos to Hebros</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abydos (Abydenos)</td>
<td>Troas</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achilleson — Troas</td>
<td></td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achilleson — Ionia</td>
<td></td>
<td>836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion (Aigienos)</td>
<td>— Aitolia</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigryion (Aigrinios)</td>
<td>— Sikelia</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiane (Aianaios?)</td>
<td>Makedonia</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigai (Aigaios)</td>
<td>Achaia</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigai (Aigaius)</td>
<td>Aiolis</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigeai (Aigaioi)</td>
<td>Chalkidike</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigeira (Aigerates)</td>
<td>Achaia</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigiale (Aigialeus)</td>
<td>The Aegean</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigina (Aiginetas)</td>
<td>The Saronic Gulf</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion (Aigieux)</td>
<td>Achaia</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigiroessa — Aiolis</td>
<td></td>
<td>802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion — Aitolia</td>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigos potamoi (Aigos po(-))</td>
<td>Thracian Chersonesos</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigosthenia (Aigosthenitas)</td>
<td>Megaris, etc.</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigys (Aigyeus)</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aineia (Aineiates)</td>
<td>Chalkidike</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ainos (Ainios)</td>
<td>Thrace: from Nestos to Hebros</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aioleion (Aiolites)</td>
<td>Chalkidike</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Aiolidai (Aiolideus)</td>
<td>Phokis</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airai (Airaios)</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
<td>837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aison (Aisonios)</td>
<td>Unlocated in Thrace</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aithaia (Aithaieus)</td>
<td>Messenia</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aitna (Aitnaios)</td>
<td>Sikelia</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akanthos (Akanthios)</td>
<td>Chalkidike</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akragas (Akragantinos)</td>
<td>Sikelia</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akrai (Akrainos)</td>
<td>Sikelia</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akraiphia, Akraiphnion</td>
<td>Boiotia</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akripos — Aitolia</td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akrothoii (Akrothoios)</td>
<td>Chalkidike</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akyphas/Pindos</td>
<td>Doris</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabanda (Alabandeus)</td>
<td>Karia</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaisa (Alaisinos)</td>
<td>Sikelia</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alalie — Spain and France</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alalphomenai — Boiotia</td>
<td></td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alapta (Alaptes)</td>
<td>Chalkidike</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alasaion (Alaseus)</td>
<td>Elis</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alea (Aleos) — Elis</td>
<td></td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alebaia — Makedonia</td>
<td></td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandropolis — Inland Thrace</td>
<td></td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alinda (Alindeus)</td>
<td>Karia</td>
<td>871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alion — Elis</td>
<td></td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alipheira (Alipheireus)</td>
<td>Arkadia</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allante (Allantaious)</td>
<td>Makedonia</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allaria (Allariotas)</td>
<td>Crete</td>
<td>944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alontion (Alontinos)</td>
<td>Sikelia</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alope (Alopeais)</td>
<td>East Lokris</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alopekonnesos (Alopekonnesios)</td>
<td>Thracian Chersonesos</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloros (Alorites)</td>
<td>Makedonia</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpa (Alpaioi)</td>
<td>West Lokris</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alponos (Alponios)</td>
<td>East Lokris</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alyzeia (Alyzaios)</td>
<td>Akarnania</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amantia (Amantieus)</td>
<td>Epeiros</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amathous (Amathousios)</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>1012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambraia (Ambraioi)</td>
<td>Akarnania</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambryssos (Ambryssios)</td>
<td>Phokis</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amisos (Amisenos)/Peiraieus</td>
<td>Pontic Coast of Asia</td>
<td>Minor 712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos (Amios)</td>
<td>Karia</td>
<td>872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphanai (Amphanaius)</td>
<td>Thessalia</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphidolia (Amphidolos)</td>
<td>Elis</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphiaka (Amphikleieus)</td>
<td>Phokis</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphipolis (Amphipolites)</td>
<td>Bisaltia</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphiassa (Amphisseus)</td>
<td>West Lokris</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amynandeis)</td>
<td>Karia</td>
<td>873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amyros (Amyreus)</td>
<td>Magnesia</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amyzon (Amyzoneus)</td>
<td>Karia</td>
<td>874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaia (Anaîtes)</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
<td>838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Anaitoi) — Elis</td>
<td></td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaktorion (Anaktorieus)</td>
<td>Akarnania</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaphe (Anaphaios)</td>
<td>The Aegean</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andros (Andrios)</td>
<td>The Aegean</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toponyms</td>
<td>Place Names</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angeia (Angeieus)</td>
<td>Dolopia 418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankon (Ankonites)</td>
<td>The Adriatic 76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anopolis (Anopolites)</td>
<td>Crete 945</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antandros (Antandrios)</td>
<td>Troas 767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthana</td>
<td>Lakedaimon 324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthedon (Anthedonios)</td>
<td>Boiotia 200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthelae</td>
<td>Malis 472</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthémous (Anthémountios)</td>
<td>Chalkidike 562</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antikyra (Antikyreus)</td>
<td>Phokis 173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antikyre (Antikyritis)</td>
<td>Malis 428</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antissa (Antissaios)</td>
<td>Lesbos 794</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antron</td>
<td>Achaia Phthiotis 433</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apellonia (Apelloniatas)</td>
<td>Crete 946</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aphrodisias</td>
<td>Kilikia 1005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argilos (Argilios)</td>
<td>Bisaltia 554</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos (Argeios)</td>
<td>Akarnania 115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos (Argeios)</td>
<td>Argolis 347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argoussa (Argoussios)</td>
<td>Thessalia 394</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariska</td>
<td>Lesbos 795</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arisbe (Arisbaios)</td>
<td>Troas 768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkades (Arkas)</td>
<td>Crete 948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arke(s)ea (Arkesieus)</td>
<td>The Aegean 486</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkesine (Arkesineus)</td>
<td>The Aegean 472</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlissos (Arlisseus)</td>
<td>Karia 875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artaion Teichos (Artaiotheichites)</td>
<td>Propontic Coast of Asia Minor 735</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artake (Artakenos)</td>
<td>Propontic Coast of Asia Minor 736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articia</td>
<td>Epeiros 87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascheion (Ascheieus)</td>
<td>Achaia 232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asea (Aseates)</td>
<td>Arkadia 267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asine (Asinaios)</td>
<td>Messenia 313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspendos (Aspendios)</td>
<td>Pamphylia 1001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assera (Asserites)</td>
<td>Chalkidike 564</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assos (Assios)</td>
<td>Troas 769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astakos (Astakenos)</td>
<td>Akarnania 116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astyra Mysia (Astyrenos)</td>
<td>Troas 770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astyra Troika</td>
<td>Troas 771</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenai (Athenaios)</td>
<td>Attika 361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenai Diades (Athenites)</td>
<td>Euboia 364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atrax (Atragios, Attrakios)</td>
<td>Thessalia 395</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aulai (Auliates)</td>
<td>Karia 877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aulon (Aulonites)</td>
<td>Messenia 314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aulon</td>
<td>Crete 949</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autokane (Autokanaios?)</td>
<td>Aiolis 804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axos (Axios)</td>
<td>Crete 950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azeia (Azeieux)</td>
<td>Troas 772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azoros (Azoriatas)</td>
<td>Perraibia 459</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargasa (Pargaseus)</td>
<td>Karia 878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargylia (Bargylieus)</td>
<td>Karia 879</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barke (Barkaios)</td>
<td>Libya 1025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batiai</td>
<td>Epeiros 88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becheirias</td>
<td>Pontic Coast of Asia Minor 713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belbina (Belbinetes?)</td>
<td>Lakedaimon 326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belbina (Belbinites)</td>
<td>The Saronic Gulf 359</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berenike</td>
<td>Epeiros 89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berga (Bergaios)</td>
<td>Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos 627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergepolis (Bergepolites)</td>
<td>Thrace: from Nestos to Hebro 642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beroia (Beroiaios)</td>
<td>Makedonia 533</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Biannos (Biannios)</td>
<td>Crete 951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bionnos</td>
<td>Crete 952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birytis (Berysios)</td>
<td>Troas 773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisanthe (Bisanthenos)</td>
<td>Propontic Thrace 673</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bizone (Bizonites)</td>
<td>Pontos: West Coast 683</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boia (Boiates)</td>
<td>Lakedaimon 327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boion (Boiaios)</td>
<td>Doris 390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Boione</td>
<td>Aiolis 805</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolbai (Bolbaieis)</td>
<td>Karia 880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bormiskos</td>
<td>Mygdonia 547</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boucheta (Bouchetios)</td>
<td>Epeiros 90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouli (Boulios)</td>
<td>Phokis 174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boura (Bourios)</td>
<td>Achaia 233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouthiea (Bouthieus)</td>
<td>Ionia 839</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouthroton (Bouthrotios)</td>
<td>Epeiros 91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brea (Breaios)</td>
<td>Unlocated in Thrace 624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentesion (Brendesinos)</td>
<td>The Adriatic 78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brikindeia (Brikindarios)</td>
<td>Rhodos 993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Brykous (Brykountios) — The Aegean 487
Byllis (Byllion) — Epeiros 92
Bysbikos (Bysbikenos) — Propontic Coast of Asia Minor 738
Byzantion (Byzantios) — Propontic Thrace 674

Chaironeia (Chaironeus) — Boiotia 201
(Chaladrioi) — Elis 249
Chaleion (Chaleieus) — West Lokris 159
Chalestra — Mygdonia 548
Chalke (Chalkeates) — The Aegean 477
Chalketor (Chalketoreus) — Karia 881
Chalkis (Chalkideus) — Aitolia 145
Chalkis (Chalkideus) — Euboia 365
Chalkis (Chalkideus) — Aiolis 806
Charadra (Charadraios) — Phokis 175
Charadrous — Chalkidike 565
(Chedrolioi) — Chalkidike 566
Chen (Cheneus) — Lakedaimon 328
Chen (Cheneus) — Oita 425
Chersonesos/Agora (Chersonesites) — Thracian
Chersonesos 661
*Chersonasos (Chersonasios, Cherronesios) — Crete 953
Chersonesos (Chersonesites) — Pontos: Skythia 695
Chersonesos (Chersonesios) — Karia 882
Chios (Chios) — Ionia 840
Chios (Chios) — Karia 883
Choirades — Pontic Coast of Asia Minor 714
Chorsiai (Chorsieus) — Boiotia 202
Chyretai (Chyretiaios) — Perrhaibia 460
Chyton — Ionia 841
Chytropolis (Chytropolitai) — Chalkidike 567

Daminon Teichos (Dammioteichites) — Propontic Thrace 675
Dar(i)eion — Propontic Coast of Asia Minor 739
Dardanos (Dardaneus) — Troas 774
Daskyleion (Daskyleianos) — Propontic Coast of Asia
Minor 740
Datala (Datales) — Crete 954
Datos (Datenos) — Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos 629
Daulis (Daulieus) — Phokis 176
Delos (Delios) — The Aegean 478
Delphi (Delphos) — Phokis 177
Derion (Derieus) — Akarnania 117
Deris (Deraoi?) — Thracian Chersonesos 662
(Diakres apo Chalkeidon) — Euboia 367
(Diakrioi en Euboia) — Euboia 366
(Diakrioi) — Rhodos 994
*Didymon Teichos (Didymoteichites) — Propontic Coast
of Asia Minor 741
Dikaia (Dikaiopolites) — Chalkidike 568
Dikaia — Thrace: from Nestos to Hebrs 643
Dion (Dieus) — Euboia 368
Dion (Diestes) — Makedonia 534
Dion (Dieus) — Chalkidike 569
Dionysopolis — Pontos: West Coast 684
Dios Hieron (Diosirites) — Ionia 842
Dioskouris — Pontos: Kolchis 709
Dipai (Dipaeus) — Arkadia 268
Dodone (Dodonaios) — Epeiros 93
Doliche (Dolichaioi) — Perrhaibia 461
Dragmos (Dragmios) — Crete 955
Drerous (Drerios) — Crete 956
Drymos (Drumios) — Phokis 178
Drys (Drytees) — Thrace: from Nestos to Hebrs 644
Dyme (Dymaios) — Achaia 234
Dyspontion (Dyspontios) — Elia 250
Dystos — Euboia 369

Echedameia (Echedamieus) — Phokis 179
Echinos (Echinaios) — Akarnania 118
Echinos (Echinaios) — Malis 429
Edessa (Edessaioi) — Makedonia 535
Eion — Chalkidike 570
Eion — Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos 630
*Ekkarra (Ekkarreus) — Achaia Phthiotis 434
Elaia (Elaaios) — Aiolis 807
Elaious (Elaiousios) — Thracian Chersonesos 663
Elaiousioi — Ionia 843
Elateia — Epeiros 94
Elitea (Eliteus) — Phokis 180
Elea (Eleaios) — Epeiros 95
Eleusis — Attika 362
Eleutherna (Eleuthernaios) — Crete 957
Elis (Elieus) — Elis 251
*Eltynia (Eltynieus) — Crete 958
Elyros (Elyrios) — Crete 959
Emporion (Emporites) — Spain and France 2
Engyon (Engyinos) — Sikelia 14
Ep(e)ion — Triphylia 304
Epesos (Epesios) — Ionia 844
Ephyra (Ephyros) — Epeiros 96
Epidamnos (Epidamnius)/Dyrrhachion (Dyrrachinos) —
The Adriatic 79
Epidaurios (Epidauriios) — Lakedaimon 329
Epidaurios (Epidauriios) — Argolis 348
Horraon (Horraitas) — Epeiros 99
*Hyaia (Hyaios) — West Lokris 160
Hyampolis (Hyampolios) — Phokis 182
(Hybileis) — Karia 887
(Hydaios) — Karia 888
Hydisos (Hydisseus) — Karia 889
Heycle (Heyletes)/Elea (Elates) — Italia 54
Hyettos (Heytittos) — Boiotia 207
(Hymissaeis) — Karia 890
Hypata (Hypataios) — Dolopia 420
Hypnia (Hypneus) — West Lokris 161
Hyporeiai (Hyporeates) — Akarnania 121
Hyrtakina (Hyrtakinios) — Crete 963
Hysiai — Boiotia 208
Ilyasos (Ilysios) — Rhodos 995
Iasonia — Pontic Coast of Asia Minor 716
Iasos (Iaseus) — Karia 891
Ichnai (Ichnaios) — Makedonia 538
Idalion (Idalios) — Cyprus 1013
Idca — Thracian Chersonesos 664
Idrias (Idrieus) — Karia 892
Idyma (Idymeus) — Karia 893
Idyros — Pamphylia 1002
Ikos (Ikios) — The Aegean 482
Ilion (Ilieus) — Troas 779
*Imachara (Imacharaios) — Sikelia 26
Imbros (Imbrios) — The Aegean 483
Iolkos (Iolkus) — Magnesia 449
Iolla (Iolleus) — Aiolis 812
Ios (Ietes) — The Aegean 484
Ioulis (Ioulites) — The Aegean 491
Isinda (Isindios) — Ionia 846
Issa (Issaios) — The Adriatic 81
(Issioi) — West Lokris 162
Issos (Isseus) — Kilikia 1007
Istasos — Chalkidike 574
Istron (Istronios) — Crete 964
Istros (Istrianos) — Pontos: West Coast 685
Itanos (Itanios) — Crete 965
Ithaka (Ithakesios) — Akarnania 122
Kabyle (Kabylenos) — Inland Thrace 654
Kalaureia (Kalaureates) — The Saronic Gulf 360
Kalchedon (Kalchedonios) — Propontic Coast of Asia Minor 743
Kalindoia — Chalkidike 575
Kallatis (Kallatanos) — Pontos: West Coast 686
Kallion (Kallieus)/Kallipolis (Kallipolites) — Aitolia 147
Kallipolis (Kallipolites) — Sikelia 27
Kallipolis (Kallipolites) — Propontic Coast of Asia Minor 744
Kalydon (Kalydonios) — Aitolia 148
Kalymna (Kalymnios) — The Aegean 485
Kalynda (Kalyndeus) — Karia 894
Kamakai — Chalkidike 576
Kamarina (Kamarinaioi) — Sikelia 28
Kamiros (Kamireus) — Rhodos 996
Kampsia — Chalkidike 577
(Kapheleis) — Ainos 421
Kaphy(i)ai (Kaphyieus) — Arkadia 275
Karambis — Pontic Coast of Asia Minor 717
*Karbasyanda (Karbasyaneus) — Karia 895
Kardamyle (Kardamyleites) — Messenia 315
Kardia (Kardianos) — Thracian Chersonesos 665
Karene (Karenaioi) — Aiolis 813
Karkinitsis (Kerkinites) — Pontos: Skythia 698
Karoussa — Pontic Coast of Asia Minor 718
Karpassia (Karpaceus) — Cyprus 1014
Karpathos (Karpathios) — The Aegean 489
Karthaia (Karthaieus) — The Aegean 492
Karyanda (Karyandeus) — Karia 896
Karystos (Karystios) — Euboia 373
Kasmenai (Kasmenaios) — Sikelia 29
Kasolaba (Kasolabeus) — Karia 897
Kasos (Kasios) — The Aegean 490
Kassopa (Kassopaios) — Epeiros 100
Kasthanaie (Kassaenaius) — Magnesia 450
Katane (Katanais) — Sikelia 30
Kaulonia (Kauloniatas) — Italia 55
Kaunos (Kaunos) — Karia 898
Kebren (Kebrenios) — Troas 780
Kedreai (Kedreates) — Karia 899
Kelerid — Kilikia 1008
Kantoripa (Kantoripinos) — Sikelia 31
Kephyaloidion (Kephyaloiditas) — Sikelia 32
Kepoi (Kepites) — Pontos: Skythia 699
Keraia (Keraitas) — Crete 966
Keramos (Kerameus) — Karia 900
Kerasous (Kerasountios) — Pontic Coast of Asia Minor 719
Keria (Keraitas) — The Aegean 495
Keryneia (Keryneus) — Achaia 236
Keryneia (Kerynites) — Cyprus 1015
Kierion (Kierieus) — Thessalia 398
Kikynethos — Magnesia 451
Killa — Aioli 814
(Killareis) — Karia 901
Kimmerikon — Pontos: Skythia 700
Kimolos (Kimolios) — The Aegean 496
Kindye (Kindyeus) — Karia 902
Kinos (Kianos) — Propontic Coast of Asia Minor 745
Kionitis (Kionites) — Karia 904
Kleitor (Kleitorios) — Arkadia 276
Kleopatra (Kleopatros) — Lakedaimon 335
Kleopatra (Kleopatros) — Crete 968
Klymenes (Klymenes) — Karia 905
Klymenes (Klymenes) — Makedonia 539
Klymenes (Klymenes) — Thessalia 401
Klymenes (Klymenes) — Karia 906
Kloch (Klochos) — Aiolis 818
Klotho (Klithos) — Arkadia 277
Klonai (Koloneus) — Propontic Coast of Asia Minor 746
Klophon (Kolophonios) — Ionia 848
Kolossa — Pontic Coast of Asia Minor 721
Komeia (Komeia) — Thessalia 399
Kopai (Kopaieus) — Boiotia 209
Korakai (Korakaios) — Magnesia 452
Korane (Koraneus) — Karia 906
Kores (Koresios) — The Aegean 493
Korinthos (Korinthios) — Megaris, etc. 227
Koryra (Koryraios) — Akarnania 123
Korone (Koroneios) — Messenia 316
Koroneia (Koroneus) — Boiotia 210
Koronta (Korontaioi) — Akarnania 124
(Korophaioi) — Ainis 422
Korykos (Korykaioi) — Ionia 849
Kos (Koos) — The Aegean 497
Kos Meropis — The Aegean 499
Kossaia (Kossaioi) — Unlocated in Thrace 624
Kotyora (Kotyories) — Pontic Coast of Asia Minor 722
Kouros (Kourios) — Cyprus 1016
Kranioi (Kranios) — Akarnania 125
Kranion (Kranonios) — Thessalia 400.
Krenides (Krenites) — Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos 632
Kressa — Thracian Chersonesos 666
Krithote (Krithousios) — Thracian Chersonesos 667
Kromna (Kromnites) — Pontic Coast of Asia Minor 723
Kromnos (Kromnites) — Lakedaimon 334
Kroton (Krotoniatas) — Italia 56
Krya (Kryeus) — Karia 907
Kynai (Kynaios) — Dolopia 419
Kyno (Kynos) — Crete 968
Kyno (Kynos) — Karia 908
Kyllene (Kyllenios) — Elis 254
Kyllene — Aioli 816
Kyme (Kymiaios) — Italia 57
Kyme (Kymiaios) — Aioli 817
Kynai (Kynaios) — Arkadia 278
Kynos (Kynos) — East Lokris 382
Kypair (Kyparreus) — Achaia Phthiotis 436
Kyparissos (Kyparissieus) — Messenia 317
Kypria (Kypirheus) — Lakedaimon 335
Kypria (Kypirheus) — Lakedaimon 336
Kyrion (Kyrionia) — Karia 909
Kyrion (Kyrionia) — Aiolis 817
Kyrhrhos (Kyrhrestes) — Makedonia 539
Kystiros (Kystirios) — Unlocated 1033
Kytaia — Pontos: Skythia 701
Kytaion — Crete 969
Kythera (Kytherios) — Lakedaimon 336
Kythnos (Kytnios) — The Aegean 501
Kyttion (Kyttinieus) — Doris 392
Kytos — Pontic Coast of Asia Minor 724
Kyzikos (Kyzikenos) — Propontic Coast of Asia Minor 747
Labrys/Labryta — Pontos: Skythia 702
Lamia (Lamieus) — Malis 431
Lamponia (Lamponios) — Troas 783
Lampsakos (Lampsakenos) — Propontic Coast of Asia Minor 748
Las (La(w)-inos) — Italia 58
Lapethos (Lapithios) — Cyprus 1017
Lappa (Lappaios) — Crete 970
Larisa (Larisaios) — Crete 970
Larisa (Larisaios) — Thessalia 401
Larisa (Larisaios) — Achaia Phthiotis 437
Larisa (Larisaios) — Troas 784
Larisa (Larisaios) — Aioli 818
Larymna (Larymnaioi) — East Lokris 383
Las (Laos) — Lakedaimon 337
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toponyms</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lasion (Lasionios)</td>
<td>Elis 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latmos (Latmios)/Heraklea (Herakleotes)</td>
<td>Karia 910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lato (Latos)</td>
<td>Crete 971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebadeia (Lebadeus)</td>
<td>Boiotia 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebedos (Lebedios)</td>
<td>Ionia 850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebena (Lebenaios)</td>
<td>Crete 972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lechoioi)</td>
<td>Unlocated 1034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledon (Ledontios)</td>
<td>Phokis 184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leibethra (Leibethrios)</td>
<td>Makedonia 540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenos</td>
<td>Elis 257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontinoi (Leontinos)</td>
<td>Sikelia 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontion (Leontesios)</td>
<td>Achaia 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepreon (Lepreatas)</td>
<td>Triphylia 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepsimandos (Lepsimandeus)</td>
<td>Karia 911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leros (Lerios)</td>
<td>The Aegean 504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lete (Letaios)</td>
<td>Mygdonia 550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letrinoi (Letrinos)</td>
<td>Elis 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leukai (Leokates)</td>
<td>Aiolis 819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leukas (Leukadios)</td>
<td>Akarnania 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leukophrys</td>
<td>Ionia 851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilaia (Lilaieus)</td>
<td>Phokis 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limnai (Limnaios)</td>
<td>Thracian Chersonesos 668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limnaia (Limnaios)</td>
<td>Akarnania 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limne</td>
<td>Pontic Coast of Asia Minor 725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindos (Lindios)</td>
<td>Rhodos 997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipara (Lipariai)</td>
<td>Sikelia 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipaxos</td>
<td>Chalkidike 582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisos (Lisios)</td>
<td>Crete 973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lissos (Lissates)</td>
<td>The Adriatic 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokroi (Lokros)</td>
<td>Italia 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Longane (Longenaios)</td>
<td>Sikelia 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lousoi (Lousiati)</td>
<td>Arkadia 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lykastos</td>
<td>Pontic Coast of Asia Minor 726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lykosoura (Lykourasios)</td>
<td>Arkadia 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyktos (Lyktios)</td>
<td>Crete 974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madytos (Madytios)</td>
<td>Thracian Chersonesos 669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesia (Magnes)</td>
<td>Aiolis 820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesia (Magnes)</td>
<td>Ionia 852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makiston (Makistios)</td>
<td>Triphylia 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makyneia (Makyneus)</td>
<td>Aitolia 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malla (Mallaios)</td>
<td>Crete 975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Malloia (Malloiatas)</td>
<td>Perrhaibia 464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallos (Marlotas, Mallotes)</td>
<td>Kilikia 1099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantinea (Mantineus)</td>
<td>Arkadia 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathesion (Marathesios)</td>
<td>Ionia 853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marganeis (Marganeus)</td>
<td>Elis 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion (Marieus)</td>
<td>Cyprus 1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maroneia (Maronites)</td>
<td>Thrace: from Nestos to Hebrs 646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massalia (Massaliotes)</td>
<td>Spain and France 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matala (Matalios)</td>
<td>Crete 976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Matropolis (Matropolites)</td>
<td>Akarnania 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medeon (Medeionios)</td>
<td>Phokis 186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medion (Medionios)</td>
<td>Akarnania 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medma (Medmaios)</td>
<td>Italia 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medmasos (Madnaseus)</td>
<td>Karia 912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megale polis (Megalopolites)</td>
<td>Arkadia 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megara (Megareus)</td>
<td>Sikelia 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megara (Megareus)</td>
<td>Megaris, etc. 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melaina Korkyra (Korkyraios)</td>
<td>The Adriatic 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Melanpagos? (Melanpagitas)</td>
<td>Aiolis 821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meliboa (Meliboieus)</td>
<td>Magnesia 453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melitaia (Melitaius)</td>
<td>Achaia Phthiotis 438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melos (Melios)</td>
<td>The Aegean 505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mende (Mendaios)</td>
<td>Chalkidike 584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesambria (Mesambrianos)</td>
<td>Pontos: West Coast 687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesambrie</td>
<td>Thrace: from Nestos to Hebrs 647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Messapioi)</td>
<td>West Lokris 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messene (Messenios)/Ithome (Ithomaios)</td>
<td>Messenia 318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Metapioi)</td>
<td>Elis 260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metapontion (Metapontinos)</td>
<td>Italia 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metauro (Mataurinos)</td>
<td>Italia 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methana (Methanaios)</td>
<td>Argolis 352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methone (Methonaios)</td>
<td>Magnesia 454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methone (Methonaios)</td>
<td>Makedonia 541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methydron (Methydrieus)</td>
<td>Arkadia 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methylios (Methyleius)</td>
<td>Thessalia 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methymna (Methymnaios)</td>
<td>Lesbos 797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolis (Matropolitas)</td>
<td>Thessalia 403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolis</td>
<td>Propontic Coast of Asia Minor 749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mieza (Miezaios/Miezus)</td>
<td>Makedonia 542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milatos (Milatios)</td>
<td>Crete 977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miletos (Milesios)</td>
<td>Ionia 854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miletopolis (Miletopolites)</td>
<td>Propontic Coast of Asia Minor 750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miletouteichos (Miletoteichites)</td>
<td>Propontic Coast of Asia Minor 751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milkoros (Milkorios)</td>
<td>Chalkidike 585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minoa (Minoetes)</td>
<td>The Aegean 473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molykreion (Molykreus)</td>
<td>Aitolia 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mondaia (Mondaieus)</td>
<td>Perrhaibia 465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mopsion (Mopsaeus)</td>
<td>Thessalia 404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgantina (Morgantinos)</td>
<td>Sikelia 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mithone (Mothonaios)</td>
<td>Messenia 319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Myania (Myaneus) — West Lokris 164
Mykalessos (Mykalessios) — Boiotia 212
Mykenai (Mykenaios) — Argolis 353
Mykonos (Mykonios) — The Aegean 506
Mylai (Mylaios) — Sikelia 38
Mylai (Mylaios) — Perrhaibia 466
Mylasa (Mylaeseus) — Karia 913
Myndos (Myndios) — Karia 914
Myronnesos (Myronnesios) — Ionia 855
Myous (Myousios) — Ionia 856
Myrina (Myrinaios) — The Aegean 502
Myrina (Myrinaios) — Aiolis 822
Myrinos (Myrionios) — Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos 633
Myrleia (Myrleianos) — Propontic Coast of Asia Minor 751
Myrmekeion — Pontos: Skythia 703
Mytilene (Mytilenaios) — Lesbos 798
Mytistratos (Mytistratos) — Sikelia 39
Nagidos (Nagides) — Kilikia 1010
Nakone (Nakones) — Sikelia 40
(Naribareis) — Karia 915
Naryandos (Naryandeus) — Karia 916
Narya (Naryaia) — East Lokris 384
Nasos (Nasiotas) — Aioli 823
Naukratis (Naukratites) — Egypt 1023
Naulochon — Ionia 857
Naupaktos (Naupaktos) — West Lokris 165
Naxia (Naxiates) — Karia 917
Naxos (Naxios) — Sikelia 41
Naxos (Naxios) — The Aegean 507
Neandreia (Neandreus) — Troas 785
Neapolis (Neapolites) — Attica 63
Neapolis (Neapolites) — Chalkidike 587
Neapolis (Neapolites) — Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos 634
Neapolis (Neapolites) — Propontic Thrace 677
Neon (Ne-) / Tithorea (Tithoreus) — Phokis 187
Neon Teichos — Aioli 824
Nestane (Nestanios) — Arkadia 284
Nikaia — Epeiros 101
Nikaia (Nikaias) — East Lokris 385
Nikonion — Pontos: West Coast 688
Nisyros (Nisyrios) — The Aegean 508
Nonakris (Nonakrieus) — Arkadia 285
Notion — Aioli 825
Notion (Notieus) — Ionia 858
Noudion — Triphylia 308
Nymphaios (Nymphatos) — Pontos: Skythia 704
Oasis — Egypt 1024
Odeinos — Pontic Coast of Asia Minor 727
Odessos (Odeseites) — Pontos: West Coast 689
Oiai (Oiaiotes) — Rhodos 998
Oianthea (Oianthia) — West Lokris 166
Oine (Oineaiotes) — The Aegean 480
Oiniadai (Oiniadas) — Akarnania 130
Oinous (Oinountios) — Lakedaimon 338
Oios (Oioiotes) — Lakedaimon 339
Olympos (Olympos) — Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos 635
Oitylos (Oitylous) / Beitylos (Beitylous) — Lakedaimon 580
Olympos (Olympos) — Chalkidike 587
Oinos (Oinos) — Crete 978
Olympos (Olympos) — Karia 919
Olympa (Olympastas) — Epeiros 102
Olynthos (Olynthios) — Chalkidike 588
Ophious (Ophous) — Pontos: West Coast 691
Ophryneus (Ophryneus) — Troas 786
Opous (Opoutios) — Elpis 261
Opous (Opoutios) — East Lokris 386
Orchomenos (Orchomenos) — Boiotia 213
Orchomenos (Orchomenos) — Arkadia 286
Oresthasion (Oresthasion) — Arkadia 287
Orgame — Pontos: West Coast 692
Orikos (Orikos) — Epeiros 103
Orneai (Orneiates) — Argolis 354
Orobia (Orobieus) — Euboia 374
Oropos (Oropios) — Boiotia 214
Orthagoria (Orthagoria) — Thrace: from Nestos to Hebros 648
Orthos (Orthios) — Thessalia 405
(Osbaioi) — Chalkidike 589
Othonos (Othorios) — Chalkidike 590
(Otlenoi) — Pontic Coast of Asia Minor 754
Ouranion (Ouranites) — Karia 920
(Oxoniaioi) — Magnesia 456
Oxynion — Thessalia 406
Pagai (Pagaioi) — Megaris, etc. 226
Pagasai (Pagasitas) — Thessalia 407
Paion — Arkadia 288
Paion — Thracian Chersonesos 670
Paisos (Paisenos) — Propontic Coast of Asia Minor 755
Paktye — Thracian Chersonesos 671
Palaigambrion — Aiolis 826
*Palaiperkote (Palaiperkosios) — Troas 787
Palauros (Palaireus) — Akarnania 131
Paleis (Paleus) — Akarnania 132
Pallantion (Pallanteus) — Arkadia 289
Pandosia (Pandosinos) — Italia 64
Pandosia — Epeiros 104
Panormos — The Aegean 510
Pantikapaion (Pantikapaites)/Bosporos (Bosporites) — Pontos: Skythia 705
Paphos (Paphios) — Cyprus 1019
Parapotamioi (Parapotamios) — Phokis 188
Parasopioi (Parasopieus) — Oita 426
Parion (Parianos) — Propontic Coast of Asia Minor 756
Paros (Parios) — The Aegean 509
(Parpariotai) — Karia 921
Parthenion — Aiolis 827
Passanda (Pasandeus) — Karia 922
Passaron — Epeiros 105
Patrai (Patreus) — Achaia 239
Pedasa (Pedaseus) — Karia 923
Pedieis (Pedieis) — Phokis 189
(Pedieis) — Rhodos 999
Peirasia (Peiraisieus) — Thessalia 408
(Peleiatai) — Karia 924
Pelinna(on) (Pelinna(e)us) — Thessalia 409
Pella (Pellaios) — Makedonia 543
Pellana (Pellaneus) — Lakedaimon 341
Pellene (Pellenes) — Achaia 240
Peparethos — The Aegean 511
*Peraia (Pereaeus) — Euboia 375
Pergamone (Pergamones) — Aiolis 828
Perge (Pergaios) — Pamphylia 1003
Perinthos (Perinthi) — Propontic Coast of Thrace 678
Perkote (Perkosios) — Troas 788
Perperene (Perperenos) — Aiolis 829
Petra (Petrinos) — Sikelia 42
*Petra (Petraioi) — Crete 979
Peuma (Peumatios) — Achaia Phthiotis 439
Phagres (Phagresios) — Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos 636
Phaistos (Phaistoi) — Crete 980
Phakion (Phakiastas) — Thessalia 410
Phalanna (Phalannaios) — Perrhaibia 468
Phalasarnes (Phalasarnios) — Crete 981
Phaloria (Phaloraias) — Thessalia 411
Phanagoria (Phanagorites) — Pontos: Skythia 706
Phanote (Phanoteus) — Epeiros 106
Phanoteus/Panopeus — Phokis 190
Phara — Akarnania 133
Phara — Arkadia 290
Pharai — Boiotia 215
Pharai (Parhaiues) — Achaea 241
Pharai (Pharaiates) — Messenia 320
Pharbelos (Pharbelios) — Chalkidike 591
Pharkadon (Pharkadonios) — Thessalia 412
Pharos (Pharios) — The Adriatic 84
Pharsalos (Pharsoios) — Thessalia 413
Phaselis (Phaselites) — Lykia 942
Phasis (Phasiannos) — Pontos: Kolchis 711
Phelloe — Achaea 242
Pheneos (Pheneus) — Arkadia 291
Pherei (Pheraios) — Thessalia 414
Phigaleia (Phigaleus) — Arkadia 292
Philippi (Philippeus) — Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos 637
Philippopolis (Philippopolites) — Inland Thrace 655
Phleious (Phleios) — Argolis 355
Phlygonion (Phlygoneus) — Phokis 191
Phoinike — Epeiros 107
Phoïtiai (Phoïtius) — Akarnania 134
Phokaia (Phokaios) — Ionia 859
*Phola (Phoiaus) — Aitolia 151
Pholegandros (Pholegandrios) — The Aegean 513
Phorieia (Phoriaeus) — Arkadia 293
Phrixai — Triphylla 309
Phyllake — Achaia Phthiotis 440
Phylea — Aitolia 152
(Phyrragioi) — Ainis 423
(Phytaioi) — Unlocated 1035
Piakos (Piakinos) — Sikelia 43
Pinda (Pidaioi) — Karia 925
Pilavors — Chalkidike 593
Pisa (Pisatas) — Elis 262
Pistases — Chalkidike 594
Pistiros (Pistiroi) — Inland Thrace 656
Pistyros — Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos 638
Pitane (Pitanaios) — Aiolis 830
Pithekoussai (Pithekoussaios) — Italia 65
Pladasa (Pladasieus) — Karia 926
Plakia (Plakianos) — Propontic Coast of Asia Minor 757
Plataiai (Plataieus) — Boiotia 216
Pleume (Pleumeus) — Chalkidike 595
Pleuron (Pleuronios) — Aitolia 153
Poissa (Poissios) — The Aegean 494
Poinos — Epeiros 108
Polichna (Polichnaios) — Troas 789
Polichne (Polichnites) — Crete 982
(Polichnitai) — Chalkidike 596
(Polichnitai) — Ionia 860
Polyrhen (Polyrhenios) — Crete 983
Poseidonia (Poseidoniatas) — Italia 66
Posideion (Posideites) — Euboia 376
Posideion — Chalkidike 597
Posideion — Syria 1022
Poteidaia (Poteidaiates) — Chalkidike 598
Potniai (Potnieus) — Boiotia 217
Po[---] — Phokis 192
Praisos (Praisios) — Crete 984
Praisios (Praisios) — Crete 984
Prasiali (Brasiates) — Lakedaimon 342
Praxillos (Prassilios) — Chalkidike 599
Priamos (Priamieus) — Crete 985
Priapos (Priapenos) — Propontic Coast of Asia Minor 758
Priene (Prieneus) — Ionia 861
Proerna (Proernios) — Achaia Phthiotis 441
Prokennesos (Prokennesios) — Propontic Coast of Asia Minor 759
Pronnios (Pronnos) — Akarnania 135
Proschion (Proscheios) — Aitolia 154
Psophis (Psophidios) — Arkadia 294
Pteleon (Pteleous) — Ionia 862
Pydna (Pydnaios) — Macedon 544
Pygela (Pygeleus) — Ionia 863
Pylaion (Parylaios) — Arkadia 295
Pylos (Pylios) — Elis 263
Pyrasos (Pyrasios) — Achaia Phthiotis 442
Pyrko — Triphylia 310
Pyrindos (Pyrindios) — Karia 927
Pyrnos (Pyrnios) — Karia 928
Pyrrha (Pyrrhaios) — Lesbos 799
Ptolemais (Ptolemaios) — Pella 469
Pythopolis (Pythopolites) — Propontic Coast of Asia Minor 760
Pyxous — Italia 67
Rhaeus (Rhaeukios) — Crete 986
Rhegion (Rheginos) — Italia 68
Rheneia (Rhenaieus, Rheneus) — The Aegean 514
Rhethymnos (Rhithymnios) — Crete 987
*Rhitten (Rhittenios) — Crete 988
Rhizous (Rhizousios) — Magnesia 457
Rhodi (Rhodetes) — Spain and France 4
Rhodos (Rhodios) — Rhodos 1000
Rhoiteon (Rhoiteus) — Troas 790
Rhypai, Hyre (Hyres) — Achaia 243
Salamis (Salaminquios) — Attika 363
Salamis (Salaminquios) — Cyprus 1020
Sale — Thrace: from Nestos to Hebros 649
Salmakis (Salmakites) — Karia 929
Same (Sameos) — Akarnania 136
Samos (Samos) — Ionia 864
Samos (the klerouchy of 365–322) — Ionia 865
Samothrace (Samothrax) — The Aegean 515
Sane (Sanaios) — Chalkidike 600
Sane — Chalkidike 601
*Saros (Sarios) — The Aegean 516
Sarte (Sartaios) — Chalkidike 602
Seleinous — The Aegean 512
Selinous (Selinousios) — Sicilia 44
Sellasia (Sellasieus?) — Lakedaimon 343
Selymbria (Selymbrianos) — Propontic Coast of Thrace 679
Ser(e)ion Teichos (Ser(e)ietichites) — Propontic Coast of Thrace 680
Seriphos (Seriphios) — The Aegean 517
Serme (Sermaios) — Chalkidike 603
Serymsia (Serymsieus) — Chalkidike 604
Sesamos (Sesamenes)/Amastris (Amastrianos) — Pontic Coast of Asia Minor 728
Sestos (Sestios) — Thracian Chersonesos 672
Seuthopolis — Inland Thrace 657
Seuthopolis — Inland Thrace 657
Sid — Lakedaimon 344
Sid — Sidetes — Pamphylia 1004
Sidousa (Sidousios) — Ionia 866
Sigeion (Sigeieus) — Troas 791
Sikinos (Sikesieus) — The Aegean 518
Sikyon (Sikonios) — Megar, etc. 228
(Sileraioi) — Sicilia 45
(Siloi) — Karia 930
Singos (Singaioi) — Mygdonia 551
Singos (Singaioi) — Chalkidike 605
Sinope (Sinopeus) — Pontic Coast of Asia Minor 729
TOPONYMS AND ETHNICS IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER

Sinos — Chalkidike 606
Siphai (Siphaius) — Boiotia 218
Siphnos (Siphnios) — The Aegean 519
Siris (Sirites) — Italia 69
Sirra (Sirraios) — Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos 639
Skabala (Skabalaios) — Chalkidike 607
(Skapsaios) — Chalkidike 608
Skarpheia (Skarpheus) — East Lokris 387
Skepsis (Skapsios) — Troas 792
Skione (Skionaios) — Chalkidike 609
Skithai (Skithaios) — Chalkidike 608
Skotoussa (Skotoussaios) — Thessalia 415
Stagira (Stagirites) — Chalkidike 610
Skoutousa (Skoutoussaios) — Thessalia 415
Smyrna (Smyrnaios) — Ionia 867
Sollion — Akarnania 137
Solyra (Soleus) — Kilikia 1011
Soloi (Solios) — Cyprus 1021
Sombia — Propontic Coast of Asia Minor 762
Stauphna (Staparchos) — Magnesia 458
Staphylia (Staphylia) — Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos 639
Strepys (Strepsoi) — Thrace: from Nestos to Hebros 650
Strepsiades (Strepsiai) — Thessalia 318
Strepsia (Strepsaios) — Chalkidike 615
Stryme — Thrace: from Nestos to Hebrus 650
Stymphalos (Stymphalos) — Arkadia 296
Styra (Styrus) — Euboia 377
Syangela (Syangela) — Karpathos 931
Sybaris (Sybaritas) — Italia 70
Sybritos (Sybritos) — Crete 990
Syre (Syrias) — The Aegean 522
Syros (Syrios) — The Aegean 523

(Talagreis) — Karpathos 932
Talana — Ainis 424
Tanagra (Tanagraits) — Boiotia 220
Tarampos — Karpathos 933
Taras (Tarantinos) — Italia 71
(Tarbanes) — Karia 934
Tarrha (Tarrhaes) — Crete 991
Taecheira (Taecheirites) — Libya 1029
Taurumoniou (Taurumonites) — Sikelia 48
Tegea (Tegeatas) — Arkadia 297
Teichoniou (Teichonii) — Phoks 194
Tekmon — Epeiros 109
Telandros (Telantrios) — Karia 935
Telemessos (Telemesseus) — Karia 936
Telos (Telios) — The Aegean 524
Temesa (Temesaios) — Italia 72
Temnis (Temnites) — Aioli 832
Tenedos (Tenedios) — Troas 793
Tenos (Tenios) — The Aegean 525
Teos (Teios) — Ionia 868
Tereia — Propontic Coast of Asia Minor 763
Terina (Terinaioi) — Italia 73
Termera (Termereus) — Karia 937
(Tersosgasseis) — Karia 938
Tetrakis — Pontic Coast of Asia Minor 731
Teuthis (Teuthidas) — Arkadia 298
Teuthrania — Aioli 833
Thalamai (Thalamates) — Messenia 321
Thaliades — Arkadia 299
Thasos (Thasios) — The Aegean 526
(Thasthareis) — Karpathos 939
Thaumakos (Thaumakos) — Achaia Phthiotis 443
Thebai (Thebaioi) — Boiotia 221
Thebai (Thebaioi) — Achaia Phthiotis 444
Thebai (Thebaioi) — Ionia 869
Thebe — Aioli 834
Thelphousa (Thelphousia) — Arkadia 300
Therma (Thermai) — Pontic Coast of Asia Minor 732
Thisbeia (Thisbeias) — Pontos: Skythia 707
Thenos (Thenios) — The Aegean 527
Therambo (Theramboi) — Chalkidike 616
*Thermi (Thermias) — The Aegean 481
Therme — Mykonos 552
Thermineae — Aitolia 155
Thespiae (Thespieus) — Boiotia 222
Thestoras — Chalkidike 617
Thetenion (Thetens) — Thessalia 416
Thibai (Thibaeus) — Boiotia 223
Thiosto (Thisaios) — Arkadia 301
Thouria (Thouriates) — Messenia 322
Thourioi (Thourios) — Italia 74
Thraistos (Thraistios) — Elis 264
Thronion (Thronieus) — East Lokris 388
Thydonos — Karia 940
Thyrea — Lakedaimon 346
Thyrreion (Thyrieus) — Akarnania 139
Tieion (Tianos) — Pontic Coast of Asia Minor 733
Tinde (Tindaios) — Chalkidike 619
Tiryns (Tirynthios) — Argolis 356
*Tisna (Tisnaios) — Aiolis 835
Tolophon (Tolophonios) — West Lokris 167
Tomis (Tomites) — Pontos: West Coast 693
Torone (Toronaios) — Chalkidike 620
Torone — Epeiros 110
Tortyneion (Tortyneus) — Arkadia 302
Torybeia (Torybeieus) — Akarnania 140
Trachis (Trachinios) — Malis 432
Trachis (Trachinios) — Phokis 195
Trailos (Trafios) — Bisaltia 555
Traleis (Traleeus) — Karia 941
Trapezous (Trapezountios) — Arkadia 303
Trapezous (Trapezountios) — Pontic Coast of Asia Minor 734

Trichoneion (Trichonieus) — Aitolia 156
Trikka (Trikkaios) — Thessalia 417
Tripoiai — Chalkidike 621
Tritaia (Tritaieus) — Achaia 244
Tritea (Triteus) — West Lokris 168
Triteis — Phokis 196
Troizen (Troizenios) — Argolis 357
Troneia (Troneieus) — Phokis 197
Tylisos (Tylisios) — Crete 992
Tyndaris (Tydarites) — Sicelia 49
Tyras (Tyranos) — Pontos: West Coast 694
Tyritake — Pontos: Skythia 708
Tyrodiza (Tyrodizenos) — Propontic Thrace 681
(Tyrrhenoi) — Sicelia 50

Xanthos (Xanthios) — Lykia 943

Zakynthos (Zakynthios) — Akarnania 141
Zankle (Zanklaios)/Messana (Messanios) — Sicelia 51
Zeleia (Zeleites) — Propontic Coast of Asia Minor 764
Zereia (Zeranios) — Chalkidike 622
Zmaratha — Epeiros 111
Zone (Zonaios) — Thrace: from Nestos to Hebros 651
3. Toponyms and City-Ethnics in Greek

Toponyms and city-ethnics are separated by a dash. If no toponym is attested the entry opens with a dash. (L) = Attested in Hellenistic and/or Roman texts only.
Βοϊα, Βοιαίος (L) — Βοιαίος (L) no. 390
Βόλβα (L) — Βολβαίος (L) no. 880
Βορμακός; Βορμακός — Βορμακός (L) no. 547
Βορυσθενής — Βορυσθενής (L) no. 690
Βόσπορος; Βοσπόρος — Βοσπόρος (L) no. 705
Βούθεια; Βουθεία — Βουθεία (L) no. 839
Βουθρότα; Βουθρότα (L) — Βουθρότα (L) no. 91
Βούλιος (L) — Βούλιος (L) no. 174
Βούλιος; Βούλιος (L) — Βούλιος (L) no. 233
Βούχετα, τά; Βουχέτιοι, τό; Βουχέτιοι, τό — Βουχέτιοι (L) no. 90
Βρά, ή; Βρα (L) no. 624
Βρεντέσιοι, τό; Βρεντέσιοι — Βρεντέσιοι; Βρεντέσιοι — Βρεντέσιοι (L) no. 78
Βρικούδα, τά; Βρικούδα, τά — Βρικούδα, τά (L) no. 993
Βρυκούς (L); Βρυκούς — Βρυκούς (L) no. 487
Βρυλλέαν; Βρυλλέαν — Βρυλλέαν (L) no. 752
Βυζάντιο, τό — Βυζάντιο (L) no. 674
Βυλλέα, ἡ (L); Βυλλέα, ἡ — Βυλλέα, ἡ (L) no. 92
Βυσίβικος; Βυσίβικος (L) no. 738
Γαλερία, ἡ (L); Γαλερία — Γαλερία (L) no. 16
Γαληψός; Αὐλεᾶς — Γαληψός (L) no. 571
Γελεαῖος; Γελεαῖος — Γελεαῖος (L) no. 651
Γαμβρίος, τό; Γαμβρίος; Γαμβρίος — Γαμβρίος (L) no. 808
Γάργαρος, ἡ; Γάργαρος, τά — Γάργαρος, τά (L) no. 775
Γέλα; Γέλα, ἡ — Γέλα, ἡ (L) no. 17
Γέλα, ἡ — Γέλα, ἡ (L) no. 572
Γάτα (L) — Γάτα (L) no. 98
Γάννας, ἡ; Γάννας (L) — Γάννας (L) no. 463
Γάννας, ἡ; Γάννας (L) — Γάννας (L) no. 396
Γάργυρα, τά; Γάργυρα, τά — Γάργυρα, τά (L) no. 696
Γάρντος, Γάρντος — Γάρντος (L) no. 960
Γάρντος, ἡ; Γάρντος, ἡ — Γάρντος, ἡ (L) no. 271
Γρήγορος, ἡ; Γρήγορος — Γρήγορος (L) no. 332
Γρήγορος, ἡ; Γρήγορος — Γρήγορος (L) no. 572
Γρήγορος, τό — Γρήγορος, τό (L) no. 98
Γρίφος, τό; Γρίφος, τό — Γρίφος, τό (L) no. 463
Γρίφος, τό — Γρίφος, τό (L) no. 396
Γρυγυττοπεδίων — Γρυγυττοπεδίων (L) no. 696
Γρήγορος, ἡ; Γρήγορος — Γρήγορος (L) no. 960
Γρήγορος, ἡ; Γρήγορος — Γρήγορος (L) no. 271
Γρήγορος, ἡ; Γρήγορος — Γρήγορος (L) no. 332
Γρήγορος, τό — Γρήγορος, τό (L) no. 98
Τόνωρος; Ἰτύρα; Ἰδυρίς (L) — no. 1002
'Ιεράπτυνα, ἡ (L) — 'Ιεραπτύνιος (L) no. 962
'Ιθάκη, ἡ — 'Ἰθάκη, ἦθος (L) no. 122
'Ἰθόμη, ἡ — 'Ἰθομέ(αίος) no. 318
'Ικος, ἡ (L) — 'Ικιος no. 482
'Ἰλις, ἡ — 'Ἰλίς no. 779
— 'Ιλιαράρας no. 26
'Ιμβρος, ἡ — 'Ιμβριός no. 483
'Ἰμέρη, ἡ; 'Ἰμέρα — 'Ἰμεραίος no. 24
'Ἰόλλα — 'Ἰολλίς no. 812
'Ιος, ἡ — 'Ιώτης no. 484
'Ἰολλίς, ἡ — 'Ἰολλίτης no. 491
'Ἰππώνα, ἡ (L); Σιτάνα, ἡ (L) — 'Ἰππανάτας no. 25
'Ἰππώνιον; Εἰπώνιον, τό; 'Ἰππώνειον (L) — Ἐπιπνειος; Ἐπιπνιεῖος; 'Ἰππωνιεῖτης (L);
— 'Ἰππωνείτης (L) no. 53
'Ἰσανδα (L); 'Ἰσαν油气 (L) — 'Ἰσάνιος no. 846
'Ἰσάς, ἡ — 'Ισασι ας no. 81
'Ἰσαος; Ἰσαος, ὁ; ἡ (L) — 'Ἰσαεύς no. 1007
'Ἰσαος, ὁ — no. 574
— 'Ιστάτας, ἡ; 'Ιστατία, ἡ — 'Ιστατιεύς; 'Εσταιεύς no. 372
'Ἰστρος; Ἰστρή — 'Ιστρεννός; 'Ιστρενός no. 665
'Ἰστρών (L) — 'Ἰστρώνιος (L) no. 964
'Ἰστανός, ὁ — 'Ἰστανόιος no. 965
— 'Ἰχναίος, ἡ — 'Ἰχναίος (L); 'Ἰχναίος no. 538
'Ἱλικός; Ἰλικός, ὁ; ἡ — 'Ἱλικές; 'Ιλόκυκος (L) no. 449

Καβύλη, ἡ; Καβύθη (L); Βαβύλη (L) Καβυληνός (L) no. 654
Καλαυρέα; Καλαυρεία; Καλαυρία — Καλαυριάτας no. 360
Καλλιδοία, ἡ; Καλλιδοία (L) — no. 575
— Κάλλατας, ἡ; Κάλλατις (L); Καλλατία (L) —
Κάλλατανος; Καλλατανός (L) no. 686
Καλλιστόλες (L) — Καλλιστόλητης no. 27
— Καλλιστόλες (L); Καλλιστόλητης (L);
— 'Καλλιστόλητης (L) no. 147
Καλλιστόλες — Κ[αλλιστόλητης] (?) no. 744
Καλλιστόνων, ὁ — no. 148
Κάλλωνα, ἡ; Κάλλωνα (L) — Καλλώνιος no. 485
Κάλλωνα, τά (L) — Καλλωνεύς; Καλλωνεύς no. 894
Καλληχόδων, ὁ; Καλληχόδοι; Καλληχόδοι — Καλληχόδιοι;
— Καλληχόδιον; Καλληχόδιον; Καλληχόδιοι no. 743
Καμακάς; Κ[ε]μακάς — no. 576
Καμάρινα, ἡ — Καμαριναίος no. 28

Καμ(ε)ρος, ὁ; ἡ — Καμερές; Καμερές; Καμερινός (L) no. 996
Κάμφα; Κάμφα (L) — Κα(-) no. 577
Κάγαμβις — no. 717
— Καρβαναφές; Καρβαναφές no. 895
Καρβαμύλη, ἡ — Καρβαμυλήτης (L); Καρβαμυλήτης (L) no. 315
— Καρδάνα, ἡ — Καρδανίος no. 665
Καρήνη, ἡ — Καρνακιος no. 813
Κάρδα ια, ἡ — Καρθαίος; Καρθαίος no. 492
— Καρκυτική; Κερκυτική — Κερκυτική (L) no. 698
Καρνούσα — no. 718
Κάρπαθός — Καρπάθιος no. 489
Καρπασία, ἡ; Καρπάσια (L) —
Καρπασία no. 1014
Κάρπανδα, τά — Καρπανδείς no. 896
Κάρπαντας, ἡ — Κάρπαντας no. 373
Καρσανάια; ἡ; Καρσανάία (L); Καρσανάια (L);
Καρσανάία (L) — Καρσανάεις no. 450
Κασμένη, ἡ; Κασμέναι — no. 29
Κάςος, ἡ — Κάσιος no. 490
Κασσώπα; Κασσώπη, ἡ (L); Κασσωπία (L) —
Κασσωπίος; Κασσωπαίος no. 100
Κασσωλάβα — Κασσωλάβες no. 897
Κατάνα, ἡ; Κατάνια — Καταναίδα no. 30
Καλκουνία, ἡ; Καλκουνία — Καλκουνίατας; Καλκουνίατας no. 55
Καύνος, ἡ — Καύνοι no. 898
— Καφελεύς no. 421
Καφνιαί, αἱ; Καφνία, αἱ — Καφνιαίος no. 275
Κεβρήν; Κεβρήνη (L); Κεβρηνία (L) — Κεβρήνιος;
— Κεβρενίος; Κεβρενεύς (ός); Κεβρενίος (L) no. 780
Κεδρίταια; (L) — Κεδρίτας; Κεδριήτης; Κεδρέατας no. 899
Κεντοριπῖνος — Κεντοριπῖνος no. 1008
Κέντοριπινα, τά; Κέντοριπινα, αἱ (L) — Κέντοριψ;
— Κέντοριπίνος no. 31
Κεράια (L) — Κεραία; Κεραία (L); Κεραία (L) no. 966
Κέραμος, ἡ (L) — Κεραμεύς; Κεραμοί no. 900
Κερασούς — Κερασούντιος no. 719
Κεριά, ἡ — Κεριάτας no. 495
Κέρμενα, ἡ (L); Κέρμενα, ἡ (L) — Κερνεύς (L) no. 236
Κερμένα, ἡ — Κερμένα (L); [Κερμ]νήτης no. 1015
Κεφαλοίδιον, τὸ; Κεφαλοίδιος; Κεφαλοίδιος (L) —
Κεφαλοίδιος; Κεφαλοίδιος (L) no. 32
Λαμία, ἦ — Λαμιεύς no. 431
Λαμπώνιον, τό — Λαμπώνιεσθα, ἦ; Λαμπώνια (L) — Λαμπώνιεσθα; Λαμπώνιεσθα no. 783
Λάμψακος, ἦ — Λαμπσακτήριον no. 748
Λάος — Λαζίνοις; Λαίνοι no. 58
Λάππθος (L); Λάππθις — Λαππσιος (L) no. 1017
Λάππα, ἦ (L) — Λαππσιος no. 970
Λάρισα, ἦ; Λάρισα — Λαρσαίος; Λαρσαίος no. 818
Λάρις (s)a, ἦ — no. 255
Λάρις (s)a, ἦ — Λαρσαίος(αίος); Λαρσαίος; Λαρσαίος no. 401
Λάρισα, ἦ — Λαρσαίος no. 437
Λάρις (s)a, ἦ — Λαρσαίος (L) no. 784
Λάρισα, ἦ — Λαρσαίος (L); Λαρσαίος (L) no. 383
Λάσ, ὁ; Λάς, ἦ — Λάδος no. 337
Λασιούκ, ὁ — Λασιούκ no. 256
Λάτμος, ἦ — Λάτμοι no. 910
Λατώ (L) — Λάεσθα no. 971
Λεβάδεια, ἦ — Λεβαδεῖα; Λεβαδεῖα no. 211
Λεβέδος, ἦ — Λεβέδος no. 850
Λεβένα (L) — Λεβεναῖος; Λεβενάιος (L) no. 972
Λεβένα, ἦ (L) — Λεβένα no. 184
Λεβένθρα, τά; Λεβένθρα (L); Λεβένθρα (L) — Λεβένθρα; Λεβένθρα (L) no. 540
Λεοντίνοι — Λεοντίνοι no. 33
Λεοντίνοι (L) — Λεοντίνοι (L) no. 237
Λέπρειοι — Λεπρείοι; Λεπρείοι no. 306
Λέρος, ἦ — Λέροι no. 504
Λεργίον, οἱ (L); Λεργίον, ἦ (L) — Λεργίον; Λεργίον no. 258
Λευκαύ, αἴ; Λευκά, ἦ (L) — Λευκάκης; Λευκάκης (L) no. 819
Λευκάς, ἦ — Λευκάδοι no. 126
Λευκόφοροι — no. 851
— Λευκώοι no. 1034
Λέξιος (L) — no. 257
Λέχθη — Λέχθα no. 550
Λεψιμανδήσ (L) — Λεψιμανδήσ; Λεψιμανδηδήσ; Λεψιμανδήσ no. 911
Λέλαια, ἦ; Λέλαιον (L) — Λελαιεύς no. 185
Λεμαία, αἶ — Λεμαία no. 668
Λεμαία, ἦ — Λεμαία no. 127
Λεμαγ, ἦ — no. 725
Λένωδος, ἦ — Λένωδοι no. 997
Λέσακος — no. 582
Λεσάρα, ἦ; Λεσάρα — Λεσάρα (L) — Λεσάρα (L); Λεσάρα (?L) no. 973
Λέσσα, ἦ; Λέσσα — Λέσσα (L); Λίσσα (L); Λίσσα (?L) no. 973
Λίσσας, ἦ; Λίσσας (L) — Λισσάτας (L) no. 82
Λογγώ (L) — Λογγαναῖος; Λογγαναῖος no. 35
Λοκρικός, ὁ; Λοκρικός no. 59
Λουσάο, ἦ; <Δ>ούσσα, τά; Λουσάκτας; Λουσάκτας; Λουσάκτας; Λουσάκτας no. 279
Λύκστος, ἦ — no. 726
Λυκόσουρα, ἦ (L) — Λυκοσουράσ (L); Λυκοσουράσ (L) no. 280
Λύκτος, ἦ; Λύκτος — Λύκτος; Λύκτος no. 974
Μαγγασα, ἦ — Μάγγας no. 852
Μαγγανή, ἦ — Μάγγαν ης no. 820
Μάδωςτος, ἦ; — Μαδώςτος no. 669
Μάκιστος, τό; Μάκιστον; Μάκιστον (L) — Μακίστοι; Μακίστοι (L) no. 307
Μακυνέα, ἦ (L); Μακυνέα (L); Μακυνέα (L) — Μακυνέα (L) no. 149
Μάλλα (L) — Μαλλαίος (L) no. 975
— Μαλλαία no. 464
Μαλλός, ἦ; Μάλα (L) — Μαλλάτας; Μαλλάτας no. 1009
Μαντινέα, ἦ; Μαντινέα; Μαντίνεια, ἦ — Μαντινέες no. 281
Μαραθήσιοι, τά; — Μαραθήσιοι no. 853
Μαργανεύς; Μάργανα (L); Μάργανα (L) — Μαργανεύς no. 259
Μάριον, τά; — Μαριεύς no. 1018
Μαρινέα, ἦ — Μαρινέα; Μαρινέα; Μαρινέα no. 646
Μασαμπρία, ἦ — no. 647
Μασσαλία, ἦ; Μασσαλία — Μασσαλίης; Μασσαλίης no. 3
Μάταλα, τά (L); Ματάλλοι (L) — Ματάλλοι (L) no. 976
Ματρόπολις, ἦ (L) — Ματρόπολις; Ματρόπολις no. 403
Μαγγάλια, πόλις; Μαγγάλια, πόλις; Μεγαλόπολις (L) — Μεγαλοπόλες; Μεγαλοπόλες no. 282
Μέγαρα, τά; Μέγαρες; Μέγαρες — Μεγαρεύς no. 36
Μέγαρα, τά; — Μεγαρεύς no. 225
Μέσεων; Μέσεων — Μέσεων no. 129
Μεδεών; Μεδεών — Μεδεών no. 186
Μέδμα — Μεδμά no. 912
Μέδμη, ἦ; Μέσμα; Μέδα (L); Μέδα (L) — Μεδμία; Μεδμία no. 60
Μέθανα, τά; Μεθανή, ἦ (L); Μεθανή, ἦ; Μεθάνα, ἦ (L) — Μεθανία no. 352
Μέθυριος, τό; — Μεθυρίιος; Μεθυρίιος no. 283
Μέθυλιον, τό (L) — Μεθυλεύς no. 402
Μεθώνη, ἡ — Μηθώνη; Μοθώνη — Μεθωναῖος no. 545
Μεθώνη, ἡ — Μεθώνη — Μεθωναῖος no. 546
Μέλαινα Κόρκυρα, ἡ (L) — Κορκυραῖος (L) no. 83 — Μελαιαπάγιος no. 821
Μελιβοια, ἡ — Μελιβοῖοι no. 453
Μελίτεα, ἡ; Μελιτία, ἡ — Μελιταῖος no. 438
Μένηδ, ἡ; Μενᾶδος; Μινᾶδος; Μινώιδος no. 584
Μεσσημβρία; Μεσσημβρία; Μεσσημβρία (L) — Μεσσημβριανός; Μεσσημβριανός (L);
Μεσσημβριανός no. 678
Μεσσά, ἡ; Μεσσά — Μεσσάνιος; Μεσσαίοι no. 37 — Μεσσαίοι no. 163
Μεσσήνη, ἡ — Μεσσήνη; Μεσσαίοι no. 318 — Μεσσάτιος no. 260
Μεσσαπίον, τὸ — Μεσσαπινόνοι no. 61
Μέταυρος; Μέταυρος — Μεταυρίνοι no. 62
Μήθυμνα, ἡ — Μήθυμνα; Μιθυμαίοι no. 797
Μηκύβερνα, ἡ — Μηκύβερνα; Μεκύβερνα οι no. 583
Μήλος, ἡ; Μάλος — Μήλοις; Μάλιοι no. 505
Μητρόπολις (L) — Μητρόπολιτα (L) no. 128
Μητρόπολις — Μητρόπολεις no. 749
Μίξα, ἡ (L); Μίξα (L); Μίξα (L) — Μίξαιος (L);
Μίξαίος no. 542
Μίλητος — Μιλήτιοι no. 977
Μίλητος, ἡ — Μιλήτιοι no. 854
Μιλητούπολις, ἡ (L) — Μιλητούπολιτῆς; Μιλητούπολιτῆς (L) no. 750
Μιλητούπολις (L) — Μιλητούπολιτά (L) no. 129
Μίλκουρος (L) — Μίλκουρος; Μίλκουρος no. 585
Μινά, ἡ (L) — Μινά; Μινά — Μινάτιοι no. 473
Μινά, ἡ; Μινά — Μινάτιοι no. 21
Μιθύμνη; Μιθύμνη, ἡ — Μιθύμνηοι (L) no. 319
Μιλύκρειον, τὸ; Μιλύκρειον, ἡ; 'Ολικραί, αἱ; Μιλυκρία (L);
Μιλύκρειον (L) — Μιλυκρείοι (L) no. 150
Μοναία (L) — Μοναίαι; Μοναίατα (L) no. 465
Μοργαντήνη, ἡ; Μοργαντίνα; Μοργαντίνον οι (L);
Μοργαντίνον (L) — Μοργαντίνοι no. 375
Μόφιοι, τὸ (L) — Μοφείς; Μοφείς (L) no. 404
Μυκάνα, ἡ (L) — Μυκάνα; Μυκανάι no. 164
Μυκαλήσας, ἡ — Μυκαλήσαι no. 212
Μυκάνα, ἡ; Μυκάνα; Αἱ; Μυκήνη; Μυκήνη, αἱ — Μυκηναῖοι; Μυκαναῖοι no. 353
Μύκονος, ἡ — Μύκονοι no. 506
Μύλαί, αἱ (L) — Μυλαῖοι no. 38
Μυλαῖ, αἱ (L) — Μυλαῖοι no. 466
Μύλασα, τὰ; Μυλασεῖς — Μυλασεῖς no. 913
Μύνος, ἡ; Μύνη — Μυνᾶς(σ)ιος no. 856
Μύρις, ἡ — Μυρινάιοι no. 502
Μύρινα, ἡ — Μυρινάιοι no. 822
Μύρκινος, ἡ; Μυρκίνια (L) — Μυρκίνοι no. 633
Μύρλεα, ἡ — Μυρλεάδοι no. 752
Μυρμήκιος; Μυρμήκιον (L) — Μυρμήκιον no. 703
Μυτιλήνη, ἡ; Μυτιλήνη; Μυτιλήνη — Μυτιληναῖοι;
Μυτιληναῖοι no. 798
Μυτισέρατος; Μυτισέρατος, τὸ (L); Μυτισέρατος, ἡ (L) — Μυτισέρατος no. 39

Νάγιδος, ἡ — Ναγίδεως no. 1010
Νακόνη, ἡ — Νακονάιοι; Νακοναίοι no. 40
— Ναραβαρεύς no. 915
— Ναραβαρεύς no. 916
Ναρίκα, ἡ (L) — Ναρίκα (L) no. 384
Ναυκράτης, ἡ — Ναυκράτητης; [Ν]αιοκράτης no. 1023
Ναυλοχοί, τὸ — Ναυ(.-) no. 857
Ναύπακτος, ἡ — Ναυπάκτικοι no. 165
Ναξία — Ναξιάτης; Ναξιάτης no. 917
Νάξος, ἡ — Νάξοι no. 597
Νάξος, ἡ — Νάξοι no. 41
Νέα γένεσις; ἡ; Νέα γένεσις, τῷ; Νέα γένεσις (L) — Νέα γένεσις no. 785
Νέα Πόλη; Νεαπόλιτα; Νεαπόλιτα; Νεαπόλιτα; Νεαπόλιτα (L);
Νεαπόλιτα; Νεαπόλιτα; Νεαπόλιτα; Νεαπόλιτα no. 634
Νέασπολις, ἡ — Νεαπόλιτης no. 677
Νέας Τείχος, τὸ — Νέας Τείχος, τῷ no. 824
Νέρον οἱ, ἡ — Νερών οἱ, ἡ no. 823
Νεστάνια, ἡ (L); Νεστάνια no. 284
Νέων; Νέων; Νέους; Νέους οἱ; Νεο(ών)οι; Νεο(ων)οί no. 187
Νίκαια no. 101
Νίκαια, ἡ — Νικαίας (L) no. 385
Νίκαιος, τὸ — Νικαίος no. 688
Νίκαιος, ἡ — Νικαίος no. 508
Νικέα, ἡ; Νικέα (L) no. 825
Νικέα, ἡ; Νικέα (L) no. 858
Νικώνα, τοι; Νικώνα, τοι; Νικώνα, τοι; Νικώνα, τοι no. 308
Νικώνα, τοῖς; Νικώνα, τοῖς; Νικώνα, τοῖς; Νικώνα, τοῖς no. 704
Νόωνας, ἡ — Νοωναῖοι no. 285
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Οι ονομασίες και οι τοποθεσίες που ενδέχεται να υπάρχουν στην ελληνική γλώσσα, όπως είναι οι ονομασίες των οποίων έχουν αναφερθεί στα ελληνικά κείμενα, καθώς και οι ονομασίες των οποίων έχουν αναφερθεί στα ελληνικά κείμενα ως τοποθεσίες.

Οι πληροφορίες που προέρχονται από τις ελληνικές πηγές είναι ιδιαίτερα αποτελεσματικές και παρέχουν ισχυρές πληροφορίες για την κυτταροθνική τάξη της Ελλάδας κατά την αρχαϊκή περίοδο. Οι πηγές που χρησιμοποιήθηκαν για την ανάπτυξη της τοποθεσιακής και κυτταροθνικής καταγγελίας είναι κυρίως οι αρχαϊκοί κείμενοι της ελληνικής γλώσσας, όπως οι Περιοδικοί και οι Περιοδικοί Περιοδικοί της Ελλάδας.

Οι πληροφορίες που προέρχονται από τις ελληνικές πηγές είναι ιδιαίτερα αποτελεσματικές και παρέχουν ισχυρές πληροφορίες για την κυτταροθνική τάξη της Ελλάδας κατά την αρχαϊκή περίοδο. Οι πηγές που χρησιμοποιήθηκαν για την ανάπτυξη της τοποθεσιακής και κυτταροθνική καταγγελίας είναι κυρίως οι αρχαϊκοί κείμενοι της ελληνικής γλώσσας, όπως οι Περιοδικοί και οι Περιοδικοί Περιοδικοί της Ελλάδας.
Πελλήνη, ἦ; Πελ(λ)άνα; Πελλάνα (L) — Πελληνεύς;  
Πελλανεύς; Πελλαναίος (L); Πελλήνας no. 240
Πετάρθης, ἦ — Πεταρθής no. 511
— Πεταρθής no. 375
Πέργαμος, τό — Πέργαμος (L) no. 828
Πέργη, ἦ — Πέργας (L) no. 1003
Πέρινος, ἦ — Περινύς no. 678
Περκάτη, ἦ; Περκάτη; Περκάτη (L) — Περκάτης;
Περκάτης no. 788
Παρπάρων (L); Παρπάρων, ἦ (L) — Παρπαρωνιώτης;
Παρπαρωνιώτης no. 829
Πέτρα (L) — Πετρίνος no. 42
— Πετράς no. 979
Πεύκο, τό (L) — Πευκά (L) no. 439
Πηδάσα, τά (L) — Πηδασάς no. 923
Πικάς (L) — Πικάνοι no. 43
Πιδάσα, τά — Πιδασέως; Πιδασέως no. 925
Πιθηκούσι(s)a — Πιθηκουσιαίος (L) no. 65
Πλάσωρος — no. 593
Πάνδος, ἦ — no. 389
Πίσα, ἦ — Πισάτης no. 262
Πίστασος — no. 594
Πίστυρος — Πιστυρής no. 656
Πίστυρος — no. 638
Πιτάνη, ἦ — Πιτανάς no. 830
— Πιτάνης; Πιτανάς; Πιτανήτης no. 926
Πλακία — Πλακινός; Πλακινός no. 757
Πλαταιά, α; Πλάταια, ἦ — Πλαταιεύς no. 216
Πλευμεύς — Πλευμεύς no. 595
Πλευριφέν, ἦ — Πλευρίφιον no. 153
Ποιάσσα, ἦ; Ποιάσσα — Ποιάσσιος; Ποιάσσιος no. 494
Ποιώνος — no. 108
Πολείενος (L) — no. 69
Πολέχνα, ἦ (L) — Πολεχνήτης no. 789
— Πολεχνάς; Πολεχνήτης no. 860
Πολέχνη, ἦ (L) — Πολεχνήτης no. 926
— Πολεχνήτης no. 596
Πολυφήν (L); Πολυφήνην, ἦ — Πολυφήνοι; 
Πολυφήνιος no. 983
Ποροδοσελήνη, ἦ — Ποροδοσαλ( ) no. 831
Ποσειδονία: Ποσειδονία, ἦ; Ποσειδονία (L) — 
Ποσειδονίατας; Ποσειδονίατης; Ποσειδονίατης no. 66
Ποσείδειον, τό — Ποσείδειος (L) no. 376
Ποσείδειον, τό — no. 597
Ποσείδημος, τό; Ποσείδήμος (L) — no. 1022
Ποτείδης, ἦ — Ποτειδητής; Ποτειδητής;
Ποτειδητήτης; Ποτειδητήτης no. 598
Ποτνιαί, α; — Ποτνιεύς no. 217
— Πο[—].ος no. 192
Πρασίος (L) — Πρασίοις no. 984
Πρασία, α; Πρασία; Πρασία (L) — Πρασίευς (L); 
Πρασίευς (L) no. 342
Πράσσιλος — [Πρά][σιλος no. 599
Πράκασ, ὁ (L); Πράκασ (L) — Πράκασ; Πράκασ;
Πράκασ (L); Πράκασ (L) no. 985
Πράκας, ὁ; — Πράκασ; Πράκασ; Πράκασ no. 758
Πραγή, ἦ — Πραγή; Πραγάιος no. 861
Προέρνα, ἦ — Προέρνα; Προερνιώς (L); Προερνιώς 
no. 441
Προκόκνημη, ἦ — Προκόκνημη, ἦ no. 759
Προύνοι, α; (L); Πρόκρονο, α; (L); Πρόκρονα (L) — 
Πρόκρονα; Πρόκρονος no. 135
Πρόσχειος, τό; Πρόσχειος — Πρόσχειος no. 154
Πτελεύς, τό — Πτελευτής no. 862
Πύγαλα, τά; Φύγαλα; Φυγαλεύς; Φυγαλεύς; 
Φυγαλεύς no. 863
Πῦδνα, ἦ; Πῦτνα; Κῦδνα (L) — Πῦδναίος; Πῦδναίος;
Πῦδναίος; Πῦδναίος no. 544
Πῦθανος (L) — no. 469
Πυθόπμος (L) — Πυθόπμος no. 760
Πύλαι, α; (L) — Πυλαγάιοι no. 295
Πύλαι (L); — Πύλαι no. 263
Πυξίς — no. 67
Πύρασος, ἦ — Πυράσιος no. 442
Πύργος, ὁ — no. 310
Πύρινδος (L) — Πυρίνδος no. 927
Πύρφος (L) — Πύρφος no. 928
Πύρρα, ἦ — Πυρραῖος no. 799
'Ραίκος — 'Ραίκοις (L) no. 986
'Ρέγιον, τό; 'Ρέγιον, τό — 'Ρέγιον; 'Ρεγίον no. 68
'Ρήμεια, ἦ; 'Ρήμεια; 'Ρήμεια; 'Ρήμεια; 'Ρήμεια (L) no. 
514
'Ριζηνία (L) — Ριζηνία no. 988
'Ριζοί, ὁ — Ριζώσιος no. 457
'Ρίθμημος; 'Ρίθμημα (L); 'Ρίθμημα (L) — Ριθήμων 
no. 987
'Ρόδη (L); 'Ρόδος (L) — 'Ρόδητης no. 4
'Ρόδος, ἦ — Ρόδιοι no. 1000
'Ροιτείον, τό — 'Ροιτείον (L); 'Ροιτέιο (L) no. 790
'Ρόγκα (L); 'Ρόγκα (L) — Γρήγορος; Γρηγόρος; 
Γρηγόρος no. 371
'Ρύσσες; 'Ρύσσα (L); 'Ρύσση (L); 'Ρυσαίη (L) — 'Ρύσ;
Ἀρφι no. 243
Συράκους, σι — Συράκος; Συράκους; Συράκος; Συράκος;
[Συράκους] Σι — Σιράκους Σιράκος; Σιράκος;
Σύρος, η — Σύρος η 523

— Ταλαγρέων η 932
Ταλάνα, η — Ταλάνα (ή η) η 424
Τάναγρα, η — Τάναγρα; Τάναγρος; Τάναγρος (ή) η 220
Ταραμπέος — η 933
Τάρα, η/ — Ταραντίον η 71
— Ταρυβέλεος, η 934
Τάρρα (ή) η — Ταρραίος (ή) η 991
Ταυρομενίνος, τό; Ταυρομενία, η (ή) η — Ταυρομενίας;
Ταυρομένιος, η (ή) η 48
Ταύχειρα, τά/η; Τεύχειρα (ή) η; Ταύχα; Τεύχα (ή); Τεύχα (ή) η — Ταύχειρος (ή) η; Ταύχειρος η 1029
Τεγέα, η; Τεγέα (ή) η — Τεγέα (ή) η 297
Τεθρόνιος, τό; Τεθρόνιος, η (ή) η — Τεθρόνιος;
Τεθρόνιος η 72
Τένεδος, η — Τενέδος η 793
[Τερεία] — Τερεία η 763
Τέρνα; Τέρεια (ή) η — Τερναίος; Τερεναίος (ή) η 73
Τέρμερον, τά; Τέρμερον (ή) — Τέρμερον (ή) η 937
— Τερμοσαγεσθής η 938
Τετράικας — η 731
Τεθέντης, η (ή) η — Τεθέντης (ή) η 298
Τευθρανία, η — Τευθρανία η 833
Τέος, η — Τέος; Τείος η 868
Τήλανδρος, τό (ή); Τήλανδρος, η (ή) η; Τήλανδρος (ή) —
Τελανδρός η 935
Τήλος, η — Τήλος η 524
Τήμνος, η/ο — Τήμνητης η 832
Τήρος, η — Τήρος η 525
Τέτοιον, τό; Τέτοιον, η (ή) η — Τετοίον η 733
Τεθροφά, η (ή); Τεθροφά (ή) η; Τεθροφά (ή) —
Τηθροφά (ή) η; Τηθροφά (ή) η 187
Τεύδη (ή) η — Τεύδη η 619
Τίρων, η — Τίρων (ή) η; Τίρων (ή) η — Τίρων (ή) η 356
— Τίρων η 835
Τολ(ο)φά, η (ή) — Τολ(ο)φά (ή) η 167
Τόμος (ή) — Τομ(ε)ίτης (ή) η; Τομάς (ή) η 693
Τορθά(ψ)ίον, τό — Τορθά(ψ)ίον η 302
Τορβεία, η — Τορβεία η; Τορβεία (ή) η — Τορβεία η; Τορβεία (ή) η 140
Τορώνη, η — Τορώνη η 110
Τορονίκος; Τορονικός η 620
Τράιλός; Τράγιλα; Τράγιλος (ή) η — Τράιλός;
Τράγιλος η 555
Τράλλειας — Τραλλείας; Τραλλείας η 941
Τραπεζίτης; Τραπεζίτης η 303
Τραπεζίτης, η — Τραπεζίτης η 734
Τραχέα, η (ή) η — Τραχέα (ή) η; Τραχέα η 195
Τραχίνη, η — Τραχίνη η 109
Τραχίνος, τό; Τραχίνος (ή) — Τραχίνος (ή);
Τραχιέβες; Τραχιέβες (ή) η; Τραχιέβες (ή) η 156
Τροιζήνη, η; Τροιζήνη, η — Τροιζήνης; Τροιζήνης;
Τροιζήνης; Τροιζήνης; Τροιζήνης (ή) η 357
Τρώνας, η — Τρώνας η 197
Τραγιδίας; Τραγιδίας η 992
Τραγοδίας; Τραγοδίας η 694
Τραγέα, η — Τραγέα η 244
Τραγόντα; Τραγόντα η 308
Τραγοδίτης; Τραγοδίτης η 681
— Τραγοδή το — Τραγοδή το 50
Τρεμάνεια, η — Τρεμάνεια η 424
Τρέβα, η — Τρέβα η 420
Τρεθγόνη, η — Τρεθγόνη η 417
Τρέπτοινος, η — Τρέπτοινος η 356
Τρέπτοινος, η — Τρέπτοινος η 356
Τρέπτοινος, η — Τρέπτοινος η 417
Τρείος, η — Τρείος η 356
Τρέμπονς, η — Τρέμπονς η 356
Τρέπτοινος, η — Τρέπτοινος η 356
Τρέπτοινος, η — Τρέπτοινος η 356
Τρέπτοινος, η — Τρέπτοινος η 356
4. Non-Polis Settlements

A. Identified Pre-Hellenistic Settlements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlements</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abarnis</td>
<td>Propontic Coast of Asia Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achaion</td>
<td>Troas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achaion limen</td>
<td>Aiolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acharna</td>
<td>Crete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adana</td>
<td>Kilikia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrasteia</td>
<td>Propontic Asia Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adryx</td>
<td>Sikelia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agathe</td>
<td>Spain and France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agathyrnion</td>
<td>Sikelia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;A&gt;griades</td>
<td>Elis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aia</td>
<td>Thessalia: Malis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aienteion</td>
<td>Troas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aidepsos</td>
<td>Euboia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigai</td>
<td>Euboia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigai/Aigaia</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigialos</td>
<td>Thrace: from Axios to Strymon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigilea</td>
<td>Euboia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigilia/Ogyllos</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiglepehira</td>
<td>Euboia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigoneia</td>
<td>Thessalia: Malis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aitolia</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akakesion</td>
<td>Arkadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akele</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akonai</td>
<td>Black Sea Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akontion</td>
<td>Arkadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akontisma</td>
<td>Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akragas</td>
<td>Aitolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akrai</td>
<td>Aitolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akrai</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akrilla</td>
<td>Sikelia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akropolis</td>
<td>Aitolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alagonia</td>
<td>Messenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alalkomenai</td>
<td>Akarnania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alesai</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alonis</td>
<td>Spain and France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alope</td>
<td>Thessalia: Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alopekia</td>
<td>Black Sea Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amarynthos</td>
<td>Euboia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambrakos</td>
<td>Akarnania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ami(...)</td>
<td>Italia and Kampania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amnistas</td>
<td>Karia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amyklaison</td>
<td>Crete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anastasios</td>
<td>East Lokris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchiale</td>
<td>Black Sea Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchiale</td>
<td>Kilikia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhoe</td>
<td>East Lokris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anemourion</td>
<td>Kilikia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antheia</td>
<td>Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antheia</td>
<td>Black Sea Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antipolis</td>
<td>Spain and France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antipolis</td>
<td>Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aphetai</td>
<td>Thessalia: Magnesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aphrodision</td>
<td>Arkadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonia</td>
<td>Aiolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonia</td>
<td>Libya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apros</td>
<td>Propontic Thrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araiai/Arai</td>
<td>Aegean Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arba</td>
<td>Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardyonion</td>
<td>Aiolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arginoussai</td>
<td>Aiolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argoura</td>
<td>Euboia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argrya</td>
<td>Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenion</td>
<td>Thessalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnai</td>
<td>Thrace: from Axios to Strymon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnaiso</td>
<td>Macedonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrhianoi</td>
<td>Thracian Chersonesos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asboto</td>
<td>Thessalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asine</td>
<td>Argolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asine</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Askania</td>
<td>Aegean Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Askra</td>
<td>Boiotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Askyris</td>
<td>Thessalia: Perrhaibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspledon</td>
<td>Boiotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assosos</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoros</td>
<td>Sikelia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaion</td>
<td>Arkadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aulis</td>
<td>Boiotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenion</td>
<td>Spain and France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aziris</td>
<td>Libya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babrantion</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baiake</td>
<td>Epeiros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilis</td>
<td>Arkadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathos</td>
<td>Arkadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beos/Beon</td>
<td>Propontic Thrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blakeia</td>
<td>Aiolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boibe</td>
<td>Thessalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boline</td>
<td>Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boliskos</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boukephalos</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boumeliaita</td>
<td>East Lokris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouneima</td>
<td>Epeiros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouthoe</td>
<td>The Adriatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryanion</td>
<td>Makedonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryseai</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callithera</td>
<td>Thessalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalai(on)</td>
<td>Thessalia: Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalia</td>
<td>Boiotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalkai</td>
<td>Thessalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalkideon limen</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charadros</td>
<td>Epeiros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charadrous</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charadrous</td>
<td>Kilikia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charakoma</td>
<td>Thrace: from Nestos to Hebros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charisai(i)</td>
<td>Arkadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheimerion</td>
<td>Epeiros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimera</td>
<td>Epeiros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choireai</td>
<td>Euboia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysa</td>
<td>Troas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysaoros</td>
<td>Karia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daphnai</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daphnous</td>
<td>East Lokris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daphnous</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dasea(i)</td>
<td>Arkadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delion</td>
<td>Boiotia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Delion — Ionia
Delphinion — Boiotia
Delphinion — Ionia
Didyma — Ionia
Dikaiarcheia — Italia and Kampania
Dion — Thessalia: Achaia
Dipoina(i) — Arkadia
Donakon — Boiotia
Donoussa — Achaia/Sikyonia
Doriskos — Thrace: from Nestos to Hebros
Drabeskos — Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos
Drabos — Thracian Chersonesos
Drymos — Boiotia
Drymoussa — Ionia
Drys — Ionia
Eileoi — Argolis
Eilesion — Boiotia
Elaiai Limen — Epeiros
Elaious — Argolis
Eleutherai — Boiotia
Elina — Epeiros
Ellomenon — Akarnania
Ellopia — Euboia
Elpai — The Adriatic
Elymnion — Euboia
Embaton — Ionia
Ennea Hodoi — Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos
Ephyra — Sikyonia
Eretria — Thessalia
Ergoion — Sikelia
Ergiske — Propontic Thrace
Erineos — Achaia
Erythrai — West Lokris
Erythrai — Thessalia: Aenis
Euboia — Akarnania
Euhydrium — Thessalia
Eupalion — West Lokris
Ganai — Propontic Thrace
Ganos — Propontic Thrace
Gasoros — Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos
Genesion/Genethlion — Argolis
Geraistos — Euboia
Geremia/Gerena — Messenia
Glephyrai — Thessalia: Magnesia
Glauke — Ionia
Glisis — Boiotia
Glypyria/Glympeis — Lakedaimon
Gortynia — Makedonia
Graia — Boiotia
Gyaros — Aegean Islands
Haimoniai — Arkadia
Halonesos — Aegean Islands
Harma — Boiotia
Harmene — Black Sea Area
Harpagion — Euboia
Harpina — Elis
Hekatompedon — Epeiros
Heleon — Boiotia
Helikore — Propontic Coast of Asia Minor
Helikranon — Epeiros
Helos — Ionia
Heros — Lakedaimon
Hermesokpeion — Spain and France
Herakleia — Elis
Herakleia — Propontic Thrace
Hermione — Propontic Coast of Asia Minor
Heronassa — Ionia
Hiera kome — Karia
Hippola — Lakedaimon
Hippopotai — Boiotia
Homilai — Thessalia: Oita
Hybla Geleatis — Sikelia
Hybla Heraia — Sikelia
Hydrous — The Adriatic
Hykkara — Sikelia
Hyle — Boiotia
Hypana — Triphylia
Hyria — Boiotia
Hyria — Kilikia
Hyria — The Adriatic
Hymne — Elis
Hysia/Hysiai — Argolis
Iasaia — Arkadia
Iasos — Lakedaimon
Idakos — Thracian Chersonesos
Idomene — Akarnania
Ilium — Epeiros
Inessa — Sikelia
Inyx/Inykos — Sikelia
Isai Limen — Thessalia: Magnesia
Ismaros — Thrace: from Nestos to Hebros
Isos — Boiotia
Istros — Aegean Islands
Ithome/Thamiai — Thessalia
Ithoria — Aitolia
Ithoria — Akarnania
Kakyon — Sikelia
Kalamai — Messenia
Kalamois — Ionia
Kale Akte — Sikelia
Kallia(i) — Arkadia
Kalliaros — East Lokris
Kallipolis — Karia
Kallipolis — The Adriatic
Kallipolitai — Thrace: from Axios to Strymon
Kamikos — Sikelia
Kauos — Arkadia
Kardamyle — Ionia
Karides — Ionia
Karion — Ionia
Karteriois, limen en — Ionia
Karyai — Lakedaimon
Karystos — Lakedaimon
Kasara — Karia
Kas(s)iope — Epeiros
Kattabia — Rhodos
Kaukasa — Ionia
Kelaitha — Thessalia
Kenchreai — Argolis
Kenchreus — Ionia
Kerdylion — Thrace: from Axios to Strymon
Keresos — Boiotia
Kerinthos — Euboia
Kerkas — Argolis
Kerkinion — Thessalia: Magnesia
Kertonon — Aiolis
Kibyra — Pamphylia
Kieros — Black Sea Area
Kinaros — Aegean Islands
Klamadai — Ionia
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Name</th>
<th>Region/Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kleai</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kleonai</td>
<td>Phokis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knauzon</td>
<td>Arkadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kobrys</td>
<td>Thracian Chersonisos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koila</td>
<td>Thracian Chersonisos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolakeia</td>
<td>Thessalia: Malis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolonai</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolonis/Kolonides</td>
<td>Messenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koloura</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kondyllos</td>
<td>Thessalia: Perrhaibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kophos</td>
<td>Thrace: from Axios to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strymon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korakesion</td>
<td>Pamphylia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kordytos</td>
<td>Pamphylia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koressos</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korokondame</td>
<td>Black Sea Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koroneia</td>
<td>Thessalia: Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korope</td>
<td>Thessalia: Magnesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KorseaI</td>
<td>Aegean Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KorseaI</td>
<td>Boiotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KorseaI</td>
<td>East Lokris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koryphasion</td>
<td>Messenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotylaion</td>
<td>Euboia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotsyrtta</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kragalidai</td>
<td>Phokis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraneia</td>
<td>Akarnania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kranon</td>
<td>Thessalia: Athamania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kremaste</td>
<td>Troas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kremnoi</td>
<td>Black Sea Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krenai</td>
<td>Akarnania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kreusis</td>
<td>Boiotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krimissa</td>
<td>Italia and Kampania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krobyle</td>
<td>Propontic Thrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krokeai</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krokyleon</td>
<td>Aitolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krommyon</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kromna</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krotalla</td>
<td>Italia and Kampania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KybeleiA</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kymisala</td>
<td>Rhodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kynosoura</td>
<td>Megaris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyparissia</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kypasis</td>
<td>Thracian Chersonisos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyre</td>
<td>Pamphylia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrie</td>
<td>Rhodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrnos</td>
<td>Euboia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrtone</td>
<td>Boiotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kytonion</td>
<td>Aiolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lade</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagaria</td>
<td>Italia and Kampania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakereia</td>
<td>Thessalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lametinio</td>
<td>Italia and Kampania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampsos</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laphron</td>
<td>West Lokris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassoia</td>
<td>Crete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latoisie</td>
<td>Crete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebinthos</td>
<td>Aegean Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecheion</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leimone</td>
<td>Thessalia: Perrhaibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepsia</td>
<td>Aegean Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lerna</td>
<td>Argolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leros</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessa</td>
<td>Argolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leukonia</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leukonion</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leuktra</td>
<td>Boiotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leuktra/Leuktron</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leuktron/Leuktra</td>
<td>Messenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limnaeum</td>
<td>Thessalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linon</td>
<td>Propontic Coast of Asia Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loryma</td>
<td>Karia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lykastos</td>
<td>Crete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LykoA</td>
<td>Arkadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lykoatai</td>
<td>Arkadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lykouria</td>
<td>Arkadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyrkeia</td>
<td>Argolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyrnateia</td>
<td>Pamphylia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyrnessos</td>
<td>Aiolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magarsos</td>
<td>Kilikia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magydos</td>
<td>Pamphylia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maiandrioi</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainake</td>
<td>Spain and France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainalos</td>
<td>Arkadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makalla</td>
<td>Italia and Kampania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makaria</td>
<td>Arkadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makra Kome</td>
<td>Thessalia: Aenis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maktorion</td>
<td>Sikelia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malea</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malene</td>
<td>Aiolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MaleyeI</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathon epi</td>
<td>thalassan: Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathoni</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marmara</td>
<td>Pamphylia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marios</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathoussa</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogylos, see Aigilia</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nais</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narthakion</td>
<td>Thessalia: Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naulochos</td>
<td>Phokis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neleia</td>
<td>Thessalia: Magnesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemos</td>
<td>Akarnania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neon Teichos</td>
<td>Propontic Thrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nerikos</td>
<td>Akarnania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nerikos</td>
<td>Epeiros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neris</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nesos</td>
<td>Akarnania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netteia</td>
<td>Rhodos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikaia</td>
<td>Spain and France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisa</td>
<td>Boiotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisaia</td>
<td>Megaris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonakris</td>
<td>Arkadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oichalia</td>
<td>Aitolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Region/Region Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oichalia</td>
<td>Euboia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oie</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oineon</td>
<td>West Lokris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oinoa/Oinoe</td>
<td>Argolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oinoe</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oion</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okalea</td>
<td>Boiotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olbia</td>
<td>Pamphylia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olenos</td>
<td>Aitolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oleros</td>
<td>Crete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olmones</td>
<td>Boiotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olouros</td>
<td>Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olpai</td>
<td>Akarnania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympias/Gonnokondyllos</td>
<td>Thessalia: Perrhaibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omphake</td>
<td>Sikelia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onchesmos</td>
<td>Epeiros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onchestos</td>
<td>Boiotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onkeion</td>
<td>Arkadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onthyron</td>
<td>Thessalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchomenos</td>
<td>Thessalia: Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordessos</td>
<td>Black Sea Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ormion</td>
<td>Thessalia: Magnesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornoi</td>
<td>Propontic Thrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oroanna</td>
<td>Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oropos</td>
<td>Epeiros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paianion</td>
<td>Aitolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaipharisalos</td>
<td>Thessalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palamedeon</td>
<td>Troas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palike</td>
<td>Sikelia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palinouros</td>
<td>Italy and Kampania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panakton</td>
<td>Euboia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panion/Paniai</td>
<td>Propontic Thrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panormos</td>
<td>Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panormos</td>
<td>Epeiros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panormos</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pantomationr</td>
<td>Crete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraipoi</td>
<td>Thrace: from Axios to Strymon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paroikopolis</td>
<td>Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paror(e)ia</td>
<td>Arkadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parthenion</td>
<td>Euboia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parthenope</td>
<td>Italy and Kampania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passanda</td>
<td>Aiolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patmos</td>
<td>Aegean Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pel — Ionia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peli — The Adriatic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peraithais</td>
<td>Arkadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pereia</td>
<td>Thessalia: Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergamos</td>
<td>Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petelia</td>
<td>Italia and Kampania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peteon</td>
<td>Boiotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phagai</td>
<td>Rhodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phaistinos</td>
<td>West Lokris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhalannaI</td>
<td>Crete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phalaro</td>
<td>Thessalia: Malis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phanai</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmakoussa</td>
<td>Aegean Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharygai</td>
<td>Phokis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayttos</td>
<td>Thessalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phelia</td>
<td>Elis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanorion</td>
<td>Argolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoiiba</td>
<td>Sikyonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoinikous</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phokaia</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photike</td>
<td>Epeiros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photinaia</td>
<td>Thessalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyliaidon</td>
<td>Thessalia: Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllos</td>
<td>Thessalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physka</td>
<td>Thrace: from Axios to Strymon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physkeis</td>
<td>West Lokris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physkos</td>
<td>Karia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pionial</td>
<td>Aiolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitya</td>
<td>Propontic Coast of Asia Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pityeia</td>
<td>Troas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plataiai</td>
<td>Sikyonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platea</td>
<td>Libya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plateis</td>
<td>Italia and Kampania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleiai/Palai</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poikilasion</td>
<td>Crete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polichna</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polichna</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polichne</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polion/Polisma</td>
<td>Troas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polis</td>
<td>West Lokris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porthmon</td>
<td>Black Sea Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porthmos</td>
<td>Euboia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pothidania</td>
<td>Aitolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pras</td>
<td>Thessalia: Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prineus</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proseis</td>
<td>Arkadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prote</td>
<td>Messenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psamathous</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pteleon</td>
<td>Thessalia: Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pteleon</td>
<td>Thracian Chersonesos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolederma</td>
<td>Arkadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptychias</td>
<td>Akarnania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pylene</td>
<td>Aitolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrgoi</td>
<td>Triphylia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhaikelos</td>
<td>Thrace: from Axios to Strymon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhambios</td>
<td>Thrace: from Axios to Strymon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhion</td>
<td>Aitolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodanianousia</td>
<td>Spain and France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodias</td>
<td>The Adriatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhytion</td>
<td>Crete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rustiana</td>
<td>East Lokris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salganeus</td>
<td>Boiotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmone</td>
<td>Elis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salon</td>
<td>Kilikia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samikon</td>
<td>Triphylia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarpedon</td>
<td>Kilikia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauria</td>
<td>Akarnania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauthaba</td>
<td>Propontic Thrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedia</td>
<td>Boiotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoinos</td>
<td>Boiotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoinous</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selge</td>
<td>Pamphylia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selinous</td>
<td>Kilikia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selinous</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepias</td>
<td>Thessalia: Magnesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setos</td>
<td>Kilikia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side</td>
<td>Karia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side</td>
<td>Thessalia: Ainis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidele</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidous</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sillyon</td>
<td>Pamphylia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sipte</td>
<td>Thrace: from Nestos to Hepros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skamandreaia</td>
<td>Troas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skape Hyle</td>
<td>Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skidros</td>
<td>Italia and Kampania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikiros/Skiritis</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skolopoioi</td>
<td>Ionais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skotoussa</td>
<td>Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skramandreia</td>
<td>Troas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skokephile</td>
<td>Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skidros</td>
<td>Italia and Kampania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikiros/Skirites</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skolopoies</td>
<td>Ionias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skotoussa</td>
<td>Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skylletion</td>
<td>Italia and Kampania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphia</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyppion</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sminthion</td>
<td>Troas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyrna</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solyegeia</td>
<td>Corinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sosthenis</td>
<td>Thessalia: Ainis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soumateion</td>
<td>Arkadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So(...)</td>
<td>Italia and Kampania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spercheiai</td>
<td>Thessalia: Ainis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephon</td>
<td>Boiotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoichades Islands</td>
<td>Spain and France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratokleia</td>
<td>Black Sea Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratopedha</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stylangion</td>
<td>Triphylia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sybota</td>
<td>Epeiros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sykyrion</td>
<td>Thessalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symaitha</td>
<td>Thessalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tainaron</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamynai</td>
<td>Eubeia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarsos</td>
<td>Kilikia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegyra</td>
<td>Boiotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teichion</td>
<td>Aitolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teichioussa</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teichos Aratou</td>
<td>Thracian Chersonesos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T(e)ristatosis</td>
<td>Propontic Thrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teleidai</td>
<td>Eubeia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temenion</td>
<td>Argolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temoessos</td>
<td>Karia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenea</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teumessos</td>
<td>Boiotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teuthrone</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thaumakie</td>
<td>Thessalia: Magnesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theline</td>
<td>Spain and France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therme</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thespriotia</td>
<td>Epeiros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thisoa</td>
<td>Arkadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoknia</td>
<td>Arkadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornax</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thronion</td>
<td>The Adriatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thessos</td>
<td>Aiolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thymbra</td>
<td>Troas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thymbrarra</td>
<td>Aiolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilphosaion</td>
<td>Boiotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiristasis</td>
<td>Thracian Chersonesos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirizis</td>
<td>Black Sea Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torikos</td>
<td>Black Sea Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tragia</td>
<td>Aegean Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trampya</td>
<td>Epeiros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapazonus</td>
<td>Thrace: from Axios to Strymon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapehia</td>
<td>Boiotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trakoloni</td>
<td>Arkadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinakrie</td>
<td>Sikelia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinasos</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triopion</td>
<td>Karia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripodiskos</td>
<td>Megaris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripolis</td>
<td>Thessalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typanei</td>
<td>Triphylia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrakiai</td>
<td>Sikelia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyros</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xanthia</td>
<td>Thrace: from Nestos to Hebrros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xynia</td>
<td>Thessalia: Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zarax</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zarex</td>
<td>Eubeia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeirenia</td>
<td>Thrace: from Nestos to Hebrros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zephyrion</td>
<td>Kilikia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoiteion</td>
<td>Arkadia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Unidentified Settlements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag. Athanassios/Prophitis Ilias</td>
<td>Thrace: from Nestos to Hebrros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag. Eirini</td>
<td>Crete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag. Giorgios Papoura</td>
<td>Crete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag. Ilias</td>
<td>Eubeia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag. Ioannis</td>
<td>Argolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag. Ioannis</td>
<td>Argolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag. Ioannis</td>
<td>Crete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag. Ioannis</td>
<td>Thrace: from Axios to Strymon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag. Leonidhas</td>
<td>Argolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag. Mina</td>
<td>Akarnania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag. Pandeleimona</td>
<td>Akarnania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag. Paraskevi</td>
<td>Eubeia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag. Triada</td>
<td>Eubeia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag. Vasileios</td>
<td>Eubeia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alistrati</td>
<td>Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amades</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendolara</td>
<td>Italia and Kampania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amnatos</td>
<td>Crete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampelia</td>
<td>Rhodos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampelos</td>
<td>Crete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amvrakia</td>
<td>Aitolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amygdaleonas</td>
<td>Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analipsis</td>
<td>Aitolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anavlokhos</td>
<td>Crete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchialos</td>
<td>Thrace: from Axios to Strymon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ano Ktimeni</td>
<td>Thessalia: Achaea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ano Parakalamo</td>
<td>Epeiros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ano Phanari</td>
<td>Argolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ano Phteri</td>
<td>Thessalia: Aenis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arachovitsa</td>
<td>Epeiros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkampolis</td>
<td>Eubeia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armakades</td>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armolia</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arvi</td>
<td>Crete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avgonema</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avgousti</td>
<td>Crete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aytepe-Altitarla</td>
<td>Propontic Thrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azoria</td>
<td>Crete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belishove</td>
<td>Epeiros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belkahve</td>
<td>Aiolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belkahve</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati</td>
<td>Argolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brinies (or Dherpeza)</td>
<td>Argolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butera</td>
<td>Sikelia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çatalkaya</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charakas</td>
<td>Crete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinita</td>
<td>Argolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choritsa</td>
<td>Argolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chryssa</td>
<td>Thrace: from Nestos to Hebrros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çobanpinari</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daphne Hill</td>
<td>Rhodos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Değirmenalti</td>
<td>Propontic Thrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialektomenalti</td>
<td>Propontic Thrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialektomon-Paradeisos</td>
<td>Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimini</td>
<td>Thessalia: Magnesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diomedeia</td>
<td>Thrace: from Nestos to Hebrros</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dorikon — Aitolia
Drossochori — Phokis
Drymon — Aitolia
Dyo Ekklesies — Aitolia
Elaionas — Elis
Elimi — Epeiros
Elinta — Ionia
Ellinika — Crete
Elliniko Kastello — Crete
Emporio — Ionia
Epanomi — Thrace: from Axios to Strymon
Erina — Ionia
Fousia — Argolis
Gennadi — Rhodos
Giftokastro — Argolis
Gla — Boiotia
Goritsa — Thessalia: Magnesia
Goumero — Elis
Gournes — Phokis
Grammenos/Vourta — Epeiros
Helliniko — Euboia
Helliniko Argolis
Incoronata — Italia and Kampania
Iria — Argolis
Kalamos — Akarnania
Kali Vrysi — Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos
Kalivo — Epeiros
Kalloni (Ayios Yioryios) — Argolis
Kalogerous — Rhodos
Kalyva — Thrace: from Nestos to Hebros
Kapari — Argolis
Karakolithos — Phokis
Karatsadagli — Thessalia: Achaia
Karos — Epeiros
Karyani — Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos
Kassauros — Rhodos
Kastellos (1) — Crete
Kastellos (2) — Crete
Kasteriotis — Crete
Kastro (Apodholou) — Crete
Kastri (Keratokampos) — Crete
Kastri (Pantannasa) — Crete
Kastri (Pharmakokephalo) — Crete
Kastri (Tourloti) — Crete
Kastrouli Zemenou — Phokis
Katsingri (Prophitis Ilias) — Argolis
Kavaki — Karia
Kefala (1) — Crete
Kefala (2) — Crete
Kefala (3) — Crete
Keramidaki, Kamara — Lakedaimon
Kharaki (= Kastro tou Sordatou) — Akarnania
Khironisi — Euboia
Khoika — Epeiros
Kinetta — Argolis
Kiotari — Rhodos
Kleisoura — Epeiros
Klepa — Aitolia
Klima — Aitolia
Klimatia — Epeiros
Komnina — Thrace: from Nestos to Hebros
Koniakos — Aitolia
Kontari — Ionia
Kontokyni — Crete
Korakia Island — Argolis
Korifi — Elia
Koroni — Argolis
Koufo — Argolis
Koukos — Thrace: from Axios to Strymon
Koukouras — Argolis
Kouts — Epeiros
Koutson — Thrace: from Nestos to Hebros
Krebeni Kato Melpeias — Messenia
Krini — Thrace: from Axios to Strymon
Krousou — Crete
Kryonerion (Galatas) — Aitolia
Kuyrulkou Kala — Karia
Kyriaki — Phokis
Lefkandi — Euboia
Lemonodhasos — Argolis
Levka — Aitolia
Lidorikion — Aitolia
Limena Vatheos (= Ormos Vathy) — Akarnania
Lithi — Ionia
Loutro — Argolis
Lukov — Epeiros
Lykoniko — Akarnania
Magoula — Argolis
Magoula sta Ila — Argolis
Makri Longoni — Rhodos
Makri — Thrace: from Nestos to Hebros
Makrini-Mt. Gyros — Aitolia
Malevros — Aitolia
Mali — Boiotia
Managros — Ionia
Mantra Voutouriou — Rhodos
Marmaralon, Ag. Petros — Lakedaimon
Matohasanaj — Epeiros
Melindra (Milindra) — Argolis
Mendenitsa — East Lokris
Mesia — Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos
Mesokomi — Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos
Mesembria — Thessalia: Achaia
Methochi — Ionia
Milea-Mt. Bouchori — Aitolia
Milingos — Ionia
Mitropoli — Rhodos
Modi — Phokis
Monopari — Crete
Monte Bubbonia — Sikelia
Monte Desusino — Sikelia
Monte Gibil Gabel — Sikelia
Monte Iudica — Sikelia
Monte San Mauro — Sikelia
Mouzakeika — Epeiros
Nea Karvali — Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos
C. Other Ancient Toponyms Discussed in the Text

Agassai — Makedonia
Agatheia — Phokis
Aiginion — Makedonia
Aiginion — Makedonia
Aigostheneia — Phokis
Ailkomena — Makedonia
Ampelos — Thrace: from Axios to Strymon
Andria — Elis
Anemoneia — Phokis
Antaieis — Phokis
Anthemousia Limne — Black Sea Area
Apatoureon — Black Sea Area
Apollonia — Thrace: from Axios to Strymon
Apollonia — Phokis
Argos Orestikon — Makedonia
Arkioessa — Black Sea Area
Athenopolis — Spain and France
Aulaiaoutechos/Agathopolis — Black Sea Area
Azania — Spain and France
Balla — Makedonia
Bokeria — Makedonia
Boukaia — Phokis
Chalkis — Thrace: from Axios to Strymon
Chryse — Aitolia
Cypsela — Spain and France
Dioryktos — Aitolia
Erannos — Phokis
Euia/Euboia — Makedonia
Gaimeion — Makedonia
Galadra — Makedonia
Genderros — Makedonia
Glechon — Phokis
Greia — Makedonia
Groneia — Makedonia
Harpasa — Karia

Nea Triglia — Thrace: from Axios to Strymon
Nea Zichni — Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos
Neo Karlovasi — Ionia
Neokhorion — Ionia
Nikesiane — Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos
Oga — Argolis
Oreiokastron — Epeiros
Ossa — Thrace: from Axios to Strymon
Oxa — Crete
Paizolia, Valtaki — Lakedaimon
Palaiochori — Euboia
Palaiokomi — Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos
Palaiotarsos-Kyriaki — Phokis
Palatia — Akarnania (see Same (no. 136))
Palia Phiva — Phokis
Paliampela — Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos
Paliocohra — Lakedaimon
Panagitsa — Argolis
Panagitsa — Phokis
Papoura — Crete
Parthenonas — Thrace: from Axios to Strymon
Patela — Crete
Perista — Aitolia
Petrochorion — Aitolia
Petrothalassa — Argolis
Phanes — Rhodos
Phaskomelia — Epeiros
Philagra — Euboia
Phoinikias — Crete
Pigadha — Argolis
Podochori — Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos
Prasidaki — Triphylia
Prokopion (Kastro) — Euboia
Prophitis Elias (1) — Crete
Prophitis Elias (2) — Crete
Psara — Akarnania
Psina — Epeiros
Pyrgos — Epeiros
Ripes — Epeiros
Riza — Epeiros
Riziani — Epeiros
Rosoufi — Phokis
Sambariza Magoula — Argolis
Sarniç — Karia
Selli — Crete
Selo — Epeiros
Skalia — Crete
Sourota — Thrace: from Axios to Strymon
Stathmos Angistas — Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos
Steno — Rhodos
Sterna — Akarnania
Sykea (Palaiokastro Kioniakos) — Aitolia
Syra — Rhodos
Tatzat — Epeiros
Theotokos — Phokis
Thermi — Thrace: from Axios to Strymon
Thermisi Kastro — Argolis
Tolmeita — Libya
Toxotes — Thrace: from Nestos to Hebrus
Trachia — Argolis
Troulli — Crete
Trypitos — Crete
Tsoukka — Aitolia
Varholomio — Elis
Vassallaggi — Sikelia
Vathi — Crete
Veni — Crete
Vigla — Crete
Voulgari Armokastella — Crete
Vounou — Thessalia: Ainis
Vourlia Amphilekias — Phokis
Vroulia — Rhodos
Zuka’d’Ajtoj — Epeiros

C. Other Ancient Toponyms Discussed in the Text

Agassai — Makedonia
Agatheia — Phokis
Aiginion — Makedonia
Aiginion — Makedonia
Aigostheneia — Phokis
Ailkomena — Makedonia
Ampelos — Thrace: from Axios to Strymon
Andria — Elis
Anemoneia — Phokis
Antaieis — Phokis
Anthemousia Limne — Black Sea Area
Apatoureon — Black Sea Area
Apollonia — Thrace: from Axios to Strymon
Apollonia — Phokis
Argos Orestikon — Makedonia
Arkioessa — Black Sea Area
Athenopolis — Spain and France
Aulaiaoutechos/Agathopolis — Black Sea Area
Azania — Spain and France
Balla — Makedonia
Bokeria — Makedonia
Boukaia — Phokis
Chalkis — Thrace: from Axios to Strymon
Chryse — Aitolia
Cypsela — Spain and France
Dioryktos — Aitolia
Erannos — Phokis
Euia/Euboia — Makedonia
Gaimeion — Makedonia
Galadra — Makedonia
Genderros — Makedonia
Glechon — Phokis
Greia — Makedonia
Groneia — Makedonia
Harpasa — Karia
Helikonioi — Phokis
Herakleia — Makedonia
Hermesion — Black Sea Area
Hieron Achilleos — Black Sea Area
Hieron Demetrios — Black Sea Area
Hieron Dios Ouriou — Black Sea Area
Hipponesos — Karia
Hya(m)peia — Phokis
Itone — Aiolis
Kabellion — Spain and France
Kastabos — Karia
Keletron — Makedonia
Kerilloi — Italia and Kampania
Kirphis — Phokis
Krade — Karia
Krisa — Phokis
Kybos — Libya
Kyme — Euboia
Kyparissos — Phokis
Kyreus — Spain and France
Laia — Karia
Larissa — Phokis
Lykoreia — Phokis
Marathon — Phokis
Marinia — Makedonia
Marmarion — Euboia
Melainai — Phokis
Memphis — Egypt
Midea/Mideia — Argolis
Milesion Teichos — Egypt
Naulochos — Black Sea Area
Nea[ —— ] — Makedonia
Oinophyta — Boiotia
Olbia — Spain and France
Onchoe — Phokis
Panoridae — Black Sea Area
Panormos — Thrace: from Axios to Strymon
Parthenopolis — Thrace: from Axios to Strymon
Patronis — Phokis
Pedaion — Aiolis
Pedasos — Troas
Petra — Makedonia
Phoinix — Karia
Phylakai — Makedonia
Physkelle/Myskella — Thrace: from Axios to Strymon
Pimpleia — Makedonia
Priola — Black Sea Area
Pyrene — Spain and France
Pyrrha — Phokis
Sekoanos — Spain and France
Skydra — Makedonia
Stephane — Phokis
Styberra — Makedonia
Tamyrae — Black Sea Area
Tauroeis — Spain and France
Thera — Karia
Thermasia — Argolis
Thermos — Aitolia
Tnymos — Karia
“Tower of Hero” — Thracian
Chersonesos
Tristolos — Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos
Troizen — Spain and France
Xylos — Karia
5. **Polities Called Polis**

**Key**

A = Called *polis* in Archaic and/or Classical sources

[A] = Listed under the heading *poleis* in Archaic and/or Classical sources

B = Known for one or more of the essential characteristics of a *polis*

C = Known for one or more characteristics of a *polis*

U = Attested as a *polis* in the urban sense

[U] = Listed under the heading *polis* in the urban sense

P = Attested as *polis* in the political sense

[P] = Listed under the heading *polis* in the political sense

T = Attested as *polis* in the territorial sense

### Spain and France

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polity</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alalie</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporion</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massalia</td>
<td>UP</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sicilia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polity</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abakainon</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adranon</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agyrion</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aitna</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akragas</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akrai</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaisa</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alontion</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enygon</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euboia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galeria</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heloron</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Italia and Kampania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polity</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henna</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraklea Minoa</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraklea</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbessos</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbita</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himera</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippana</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imachara</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallipolis</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamarina</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>[U]P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasmenai</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katane</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentoripa</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kephaloidion</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontinoi</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipara</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longane</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megara</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgantina</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mylai</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mytistratos</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakone</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naxos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petra</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piakos</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selinous</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sileraioi</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stielanaioi</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrakousai</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tauromenion</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
<td>[U]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyndaris</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrrenhioi</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zankle/Messana</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Adriatic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polity</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lokrooi</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medma</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
<td>[U]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metapontion</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metauros</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neapolis</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandosia</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
<td>[U]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pithekousaie</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poseidonia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>[U]P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyxous</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhexion</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siris</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sybaris</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taras</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temesa</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terina</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
<td>[U]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thourioi</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U[P]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Epeiros

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polity</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amantia</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artichia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batiai</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Berenike]</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boucheta</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouthroton</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byllis</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodone</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elateia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elea</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephyra</td>
<td>Agrinion</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gitana</td>
<td>Akripos</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horraon</td>
<td>Halikyrna</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kassopa</td>
<td>Kalydon</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passaron</td>
<td>Molykreion</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poionos</td>
<td>Phola</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torone</td>
<td>Therminea</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akarnania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agrinion</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigition</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Akripos</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Halikyrna</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kallion/Kallipolis</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kalydon</td>
<td>[A][B]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makynea</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Molykreion</td>
<td>[A][B]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phola</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phylea</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pleuron</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proschion</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Therminea</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boiotia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aiolidai</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ambyssos</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amphikaia</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antikyra</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boilis</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drymos</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Echedameia</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elateia</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erochos</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kirrha</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ledon</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megaris, Korinthia, Sikyonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigosthenes</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigosthenes</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigosthenes</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigosthenes</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigosthenes</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigosthenes</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigosthenes</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigosthenes</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigosthenes</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigosthenes</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigosthenes</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigosthenes</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigosthenes</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigosthenes</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigosthenes</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigosthenes</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigosthenes</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigosthenes</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigosthenes</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigosthenes</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigosthenes</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigosthenes</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigosthenes</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigosthenes</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigosthenes</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megaris, Korinthia, Sikyonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sikyon</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megaris, Korinthia, Sikyonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megaris, Korinthia, Sikyonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megaris, Korinthia, Sikyonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megaris, Korinthia, Sikyonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>City/Area</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achaia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigai</td>
<td>[A]B [U]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigeira</td>
<td>A U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigion</td>
<td>[A]B [U]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ascheion</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boura</td>
<td>A U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dyme</td>
<td>[A]B [U]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helike</td>
<td>A U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keryneia</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leontion</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olenos</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patrai</td>
<td>[A]B [U]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pellene</td>
<td>A UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pharai</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phelloe</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhypai</td>
<td>[A]B [U]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tritia</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alasyaion</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alion</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amphidolia</td>
<td>A P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anaitoi</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chaladrioi</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dyspontion</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elis</td>
<td>A UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eupagion</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ewaoioi</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyllene</td>
<td>A U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larissa</td>
<td>A U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lasion</td>
<td>A P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lenos</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letrinoi</td>
<td>A P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marganeis</td>
<td>A P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metapioi</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opous</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pisa</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pylos</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thraistos</td>
<td>A UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arkadia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alea</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alipheira</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asea</td>
<td>A PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dipaia</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Euaimon</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eutaia</td>
<td>A UT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gortys</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Halous</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helisson</td>
<td>A UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heraia</td>
<td>A U [P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaphyai</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kleitor</td>
<td>A P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Koila</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kynaitha</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lousoi</td>
<td>A P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lykosoura</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mantinea</td>
<td>A UPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Megale polis</td>
<td>A UPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methydrion</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nestane</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonakris</td>
<td>A T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orchomenos</td>
<td>A UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oresthasion</td>
<td>A U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paion</td>
<td>A UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pallantion</td>
<td>A PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phara</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pheneos</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phigaleia</td>
<td>[A]B [P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phorieia</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psophis</td>
<td>A P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pylai</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stymphalos</td>
<td>A [U]P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tegea</td>
<td>A UPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teuthis</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thaliades</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thelpousa</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thiskoas</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Torthyneion</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trapezous</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Triphilia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epeion</td>
<td>A UPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epitalion</td>
<td>A P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lepreon</td>
<td>A UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makiston</td>
<td>A U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noudion</td>
<td>A U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phrixai</td>
<td>A UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pyrgos</td>
<td>A U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skillous</td>
<td>A P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Messenia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aithia</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asine</td>
<td>[A]B [U][P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aulon</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kardamyle</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Korone</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyparissos</td>
<td>[A]B [U]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Messene/Ithome</td>
<td>A UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mothone</td>
<td>A U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pharai</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thalamai</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thouria</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lakedaimon</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigys</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anthana</td>
<td>A U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aphroditia</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belbina</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boia</td>
<td>A U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chen</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epidauros</td>
<td>A U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Etis</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Euca</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geronthrai</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gytheion</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kromnos</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyphanta</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kythera</td>
<td>A U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Las</td>
<td>A U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oinos</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oios</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oitylos</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pellana</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prasiai</td>
<td>A U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sellasia</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Side</td>
<td>A U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>A UPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thryeas</td>
<td>A U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Argolis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Argos</td>
<td>A UPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epidauros</td>
<td>A UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Halieis</td>
<td>A UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermion</td>
<td>A [U]P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kleonai</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methana</td>
<td>A U?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mykenai</td>
<td>A U?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orneai</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phleious</td>
<td>A UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tiryns</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Troizen</td>
<td>A UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saronic Gulf</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aigina</td>
<td>A UPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belbina</td>
<td>A U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kalaureia</td>
<td>A UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attika</td>
<td>Athenai</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eleusis</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salamis</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euboia</td>
<td>Athenai Diades</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chalkis</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diakroi in Euboia</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diakres apo Chalkideon</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dion</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dystos</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eretria</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grynchai</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Histiaia/Oreos</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karystos</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oropiai</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peraia</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posideion</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Styra</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lokris</td>
<td>Alope</td>
<td>[A]C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alponos</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Halai</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knemides</td>
<td>[A]C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kynos</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larymna</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Naryka</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nikaiα</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opous</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skarpheia</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thronion</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris</td>
<td>Akyphas/Pindos</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boion</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erineos</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kytinion</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thessalia</td>
<td>Amphanai</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Argoussa</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atrax</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gomphoi</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gyrton</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kierion</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kondaia</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larisa</td>
<td>Methyion</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolis</td>
<td>Mopson</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthos</td>
<td>Oxynion</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagasai</td>
<td>Peirasia</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelinnaion</td>
<td>Phakion</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phaloria</td>
<td>Pharkadon</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharsalos</td>
<td>Skotoussa</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pherai</td>
<td>Thetionion</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trikka</td>
<td>Dolopia</td>
<td>[A]C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angeia</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ktimene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ainis</td>
<td>Hypata</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapheleis</td>
<td>Korophaioi</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyrragioi</td>
<td>Talana</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oita</td>
<td>Chen</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parasopoioi</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malis</td>
<td>Anthel</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antikyre</td>
<td>Echinos</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleia</td>
<td>Lamia</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trachis</td>
<td>Aukai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achaia Phthiotis</td>
<td>Antron</td>
<td>[A]C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ekkarras</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Halos</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kypaire</td>
<td>[A]C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larisa</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melitaia</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peuma</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phylake</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thaumakoi</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thebai</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesia</td>
<td>Amyros</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eureaioi</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eurymenai</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homolian</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iolkos</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kasthanaie</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kikynethos</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Korakai</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meliboa</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methone</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olizon</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxniaioi</td>
<td>[A]C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhizous</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spalauthra</td>
<td>[A]C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perrhaibia</td>
<td>Azoros</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chyretiai</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doliche</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erekinion</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gonnos</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malloia</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mondaia</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mylai</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oloosson</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phalanna</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phthoinon</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athamania</td>
<td>Argethia</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Aegean</td>
<td>Aigiale</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arkesine</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minoa</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anaphe</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andros</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Astypalaia</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chalke</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delos</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helene</td>
<td>[A]C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oine</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLITIES CALLED POLIS**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Therma</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U[P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U[P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imbros</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ios</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalymna</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Karpathos)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkesseia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brykous</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eteokarpathioi</td>
<td>[A][B]</td>
<td>[P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karpathos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasos</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
<td>[P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Keos)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ioulis</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karthaia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koresia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poissa</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keria</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimolos</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kos)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astypalaia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halasarna</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kos Meropis</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kythnos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U[P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lemnos)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hephaistia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrina</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leros</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mykonos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U[P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naxos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisyros</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paros</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Peparethos)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panormos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peparethos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seleinous</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pholegandros</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rheneia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samothrake</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>[U]P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saros</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriphos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikinos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siphnos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skiathos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U[P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyros</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syme</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
<td>[P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syros</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>[U]P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telos</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U[P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thasos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thera</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makedonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiane</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigeai</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alebaia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allante</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloros</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beroia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion</td>
<td>[A][B]</td>
<td>[U]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edessa</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europos</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleion</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ichnai</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrrhos</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leibethra</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methone</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mieza</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pella</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pella</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pydna</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U[P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mygdonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arethousa</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U[P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bormiskos</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalystre</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lete</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therme</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baisalta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphipolis</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argilos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailos</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalkidike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aige</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aineia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aileonion</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akanthos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akrothoioi</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alapta</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthemous</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aphytis</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assera</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charadrous</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chedroloi</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
<td>[P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chytropolis</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dikaia</td>
<td>[A][B]</td>
<td>[P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eion</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galepsos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gigonos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U[P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haisa</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istaros</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalindoia</td>
<td>[A][B]</td>
<td>[P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamakai</td>
<td>[A][B]</td>
<td>[P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampsa</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kissos</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kithas</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
<td>[P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kleonai</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kombaeria</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipaxos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mekyberna</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mende</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milkoros</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
<td>[P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neapolis</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olophyrhos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olynthos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osbailoi</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othoros</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
<td>[P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharbelos</td>
<td>[A][B]</td>
<td>[P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phegontioi</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pileros</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pistasos</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
<td>[P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleume</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
<td>[P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polichnitai</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poteidaion</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prassilos</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prasino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sane on Pallene</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sane on Athos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarte</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serme</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermelio</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sings</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinos</td>
<td>[A][C]</td>
<td>[P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skala</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skapsainoi</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skione</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skithai</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smila</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spartolos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stagiros</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stolos/Skolos A UP
Strepsa B
Therambos A UP
Thestoros C
Thyssos A UP
Tinde [A][C] [P]
Torone A UPT
Tripoi [A][B] [P]
Zereia C

Unlocated in Thrace
Aison [A][C] [P]
Brea B
Kossaia C
Okolon C

Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos
Apollonia A U
Berga B
Datas A U
Eion A U
Galepsos [A][B] [U]
Krenides B
Myrkinos A UP
Neapolis [A][B] [U][P]
Oisyme A U
Phagres [A][B] [U]
Philippoi B
Pistyros A UT
Sirra C

Thrace: from Nestos to Hebros
Abdera A UPT
Ainos A UP
Bergepolis C
Dikaia A U
Drys B
Kypsel B
Maroneia A U[P]
Mesambrie A UT
Orthogoria B
Sale A U
Stryme A PT
Zone A U

Inland Thrace
Alexandropolis B
Apros C
Kabyle C
Philippopolis B

Pistiros C
Seuthopolis B

Thracian Chersonesos
Aigos potamoi C
Alopeknessos [A][B] [U][P]
Arapelos [A][C] [U]
Chersonesos/Agora A UT
Deris B
Elaios [A][B] [U][P]
Ike [A][C] [U]
Kardia A UP
Kressa [A][C] [U]
Kritthote A UP
Limnai [A][B] [P]
Madytos A U[P]
Paion [A][C] [U]
Paktye A U
Sestos A UP

Propontic Thrace
Bisanthe B
Byzantion A UP
Daminon Teichos B
Heraion Teichos A U
Neapolis B
Perinthos A U[P]
Selymbria A UP
Serrion Teichos C
Tyrodiza B

Pontos: West Coast
Apollonia A U[P]
Bizeone C
Dionysopolis B
Istros A P
Kallatis [A][B] [U]
Mesambria A U
Nikonion A U
Odessos [A][B] [U]
Olbia/Borysthenes A UPT
Ophiousa A U
Orgame C
Tomis C
Tyras B

Pontos: Skythia
Chersonesos A UP
Gorgippia B
Hermonassa A U

Karkinitis A U
Kepoi [A][B] [U]
Kimmerikon C
Kytaia [A][C] [U]
Labrys A UP
Myrmekeion [A][C] [U]
Nymphaion [A][B] [U]
Pantikapao/Bosporos A[B] [U]
Phanagoria A U
Theodosia [A][B] [U]
Tyritake C

Pontos: Kolchis
Dioskouris A UP
Gyenos A U
Phasis A U

Pontic Coast of Asia Minor
Amisos B
Becheirias A U
Choireades A U
Herakleia A UP
Iasonia A U
Kambis A U
Karoussa A U
Kerasous A U
Kinolis A U
Koloussa A U
Kotyora A UP
Kromna B
Kytore A U
Limne A U
Lykastos A U
Odeinos A U
Sesamos A U
Sinope A UP
Stameneia A U
Tetakis A U
Themiskryra A U
Tieion A U
Trapezous A UP

Propontic Coast of Asia Minor
Artaiu Teichos C
Artake A U
Astakos B
Bysbikos B
Darion B
Daskyleion B
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polis</th>
<th>K (Kleis)</th>
<th>M (Metropolis)</th>
<th>L (Lamponeia)</th>
<th>S (Samos)</th>
<th>T (Tenedos)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Didymon Teichos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harpagion</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalchedon</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallipolis</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U [P]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kios</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolonai</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyzikos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampsakos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolis</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miletoiopolis</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miletoiteichos</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrleia/Brylleion</td>
<td>[A] [B]</td>
<td>[U]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olbia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otelnai</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Països</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parion</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U [P]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plakia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priapos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prokonnesos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pythopolis</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skylake</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sombia</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tereia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeléia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abydos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achilleion</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U [P]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antandros</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arisbe</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assos</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astyra Mysia</td>
<td>[A] [B]</td>
<td>[U]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astyra Troika</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azeia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brytis</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dardanos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gargara</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentinos</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gergis</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamaxitos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illion</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kebran</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokylion</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolonai</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamponeia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larisa</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neandreia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U [P]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ophryneion</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U [P]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaiokorkôte</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkote</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polichna</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhoiteion</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigeon</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skepsis</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenedos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigaias (aka Aigaios)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigiroessa</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atarneus</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autokane</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boione</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalkis</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaia</td>
<td>[A] [B]</td>
<td>[U]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambrion</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gryneion</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halisarna</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleia</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iolla</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karene</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killa</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kisthene</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyzikos (aka Kyzikos)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampsakos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miletos (aka Miletos)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myronnesos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naoulochon</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notion</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U [P]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaigambrion</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaiokorkôte</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergamon</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persephon</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitane</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podoselene</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temnos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teuthrania</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thebe</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tisna</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airai</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altai</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chios</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chyton</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darios (aka Darios)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaousiosi</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erythrai</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isinda</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klazomenai</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolophon</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korykos</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebedos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leukophrys</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathon (aka Marathon)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melos (aka Melos)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myos (aka Myos)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naoulochon</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notion</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U [P]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptera (aka Ptera)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pygela</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samos (aka Samos)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U [P]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sideus (aka Sideus)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyrna (aka Smyrna)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thebai</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabandia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alinda (aka Alinda)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amisos (aka Amisos)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>[P]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amyndeis</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amyzon (aka Amyzon)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayrissos (aka Ayrissos)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The above list includes the names of various ancient Greek cities and their classification based on the type of polis (K, M, L), along with their respective abbreviations (K, M, L). The list is organized by region and further categorized by their specific district or region within that region. The list includes cities from various regions such as Ionia, Aiolis, Troas, Karia, and others, each categorized by their historical context and regional significance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polities Called Polis</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armelitai</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aulai</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargasa</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargylia</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolbey</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalketor</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chersonesos</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chios</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erineis</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euromos</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halikarnassos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybleis</td>
<td>[A]</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>[P]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydaiëis</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydios</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hymisëis</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iasos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idrias</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idyma</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalynda</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karbasyanda</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karyanda</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasolaba</td>
<td>[A]</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>[P]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaunos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U[P]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedreia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keramos</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killareis</td>
<td>[A]</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>[P]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindye</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knidos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodapeis</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolýrgeis</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koranza</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krya</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyllandos</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrbissos</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latmos/Herakleia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepismandroi</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medmasos</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mylasa</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myndos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narisbareis</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naryandos</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naxia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olaiëis</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olymos</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouranion</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parpariotai</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passanda</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petasa</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peleiatai</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pídasa</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pladasa</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrindos</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrnos</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syangela/Theangela</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmakis</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siloi</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandros</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telemessos</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termara</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terssogasæis</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thasfareis</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thydonos</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tralleis</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phælis</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U[P]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xanthos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allaria</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anopolis</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apellonia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptara</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkades</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aulon</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>[U]P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bionnos</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bionnos</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bionnos</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chersonasos</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datala</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dragmos</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreros</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U?P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleuthera</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eltynia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyros</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gortyns</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UPT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gortyns</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UPT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleion</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierapynta</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyrtakina</td>
<td>[A]</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>[U]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istron</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itanos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keraia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knosos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kydonia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kytaion</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lappa</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lato</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebena</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyktoûs</td>
<td>[A]</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>[U]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matala</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milatos</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olous</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petra</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phaistos</td>
<td>[A]</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>[U]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phalasarna</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polichne</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyrhen</td>
<td>[A]</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>[U]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praïsos</td>
<td>[A]</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>[U]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priâsos</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhaukos</td>
<td>[A]</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>[U]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhithymnmos</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhitton</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalai</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sybrita</td>
<td>[A]</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>[U]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarra</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tylisos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodoûs</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brîkindera</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diakrioi</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ialysos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamiros</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oïaï</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedieis</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UPT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspendos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UPT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idyros</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perge</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilikia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aphrodisias</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmoï</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelenderis</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagidos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soloi</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cyprus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amathous</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>[U]</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idalion</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karpasia</td>
<td>[A]C</td>
<td>[U]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keryneia</td>
<td>[A]C</td>
<td>[U]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kourion</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapethos</td>
<td>[A]B</td>
<td>[U]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paphos</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salamis</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soloi</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Syria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posideion</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Egypt</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naukratis</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U[P]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oasis</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Libya</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barke</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eu(h)esperides</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinyps</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrene</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UPT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taucheira</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unlocated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astraiousioi</td>
<td>[A]C</td>
<td>[P]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erodioi</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurymachitai</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kystiros</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lechoioi</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phytaioi</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **Polities Called Asty and Polisma**

**Key**

*asty = Called *asty* in Archaic and/or Classical sources*

*polisma = Called *polisma* in Archaic and/or Classical sources*

**Sikelia**
- Akragas: *asty*
- Kamarina: *asty*
- Kentoripa: *polisma*
- Syrakousai: *asty*

**Italia and Kampania**
- Metapontion: *asty*

**Akarnania**
- Sollion: *polisma*

**Boiotia**
- Chaironeia: *polisma*
- Plataiai: *asty*
- Thebai: *asty*

**Megaris, Korinthia, Sikyonia**
- Korinthos: *asty*
- Sikyon: *asty*

**Elis**
- Elis: *asty*

**Lakedaimon**
- Kythera (Skandaia): *polisma*
- Prassiai: *polisma*
- Sparta: *asty, polisma*

**Argolis**
- Phleious: *asty*

**Saronic Gulf**
- Aigina: *asty*

**Attika**
- Athenai: *asty, polisma*

**Euboia**
- Eretria: *asty*

**East Lokris**
- Opous: *asty*

**Doris**
- Boion: *polisma*
- Erineos: *asty, polisma*
- Kyrinion: *polisma*

**Thessalia**
- Larisa: *asty*
- Pharsalos: *asty*

**The Aegean**
- Naxos: *asty*
- Siphnos: *asty*
- Tenos: *asty*

**Makedonia**
- Aigeai: *asty*
- Dion: *polisma*

**Mygdonia**
- Therme: *polisma*

**Bisaltia**
- Amphipolis: *polisma*

**Chalkidike**
- Akrothooi: *polisma*
- Dion: *polisma*
- Kleonai: *polisma*

**Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos**
- Eion: *asty*

**Propontic Thrace**
- Perinthos: *asty*

**Pontos: West Coast**
- Obia: *asty*
- Ilion: *polisma*

**Troas**
- Abydos: *asty*

**Aiolis**
- Parthenion: *polisma*

**Ionía**
- Chios: *asty*
- Ephesos: *polisma*
- Kolophon: *asty*
- Miletos: *asty, polisma*
- Samos: *asty*
- Smyrña: *asty*

**Lykia**
- Xanthos: *asty*

**Cyprus**
- Salamis: *asty*

**Libya**
- Barke: *asty*
- Kyrene: *asty*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sikelia</td>
<td>Akragas C5</td>
<td>Italia</td>
<td>Herakleia C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gela C5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lokroai C4s−C3e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Himera C5m</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rhegion C5s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syrakousai C5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Siris/Polieion C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sybaris C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taras C5l−C4e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thourioi C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Adriatic Sea</td>
<td>Epidamnos/Dyrrhachion C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akarnania</td>
<td>Ambrakia C6m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Korkyra C4f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West Lokris</td>
<td>Oianthea C7l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boiotia</td>
<td>Plataiai C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thebai C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thespiai C4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Megaris, Korinthos, Sikyon</td>
<td>Megara C5f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Korinthos C4f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sikyon C4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elis</td>
<td>Elis C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arkadia</td>
<td>Mantinea C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paion C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phigaleia C4f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aegean Islands</td>
<td>Thelphousa C4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trapezous C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Triphylia C5f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lepreon C5f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Messenia C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lakedaimon C4s−C3e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Argolis C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Epidaurus C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Saronic Gulf Islands Aigina C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attika Athenai C6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Euboia Eretria C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Karystos C4l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East Lokris Opous C4s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thessalia</td>
<td>Thessalia Krannon C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Larisa C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pharsalos C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perrhaibia</td>
<td>Phalanna C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesbos</td>
<td>Lesbos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Polities Called Patris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mytilene</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrrha</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chios</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesos</td>
<td>C4e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolophon</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesia</td>
<td>C4l–C3e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phokaia</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samos</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samos (the klerouchy of 365–322)</td>
<td>C4m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teos</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halikarnassos</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knosos</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ialysos</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodos</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euhesperides</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrene</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8. Use of City-Ethnic

**Key**
- Ci = Collective internal
- Ce = Collective external
- Ii = Individual internal
- Ie = Individual external
- —— = Unattested in Archaic and Classical sources

#### Spain and France

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Ethnonyms</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alalie</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporion</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massalia</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abakainon</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adranon</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agryon</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aitna</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akragas</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ii, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akrai</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaïs</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alontion</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonia</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engyon</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euboïa</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galeria</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heloron</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henna</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleia</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleia Minoa</td>
<td>Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbesos</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbita</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippana</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himera</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallipolis</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamarina</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasmenai</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katane</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentoripa</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kephalaïdion</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sikelia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Ethnonyms</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lipara</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longane</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megara</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgantina</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myläi</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mytristratos</td>
<td>——</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakone</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naxos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petra</td>
<td>Gi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piakos</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selinous</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stileræia</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stileræioi</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrakousai</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tauromenion</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyndaris</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrrhenoi</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zankle/Messana</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Epeiros

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Ethnonyms</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amantia</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artichia</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bataia</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berenike</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boucheta</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouthroton</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byllis</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodona</td>
<td>Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elea</td>
<td>Ci, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephyra</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurymenai</td>
<td>Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Italia and Kampania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Ethnonyms</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herakleia</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metapontion</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metauros</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neapolis</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandosia</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pithèkoussai</td>
<td>——</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poseidonia</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyxous</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhéigion</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siris</td>
<td>Ci, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sybaris</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taras</td>
<td>Gi, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temesa</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thourioï</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thérimênai</td>
<td>Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thcrias</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Térmioï</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekmon</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torone</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zmaratha</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### The Adriatic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Ethnonyms</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adria</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankon</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonia</td>
<td>Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bretonsien</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidamnos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleia</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issa</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lissos</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melaina Korkyra</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharos</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spina</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Euboea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Ethnonyms</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amantia</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artichia</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bataia</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berenike</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boucheta</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouthroton</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byllis</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodona</td>
<td>Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elea</td>
<td>Ci, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephyra</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurymenai</td>
<td>Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Epeiros

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Ethnonyms</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amantia</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artichia</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bataia</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berenike</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boucheta</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouthroton</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byllis</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodona</td>
<td>Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elea</td>
<td>Ci, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephyra</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurymenai</td>
<td>Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Euboea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Ethnonyms</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amantia</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artichia</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bataia</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berenike</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boucheta</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouthroton</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byllis</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodona</td>
<td>Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elea</td>
<td>Ci, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephyra</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurymenai</td>
<td>Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Euboea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Ethnonyms</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amantia</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artichia</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bataia</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berenike</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boucheta</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouthroton</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byllis</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodona</td>
<td>Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elea</td>
<td>Ci, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephyra</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurymenai</td>
<td>Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Euboea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Ethnonyms</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amantia</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artichia</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bataia</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berenike</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boucheta</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouthroton</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byllis</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodona</td>
<td>Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elea</td>
<td>Ci, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephyra</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurymenai</td>
<td>Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Euboea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Ethnonyms</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amantia</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artichia</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bataia</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berenike</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boucheta</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouthroton</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byllis</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodona</td>
<td>Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elea</td>
<td>Ci, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephyra</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurymenai</td>
<td>Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akarnania</td>
<td>West Lokris</td>
<td>Phokis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alyzeia</td>
<td>Alpa</td>
<td>Abai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambrakia</td>
<td>Amphissa</td>
<td>Aiolidai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaktorion</td>
<td>Chaleion</td>
<td>Antikyra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos</td>
<td>Hyaia</td>
<td>Boulis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astakos</td>
<td>Hypnia</td>
<td>Oianthea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derion</td>
<td>Issioi</td>
<td>Telophon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinos</td>
<td>Messapioi</td>
<td>Tritea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euripos</td>
<td>Myania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraklea</td>
<td>Naupaktos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyporeiai</td>
<td>Oianthea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithaka</td>
<td>Telophon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korkyra</td>
<td>Tritea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koronta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kranioi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leukas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limnaia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matropolis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oiniadae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palairos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paleis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoitiain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronnoi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sollion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thryreion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torbyeia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zakynthos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aitolia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akripos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalkis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halikyrna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallon/Kallipolis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalydon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makynea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molykreion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phylea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleuron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proschion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therminea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trichoneion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Boiotia                      |                             |                           |                                               |                           |
| Akraiaphia                   |                             |                           |                                               |                           |
| Alalkomenai                  |                             |                           |                                               |                           |
| Anthedon                     |                             |                           |                                               |                           |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elis</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Phara</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gytheion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alasyaion</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Pheneos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td>Kromnos</td>
<td>Ie?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alion</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Phigaleia</td>
<td>Ce, Ie</td>
<td>Kyphanta</td>
<td>Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphidolia</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Phoridia</td>
<td>Ce or Ie</td>
<td>Kythera</td>
<td>Ce, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaitoi</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Psophis</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td>Las</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaladrioi</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td>Pyli</td>
<td>Ie</td>
<td>Oinous</td>
<td>Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyspontion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stymphalos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>Oios</td>
<td>Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elis</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>Tegea</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>Oitylos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eupagion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teuthis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peliana</td>
<td>Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewaoioi</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Thaliades</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prasai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyline</td>
<td>Ie</td>
<td>Thelphousa</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td>Sellasia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larissa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thisoa</td>
<td>Ie</td>
<td>Side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasion</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Torthynoion</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenos</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trapenzous</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thryra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letrinoi</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marganeis</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metapioi</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opous</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisa</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td>Epithalion</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pylos</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Lepreon</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrastos</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Makiston</td>
<td>Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkadia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noudion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alea</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>Phrixai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alipheira</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pyrgos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asea</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Skillous</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipia</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euaimon</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eutaia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gortys</td>
<td>Ce, Ie</td>
<td>Aithaia</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halous</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aine</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helisson</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Aulon</td>
<td>Ie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraia</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>Kardamyhe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaphyai</td>
<td>Ce, Ie</td>
<td>Kyparissos</td>
<td>Ci, Ie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kleitor</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>Messene/Ithome</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koila</td>
<td></td>
<td>Korone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kynaithna</td>
<td>Ie</td>
<td>Kyparissos</td>
<td>Ci, Ie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lousoi</td>
<td>Ci, Ie</td>
<td>Messene/Ithome</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lykosoura</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mothone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantinea</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>Pharai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megale polis</td>
<td>Ce, Ie</td>
<td>Thalamai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methydrion</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>Thouria</td>
<td>Ce, Ci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestane</td>
<td>Ce or Ie</td>
<td>Aigys</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonakris</td>
<td>Ce or Ie</td>
<td>Anthana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchomenos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>Aphroditia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oresthasion</td>
<td>Ie</td>
<td>Belbina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Boia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallantion</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td>Chen</td>
<td>Ie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Epidauros</td>
<td>Ie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Etis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eu</td>
<td>Ce?, Ii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geronthrhai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triphylia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messenia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saronic Gulf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attika</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euboia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimolos</td>
<td>Ce, Ie</td>
<td>Europolis</td>
<td>Ce, Ie</td>
<td>Kithas</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kos)</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Herakleion</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Kleonai</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astypalaia</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Ichnai</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td>Kombreia</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halasarna</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Kyrrhos</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Lipaxos</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>Leibethra</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td>Mekyberna</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kos Meropis</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Methone</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>Mende</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kythnos</td>
<td>Ce, Ie</td>
<td>Mieza</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Milkoros</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lemnos)</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Pella</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Neapolis</td>
<td>Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hephaistia</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td>Pydna</td>
<td>Ci, Ie</td>
<td>Olophyxos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrina</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Olynthos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leros</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Osbaioi</td>
<td>Ce, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Othoros</td>
<td>Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mykonos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Pharbelos</td>
<td>Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naxos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ii?, Ie</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Phegontioi</td>
<td>Ce, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisyros</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Piloros</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paros</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Pistasos</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Peparethos)</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Pleume</td>
<td>Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panormos</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Polichnai</td>
<td>Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peparethos</td>
<td>Ce, Ie</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Posideon</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seleinous</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Poteidaia</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pholegandros</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Prassilos</td>
<td>Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhenia</td>
<td>Ce, Ie</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Sane, Pallene</td>
<td>Ce?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samothrake</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Sane, Akte</td>
<td>Ce?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saros</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Sarte</td>
<td>Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriphos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Serme</td>
<td>Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikinos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Sermylia</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siphnos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Singos</td>
<td>Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Skathi)</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Sinos</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaiiskathos</td>
<td>Ie</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Skabala</td>
<td>Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skiathos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Skapsaioi</td>
<td>Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyros</td>
<td>Ce, Ii?, Ie,</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Skione</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syme</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Skithai</td>
<td>Ci—?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syros</td>
<td>Ce, Ie</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Smila</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Spartolos</td>
<td>Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Stagiros</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thasos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Stolos/Skolo</td>
<td>Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therai</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Strepsa</td>
<td>Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalkidike</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Aige</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Therambos</td>
<td>Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigai</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Aineia</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td>Thestoros</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alebaia</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Aioleion</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Thyssos</td>
<td>Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allanto</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Akanthos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>Tinde</td>
<td>Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloros</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Akronthooi</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Torone</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beroia</td>
<td>Ie</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Tripoiai</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Zereia</td>
<td>Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edessa</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Unlocated in Thrace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Makedonia**

<p>| Aiane            | ——     | ——              | ——     | Aison     | Ce      |
| Aigeai           | ——     | ——              | ——     | Brea      | Ce      |
| Alebaia          | ——     | ——              | ——     |            |         |
| Allanto          | Ce     | ——              | ——     |            |         |
| Aloros           | ——     | ——              | ——     |            |         |
| Beroia           | Ie     | ——              | ——     |            |         |
| Dion             | ——     | ——              | ——     |            |         |
| Edessa           | ——     | ——              | ——     |            |         |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pontos, Kolchis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dioskouiris Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gynenos Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phasis Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pontic Coast of Asia Minor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amisos Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Becheirias Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choirades Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herakleia Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iasonia Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karambis Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karoussa Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kerasous Ce, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kinolos Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Koloussa Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kotyora Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kromna Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kytoros Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limne Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lykastos Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odeinios Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sesamos Ci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sinope Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stameneia Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tetrakis Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Themiskrya Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tieion Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trapezous Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Propontic Coast of Asia Minor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artaiou Teichos Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artake Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Astakos Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bysbikos Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Darion Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daskyleion Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Didymon Teichos Ci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harpagion Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kalchedon Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kallipolis Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kios Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kolonai Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyzikos Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lampskakos Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metropolis Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mileitouspolis Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miletouteichos Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myrieia/Bryllion Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonia Ci, Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galepsos Ci, Ce, Ie?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krenides</td>
<td>Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrkinos</td>
<td>Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neapolis Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oisyme Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phagres Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippoi Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pistyros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Propontic Thrace</strong></td>
<td>Bisanthe Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Byzantion Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daminon Teichos Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heraion Teichos Ci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neapolis Ce, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perinthos Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selymbria Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serrion Teichos Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tyrodiza Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thrace: from Nestos to Hebros</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdera Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ainos Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergepolis Ci, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dikaia Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drys</td>
<td>Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kypseia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maroneia Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesambrie Ci, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthogoria Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stryme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone Ci, Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Propontic Coast of Asia Minor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artaiou Teichos Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artake Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Astakos Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bysbikos Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Darion Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daskyleion Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Didymon Teichos Ci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harpagion Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kalchedon Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kallipolis Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kios Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kolonai Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyzikos Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lampskakos Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metropolis Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mileitouspolis Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miletouteichos Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myrieia/Bryllion Ci, Ie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inland Thrace**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandropolis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabyle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippopolis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pistyros Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seuthopolis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thracian Chersonesos**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aigos potamoi Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alopekonnesos Ci, Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araplos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chersonesos/Agora Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deris</td>
<td>Ce?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaious Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kardia Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kressa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Olbia —— Oltenoi Ce
Paisos Ce
Parion Ci, Ce, Ie
Plakia Ce
Priapos Ci, Ce
Prokonnesos Ci, Ce, Ie
Pythopolis Ce
Skylake ——
Somba ——
Tereia ——
Zeleia Ci, Ie

Troas
Abydos Ci, Ce, Ie
Achilleion ——
Antandros Ci, Ce, Ie
Arisbe Ce
Assos Ci, Ce
Astyra Mysia Ce
Astyra Troika ——
Azeia Ce
Birytis Ci, Ce
Dardanos Ci, Ce, Ie
Gargara Ci, Ce, Ie
Gentinos Ci, Ce
Gergis Ci, Ce
Hamaxitos Ci, Ce
Ilion Ci, Ce, Ie
Kebren Ci, Ce, Ie
Kokylon Ce
Kolona Ci
Lamponia Ca
Larisa ——
Neandreia Ci, Ce
Ophryneion Ci, Ce?
Palaipkote Ce
Perkote Ce
Polichna Ce
Rhoiteion Ci
Sigeion Ci, Ce, Ie
Skepsis Ci, Ce
Tenedos Ci, Ce, Ie

Lesbos
Antissa Ce, Ie
Arisbe ——
Eresos Ci, Ce, Ie
Methymna Ci, Ce, Ie
Mytilene Ci, Ce, Ie
Pyrrha Ce, Ie

Aiolis
Adramyttion Ci, Ie
Aigai(ai) Ci
Aigioessa ——
Atarneus Ci, Ie
Autokane Ci
Boione ——
Chalkis Ci, Ce
Elaia Ce
Gambriion Ci
Gryneion Ci, Ce
Halisarai Ci
Herakleia Ci
Iolla Ci
Karene Ci
Killa Ci
Kistheni Ci
Kylene Ci, Ce
Kyme Ci
Larisa Ci
Leukai Ci
Magna Ci
Melanpagon Ci
Myrina Ci, Ce
Naxos Ci
Neon Teichos Ci
Notion ——
Palaigmbrion Ci
Parthenion Ci
Pergamon Ci
Perperene Ci
Pitane Ci
Pordoselene Ci
Temnos Ci, Ie
Teuthrani Ci
Thebe Ci, Ie
Tisna ——

Ionia
Achilleion Ci
Airai Ci, Ce
Ania Ce
Boutheia Ce
Chios Ci, Ce, Ie
Chylon Ci, Ce, Ie
Dios Hieren Ce

Karia
Alabanda Ce
Alinda Ce
Amos Ce
Amynandeis Ce
Amyzon Ci, Ce
Arliissos Ce
Armelita Ce
Aulai Ce
Bargasa Ce
Bargylia Ce
Bolbai Ce
Chalketor Ci, Ce, Ie
Chersonesos Ci, Ce
Chios Ce
Erineis Ce
Euromos Ci, Ce
Halikarnassos Ci, Ce, Ie
Hyblaysia Ce
Hydaeis Ce
Hydisos Ce
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Ethnic</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Ethnic</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Ethnic</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Ethnic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hymisseis</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Terssogasseis</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ie</td>
<td>Polyrhén</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iasos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td>Ie</td>
<td>Thasareis</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Praisos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idrias</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Tydonos</td>
<td>Tralleis</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td>Priansos</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idyma</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td>Lykia</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td>Rhaukos</td>
<td>Ci, Ie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalynda</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Phaselis</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>Rithimnos</td>
<td>Ci, Ie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karbasyanda</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Xanthos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td>Riten</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karyanda</td>
<td>Ce, Ie</td>
<td>Crete</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td>Stalai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasolaba</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Allaria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sybrita</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaunos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td>Anopolis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tarrha</td>
<td>Ci, Ie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kedreai</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Apostrion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tylisos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keramos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td>Apollonia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rhodos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ii, Ie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killareis</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Axos</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td>Rhondos</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindye</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td>Biannonos</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td>Brikindera</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knidos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td>Bionnos</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td>Diakrioi</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodapias</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Chersonasos</td>
<td>Ci, Ie</td>
<td>Ialysos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koliyrgis</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Datala</td>
<td>Ci, Ie</td>
<td>Kamiros</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koranza</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td>Dragmos</td>
<td>Ci, Ie</td>
<td>Lindos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krya</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Dreros</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td>Oiai</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyllandos</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Eleutherna</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td>Pedieis</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrbissos</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Eltynia</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td>Rhodes</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ii, Ie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latmos/Heraklea</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>Hekalkeion</td>
<td>Ci, Ie</td>
<td>Pamphylia</td>
<td>Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepsimandos</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Hierapytne</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td>Aphodos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medmasos</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Hyrtakine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Holmoi</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mylasa</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td>Istron</td>
<td></td>
<td>Issos</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myndos</td>
<td>Ce, Ie</td>
<td>Itanos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td>Kelenderis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narishareis</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Keraia</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td>Mallos</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naryandos</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Knosos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>Nagidos</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naxia</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Kydonia</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>Side</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oiai</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Kytaion</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td>Kilikia</td>
<td>Ci, Pe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olymos</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Lappa</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Aphrodisias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouranion</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Lato</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Holmoi</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parpariotai</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Lebena</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Issos</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passanda</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Lisos</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Keryneia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedasa</td>
<td>Ie</td>
<td>Lyktos</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td>Kourion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peleiatai</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Malla</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td>Lapethos</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pidasa</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Matala</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pladasa</td>
<td>Ci, Ce</td>
<td>Milatos</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Paphos</td>
<td>Ci, Ie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrindos</td>
<td>Ci or Ce</td>
<td>Oous</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td>Salamis</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrinos</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Phaiston</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td>Soloi</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmakis</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td>Phalasarna</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siloii</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Polichne</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Posideion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Ethnicities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Naukratis</td>
<td>Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oasis</td>
<td>——</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kinyps</td>
<td>——</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eurymachitai</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyrene</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kystiros</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lechoioi</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phytaioi</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>Barke</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Euhesperides</td>
<td>Ci, Ce, Ie</td>
<td>Unlocated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Astraiousioi</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erodioi</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notice:**
- Ce: Classical Greece
- Ie: Indigenous Egyptian
## 9. Size of Territory

### Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Territory</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ≤ 25 km²</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–100 km²</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100–200 km²</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200–500 km²</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 500 km²</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U = unlocated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—— = unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spain and France

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alalie</td>
<td>3?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massalia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sikelia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abakainon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adranon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agyrion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aitna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akrugas</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akrai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaisa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alontion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engyon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euboia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galeria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>4 or 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heleron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraklea U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraklea Minoa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbessos U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbita U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himera 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imachara U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallipolis U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamarina 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasmenai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katane 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentoripa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Italy and Campania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kephaloidion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontinoi</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipara</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megara</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgantina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mylai</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mytistratos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakone U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naxos</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petra U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piakos U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selinous 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sileraioi U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stielanaioi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrakousai 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tauremenion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyndaris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrrhenoi U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zanka/Messana 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Adriatic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonia 5?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentesion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidamnos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleia U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issa 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lissos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melaina Korkyra 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharos 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Epeiros

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amantia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batiai 1 or 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berenike</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boucheta 1 or 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouthroton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byllis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodona</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elateia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephrya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurymenai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gitana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horraon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kassopa 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikaia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orikos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandosia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passaron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phanote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoinike</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poionos U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekmon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torone 1 or 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zmaratha</strong></td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Akarnania</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alyzeia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambrakia</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaktorion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astakos</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euripos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleia</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyporeiai</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithaka</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korkyra</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koronta</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kranioi</td>
<td>2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leukas</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limnaia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matropolis</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oiniadai</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palairos</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paleis</td>
<td>2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoitai</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronnoi</td>
<td>2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sollion</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratos</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thyrreion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torybeia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zakynthos</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aitolia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrinion</td>
<td>2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akripos</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalkis</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halikyrna</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalydon</td>
<td>2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makyneia</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molykreion</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phola</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phylea</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleuron</td>
<td>2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proschion</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therminea</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trichoneion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Lokris</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphissa</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaleion</td>
<td>2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyaia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypnia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issios</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messapios</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myania</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naupaktos</td>
<td>2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oianthea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolophon</td>
<td>1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tritea</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phokis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abai</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiolidai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambryssos</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphiakaia</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antikyra</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulis</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charandra</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daulis</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphi</td>
<td>2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drymos</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echedameia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elateia</td>
<td>3 or 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erochos</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyampolis</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirhra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledon</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilaia</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medeon</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neon/Tithorea</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parapotamioi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedieis</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phanoteus</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phlygonion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Po[———]</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiris</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teitronion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trachis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triteis</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troneia</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boiotia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akrainphia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alalkomenai</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Megas, Korinthia, Sikyonia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigosthena</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korinthos</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megara</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagai</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikyon</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achaia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigai</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigeira</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion</td>
<td>2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascheion</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boura</td>
<td>2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helike</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keryneia</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olenos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pellene</td>
<td>3 or 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phelloe</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhypai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tritaia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elis</td>
<td>Alasyaion U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alion U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amphidolia U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anaitoi U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chaladrioi U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dyspontion U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elis 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eupagion U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ewaoioi U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyllene 1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larissa U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lasion 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lenos U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letrinioi 1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marganeis 1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metapioi U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opous U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pisa 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pylos 1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thraitos U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkadia</td>
<td>Alea 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alipheira 2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asea 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dipaia U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Euaimon U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eutaia 1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gortys 2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Halous 2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helisson 1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heraia 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaphyai 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kleitor 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Koila U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kynaitha 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lousoi 2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lykosoura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mantinea 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Megale polis 4 or 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methydron 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nestane 1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonakris 1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orchomenos 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oresthasion 1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pallantion 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phara U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pheneos 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phigaleia 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phorieia U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psophis 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pylai U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Symphalos 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tegea 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teutis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thaliades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thelphousa 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thisoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Torathyneion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trapezous 1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triphilia</td>
<td>Epeion 1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epitalion 1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lepreon 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makistos 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noudion U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phrixai 1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pyrgos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skillous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messenia</td>
<td>Aithaia U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asine 2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aulon 1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kardamyle 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Korone 2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyparissos 3 or 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Messene/Ithome 4 or 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mothone 2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phrai 1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thalamai 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thouria 1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
<td>Aigys 1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anthana 1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aphroditia U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belbina 1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boia 2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chen U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epidauros 2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Etis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eu 2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geronthrai 2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gytheion 2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kromnmos 1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyphanta 1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kythera 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Las 1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oinos U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oios 1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oitylos 1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pellana 1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prasiai 2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sellasia 1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Side 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sparta 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thyrea 1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argolis</td>
<td>Argos 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epidauros 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Halieis 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermon 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kleonai 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methana 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mykenai 2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orneai 1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phleious 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tiryns 2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Troizen 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saronic Gulf</td>
<td>Aigina 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belbina 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kalaureia 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attika</td>
<td>Athenai 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eleusis 1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salamis 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euboia</td>
<td>Athenai Diades 1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chalkis 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diakrioi en Euboia U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diakres apo Chalkideon U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dion 1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dystos 1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eretria 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grynchhai 1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Histiaia/Oreos 4, later 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karystos 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orobiai 1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lokris</td>
<td>Alope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alponos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Halai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knemides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kynos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larymna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Naryka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nikaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skarpeia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thronion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris</td>
<td>Akyphas/Pindos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erineos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kytninion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thessalia</td>
<td>Amphanai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Argoussa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atrax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gomphoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gyrton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kierion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kondaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kranon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methyliion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metropolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mopsion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orthos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxynion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pegasai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peirasia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pelinnaion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phakion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phaloria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pharkadon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pharsalos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pherai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skotooussa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thetonion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trikka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolopia</td>
<td>Angeia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ktimene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ains</td>
<td>Hypata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kapheleis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Korophaioi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phyrhrhagioi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oita</td>
<td>Chen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parasopioi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malis</td>
<td>Anthele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antikyre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Echinos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herakleia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lamia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trachis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achaia Phthiotis</td>
<td>Antron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ekkarra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Halos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kypaira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melitaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peuma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phylake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proerna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pyrasos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thaumakoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thebai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesia</td>
<td>Amyros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eureaioi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eurymenai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homolion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iolkos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kasthaneia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kikynethos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Korakai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meliboa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxoniaioi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhizous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spalauthra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perrhaibia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azoros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chryretai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doliche</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ereikinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonnos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malloia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mondaia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mylai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oloosson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phalanna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pythoion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athamania</td>
<td>Argethia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Amorgos)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigiale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkesine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minoa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaphe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astypalaia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ikaros)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imbros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalymna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Karpalos)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkesia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brykous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eteokarpathioi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karpathos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Keos)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ioulis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karthaia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koresia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poiessa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimolos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kos)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Astypalaia | Methone | Mende | 3?
Halasarna | Mieza | Milkoros | U
Kos | Pella | Neapolis | 2
Kos Meropis | Pydna | Olophyxos | 1 or 2
Kythnos | | Olynthos | 5
(Lemnos) | | Osbaioi | U
Hephaistia | | Othoros | U
Myrina | | Pharbelos | U
Leros | | Phegontioi | U
Melos | | Pilros | ---
Mykonos | | Pistasos | U
Naxos | | Pleume | 1
Nisyros | | Polichnaitai | U
Paros | | Posideion | U
(Peparethos) | | Poteidaia | 2
Panormos | | Prassilos | U
Peparethos | | Sane, Pallene | 2
Seleinous | | Sane, Akte | 2 or 3
Pholegandros | | Sarte | ---
Rheneia | | Serme | U
Samothrace | | Sermylia | 1 or 2
Saros | | Singos | 2 or 3
Seresphos | | Sinos | 1 or 2
Sikinos | | Skabala | 2 or 3
Siphnos | | Skapsai | U
Skiathos | | Skione | 2
Skyros | | Skithai | U
Syme | | Smila | U
Syros | | Spartolos | ---
Telos | | Stagiros | ---
Tenos | | Stolos/Skolos 2 or 3 | ---
Thasos | | Strepsa | ---
Thera | | Therambos | 2
--- | | Thestoros | U
--- | | Thyssos | 1 or 2
--- | | Tinde | ---
--- | | Torone | 3
--- | | Tripoiai | U
--- | | Zereia | U
--- | | Thrace, unlocated | ---
Makedonia | Apollonia | ---
Aiane | --- | ---
Aigeai | Aige | ---
Alebaia | Aineia | ---
Allante | Aioleion | ---
Aloros | Akanthos | ---
Beroia | Akrothoii | ---
Bion | Alapta | ---
Dion | Anthemous | ---
Eion | Aphytis | ---
--- | Assera | ---
--- | Charadrous | ---
--- | Chedriloii | ---
--- | Chytropolis | ---
--- | Dikaia | ---
--- | Dion | ---
--- | Eion | ---
--- | Galepsos | ---
--- | Gignos | ---
--- | Haisa | ---
--- | Iostos | ---
--- | Kalindoiua | ---
--- | Kamakai | ---
--- | Kampsa | ---
--- | Kissos | ---
--- | Kithas | ---
--- | Kleonai | ---
--- | Kembreia | ---
--- | Lipaxos | ---
--- | Mekyberna | ---
--- | Mende | ---
--- | Milkoros | ---
--- | Neapolis | ---
--- | Olophyxos | ---
--- | Olynthos | ---
--- | Osbaioi | ---
--- | Othoros | ---
--- | Pharbelos | ---
--- | Phegontioi | ---
--- | Pilros | ---
--- | Pistasos | ---
--- | Pleume | ---
--- | Polichnaitai | ---
--- | Posideion | ---
--- | Poteidaia | ---
--- | Prassilos | ---
--- | Sane, Pallene | ---
--- | Sane, Akte | ---
--- | Sarte | ---
--- | Serme | ---
--- | Sermylia | ---
--- | Singos | ---
--- | Sinos | ---
--- | Skabala | ---
--- | Skapsai | ---
--- | Skione | ---
--- | Skithai | ---
--- | Smila | ---
--- | Spartolos | ---
--- | Stagiros | ---
--- | Stolos/Skolos 2 or 3 | ---
--- | Strepsa | ---
--- | Therambos | ---
--- | Thestoros | ---
--- | Thyssos | ---
--- | Tinde | ---
--- | Torone | ---
--- | Tripoiai | ---
--- | Zereia | ---
--- | Thrace, from Strymon to Nestos | ---
--- | Apollonia | ---
--- | Berga | ---
### Propontic Thrace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bisantion</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byzantion</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daminon Teichos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraion Teichos</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neapolis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perinthos</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selymbria</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serrion Teichos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrida</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Propontic Coast of Asia Minor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artaiou Teichos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astakos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bysbikos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dareion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daskyleion</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didymon Teichos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harpagion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalchedon</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallipolis</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kios</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolonai</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyzikos</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampskakos</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolis</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miletoupolis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miletoutteichos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrelia/Bryllion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olbia</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otrinoi</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paixos</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parion</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plakia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priapos</td>
<td>2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prokonnesos</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pytthopolis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>size of territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skylake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sombia</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tereia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zelea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Troas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abydos</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achilleion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antandros</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aribe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assos</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astyra</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astyra Troika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azeia</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birytis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dardanos</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gargara</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentinos</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gergis</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamaxitos</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilion</td>
<td>3 or 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kebran</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokylio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolonai</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampioneia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larisa</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neandreia</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ophryneion</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaiperkote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkote</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polichna</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhoiteion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigeion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speksis</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenedos</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lesbos</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antissa</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arisba</td>
<td>2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eresos</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methymna</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mytilene</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrrha</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aiolis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adramyttion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigai(ai)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigiroessa</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atarneus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autokane</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boione</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalkis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaia</td>
<td>2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambrion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gryneion</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halisarna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iolla</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killa</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kisthene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyllene</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyme</td>
<td>2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larisa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leukai</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanpagoi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrina</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neon Teichos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notion</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaigambrion</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parthenion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergamon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perperene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitane</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pordoselene</td>
<td>1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temnos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teuthrania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thebe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tisna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ionia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achilleion</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airai</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaia</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouthia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chios</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chytton</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dios Hieron</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaiousoi</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesos</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erythrai</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isinda</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiazomenai</td>
<td>3 or 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolophon</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korykos</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebedos</td>
<td>2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leukofrys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesia (Mai)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathesion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miletos</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myonnesos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myous</td>
<td>2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naulochon</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notion</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phokaia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polichnatai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priene</td>
<td>3 or 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pteleon</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pygela</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samos</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidousa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyrna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teos</td>
<td>3 or 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thebai</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Karia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabanda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alinda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amyndaeis</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amyzon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arliosos</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armelitai</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aulai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargasa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargylia</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolbai</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalketor</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chersonesos</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chios</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erineis</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euromos</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halikarnassos</td>
<td>2, with dependencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybliseis</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydaelis</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydissos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hymisese</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iasos</td>
<td>2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idrias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idyma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalynda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karbasyanda</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Size of Territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karyanda</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasolaba</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaunos</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kedreai</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keramos</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killareis</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindye</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knidos</td>
<td>4 or 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodapeis</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koliyrges</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koranza</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krya</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyllandos</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrbissos</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latmos/Herakleia</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepsimandos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medmasos</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mlyasa</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myndos</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narisbareis</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naryandos</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naxia</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olaios</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olymos</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouranion</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parpariotai</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passanda</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedasa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peleiai</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pidaa</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pladasa</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrindos</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pynnos</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmakis</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silo</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syangela/Theangela</td>
<td>2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talagreis</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taramtos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarbanelis</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telandros</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telemessos</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termira</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tersogasseiis</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thasthareis</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thydonos</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tralleis</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lykia</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phaselis</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crete</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xanthos</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allaria</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anopolis</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptara</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkades</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aulon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axos</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biannos</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bionos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chersonasos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datala</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dragnos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deros</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleutherna</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eltynia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyros</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gortyns</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gortyns</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierapytna</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyrtakina</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istron</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itanos</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keraia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knosos</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kydonia</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kytaion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lappa</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lato</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebena</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisos</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyktos</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malla</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matala</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milatos</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olous</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petra</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phaistos</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phalasarna</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polichne</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyvren</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praisos</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priansos</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhaekos</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhithynmos</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhitten</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalai</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sybrita</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrha</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tylisos</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodos</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brikinder</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diakrioi</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ialysos</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamiros</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindos</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oiai</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedieis</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodos</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamphylia</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspendos</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idyros</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perge</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilikia</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aphrodiasias</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmoi</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issos</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelenderis</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallos</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagidos</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soloi</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amathous</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idalion</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karpassis</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keryneia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kourion</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapethos</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paphos</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salamis</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soloi</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posideion</td>
<td>1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naukratis</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oasis</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barke</td>
<td>4 or 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euheesperiides</td>
<td>2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinyps</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrene</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taucheira</td>
<td>3?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlocated</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astraiousioi</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SIZE OF TERRITORY**: 1327
10. Poleis in 400 versus Poleis no longer or not yet Existing in 400

A. Poleis in 400

**Spain and France**
Emporion
Massalia

**Sikelia**
Abakainon
Agyrion
Akrai
Alaisa
Apollonia
Engyon
Galeria
Heloron
Henna
Herakleia Minoa
Imachara
Kallipolis
Kamarina
Kasmenai
Kephaloidion
Lipara
Longane
Morgantina
Mylai
Mytistratos
Nakone
Selinous
Syrakousai
Zankle/Messana

**Italia and Kampania**
Herakleia
Hipponion
Hyele
Kaulonia
Kroton
Kyme
Laos
Lokroi
Medma
Metapontion
Metauros

**The Adriatic**
Adria
Apollonia
Brentesion
Epidamnos/Dyrrhachion
Spina

**Epeiros**
Batai
Boucheta
Bouthroton
Dodone
Elateia
Ephyra
Pandosia

**Akarnania**
Alyzeia
Ambrakia
Anaktorion
Argos
Astakos
Derion
Herakleia
Ithaka
Korkyra
Koronta
Kranioi
Leukas
Oiniadai
Palaioi
Paleis
Phoitiiai
Pronnoi

**Aitolia**
Aigition
Chalkis
Kallion
Kalydon
Makynia
Molykreion
Phola
Pleuron
Proschion
Trichoneion

**West Lokris**
Alpa
Amphissa
Chaleion
Hyaia
Hypnia
Issioi
Messapioi
Myania
Naupaktos
Oianthea
Tolophon
Tritea

**Phokis**
Abai
Ambryssos
Amphikαιa
Antikyra
Boulis
Charadra
Daulis
Delphoi
Drymos
Echedameia
Elateia
Erochos
Hyampolis

Same
Stratos
Zakynthos
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poleis in 400</th>
<th>1329</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ledon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilaia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medeon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neon/Tithorea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parapotamioi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedieis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phaneoteus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phlygonion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Po[———]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teithronion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trachis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troneia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boiotia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akraiphia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthedon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaironeia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorsiai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erythrai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eteonos/Skaphai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eutresis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haliartos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyetos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hysiai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koroneia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebadeia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mykalessos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchomenos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oropos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siphai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skolos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanagra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thebai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thespiai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thisbai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Megaric, Korinthia, Sikyonia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korinthos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikyon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achaia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigeira</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helike</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keryneia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olenos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pellene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheloe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhypai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trytaia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alasyaion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphidolia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eupagion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larissa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letrinoi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marganeis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pylos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thraistos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arkadia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alipheira</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipeia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euaimon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eutaia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gortys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helisson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaphyai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kleitor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koila</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kynaitha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lousoi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lykosoura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantinea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methydron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonakris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchomenos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oresthasion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallantion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheneos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phigaleia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phorieia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psophis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pylai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stymphalos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teuthis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thaliades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelphousa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thisoe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torthynneion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapezous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Triphylia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epeion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epitalion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepreon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makiston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrixai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrgos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skillous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Messenia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aithaia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aulon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kardamyle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyparisos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalamai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thouria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lakedaimon</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aphroditia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briona</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidauros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geronthrai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gytheion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kromnos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kythera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>City 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las</td>
<td>Boion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oinous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oitylos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pellana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prasiai/Oreiatai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sellasia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argolis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidaurus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halicis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermionon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kleonai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phleious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troizen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saronic Gulf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belbina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalaureia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salamis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euboia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenai Diades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalkis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eretria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histiaia/Oreos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karystos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orobiai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posideion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lokris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alponos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kynos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larymna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naryka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skarpheia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thronion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Astypalaia
Chalke
Delos
Helene
(Ikaros)
Oine
Therma
Ikos
Imbros
Ios
Kalymna
(Karpathos)
Arkesseia
Brykous
Karpathos
Kasos
(Keos)
Ioulis
Karthaia
Koresia
Poissa
Keria
Kimolos
(Kos)
Astypalaia on Kos
Halasarna
Kos Meropis
Kythnos
(Lemnos)
Hephaistia
Myrina
Leros
Melos
Mykonos
Naxos
Nisyros
Palaikathioi
Paros
(Peparethos)
Panormos
Peparethos
Seleinous
Pholegandros
Rheneia
Samothrake
Saros
Seriphos
Sikinos
Siphnos
Skiathos
Skyros
Syme
Syros
Telos
Tenos
Thasos
Thera

Makedonia
Aiace
Aigeai
Alebaia
Allante
Aloros
Beroia
Dion
Edessa
Europos
Heraclaeion
Ichnai
Kyrrhos
Leibeuthra
Methone
Mieza
Pella
Pydna

Mygdonia
Apollonia
Arethousa
Bormiskos
Heraclaea
Lete
Sindos
Therme

Bisaltia
Amphipolis
Argilos
Trailos

Chalkidike
Aige
Aineia
Aioleion
Akanthos
Akrothoii
Alapta

Anthemous
Aphytis
Assera
Charadrous
Chedrolius
Chytropolis
Dikaia
Dion
Eion
Galepsos
Gigones
Haisa
Istasos
Kalindoa
Kamakai
Kampsai
Kissos
Kithas
Kleonia
Kombreia
Lipaxos
Mekyberna
Mende
Milkoros
Neapolis
Olophruxos
Olynthos
Osbaioi
Othoros
Pharbela
Phegontioi
Piloros
Pistamos
Pleume
Polichnita
Posidonia
Poteidaia
Prassilos
Sane on Pallene
Sane on Athos
Sarte
Serme
Sermilia
Singos
Sinos
Skabala
Skapsaios
Skione
Skithai
Smila
Spartolos
Stagiros
Stolos/Skolos
Strepsa
Therambos
Thestoros
Thyssos
Tinde
Torone
Tripoiai
Zereia

Unlocated in Thrace
Aison
Brea
Kossaia
Okolon

Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos
Apollonia
Berga
Galepsos
Myrkinos
Neapolis
Oisyme
Phagres
Pistyros

Thrace: from Nestos to Hebrors
Abdera
Ainos
Bergepolis
Dikaia
Drys
Kypselia
Maroneia
Mesambrie
Orthagoria
Sale
Stryme
Zone

Inland Thrace
Pistiros

Thracian Chersonesos
Alopekonnesos
Arapllos
Chersonesos/Agora
Deris
Elaious
Ide
Kardia
Kressa
Krithote
Limnai
Madytos
Paion
Pakte
Sestos

Propontic Thrace
Bisantion
Daminon Teichos
Heraion Teichos
Neapolis
Perinthos
Selymbria
Serrion Teichos
Tyrodiza

Pontos: West Coast
Apollonia
Bizone
Dionysopolis
Istros
Kallatis
Mesambria
Nikonion
Odessos
Olbia/Borysthenes
Ophiousa
Orgame
Tomis
Tyras

Pontos: Skythia
Chersonesos
Gorgippia
Hermonassa
Karkinitis
Kepoi
Kimmerikon
Kytaia
Labrys
Myrmekeion
Nymphaion
Pantikapaion/Bosporos
Phanagoria
Theodosia
Tyritake

Pontos: Kolchis
Dioskouris
Gyenos
Phasis

Pontic Coast of Asia Minor
Amisos/Peiraieus
Becheirias
Herakleia
Karoussa
Kerasous
Kinolis
Koloussa
Kotyora
Kromna
Kytoros
Limne
Sesamos
Sinope
Stameneia
Themiskryra
Tieion
Trapezous

Propontic Coast of Asia Minor
Artaiou Teichos
Artake
Astakos
Bysbikos
Dareion
Daskyleion
Didymon Teichos
Harpagion
Kalchedon
Kallipolis
Kios
Kolonai
Kyzikos
Lampsakos
Metropolis
Miletoupolis
Miletouteichos
Myrleia
Olbia
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Aiolis
Adramyttion
Aigai(ai)
Agiroessa
Atarneus
Autokane
Boione
Chalkis
Elaia
Gambrion
Gryneion
Halisarna
Herakleia
Iolla
Karene
Killa
Kisthene
Kyllene
Kyme
Larisa
Leukai
Magnesia
Melanpogos
Myrina
Nasos
Neon Teichos
Notion
Palaiagambriion
Parthenion
Pergamon
Perperene
Pitane
Pordoselene
Temnos
Teuthrania
Thebe
Tisna

Ionie
Achilleion
Airai
Anaia
Boutheia
Chios
Chyton
Dios Hieron
Elaiousioi
Ephesos

Erythrai
Isinda
Klazomenai
Kolophon
Korykos
Lebedos
Leukophrys
Magnesia
Marathesion
Miletos
Myonnesos
Myous
Notion
Phokaia
Polichnittai
Priene
Pteleon
Pygela
Samos
Sidousa
Teos
Thebai

Karia
Amos
Amynandeis
Amyzon
Aulai
Bargasa
Bargylia
Bolbai
Chalketor
Chersonesos
Chios
Erineis
Euromos
Halikarnassos
Hydios
Hymisseis
Idrias
Idyma
Kalynda
Karbasyanda
Karyanda
Kindye
Knidos
Kodapeis
Krya

Lesbos
Antissa
Eresos
Methymna
Mytilene
Pyrrha

Troas
Abydos
Achilleion
Antandros
Arisbe
Assos
Astyra Mysia
Astyra Troika
Azeia
Birytis
Dardanos
Gargara
Gentinos
Gergis
Hamaxitos
Ilion
Kebren
Kokylion
Kolonai
Lamponeia
Larisa
Neandreia
Neandreia
Ophryneion
Palaiperkote
Perkote
Policlina
Rhoditeion
Sigeion
Skipsis
Tenedos

Otlengi
Parion
Plakia
 Priapos
Prokonnesos
Pythopolis
Sombia
Tereia
Zeleia
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poleis in 400</th>
<th>Poleis no longer or not yet existing in 400</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kyllandos</td>
<td>Istron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrbissos</td>
<td>Itanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latmos/Herakleia</td>
<td>Knosos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepsimandos</td>
<td>Kytaion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medmasos</td>
<td>Lato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mylasa</td>
<td>Lebena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myndos</td>
<td>Lisos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narisbareis</td>
<td>Lyktos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naryandos</td>
<td>Malla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naxia</td>
<td>Milatos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olaeis</td>
<td>Olous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olymos</td>
<td>Petra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parpariotai</td>
<td>Phaistos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passanda</td>
<td>Phalasarna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedasa</td>
<td>Polichne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peleiatai</td>
<td>Polyrhen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pidasa</td>
<td>Praios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyryndos</td>
<td>Rhytten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrnos</td>
<td>Sybrika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmakis</td>
<td>Tarrha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siloi</td>
<td>Tylisos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talagreis</td>
<td>Rhodos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taramptos</td>
<td>Ialysos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarbeneis</td>
<td>Kamiros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telandros</td>
<td>Lindos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telemessos</td>
<td>Rhodos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ternera</td>
<td>Pamphylia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thasthareis</td>
<td>Aspendos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thydonos</td>
<td>Idyros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tralleis</td>
<td>Perge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lykia</td>
<td>Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phaselis</td>
<td>Kilikia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crete</td>
<td>Aphrodisias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anopolis</td>
<td>Holmoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonia</td>
<td>Issos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptara</td>
<td>Kelenderis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aulon</td>
<td>Mallos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axos</td>
<td>Nagidos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biannos</td>
<td>Soloi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catala</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreros</td>
<td>Amathous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleutherna</td>
<td>Idalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eltynia</td>
<td>Karpasia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyros</td>
<td>Keryneia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gortyns</td>
<td>Kourion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleion</td>
<td>Lapethos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierapynta</td>
<td>Marion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paphos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salamis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soloi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posideion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Naukratis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Libya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Euhesperides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyrene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taucheira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unlocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Astraiosioi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erodioi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eurymachitai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kystiros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phytaioi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Poleis no longer or not yet existing in 400**

**Spain and France**
- Alalie: abandoned in c.540
- Rhode: colonised by Massalia in, perhaps, C4e

**Sikelia**
- Adranon: founded by Dionysios I c.400
- Aitna: Aitnaians expelled in 461
- Akragas: destroyed in 406, refounded in C4s
- Alontion: Sikel community, Hellenised in C4
- Euboia: incorporated into Syracuse in C5e
- Gela: destroyed in 405, refounded in C4s
- Herakleia: short-lived colony founded by Dorieus in C6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Founded/Established</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herbessos</td>
<td>Sikel community,</td>
<td>Lissos founded by</td>
<td>Thyreion a polis from C4 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hellenised in C4</td>
<td>Dionysios I in C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbita</td>
<td>Sikel community,</td>
<td>Melaina Korkyra</td>
<td>Torybeia a polis from C4 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hellenised in C4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himera</td>
<td>destroyed in 409</td>
<td>Pharos colony founded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>by Paros in 385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippana</td>
<td>indigenous community,</td>
<td>Epeiros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>refounded as a</td>
<td>Amantia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hellenic polis in C4</td>
<td>Artichia not yet a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>settled by Campanians</td>
<td>polis in 400?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>403–396</td>
<td>Artichia [Berenike]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katane</td>
<td>Sikel community,</td>
<td>Byllis not yet a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>refounded as a Hellenic</td>
<td>polis in 400?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>polis in C4</td>
<td>Elea not yet a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>polis in 400?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eurymenai not yet a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>polis in 400?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gitana not yet a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>polis in 400?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Horraon a polis from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C4m onwards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megara</td>
<td>incorporated into</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syracuse 403, resettled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in 396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naxos</td>
<td>enslaved by Syracuse in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petra</td>
<td>indigenous community?,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hellenised in C4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piakos</td>
<td>indigenous community?,</td>
<td>Nikaia not yet a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hellenised in C4</td>
<td>polis in 400?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Olympos not yet a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>polis in 400?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orikos a polis from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C4m onwards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Passaron not yet a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>polis in 400?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phanote not yet a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>polis in 400?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phoinike a polis from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C4m onwards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poionos a polis from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C4m? onwards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tekmon not yet a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>polis in 400?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Torone a polis from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C4m? onwards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zmaratha a polis from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C4m? onwards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sileraioi</td>
<td>indigenous community?,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hellenised in C4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikelanaioi</td>
<td>indigenous community?,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hellenised in C4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tauromenion</td>
<td>a Hellenic polis from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C4e onwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyndaris</td>
<td>founded by Dionysios I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in 396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrrenhoi</td>
<td>indigenous community,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hellenised in C4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italia and Kampania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poseidonia</td>
<td>conquered by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leukanians in C5–C4e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siris/Polieion</td>
<td>disappeared in C5s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sybaris</td>
<td>destroyed in 510,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disappears in C5f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Adriatic</td>
<td>Ankon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>colonised by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syracusans c.387</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleia</td>
<td>probably founded by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dionysios I in C4e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issa</td>
<td>probably founded by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dionysios I in C4e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aitolia</td>
<td>Agrinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a polis from C4m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>onwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akripos</td>
<td>a polis from C4e?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>onwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halikyrna</td>
<td>not yet a polis in C400?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyea</td>
<td>a polis from C4e?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>onwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sollion</td>
<td>incorporated into</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palairos in 431/0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therminea</td>
<td>a polis from C4e?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>onwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phokis</td>
<td>Aiolidai</td>
<td>presumably destroyed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in 480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirrha</td>
<td>ghost polis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triteis</td>
<td>presumably destroyed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in 480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boiotia</td>
<td>Alalkomenai</td>
<td>incorporated into</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Koroneia in C7–C6?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potniai</td>
<td>synoecised with Thebes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>431, not re-established</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>later</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megaris, Korinthia, Sikyonia</td>
<td></td>
<td>not yet a polis in 400?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigosthena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagai</td>
<td>not yet a polis in 400?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achaia</td>
<td>Ascheion</td>
<td>not yet a polis in 400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elis</td>
<td>Anaitoi</td>
<td>no longer a polis in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>400?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaladrioi</td>
<td>no longer a polis in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dysponention</td>
<td>destroyed c.570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewaoioi</td>
<td>no longer a polis in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenos</td>
<td>no longer a polis in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Metapioi no longer a polis in 400?
Pisa a polis 365–62

Arkadia
Megale polis founded in 368

Triphylia
Noudion destroyed by Elis in C5?

Messenia
Korone founded or refounded in 369
Messene/Ithome founded in 369

Lakedaimon
Aigys need not have existed before C4
Belbina not earlier than C4 perhaps a C4 foundation
Kyphanta
Thyrea destroyed in 424

Argolis
Mykenai destroyed c.460
Orneai destroyed c.416/15
Tiryns destroyed in 460s

Attika
Eleusis in existence 403–401

Euboia
Diakrioi incorporated into Eretria C5–C4
Diakres apo incorporated into Chalkis C5?
Dystos ghost polis? still a dependent polis in C4m?
Grynchai incorporated into Eretria C5–C4e
Peraia incorporated into Eretria C5–C4e
Styra incorporated into Eretria C5

East Lokris
Knemides ghost polis?
Nikaia founded in C4f

Doris
Akyphas/Pindos not yet a polis in 400?

Thessalia
Metropolis founded by synoecism in C4f
Phaloria not yet a polis in 400?

Malis
Trachis absorbed by Herakleia in 426

Phthiotis
Peuma not yet a polis in 400?
Thebai founded by synoecism in C4

Messenia
Korone founded or refounded in 369

Magnesia
Amyros abandoned c.400, population moved to Kasthania?

The Aegean
Eteokarpadhoi splinter community in 5? no polis town?
Kos synoecised in 366/5

Mygdonia
Chalestre perhaps not a Hellenic polis in 400

Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos
Datos founded c.360
Eion incorporated into Amphipolis in C5
Krenides founded c.360
Philippoi founded in 356
Sirra presumably a polis from C4m onwards

Inland Thrace
Alexandropolis founded in 341
Apros not yet a polis in 400
Kabyle founded c.340
Philippiopolis founded in C4m
Seuthopolis founded c.325–15

Thracyan Chersonesos
Aigos potamoi not a polis between C5 and C4m

Pontic Coast of Asia Minor
Choirades not a Hellenic polis in 400

Iasonia ghost polis
Karambis ghost polis
Lykastos ghost polis
Odeinios ghost polis
Tetrakis ghost polis

Propontic Coast of Asia Minor
Paion incorporated into Lampsakos in, perhaps, C6
Skylake perhaps incorporated into Kyziko before 400

Lesbos
Arisba incorporated into Methymna in C6

Ionia
Naulochon Smyrna a polis in C4 onwards
Smyrna destroyed in C6m, refounded in C4l.

Karia
Alabanda not yet a Hellenic polis in 400?
Alinda not yet a Hellenic polis in 400?
Arlissos not yet a Hellenic polis in 400?
Armelitai not yet a Hellenic polis in 400?
Hybliseis not yet a Hellenic polis in 400?
Hydaieis not yet a Hellenic polis in 400?
Iasos destroyed in 405, reappears in C4f
Kasolaba not yet a Hellenic polis in 400?
Kaunos not yet a Hellenic polis in 400?
Kedreai destroyed in 405, reappears in C4–C3
Keramos not yet a Hellenic polis in 400?
Koliiyrgesi not yet a Hellenic polis in 400?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Koranza</td>
<td>not yet a Hellenic polis in 400?</td>
<td>Arkades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouranion</td>
<td>not yet a Hellenic polis in 400?</td>
<td>Arkades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pladasa</td>
<td>not yet a Hellenic polis in 400?</td>
<td>Archononos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syangela?</td>
<td>not yet a Hellenic polis in 400?</td>
<td>Chersonosos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theangela</td>
<td>not yet a Hellenic polis in 400?</td>
<td>Dragmos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terssogasseis</td>
<td>not yet a Hellenic polis in 400?</td>
<td>Hyrtakina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lykia</td>
<td>Xanthos not yet a Hellenic polis in 400?</td>
<td>Keraia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crete</td>
<td>Allaria a polis from C45 onwards</td>
<td>Matala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Priants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rhaukos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rhithynmos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stalai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodos</td>
<td>Brikender incorporated into Lindos in C5?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diakrio incorporated into Lindos in C5?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oiai incorporated into Lindos in C5?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedie incorporated into Lindos in C5?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>Kinyps short-lived colony founded by Dorieus in C6l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Constitution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bas. = Basileia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem. = Demokratia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ol. = Oligarchia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol. = Politeia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyr. = Tyrannis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spain and France</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Massalia</td>
<td>Ol. later Dem. (Pol.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sikelia</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agyrion</td>
<td>Tyr. C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aitna</td>
<td>Bas. Tyr. C5f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akragas</td>
<td>Tyr. 570–471; Dem. c.500; 471–3; Ol. 450s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonia</td>
<td>Tyr. C4m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engyon</td>
<td>Tyr. C4m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>Tyr. 505–466/5; Ol. C5l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henna</td>
<td>Tyr. C5l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbita</td>
<td>Bas. C5m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himera</td>
<td>Tyr. C5e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamarina</td>
<td>Tyr. C5f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katane</td>
<td>Tyr. C4m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentoripa</td>
<td>Tyr. C6l, C4m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontinoi</td>
<td>Ol. C7l; Tyr. C7l; Dem. C5s; Ol. C5l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selinous</td>
<td>Tyr. C6m–?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrakousai</td>
<td>Ol. C8s–C6; Tyr. C6; Ol. C6l; Dem. C5e; Tyr. 485–466; Dem. 466–406; Tyr. 406–344; Dem. 344–?; Ol. 336–316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tauromenion</td>
<td>Tyr. C4m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zankle</td>
<td>Bas. C5e–488/7; Tyr. C4m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Italia and Kampania</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heraklea</td>
<td>Tyr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyle</td>
<td>Tyr. C5f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaulonia</td>
<td>Ol. C6l–C5f?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kroton</td>
<td>Ol. 510; Dem. C6l; Tyr. C5e; Ol. C5m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyme</td>
<td>Ol. 504; Tyr. 504–490; Ol. 490–?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokroi</td>
<td>Ol. 352; Tyr. 352 or 346; Dem. 346–?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metapontion</td>
<td>Ol. C5l; Dem. C5l–?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neapolis</td>
<td>Dem. C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhegion</td>
<td>Ol. 494; Tyr. 494–461</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sybaris</td>
<td>Ol. C6s; Tyr. C6l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taras</td>
<td>Pol. C6l; Tyr. C6l; Dem. C5f–?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thourioi</td>
<td>Dem. 413; Ol. 413–?; Dem. C4?; dynastean C4?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Adriatic</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apollonia</td>
<td>Dem. C5–C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidamnos</td>
<td>Ol. 437–433; Dem. 433–435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Akarnania</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambrakia</td>
<td>Tyr. C6; Ol. C6–C5; Dem. C4m; Ol. 338–336; Dem. 336–?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astakos</td>
<td>Tyr. C5s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korkyra</td>
<td>Tyr. C6; Ol. C5; Dem. 426–361; Ol. 361–?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leukas</td>
<td>Tyr. C7s–C6; Ol. 425–416; Dem. C5e–?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zakynthos</td>
<td>Dem. C5–404; Ol. 404–446; Dem. 380s–408</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>West Lokris</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chaleion</td>
<td>Ol. C5m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oianthea</td>
<td>Ol. C5m; Tyr. C4f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phokis</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delphoi</td>
<td>Ol./Dem. C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boiotia</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akraipia</td>
<td>Ol. 446–386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaironeia</td>
<td>Ol. 446–386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haliartos</td>
<td>Ol. 446–386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyetos</td>
<td>Ol. 446–386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopai</td>
<td>Ol. 446–386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koroneia</td>
<td>Ol. 446–386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Megaris, Korinthia, Sikyonia</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korinthos</td>
<td>Bas. 487–C8m; Ol. C8m–C7m; Tyr. C7m–C6e; Ol. C6e–C4l; Dem. 392–386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megara</td>
<td>Ol. Tyr. C7s; Ol. Dem. C6; 427–24; c.375–2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikyons</td>
<td>Tyr. C7m–C6m; Ol. C6m–C4l; Tyr. 367–66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achaia</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aigai</td>
<td>Ol. 417–366 and C4s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigeira</td>
<td>Ol. 417–366 and C4s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion</td>
<td>Ol. 417–366 and C4s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascheion</td>
<td>Ol. 417–366 and C4s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyme</td>
<td>Ol. 417–366 and C4s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keryneia</td>
<td>Ol. 417–366 and C4s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontion</td>
<td>Ol. 417–366 and C4s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olenos</td>
<td>Ol. 417–366 and C4s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrai</td>
<td>Ol. 417–366 and C4s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pellene</td>
<td>Ol. 417–366 and C4s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharai</td>
<td>Ol. 417–366 and C4s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Orichomos | Ol. 446–364 | |
| Plataiai | Dem. C5s | |
| Siphai | Ol. C5s | |
| Tanagra | Ol. 446–386 | |
| Thebai | Ol. C6–379; Dem. 378–35 | |
| Thespiai | Ol. 446–372 | |
Athenai Bas.? – C
Attika
Phelloe Ol. 417–366 and C.45; Dem. 366–365
Phryai Ol. 417–366 and C.45; Dem. 366–365
Tritiaia Ol. 417–366 and C.45; Dem. 366–365

Elis
Ol. C.6–471; Dem. 471–365; Ol. 365–?

Arkadia
Helissa Dem. C.4f
Heraia Dem. C.4f
Mantinea Dem. C.6–385; Ol. 385–370; Dem. 370–?
Megalopolis Dem. 368–?
Phigaleia Dem. C.4f
Tegae Ol. 370–370; Dem. 370–?

Messenia
Messen Dem. 369–?

Lakedaimon
Sparta Mixed

Argolis
Argos Bas.? – C.6f; Ol. C.6–C.5f; Dem. C.5f–C.4f; Ol. 417 and 370
Epidaurus Ol. – C.75; Tyr. C.75; Dem. C.4
Phleious Tyr. C.6; Dem. C.4e; Ol. 379–?

Saronic Gulf
Aigina Ol. C.5

Attika
Athenai Bas.? – C.8; Ol. C.8–561; Tyr. 561–510; Dem. 508/7–322/1; Ol. 411, 404–3
Eleusis Ol. 403–401

Euboia
Chalkis Tyr. C.6; Ol. C.6, C.5f; Dem. C.6, C.5–C.4f
Eretria Ol. C.6, C.5e; Dem. C.6, C.5–C.4f, C.45; Tyr. C.4m
Histiaia/Oreos Ol. C.5f, C.5l; Dem. C.55, C.4f, C.45; Tyr. C.4f, C.4m

Karystos Dem. C.5; Ol. C.5l

East Lokris
Opous Ol. C.5f

Thessalia
Kranion Ol. C.6; Tyr. C.4
Lariss Ol.
Pharsalos Ol.
Pagassai Tyr. C.4f
Phere Tyr. C.5–C.4f

The Aegean
Andros Dem. 411–C.4e; Dem. C.4 e–?
Kos Dem. 366/5–C.4m; Ol. C.4m; Dem. 332–?
Paros Ol. 340/9–404; Tyr. or Ol. C.4e; Dem. 393–?
Siphnos Dem. C.5–404/3; Ol. 404/3–394/3; Dem. 394/3–?
Tenos Dem. C.5–411; Ol. 411–?
Thasos Dem. 411–C.4e; Dem. C.4e;41–407; Dem. 407–404; Ol. 404–c.390; Dem. 390–?
Thera Bas. Ol. Dem.

Makedonia
Aiane Bas.
Beroia Ol.

Chalkidike
Amphipolis Dem. 437/6?; Dem. C.4m
Akanthos Dem. C.4e
Aphytis Dem. C.4e
Mende Dem. 423; Ol. 423;
Dem. 423–?
Torone Dem. 423; Ol. 423–?

Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos
Myrkinos Tyr. C.6l
Neapolis Dem. C.5s
Philippoi Mixed C.4s

Thrace: from Nestos to Hebros
Abdera Dem. C.5

Thracian Chersonesos
Alopekon-nesos Tyr. C.6s
Chersonesos/ Tyr. C.6s
Agora
Elaios Tyr. C.6s
Kardia Tyr. C.6s, C.4s
Krithote Tyr. C.6s
Limnai Tyr. C.6s
Madytos Tyr. C.6s
Pakte Tyr. C.6s
Sestos Tyr. C.6s

Propontic Thrace
Byzantion Tyr. C.6l; Ol. 404–390; Dem. 390–?

Pontos: West Coast
Apollonia Ol. C.6
Istrus Ol. 4.5s; Dem. C.5s–?
Olbia Ol. 4.5–c.480; Tyr. c.480–?; Dem. C.4

Pontos: Skythia
Chersonesos Dem. C.5–C.4
Nymphaion Bas. C.5–?
Pantikapaion Tyr. C.5l; Bas. C.5–?
Phanagoria Bas. C.4e–?
Theodosia Bas. C.4e–?
Tyritake Bas. C.5s–?

Pontic Coast of Asia Minor
Amisos Dem. C.5s
Herakleia Dem. C.6m; Tyr. C.6s; Ol. C.6l; Pol. C.5f; Dem. C.5l; Tyr. 364–?
Sinope Tyr. C.5m; Dem. C.5s

Propontic Coast of Asia Minor
Kalchedon Dem. C.4m
Kimos Dem. C.6; Tyr. 337–302
Kyzikos Tyr. C.6l; Dem. C.5?
Lampsakos Bas.? C.7; Tyr. C.6l–C.5e, C.4f, 3408s. Dem. C.4l
Myrleia Tyr. 337–302

Parion Tyr. C.6l
Prokonnesos Tyr. C.6l
Zeleia Dem. 334–?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trojan</th>
<th>Troas</th>
<th>Abydos</th>
<th>Tyr. 520s; Ol. 411–C₄ₑ; Tyr. C₄f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assos</td>
<td>Tyr. C₄m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gergis</td>
<td>Persian “satraps”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilion</td>
<td>Dem. C₄l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigeion</td>
<td>Tyr. C₆, C₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenedos</td>
<td>Bas. C₇–C₆?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbos</td>
<td>Antissa</td>
<td>Tyr. C₄s–332; Dem. C₄?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eresos</td>
<td>Tyr. C₄s–332; Dem. C₄l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methymna</td>
<td>Dem. C₄l; Ol. C₄m; Tyr. C₄m–332; Dem. C₄?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mytilene</td>
<td>Bas. C₇; Tyr. C₇l–C₆e; Ol. C₆; Tyr. C₆l–C₅e; Ol. C₅–427; Dem. 427–405; Ol. 405–389; Dem. 389–C₄m; Tyr. C₄m–347/6; Dem. 347/6–333; Tyr. 333–332; Dem. 332–?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priene</td>
<td>Dem. C₄l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samos</td>
<td>Bas. C₇; Ol. C₇–C₆e; Tyr. 5908–479; Dem. 492; Ol. 479–441; Dem. 441–404; Ol. 404–365; klerouchy 365–22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teos</td>
<td>Dem. C₅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knidos</td>
<td>Ol. ?–C₄; Dem. C₄–?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyllandos</td>
<td>Tyr. C₅s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mylasa</td>
<td>Dem. C₄s; Tyr. C₄l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syangela/</td>
<td>Tyr. C₅s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theangela</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crete</td>
<td>Axos</td>
<td>Bas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lappa</td>
<td>Bas.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodos</td>
<td>Ialysos</td>
<td>Dem. ?–411; Ol. 411–?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kamiros</td>
<td>Dem. ?–411; Ol. 411–?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lindos</td>
<td>Dem. ?–411; Ol. 411–?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhodos</td>
<td>Ol. ?–395; Dem. 395–91; Ol. 391–90; Dem. 390–55; Ol. 355–32; Dem. 332–?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilikia</td>
<td>Soloi</td>
<td>Dem. 333–?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Amathous</td>
<td>Bas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ialdion</td>
<td>Bas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kourion</td>
<td>Bas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lapethos</td>
<td>Bas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>Bas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paphos</td>
<td>Bas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salamis</td>
<td>Bas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soloi</td>
<td>Bas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>Barke</td>
<td>Bas. C₆; Ol. C₆–C₄</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Euhesperides</td>
<td>Ol. C₅–C₄</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyrene</td>
<td>Bas. c.631–440; Dem. C₆m, 440–?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 12. Decision-Making Institutions

**Key**
- *demos* = assembly, sometimes called *ekklesia* or *halia* or *polis vel sim.*
- *boule* = council
- *dikasterion* = court, manned with jurors or magistrates
- *gerousia* = council of elders
- *nomothetai* = boards of legislators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Spain and France</strong></th>
<th><strong>Sikelia</strong></th>
<th><strong>Akarnania</strong></th>
<th><strong>Messenia</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Massalia</td>
<td><em>boule</em> of 600</td>
<td><em>demos</em></td>
<td><em>demos</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agrigento</strong></td>
<td><em>demos, boule, dikasterion</em></td>
<td><em>Korkyra</em></td>
<td><em>Messene</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gela</strong></td>
<td><em>demos</em></td>
<td><em>Stratos</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kamarina</strong></td>
<td><em>demos</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catane</strong></td>
<td><em>demos</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kontoripa</strong></td>
<td><em>demos</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Megara</strong></td>
<td><em>demos or dikasterion</em></td>
<td><em>Delphi</em></td>
<td><em>Lakedaimon</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nakone</strong></td>
<td><em>boule, demos</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sparta</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selinous</strong></td>
<td><em>demos or dikasterion</em></td>
<td><em>Hyettos</em></td>
<td><em>demos, gerousia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Syракousai</strong></td>
<td><em>demos, boule, nomothetai</em></td>
<td><em>Koroneia</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zankle/Messana</strong></td>
<td><em>demos</em></td>
<td><em>Kopai</em></td>
<td><em>Argolis</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Italia</strong></th>
<th><strong>Boiotia</strong></th>
<th><strong>Megaris, Korinthia, Sikyonia</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heraclea</strong></td>
<td><em>demos</em></td>
<td><em>Korinths</em> (of 80 = gerousia?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kroton</strong></td>
<td><em>demos, gerousia, The Thousand</em></td>
<td><em>Megara</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kyme</strong></td>
<td><em>demos, boule, gerousia?</em></td>
<td><em>Elis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lokroi</strong></td>
<td><em>demos, boule, gerousia?</em></td>
<td><em>Chaladrioi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neapolis</strong></td>
<td><em>demos, boule</em></td>
<td><em>Elis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poseidonia</strong></td>
<td><em>demos</em></td>
<td><em>Megara</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rhigion</strong></td>
<td><em>demos</em></td>
<td><em>Elis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thessalia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Megara</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Malis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Elis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Magnesia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Aegean</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Andros</strong></td>
<td><em>boule</em></td>
<td><em>Lousoi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arkesine</strong></td>
<td><em>demos, boule, dikasterion</em></td>
<td><em>Mantinea</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delos</strong></td>
<td><em>demos, boule</em></td>
<td><em>Stymphalos</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imbros</strong></td>
<td><em>demos, boule</em></td>
<td><em>Tegea</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ios</strong></td>
<td><em>demos, boule</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kalymna</strong></td>
<td><em>demos, boule</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Towns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontos: Skythia</td>
<td>Chersonesos boule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontic Coast of Asia Minor</td>
<td>Herakleia boule, dikasterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sinope boule, dikasterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propontic Coast of Asia Minor</td>
<td>Kios, boule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyzikos, boule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lampsaoks, boule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zeleia, boule, dikasterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troas</td>
<td>Dardanos boule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skepsi, boule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenedos, boule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbos</td>
<td>Eresos, boule, dikasterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mytilene, boule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiolis</td>
<td>Gryneion, boule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyeme, boule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nasos, boule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionia</td>
<td>Airai, boule, dikasterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chios, boule, dikasterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ephesus, boule, dikasterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erythrai, boule, dikasterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kolophon, boule, dikasterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magnesia, boule, dikasterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miletos, boule, dikasterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myous, boule, dikasterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phokaia, boule, dikasterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crete</td>
<td>Axos, boule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bionnos, dikasterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Datala, boule, dikasterion, tois ithyntasi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gortyns, boule, dikasterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knosos, boule, dikasterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lyktos, boule, dikasterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhitett, boule, dikasterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tylos, boule, dikasterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodos</td>
<td>Kamiros, boule, dikasterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lindos, boule, dikasterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhodos, boule, dikasterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamphylia</td>
<td>Aspendos, boule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>Euhesperides, boule, gerousia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyrene, boule, gerousia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thracean Chersonesos**
- Elaious, boule
- Chersonesos/, boule, dikasterion
- Agora, boule

**Pontos: West Coast**
- Kallatis, boule
- Olbia, boule, dikasterion
- Tyra, boule, dikasterion

**Chalkidike**
- Amphipolis, boule, dikasterion
- Arethousa, boule, dikasterion
- Olynthos, boule, dikasterion
- Poteidaia, boule (as Athenian klerouchy)

**Lemnos**
- Hephaistia, boule
- Myrina, boule
- Naxos, boule

**Thera**
- Paros, boule
- Papearethos, boule
- Pholeagandros, boule
- Sikinos, boule
- Skiathos, boule
- Skyros, boule
- Telos, boule
- Thasos, boule

**Thracean Chersonesos**
- Kios, boule
- Kyzikos, boule
- Lampsaoks, boule
- Zeleia, boule

**Karia**
- Amyzon, boule
- Halikarnassos, boule
- Iasos, boule
- Killareis, boule
- Knidos, boule, gerousia
- Mylasa, boule

**Crete**
- Axos, boule
- Bionnos, dikasterion
- Datala, boule, dikasterion, tois ithyntasi
- Gortyns, boule, dikasterion
- Knosos, boule, dikasterion
- Lyktos, boule, dikasterion
- Rhitett, boule, dikasterion
- Tylos, boule, dikasterion

**Rhodos**
- Kamiros, boule
- Lindos, boule
- Rhodos, boule, dikasterion

**Pamphylia**
- Aspendos, boule

**Libya**
- Euhesperides, boule, gerousia
- Kyrene, boule, gerousia
13. Civic Subdivisions

Spain and France
Massalia gene
Sikelia
Engyon phratriai
Himera phratriai, phyla?
Kamarina phyla?, phratriai, triakades
Morgantina eikades
Naxos phyla or phratriai
Selinous patriai
Syraousai (3 Doric) phyla
Zankle/Messana phyla
Italia and Kampania
Herakleia two unnamed types
Kaulonia unnamed type
Lokroi 3 phyla, 32? "demoi", phratriai
Metapontion phyla? or demoi?
Poseidonia unknown type
Terina territorial units
Thourioi 10 phyla
The Adriatic
Epidamnos phyla
Issa 3 Dorian phyla
Melaina Korkyra 3 Dorian phyla
Arkadia
Mantinea 5 phyla, komai
Megalopolis 6 phyla
Phigaleia phyla
Tegea 4 phyla
Lakedaimon
Sparta 3 Dorian phyla, 5 obai
Argolis
Argos 3 Dorian phyla + 4th phyle, 12 phratriai, pentekostyes
Epidaurus 2 Dorian phyla + 2 phyla, 39 territorial units
Troizen 3? Dorian phyla + 4th phyle
Saronic Gulf
Aigina patriai
Attika
Athenai 4 Ionian phyla, phratriai, naukrariai; 10 phyla, 30 trittyes, 139 demoi
Euboia
Athenai Diades demos of Histiaia/Oreos
Chalkis demoi
Dion demos of Histiaia/Oreos
Dystos demos of Eretria
Eretria 6 phyla; 5 choroi; 55–60 demoi
gryneis demos of Eretria
Histiaia (Oreos) Phyla; 25–30 demoi
Orobiai demos of Histiaia/Oreos
Peraia demos of Eretria
Posidion demos of Histiaia/Oreos
Styra demos of Eretria; unidentified sub-

Megaris, Korinthia, Sikyon

Aigosthena kome of Megara
Korinthos 3 Dorian phyla, 8 territorial phyla, hemiogda, triakades, phratriai; komai?
Megara 3 Dorian phyla, 5 komai, hekatostyes
Sikyon 3 Dorian phyla + 4th phyle, 4 new phyla

Achaia
Dyme 3 phyla

Elis
Elis 12, later 8 phyla

The Aegean
Chalke demos of Rhodos
Delos 4 phyla, several trittyes
Imbros. Kleisthenic phyla and demoi
Kalymna 5 phyla, 7 demoi, 3 Dorian phyla
(Keos)
Ioulis 7 phylai, koineia
Karthaia  phylai, oikoi
Koresia  phyle of Ioulis
(Kos)
Astypalaia demos of Kos, subdivided into phylai
Kos 3 Dorian phylai, 9 chiliastyes, triakades, pentekostyes
(Lemnos)
Hephaistia Kleisthenic phylai and demoi
Myrina Kleisthenic phylai and demoi
Paros demoi?, patrai
Samothrake 5 phylai
Skyros Kleisthenic phylai and demoi
Syros 3 phylai
Tenos 10 phylai, patrai
Thasos phylai?, patrai?
Thera 3 Dorian phylai

Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos
Abdera phyle

Thrace: from Nestos to Ebros
Byzantion hekatostyes, patrai?, thiasoi?

Propontic Thrace
Perinthus 3 of the Ionic phylai

Pontos: West Coast
Dionysopolis phylai
Odessos 7 phylai
Tomis phylai

Pontos: Skythia
Chersonesos hekatostyes

Pontic Coast of Asia Minor
Herkleia 3 Dorian phylai, 4, later 60, hekatostyes

Propontic Coast of Asia Minor
Kalchedon hekatostyes?
Kyzikos 6 Milesian phylai

Troas
Ilion phylai
Skepsis phylai

Ionia
Chios phylai, phratriai, gene, units designated by numbers and letters
Ephesos 5 phylai, c. 50 chiliastyes
Erythrai phylai, gene, chiliastyes
Kolophon gene
Magnesia 12 phylai
Miletos 6 Ionic phylai, 9–12 phylai
Pygela phylai, gene
Samos 6 Ionic phylai?
Teos Ionic phylai?

Karia
Iasos 6 phylai, patriai
Keramos phyle
Koranza demoi? or komai?
Latmos phylai, phratriai
Mylasa 3 phylai
Pidas phylai, phratriai

Crete
Axos phylai, hetaireia
Chersonasos phylai?
Datala phylai
Dreros phylai, agela, hetaireia?
Eleutherna politeia?
Gortyns phylai, startoi
Hierapytna phylai?
Knosos phylai?
Lato phylai?
Lyktos phylai
Malla phylai
Olous phylai
Praisios phylai?

Rhodos
Ialysos a phyle of Rhodos
Kamiros a phyle of Rhodos, phylai, demoi, ktoinai, patriai
Lindos a phyle of Rhodos, demoi, ktoinai
Rhodos phylai, demoi, ktoinai

Libya
Kyrene 3 Dorian phylai, later 3 phylai, patrai, hetairai
## 14. Proxenoi

### Key
- **Rec.** proxenia bestowed on citizen of polis X
- **Giv.** proxenia bestowed by polis X

### Sikelia
- Akragas: Rec.
- Gela: Rec.
- Herbita: Rec.
- Katane: Rec.
- Lipara: Rec.
- Syракousai: Rec.

### Italia and Kampania
- Herakleia: Rec.
- Hipponion: Rec.
- Kroton: Rec.
- Neapolis: Giv.
- Taras: Rec.
- Thourioi: Rec.

### The Adriatic
- Apollonia: Rec.

### Akarnania
- Alyzeia: Rec.
- Ambrakia: Rec.
- Argos: Rec.
- Leukas: Rec.
- Paleis: Rec.
- Phoitiia: Rec.
- Stratos: Giv.
- Thyrreion: Rec.
- Zakynthos: Rec.

### Aitolia
- Kallion: Rec.
- Makynnea: Rec.
- Proschion: Rec.

### West Lokris
- Chaleion: Giv. Rec.
- Oianthea: Giv. Rec.

### Phokis
- Delphoi: Giv. Rec.
- Elateia: Rec.
- Teithronion: Rec.

### Boiotia
- Haliartos: Giv.
- Koroneia: Rec.
- Lebadeia: Rec.
- Oropos: Giv.
- Plataiai: Rec.
- Tanagra: Rec.
- Theop finest: Rec.

### Megaris, Korinthia, Sikyonia
- Sikyon: Rec.

### Achaia
- Aigeira: Rec.
- Aigion: Rec.
- Ascheion: Rec.
- Pellene: Rec.
- Phthai: Rec.
- Phelloe: Rec.

### Elis
- Pisa: Giv.

### Arkadia
- Kaphyai: Rec.
- Kleitor: Rec.
- Lousoi: Giv.
- Megalopolis: Rec.
- Orchomenos: Rec.
- Pallantion: Rec.
- Pheneos: Rec.
- Phigaleia: Giv.
- Stymphalos: Giv. Rec.

### Triphylia
- Skillous: Rec.

### Messenia
- Asine: Rec.
- Kyparissos: Rec.
- Thouria: Rec.

### Lakedaimon
- Epidauros: Rec.
- Kyphanta: Rec.
- Oinous: Rec.
- Pellana: Rec.
- Sparta: Giv. Rec.

### Argolis
- Kleonai: Rec.
- Phleious: Giv. Rec.
- Troizen: Rec.

### Saronic Gulf

### Attika

### Euboia
- Chalkis: Rec.
- Karystos: Rec.

### East Lokris
- Larymn: Rec.
- Opous: Rec.
- Skarpheia: Rec.

### Thessalia
- Gyrton: Rec.
- Krranon: Rec.
- Larisa: Rec.
Pharsalos Rec.
Pherai Giv. Rec.
Skotoussa Rec.
Ainis Rec.
Hypata Giv.
Oita Rec.
Parasopioi Rec.
Malis Rec.
Echinos Rec.
Herakleia Rec.
Lamia Giv.
Achaia Phthiotis
Larisa Rec.
Proerna Rec.
Thaumakoi Rec.
Magnesia
Meliboia Rec.
Perrhaibia
Gonnos Giv.
Athanania
Argethia Rec.
The Aegean
Anaphe Giv.
Andros Giv. Rec.
Arkesine Giv.
Astypalaia Rec.
Delos Giv. Rec.
Ios Giv. Rec.
Kalyymna Giv.
(Ieros)
Ioulis Rec.
Karthia Giv.
Keria Rec.
Kos Giv. Rec.
(Lemnos) Giv.
Myrina Giv.
Melos Rec.
Mykonos Rec.
Naxos Giv. Rec.
Oine Giv. Rec.
Palaiiskathos Rec.
Paros Giv. Rec.
Phoilegandros Giv.
Samothrace Giv.
Seriphos Rec.
Sikinos Giv.
Syros Rec.
Tenos Rec.
Thasos Giv. Rec.
Thera Rec.
Makedonia
Aigeai Rec.
Europos Rec.
Pella Rec.
Pydna Rec.
Mygdonia
Arethousa Rec.
Bisaltia
Amphipolis Rec.
Chalkidike
Akrothooi Rec.
Mende Rec.
Olynthos Rec.
Phegontioi Rec
Poteidaia Giv.
Thraco: from Strymon to Nestos
Philippos Rec.
Thraco: from Nestos to Hebros
Abdera Rec.
Ainos Rec.
Maroneia Rec.
Thracian Chersonesos
Kardia Rec.
Sestos Rec.
Propontic Thrace
Byzantion Giv. Rec.
Selymbria Rec.
Pontos: West Coast
Istros Giv. Rec.
Kallatis Giv. Rec.
Mesambria Rec.
Olbia Giv. Rec.
Chersonesos Rec.
Pantikapaion Giv. Rec.
Phanagoria Giv.
Pontic Coast of Asia Minor
Amisos Rec.
Herakleia Giv. Rec.
Sinope Giv. Rec.
Trapezous Rec.
Propontic Coast of Asia Minor
Kalchedon Rec.
Kios Giv. Rec.
Kyzikos Rec.
Lampsakos Rec.
Parion Rec.
Prokonnesos Rec.
Zeleia Giv.
Troas
Abydos Rec.
Gargara Rec.
Hamaxitos Giv.
Ilion Giv.
Rhioiteion Rec.
Sigeion Rec.
Tenedos Rec.
Lesbos
Eresos Rec.
Methymna Rec.
Mytilene Giv. Rec.
Pyrrha Rec.
Aiolis
Adramyttion Rec.
Elia Rec.
Gryneion Giv.
Pergamon Rec.
Pitane Rec.
Ionia
Chios Giv. Rec.
Ephesos Giv. Rec.
Erythrai Giv. Rec.
Klazomenai Rec.
Kolophon Giv.
Lebedos Giv.
Magnesia Giv.
Miletos Rec.
Myous Giv.
Phokaia Rec.
Priene Giv.
Samos Rec.
Teos Giv.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Karia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chalketor</td>
<td>Giv. Rec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Euromos</td>
<td>Rec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Halikarnassos</td>
<td>Rec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iasos</td>
<td>Giv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaunos</td>
<td>Rec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keramos</td>
<td>Giv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knidos</td>
<td>Giv. Rec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Koranza</td>
<td>Rec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mylasa</td>
<td>Rec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pladasa</td>
<td>Giv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syangela/Theangela</td>
<td>Rec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telemessos</td>
<td>Rec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crete</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gortyns</td>
<td>Rec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhaukos</td>
<td>Rec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhithymnos</td>
<td>Rec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rhodos</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ialysos</td>
<td>Rec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lindos</td>
<td>Giv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhodos</td>
<td>Rec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pamphylia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aspendos</td>
<td>Rec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cyprus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salamis</td>
<td>Rec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Egypt</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Naukratis</td>
<td>Rec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Libya</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyrene</td>
<td>Rec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Euhesperides</td>
<td>Giv.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Theorodokoi

**Key**
- Arg. = Heraia at Argos
- Delph. = Pythian Games at Delphoi
- Epid. = Askleпiaia at Epidauros
- Nem. = Nemean Games

**Sikelia**
- Akragas Epid.
- Gela Epid.
- Katane Epid.
- Leontinoi Epid.
- Syrakousai Epid.
- Zankle Epid.

**Italia and Kampania**
- Herakleia Delph.
- Kroton Epid.
- Lokroi Epid.
- Metapontion Epid.
- Rheidion Epid.
- Taras Epid.
- Terina Epid.
- Thourioi Epid.

**The Adriatic**
- Apollonia Arg.

**Epeiros**
- Artichia Epid.
- Kassope Epid.
- Pandosia Epid.
- Phoinike Arg.
- Poionos? Epid.
- Torone? Epid.
- Zmaratha Epid.

**Akarnania**
- Alyzeia Epid., Arg.
- Ambrakia Epid., Arg., Delph.
- Argos Epid., Arg.
- Astakos Epid., Nem.
- Derion Nem.
- Echinos Epid., Nem.

**Euripos** Epid., Nem.
**Hyporeiai** Epid.
**Korkyra** Epid., Arg., Nem., Delph.
**Koronta** Epid.
**Leukas** Epid., Arg., Nem.
**Limnaia** Epid., Nem.
**Medeon** Epid., Arg., Nem.
**Oiniadai** Epid., Nem.
**Palairos** Epid., Arg., Nem.
**Phoitiai** Epid., Nem.
**Stratos** Epid., Nem.
**Thyrreion** Epid., Arg., Nem.
**Torybeia** Epid., Arg.

**Aitolia**
- Akripous Epid.
- Kalydon Epid.
- Phylea Epid.
- Proschion Epid.
- Thermine Epid.

**West Lokris**
- Amphissa Epid.
- Naupaktos Epid.
- Oianthea Epid.

**Phokis**
- Delphoi Epid.

**Boiotia**
- Koroneia Epid.
- Lebadeia Epid., Delph.
- Orchomenos Epid.
- Thebai Epid.
- Thespia Epid.

**Megaris, Korinthia, Sikyonia**
- Korinthos Epid.
- Megara Epid.
- Sikyon Pisa

**Achaia**
- Helike Delph.
- Phara Delph.

**Arkadia**
- Alea Arg.
- Halous Delph.
- Heraia Delph.
- Kleitor Arg.
- Koila Delph.
- Methydrion Delph.
- Pallantion Delph.
- Phara Arg.
- Pheneos Arg., Delph.
- Stymphalos Arg.
- Tegea Delph.

**Attika**
- Athenai Epid., Delph.

**Euboia**
- Eretria Nem.

**The Aegean**
- Andros Arg.
- Seriphos Nem.
- Thasos Epid., Arg.

**Thessalia**
- Atrax Epid.
- Gyrton Epid.
- Larisa Epid.
- Oxyinion Epid.
- Pharkadon Epid.

**Magnesia**
- Homolion Epid.

**Perrhaiibia**
- Pythoion Epid.

**Makedonia**
- Allante Nem.
- Methone Epid.
- Pella Nem.
- Pydna Epid.

**Mygdonia**
- Apollonia Epid.
Arethousa Epid.
Lete Nem.

**Bisaltia**
Amphipolis Epid., Nem.
Argilos Epid.
Trailos Epid.

**Chalkidike**
Aineia Epid.
Akanthos Epid.
Aphytis Epid.
Dikaia Epid.
Kalindoia Epid.
Mende Epid.
Olynthos Epid.
Poteidaia Epid.
Skione Epid.
Stagiros Epid.
Stolos/Skolos Epid.

**Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos**
Berga Epid.

**Thrace: from Nestos to Hebrós**
Datios Epid.
Neapolis Epid.

**Propontic Thrace**
Kios Arg.
Lampsakos Nem.
Miletouteichos Arg.
Myrleia (Bryllion) Arg.

**Troas**
Tenedos Arg.

**Aiolis**
Kyme Arg., Nem.

**Ionia**
Chios Arg., Nem.
Ephesos Arg.
Erythrai Arg.

Klazomenai Arg.
Lebedos Arg.
Magnesia Arg.
Miletos Arg.
Naulochon Arg.
Notion Arg., Nem.
Pygela Arg.
Teos Arg.

Karia Arg.

Cyprus
Kourion Nem.
Salamis Nem.
Soloi Nem.

Libya
Barke Arg.,
Euheesperides Arg.,
Kyrene Arg.
Taucheira Arg.,
# 16. Panhellenic Victors

## Key
- Isthm. = Isthmian Games
- Nem. = Nemean Games
- Ol. = Olympic Games
- Pyth. = Pythian Games

### Sikelia
- Akragas: Ol., Pyth., Isthm.
- Gela: Ol., Pyth.
- Kamarina: Ol.
- Naxos: Ol., Pyth.
- Syrakousai: Ol., Pyth.
- Zankle: Ol.

### Italia and Kampania
- Kroton: Ol., Pyth.
- Lokroi: Ol., Pyth.
- Metapontion: Pyth.
- Poseidonia: Ol.
- Rhegion: Ol.
- Sybaris: Ol.
- Taras: Ol.
- Terina: Ol.
- Thourioi: Ol., Pyth., Nem., Isthm.

### The Adriatic
- Apollonia: Ol.
- Epidamnos: Ol.

### Akarnania
- Ambrakia: Ol.
- Korkyra: Ol.
- Stratos: Ol.

### Phokis
- Delphoi: Ol., Pyth.
- Parapotamioi: Pyth.

### Boiotia
- Orchomenos: Ol.
- Thebai: Ol., Pyth., Nem., Isthm.
- Thespiai: Ol.

### Megaris, Korinthia, Sikyon
- Korinthos: Ol., Pyth., Nem., Isthm.
- Sikyon: Ol., Pyth., Nem., Isthm.

### Achaia
- Aigeira: Ol.
- Aigion: Ol.
- Dyme: Ol.
- Patrai: Ol., Pyth., Nem., Isthm.
- Pellene: Ol., Isthm.

### Elis
- Dyspontion: Ol.
- Lenos: Ol.
- Pisa: Ol.

### Arkadia
- Dipaia: Ol.
- Heraia: Ol.
- Kleitor: Ol.
- Lousoi: Ol., Pyth.
- Mantinea: Ol.
- Methydriion: Ol.
- Orestasion: Ol.
- Pheneos: Ol.
- Phigaleia: Ol., Isthm.
- Stymphalus: Ol., Pyth., Nem., Isthm.

### Lakedaimon
- Sparta: Ol., Pyth., Nem., Isthm.

### Messenia
- Messene: Ol., Nem., Isthm.

### Argolis
- Argos: Ol., Pyth., Nem., Isthm.
- Kleonai: Ol.
- Phleious: Ol.
- Tiryns: Ol.
- Troizen: Ol.

### Saronic Gulf

### Attika
- Athenai: Ol., Pyth., Nem., Isthm.

### Euboia
- Chalkis: Ol., Pyth.
- Eretria: Ol.

### East Lokris
- Opous: Ol., Pyth., Nem., Isthm.

### Thessalia
- Krannon: Ol.
- Larisa: Ol.
- Pelinna(ion): Ol., Pyth.
- Pharsalos: Ol., Pyth., Nem., Isthm.
- Skotoussa: Ol.

### The Aegean
- Andros: Ol.
- Astypalaia: Ol.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kos Meropis</td>
<td>Ol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melos</td>
<td>Ol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peparethos?</td>
<td>Ol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thasos</td>
<td>Ol., Pyth., Nem., Isthm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Makedonia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pella</td>
<td>Pyth., Isthm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thrace: from Nestos to Hebros</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maroneia</td>
<td>Ol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Propontis, North</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byzantion</td>
<td>Ol.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lesbos</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbos</td>
<td>Mytilene Ol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chios</td>
<td>Ol., Isthm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesos</td>
<td>Ol., Pyth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klasomenai</td>
<td>Ol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolophon</td>
<td>Ol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesia</td>
<td>Ol., Pyth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miletos</td>
<td>Ol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samos</td>
<td>Ol., Pyth.(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyrna</td>
<td>Ol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karia</td>
<td>Halikarnassos Ol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodos</td>
<td>Ialysos Ol., Pyth., Nem., Isthm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodos</td>
<td>Ol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barke</td>
<td>Ol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrene</td>
<td>Ol., Pyth., Isthm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spain and France</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporion</td>
<td>Artemis Ephesia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. Major Divinities

Massalia  Artemis Ephesia, Athena
Rhode  Artemis Ephesia

Sikelia
Adranon  Hephaistos
Aitna  Zeus
Akragas  Athena Polias (Lindia?), Zeus Polieus (Atabyrios)
Alaisa  Apollo Archagetas
Gela  Athena (Lindia)
Heloron  Demeter?
Henna  Demeter
Himera  Athena?
Kamarina  Athena Poliaochos
Lipara  Hephaistos?
Naxos  Dionysos
Selinous  Zeus
Syarakousai  Apollo, Artemis, Athena, Zeus (Olympios)

Italia and Kampania
Kaulonia  Apollo Daphnephoros
Kroton  Apollo Pythios
Lokroi  Athena, Persephone
Medma  Athena Promachos?
Neapolis  Demeter
Poseidonia  Poseidon
Rhegion  Apollo
Siris  Athena Illias

The Adriatic
Apollonia  Apollo

Epeiros
Dodona  Zeus Dodonaios
Kassope  Aphrodite
Passaron  Zeus Areios
Phoinike  Athena Polias

Akarnania
Ambrakia  Apollo Soter, Herakles
Anaktorion  Apollo Aktios
Ithaka  Athena Polias
Korkyra  Apollo Korykaios

Aitolia
Kalydon  Artemis Laphria
Molykreion  Poseidon

West Lokris
Naupaktos  Athena Polias, Apollo

Phokis
Abai  Apollo
Ambryssos  Artemis Diktynaia
Antikyra  Athena
Delphi  Apollo Pythios
Elateia  Athena Krania
Erochos  Demeter
Hyampolis  Artemis Elaphebolia
Stiris  Demeter

Boiotia
Akraiphia  Zeus
Alalkomenai  Athena Alalkomeneis
Anhedon  Zeus Karaios and Anthas
Chaironeia  Zeus?
Haliartos  Athena Itonia
Hysiai  Demeter Eleusinia?
Kopai  Demeter Tauropolos?
Koroneia  Athena Itonia
Lebadeia  Zeus Basileus
Orchomenos  Zeus Karaios and Soter
Plataiai  Hera
Tanagra  Hermes Kriophoros and Promachos
Thebai  Demeter Thesmophoros and Dionysos
Thespiai  Apollo Archegetas

Megaris, Korinthia and Sikyonia
Korinthos  Aphrodite, Hera, Poseidon
Megara  Apollo Pythios
Sikyon  Artemis and Apollo

Achaia
Aigeira  Artemis?
Aigion  Zeus Homarios
Helike  Poseidon Helikonios
Pellene  Apollo
Elis
Elis Zeus Olympios

Arkadia
Gortys Asklepios
Kleitor Athena Koria
Lousoi Artemis Hemera
Lykosoura Demeter and Despoina
Mantinea Poseidon Hippos
Megalopolis Athena Polias and Zeus Lykaios
Orchomenos Artemis Mesopolitis
Pheneos Hermes
Phigaleia Dionysos
Psophis Artemis Erykine
Stymphalos Artemis
Tegea Athena Alea

Messenia
Messene Zeus Ithomatas

Lakedaimon
Aphroditia Aphrodite
Sparta Apollo Karneios, Artemis Orthia, Athena (Chalkioikos, Poliachos)
Geronthrai Apollo?
Kythera Aphrodite
Pra siai Apollo?

Argolis
Argos Apollo Lykeios
Epidaurus Asklepios
Hermion Demeter Chthonia
Phleious Ganymeda (Hebe)
Troizen Apollo Thearios?

Saronic Gulf
Aigina Apollo Delphinios
Kalaureia Poseidon Kalauros

Attika
Athenai Athena Poliouchos, Polias

Euboia
Chalkis Zeus Olympios, Athena
Eretria Apollo Daphnophoros
Histiaia/Oreos Artemis Prosseos?
Karystos Dionysos?

East Lokris
Halai Athena Poliouchos
Larymna Dionysos?

Thessalia
Argoussa Athena Polias?
Krannon Athena, Asklepios, Apollo
Metropolis Aphrodite
Pagasai Apollo Pagasaios
Pharsalos Zeus Olympios or Soter
Pherai En(n)odia
Trikka Asklepios

Malis
Herakleia Herakle
Lamia Dionysos

Achaia
Halos Artemis Panachaia
Thebai Athena Polias?

Magnesia
Iolkos Artemis

Perrhaibia
Gonnos Athena Polias
Mondaia Themis
Pythoion Apollo Pythios

The Aegean
(Amorgos)
Aigiale Athena Polias
Arkesine Hera?
Minoa Apollo Pythios
Anaphe Apollo Asgelatas
Andros Apollo Pythios
Brykous Poseidon Porthmios?
Chalke Apollo?
Delos Apollo
(Ikaros)
Oine Artemis Tauropolos
Therma Asklepios?
Imbros. Athena Polias
Kalymna Apollo
(Keos) Athena Polias and Zeus Polieus
Ioulis Apollo Pythios
Karkhia Apollo Pythios
Koros Apollo Smintheus?
(Leinno) Hepsaistos
Myrina Artemis Selene
Naxos Dionysos
Nisyros Poseidon
Paros Athena Poliouchos
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Samothrake Athina
Sikinos Apollo Pythios?
Syme Athina?
Syros Kabeiroi
Telos Athena Polias and Zeus Polieus
Tenos Poseidon and Amphitrite
Thasos Artemis Hekate, Apollo Pythios, Athena Poliouchos, Herakles
Thera Athena Polias

Makedonia
Aigeai Zeus, Herakles Patroos
Beroia Herakles Kynagidas
Dion Zeus Olympios
Kyrrhos Athena Kyrrethestis
Mieza Asklepios?
Pella Athena Alkidemos

Bisaltia
Amphipolis Apollo

Chalkidike
Aphytis Zeus Ammon
Mende Dionysos?
Poteidaia Poseidon
Torone Athene?

Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos
Galepsos Demeter?
Neapolis (Athena) Parthenos
Oisyme Athena Polias

Thrace: from Nestos to Hebrôs
Abdera Dionysos, Apollo
Ainos Hermes Perheraios
Maroneia Dionysos
Zone Apollo

Thracian Chersonesos
Byzantion Apollo
Perinthos Hera
Selymbria Apollo (Pythios)

Pontos
Istrai Zeus Polieus, Apollo Ietros
Kallatis Zeus Polieus, Athena Polias
Mesambria Zeus Hyperdexios, Athena Soteira
Odessos Apollo
Olbia Apollo Delphinios
Tyras Apollo Ietros
Chersonesos Zeus, Ge, Helios, Parthenos
Gorgippia Aphrodite, Herakles, Demeter
Hermonassa Apollo Ietros
Karkinits Aphrodite
Myrmekeion Apollo Ietros
Pantikaiaon Apollo
Phanagoria Aphrodite
Theodosia Aphrodite, Demeter
Dioskouris Dioskouroi?
Phasis Apollo Hegemon
Sinope Apollo Ietros and Delphinios

Propontic Coast of Asia Minor
Kalchedon Apollo Pythios or Chresterios
Kios Apollo
Kyzikos Apollo
Lampsakos Priapos
Parion Apollo Aktaios
Priapos Priapos
Prokonnesos Apollo

Troas
Antandros Artemis Astyrene, Apollo
Assos Athena Polias
Astyra Artemis Astyrene
Hamaxitos Apollo Smintheus
Ilion Athena Ilias
Kolonai Apollo Kallaios
Neandreia Apollo?
Skepsis Athena Polias?
Tenedos Apollo Smintheus

Aiolis
Gryneion Apollo Gynaieus

Ionia
Chios Athena Poliouchos
Ephesos Artemis
Erythrai Athena Polias
Klazomenai Athena Polias
Kolophon Athena Polias
Leukophrys Artemis
Magnesia Artemis Leukophryene
Priene Athena
Samos Hera

Karia
Amyzon Artemis?
Halikarnassos Ares
Iasos Apollo
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Divinity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knidos</td>
<td>Aphrodite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mylasa</td>
<td>Zeus at Labraunda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telemessos</td>
<td>Apollo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tralleis</td>
<td>Zeus Larasios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apellonia</td>
<td>Apollo (Dekataphoros?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptara</td>
<td>Artemis Aptara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axos</td>
<td>Apollo Axios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biannos</td>
<td>Ares?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreros</td>
<td>Apollo Delphinios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleutheria</td>
<td>Zeus Polioachos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gortys</td>
<td>Athena Poliouchos, Apollo Pythios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierapytna</td>
<td>Athena Polias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istron</td>
<td>Athena Polias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lato</td>
<td>Eleuthyia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebena</td>
<td>Asklepios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisos</td>
<td>Diktynna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyktos</td>
<td>Athena Polias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malla</td>
<td>Zeus Monnittios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olous</td>
<td>Zeus Tallaios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phalasarna</td>
<td>Artemis Diktynna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priansos</td>
<td>Athena Polias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrha</td>
<td>Apollo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ialysos</td>
<td>Athena Polias and Zeus Polieus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamiros</td>
<td>Athena Polias and Zeus Polieus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindos</td>
<td>Athena Lindia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodos</td>
<td>Helios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamphylia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perge</td>
<td>Artemis Pergaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side</td>
<td>Athena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilikia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aphrodias</td>
<td>Aphrodite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallos</td>
<td>Amphilochos?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amathous</td>
<td>Aphrodite Kypría</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idalion</td>
<td>Aphrodite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kourion</td>
<td>Apollo Hylates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paphos</td>
<td>Aphrodite Wanassa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salamis</td>
<td>Zeus Salaminios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naukratis</td>
<td>Apollo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrene</td>
<td>Apollo Karneios</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 18. Members of the Delian League

**Key**

A, [A], B, C = *polis* status  
Ass. = attested in assessment decrees only  
Top. = recorded by toponym  
Eth. = recorded by ethnic  
Eth./Top. = recorded both by toponym and ethnic

**Members recorded by, probably, city-ethnic and/or toponym**

### Lakonia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kythera</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td>(not in the tribute lists)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Saronic Gulf

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aigina</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belbina</td>
<td>Ass. Top. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Euboia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athenai Diades</td>
<td>Eth./Top. [A]B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalkis</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diakrioi</td>
<td>Eth. C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diakres apo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalkideon</td>
<td>Eth. C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion</td>
<td>Eth. [A]B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eretria</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grynychai</td>
<td>Eth. B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histiaia</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karystos</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posideion Ass. Top. C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styra</td>
<td>Eth. [A]B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Aegean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amorgos</td>
<td>Eth. AAA (island, 3 poleis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaphe</td>
<td>Eth. B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andros</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkesseia</td>
<td>Top. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astypaleia</td>
<td>Eth. B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brykous</td>
<td>Eth./Top. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalke</td>
<td>Eth. B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delos</td>
<td>Eth. A (not in the tribute lists)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eteokarpathioi</td>
<td>Eth. [A]B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hephaistia</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikos</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imbros</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ios</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalymna</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karpathos</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasos</td>
<td>Eth. [A]C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keos</td>
<td>Eth. AAA (island, 4 poleis, Koresia)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keria</td>
<td>Ass. Top. C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Koresia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kos</td>
<td>Eth. ACC (island, 3 poleis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kythnos</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leros</td>
<td>Top. C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melos</td>
<td>Ass. Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mykonos</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrina</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naxos</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisyros</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oine</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paros</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peparethos</td>
<td>Eth. AAA (island, 3 poleis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pholegandros</td>
<td>Eth./Top. B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhenai</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samothrake</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saros</td>
<td>Eth. B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriphos</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikinos</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siphnos</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skiathos</td>
<td>Eth.? AA (not in the tribute lists)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyros</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syme</td>
<td>Eth./Top. [A]C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syros</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenos</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thasos</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thera</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Members of the Delian League
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Eth.</th>
<th>Top.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thermai</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makedonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleion</td>
<td>Ass.</td>
<td>Top.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methone</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mygdonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bormiskos</td>
<td>Ass.</td>
<td>Top.</td>
<td>C:?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisaltia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argilos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailos</td>
<td>Ass.</td>
<td>Top.</td>
<td>B:α</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalkidike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aige</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>[A]B:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aineia</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aioleion</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akanthos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akrothooi</td>
<td>Ass.</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:β</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aphytis</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assera</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chedrolioi</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>[A]C:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dikaia</td>
<td>Eth./Top.</td>
<td>[A]B:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:β</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gale(psos)</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gigonos</td>
<td>Top.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haisa</td>
<td>Top.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamakai</td>
<td>Top.</td>
<td>[A]B:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kithas</td>
<td>Top.</td>
<td>[A]C:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kleonai</td>
<td>Top.</td>
<td>A:β</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mekyberna</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mende</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milkoros</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>[A]C:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neapolis</td>
<td>Eth./Top.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oloffyos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:β</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olynythos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othoros</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>[A]C:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharbelos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>[A]B:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phegontioi</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>B:?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piloros</td>
<td>Top.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pistasos (Istasos)</td>
<td>Top.</td>
<td>[A]C:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleume</td>
<td>Eth./Top.</td>
<td>[A]C:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polichnitis</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>C:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posideion</td>
<td>Ass.</td>
<td>Top.</td>
<td>C:?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poteidaia</td>
<td>Eth./Top.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prassilos</td>
<td>Top.</td>
<td>B:?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sane Pallene</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td>(on Pallene or Athos?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarte</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serme</td>
<td>Eth./Top.</td>
<td>C:?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermymlia</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinos</td>
<td>Top.</td>
<td>[A]C:?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skabala</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>B:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skapsaioi</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>B:?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skione</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smila</td>
<td>Top.</td>
<td>A:?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spartolos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stagiros</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolos/Skolos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strepsa</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>B:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therambos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thestoros</td>
<td>Ass.</td>
<td>Top.</td>
<td>C:?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thyssos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:β</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinde</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>[A]C:?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torone</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripoiai</td>
<td>Top.</td>
<td>[A]B:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zereia</td>
<td>Ass.</td>
<td>Top.</td>
<td>C:?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrace, unlocated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aison</td>
<td>Eth./Top.</td>
<td>[A]C:?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kossaia</td>
<td>Ass.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>C:?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berga</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>B:β</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galepsos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>[A]B:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neapolis</td>
<td>Eth./Top.</td>
<td>[A]B:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrace: from Nestos to Hebros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdera</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ainos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dikaia</td>
<td>Top.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drys</td>
<td>Ass.</td>
<td>Top.</td>
<td>B:?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maroneia</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale</td>
<td>Ass.</td>
<td>Top.</td>
<td>A:?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone</td>
<td>Ass.</td>
<td>Top.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thracian Chersonesos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alopekennesos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>[A]B:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chersonesitai ap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agoras</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deris</td>
<td>Ass.</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>B:α</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaiious</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>[A]B:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limnai</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>[A]B:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madytos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sestos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propontic Thrace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisanthe</td>
<td>Ass.</td>
<td>Top.</td>
<td>B:β</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byzantion</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daminon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teichos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>B:α?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neapolis ap'</td>
<td>Athenon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perinthos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selymbria</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serrion Teichos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrodisa</td>
<td>Eth./Top.</td>
<td>B:?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontos: West Coast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonia</td>
<td>Ass. Top.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallatis</td>
<td>Ass.?</td>
<td>[A]:β:α</td>
<td>(suppl. Avram)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesambria</td>
<td>Ass.?</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td>(suppl. Avram)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikonion</td>
<td>Ass. Top.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orgame</td>
<td>Ass.?</td>
<td>C:α</td>
<td>(suppl. Avram)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomis</td>
<td>Ass.?</td>
<td>C:α</td>
<td>(suppl. Avram)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiras</td>
<td>Ass. Top.</td>
<td>B:β?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontos: Skythia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimmerikon</td>
<td>Ass.?</td>
<td>C:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nymphaion</td>
<td>Ass. Top.</td>
<td>[A]:β:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontic Asia Minor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleia</td>
<td>Ass. Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerasous</td>
<td>Ass.?</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propontic Coast of Asia Minor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artaioi</td>
<td>Teichos Ass.</td>
<td>Eth./Top.</td>
<td>C:β</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artake</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astakos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>B:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bysbikos</td>
<td>Eth./Top.</td>
<td>B:?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dareion</td>
<td>Ass. Top.</td>
<td>B:?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daskyleion</td>
<td>Eth./Top.</td>
<td>B:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didymon Teichos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>B:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harpagion</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>B:α?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalchedon</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallipolis</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kios</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolonai</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>B:?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyzikos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampsakos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolis</td>
<td>Ass. Top.</td>
<td>B:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miletouictechos Ass.</td>
<td>Top.</td>
<td>B:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrelia (Bryllyon)</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>[A]:β:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olenoi</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>C:?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paisos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parion</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priapos</td>
<td>Eth./Top.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prokonnesos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pythopolis</td>
<td>Ass. Eth.</td>
<td>B:?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sombia</td>
<td>Top.</td>
<td>B:?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tereia</td>
<td>Ass. Top.</td>
<td>C:?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeleia</td>
<td>Top.</td>
<td>A:?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abydos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achilleion</td>
<td>Ass. Top.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antandros</td>
<td>Ass. Top.</td>
<td>A:β</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arisbe</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>B:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>B:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astyra</td>
<td>Eth./Top.</td>
<td>[A]:β:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astyra Troika</td>
<td>Ass. Top.</td>
<td>C:?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azeia</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>C:β?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birytis</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>B:?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dardanos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gargara</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:β</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentinos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>B:?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamaxitos</td>
<td>Ass. Top.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilion</td>
<td>Ass. Top.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kebren</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolonai</td>
<td>Ass.?</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td>(heavily restored)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamponeia</td>
<td>Eth./Top.</td>
<td>B:?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larisa</td>
<td>Ass. Top.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neandria</td>
<td>Eth./Top.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ophryneion</td>
<td>Ass.?</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td>(heavily restored)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaiorkote</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>C:?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkote</td>
<td>Eth./Top.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polichna</td>
<td>Ass.? Eth.</td>
<td>C:?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhoiteion</td>
<td>Ass. Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigeion</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skepsis</td>
<td>Ass. Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenedos</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A:α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbos</td>
<td>Lesbos</td>
<td>AAAA:α</td>
<td>(not in the tribute lists)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(island, 5 poleds)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiolis</td>
<td>Elaia Eth./Top.</td>
<td>[A]:B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gryneion</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karene</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(Kraters fr. 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyme</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larisa</td>
<td>Ass. Eth./Top.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrina</td>
<td>Eth./Top.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitane</td>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pordoselene</td>
<td>Ass. Top.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ionia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airai</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td>Hydaeis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boutheia</td>
<td>Eth./Top. B</td>
<td>Hydisos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chios</td>
<td>A (not in the tribute lists)</td>
<td>Hymisseis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iasos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dios Hieron</td>
<td>Eth. B</td>
<td>Idrias As.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaiosioi</td>
<td>Eth. B</td>
<td>Idyma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesos</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td>Kalynda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erythrai</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td>Karbasyanda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isinda</td>
<td>Eth. C</td>
<td>Karyanda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klazomenai</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td>Kasolaba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolophon</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td>Kaunos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebedos</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td>Kedreai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leros</td>
<td>Top. (not in the inventory, see 1083)</td>
<td>Killareis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kindye Eth./Top. B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathesion</td>
<td>Eth. C</td>
<td>Knidos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miletos</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td>Kodapeis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myous</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td>Krya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notion</td>
<td>Eth./Top. A</td>
<td>Kyllandos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phokaia</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td>Kyrbissos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polichnitai</td>
<td>Eth. B</td>
<td>Latmos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priene</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td>Lepsimandos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pteleon</td>
<td>Eth. B</td>
<td>Medmasa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pygela</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td>Mylasa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samos</td>
<td>A (not in the tribute lists)</td>
<td>Myndos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Narisbareis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidousa</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td>Naxia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teichiousa</td>
<td>Top. (not in the inventory, see 1085)</td>
<td>Olaieis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Olymos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teos</td>
<td>Eth. A</td>
<td>Ouranion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parpariotai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Passanda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Karia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alinda</td>
<td>? B:γ</td>
<td>Peleiatai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>Eth. [A]C:β</td>
<td>Pidasa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amynandeis</td>
<td>Eth. C:β</td>
<td>Pladasa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amyzon</td>
<td>Eth. B:β</td>
<td>Polichnaioi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlissos</td>
<td>Eth./Top. B:γ</td>
<td>(not in the inventory)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aulai</td>
<td>Eth. C:?</td>
<td>Pynros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargasa</td>
<td>Eth. C:γ</td>
<td>Siloi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargylia</td>
<td>Eth. B:β</td>
<td>Syangela/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolbai</td>
<td>Eth. C:?</td>
<td>Theangela</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalketor</td>
<td>Eth. A:β</td>
<td>Taramptos Ass.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chersonesos</td>
<td>Eth. B:α</td>
<td>Tarbaneis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chios</td>
<td>Eth. C:β</td>
<td>Telandros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erineis</td>
<td>Eth. C:?</td>
<td>Termera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euromos</td>
<td>Eth. B:β</td>
<td>Thasthareis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halikarnassos</td>
<td>Eth. A:β</td>
<td>Thydonos ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybliseis</td>
<td>Eth. [A]B:γ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Members recorded by name of ruler

Pakyes Idymeis—Πακτύς Ἱδυμές (IG I 260.1.16; cf. 262.40)

Pikres Syangeleus—Πίκρες Συαγγελεύς (IG I 259.v.16; Συαγγελεύς ὄνομα ἄρχει Πίτρες (IG I 284.7–8; cf. 263.1.14–15; 280.1.66–67; 282.4.48–49)

Sa[---] Killareus—[Κ]ιλλαρεύς ὄνομα ἄρχει (IG I 261.1.16; [Σαμβακτύς] ὄνομα (IG I 259.1.27)

Tymnes—Κάρας ὄνομα Τύμνες ἄρχει (IG I 261.1.113–14; 267.1.25; 270.v.10 (completely restored); 271.1.84; 272.1.79)

Unconvincingly restored toponyms and ethnics

Dandake—Δανδάκε (IG I 71.1.170) ATL i. 478–79

Haloniesoi—[Η]αλώνεισοι (IG I 71.1.101) ATL i. 468

Karkinitis—Καρκινιτίς (IG I 71.1.165) ATL i. 496–97.

Avram suggests Kallatis

Karoussa—Κάρουσσα (IG I 71.1.129) ATL i. 497

Karyes para Idyma—Κάρυς παρα Πίτρες (IG I 71.1.94–5) ATL i. 498–99

Kolone—Κόλων (IG I 71.1.135) ATL i. 505

Kroseis—Κροσής (IG I 71.1.116) ATL i. 506–7

Krousis—Κρούσης (IG I 77.v.41–42) ATL i. 539–41

Kythera—Κυθήρα (IG I 287.1.23) ATL i. 507

Mylai—Μυλαί (IG I 71.1.137) ATL i. 520–21

Neapolis—Νεοπόλις (IG I 70.1.70 Δεν Λευκοί) Ἀκροπολίς (IG I 259.1.18–20)

Nipsa—Νηπίσα (IG I 71.1.143) ATL i. 526–27

Palamedeion—Παλαμέδειον (IG I 71.1.136) ATL i. 531

Patriaeus—Πατριάς (IG I 71.1.168) ATL i. 532

Pergameotichaitai—Περγάμεοι (IG I 71.1.64) ATL i. 533–34

Petra—Πέτρα (IG I 71.1.133, completely restored at IG I 77.v.19) ATL i. 555

Pieres para Pergamon—Πιρές παρα Πέργαμον (IG I 71.1.64–62) ATL i. 538

Tamyrake—Ταμύρακε (IG I 71.1.164) ATL i. 553

Thymbra—Θημβρα (IG I 71.1.134) ATL i. 491.

Members recorded by regional ethnic

Bottaios—Βοτταῖοι (IG I 266.11.19)

Kares—Κάραις ὄνομα Τύμνες ἄρχει (IG I 71.1.113; 267.1.25; 270.v.10; 272.1.79)

Lykioi—Λυκιοί (IG I 261.1.30; 262.v.33; 266.11.34) ATL i. 513–14

Members recorded by, probably, regional ethnic

Maiandrion—Μαίανδριον (IG I 71.1.133; 259.1.29; 261.1.5; 267.v.19)
### 19. Stasis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spain and France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massalia</td>
<td>C6–C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikelia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adranon</td>
<td>340s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akragas</td>
<td>c.570, 554, 488, 471, 4505, 413, 394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>C7–C6, 505, 498, 491, 406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henna</td>
<td>C4f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himera</td>
<td>C5e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamarina</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontinoi</td>
<td>C6, 424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megara</td>
<td>C8s, C6, c.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakone</td>
<td>C4l–C3e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naxos</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrakousai</td>
<td>C7m–340, 19 out-breaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zankle</td>
<td>424–2, 415, 399, 394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italia and Kampania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kroton</td>
<td>510, C5e, C5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyme</td>
<td>504, 490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokroi</td>
<td>C7e, 346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metapontion</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neapolis</td>
<td>C4?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pithekoussai</td>
<td>C7?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhegion</td>
<td>461, 425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sybaris</td>
<td>c.700, 511–510, 445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thourioi</td>
<td>434, c.414, 413, C4?, 410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Adriatic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonia</td>
<td>C6?, C5–C4?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidamnos</td>
<td>C5s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akarnania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambrakia</td>
<td>C6e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaktorion</td>
<td>432, 425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos</td>
<td>440–38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korkyra</td>
<td>420s, 411/10, 375/4, 361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koronta</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratos</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zakynthos</td>
<td>c.390?, 375/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lokris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphissia</td>
<td>340–38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phokis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphi</td>
<td>C4f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boiotia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaironeia</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchomenos</td>
<td>424, 364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oropos</td>
<td>412/11, 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plataiai</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siphaei</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thebai</td>
<td>C4e, 382–79, 364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thespiai</td>
<td>414, 378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megaris, Korinthia, Sikyonia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korinthos</td>
<td>C7s, 582, 395–87, 375, 366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megara</td>
<td>C6, 427–24, 375, 343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikyon</td>
<td>C6m, 417, 375, 367–66, c.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achaia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pellene</td>
<td>366–65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elis</td>
<td>471, c.400, 365, 343, 336–35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkadia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantinea</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phigaleia</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegea</td>
<td>418, 370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kythera</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>C8l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argolis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos</td>
<td>417, 370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phleious</td>
<td>395, 381–79, 374, 367/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troizen</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saronic Gulf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigina</td>
<td>480s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenai</td>
<td>630s, C7l–C6e, 560s, 550s, 540s, 510, 508/7, 411, 404/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euboia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalkis</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eretria</td>
<td>413–11, 357, 348, 342, 341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histiaia/Oreos</td>
<td>C5f, 357, 342, 341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karystos</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thessalia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larisa</td>
<td>C5l, 370/69, c.344/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharkadon</td>
<td>320s or earlier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharsalos</td>
<td>C4e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trilkia</td>
<td>320s or earlier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harakleia</td>
<td>399, 395, 371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Aegean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delos</td>
<td>330s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ioulis</td>
<td>360s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kos</td>
<td>366/3?, C4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melos</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naxos</td>
<td>C6s, C500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paros</td>
<td>410/9, 393, 373/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siphnos</td>
<td>C4e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syros</td>
<td>C4f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thasos</td>
<td>411, 410, 410/9, 407, 405/10, 389/8, 385, 340/39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thera</td>
<td>370s?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makedonia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pydna</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisaltia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphipolis</td>
<td>424, 363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalkidike</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akanthos</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eion</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mekyberna</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mende</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Olynthos 349
Poteidaia 423
Spartolos 429
Torone 423, 349

_Thrace: from Nestos to Hebrós_
Ainos 340

_Propontic Thrace_
Byzantion C6, 409/8, 403–399, 390/89
Selymbria 410, 408

_Pontos: West Coast_
Apollonia C6, C5–C4?
Istros C58

_Pontic Coast of Asia Minor_
Herakleia C6l, C5l, C4

_Propontic Coast of Asia Minor_
Kyzikos C5f?
Zeleia 334

_Troas_
Abydos C360
Antandros 424

_Lesbos_
Antissa 428/7, 412, 390/89
Eresos 428/7, 412–11, 390/89
Methymna 428/7, 412–11, 406, 390/89, 332
Mytilene C7, C7s, C7l–C6e, C5e, 428/7, 412, 389, 350s, 346, 333–332
Pyrrha 428/7, 412, 390/89

_Aiolis_
Karene Archaic
Kyme C5 or C4

_Ionia_
Anaia 428/7
Chios 480, 412, 409, 398, C4m, 330s
Ephesos 492, 334
Erythrai C5m, C387, 330s
Klazomenai 412–7, C387/6, C4f
Kolophon C700, 430, 427
Miletos C6, 452, 405, 402
Phokaia C4m
Samos 441–39, 412–11, 405

_Karia_
Halikarnassos C5m
Iasos C4f
Knidos C4?
Myndos 334

_Crete_
Knosos C5e

_Rhodos_
Ialysos 411
Kamiros 411
Lindos 411
Rhodos 395, 391–90, 380s, 355, 351

_Kilikia_
Mallos 333

_Cyprus_
Salamis 499

_Libya_
Kyrene C6m, C5m, C325
20. Destruction and Disappearance of Poleis

Key
Andrap. = Andrapodismos
Destr. = Destruction of urban centre
Dioik. = Dioikismos
Exp. = Expulsion of population

Sikelia
Akragas Destr. 406
Gela Destr. 405
Euboia Andrap. 480s
Herakleia Destr. C5e
Himera Destr. C6e; Destr., Andrap. 409
Kamarina Destr., Exp. 484
Katane Destr., Andrap. 403
Megara Destr., Andrap. c.483
Morgantina Destr. 459/8
Naxos Destr., Andrap. 403
Selinous Destr., Andrap. 409
Zankle Andrap. 488/7

Italia and Kampania
Hipponion Destr., Exp. 388
Kaulonia Destr., Exp. 389
Kyme Andrap. 421
Rhegion Andrap., Destr. 387
Siris Destr. C6m
Sybaris Destr., population killed off, 510

Akarnania
Argos Amphil. Andrap. c.440

Phokis
Abai Destr. 480,
Aiolidai Destr. 480,
Ambyssos Dioik. 346
Amphikaia Destr. 480, Dioik. 346
Antikyra Dioik. 346
Charadra Destr. 480, Dioik. 346
Daulis Destr. 480, Dioik. 346
Drymos Destr. 480, Dioik. 346
Echedameia Dioik. 346
Elateia Destr. 480, Dioik. 346
Erochos Destr. 480, Dioik. 346
Hyampolis Destr. 480, Dioik. 346

Kirrha Destr., Andrap. C6e (ghost polis)
Ledon Dioik. 346
Lilaia Dioik. 346
Medeon Dioik. 346
Neon/Tithorea Destr. 480, Dioik. 346
Parapotamoi Destr. 480, Dioik. 346
Pedieis Destr. 480
Phanoteus Destr. 480, Dioik. 346
Phlygonion Dioik. 346
Poi Dioik. 346
Siris Dioik. 346
Teithronion Destr. 480, Dioik. 346
Trachis Dioik. 346
Triteis Destr. 480
Troneia Dioik. 346

Boiotia
Chaironeia Andrap. 446
Chorsiai Destr., Andrap. 346?
Koroneia Andrap. 346
Orchomenos Destr., Andrap. 364; Andrap. 346
Plataiai Destr. 480; Andrap. 427; Destr. 426; Destr., Exp. 373
Thebai Andrap., Destr. 335
Thespiai Destr. 480

Achaia
Pellene Destr., Andrap. C6e

Elis
Dyspontion Destr. c.570
Pylos Destr. 360s

Arkadia
Mantinea Destr., Dioik. 385
Tegea planned Andrap. C6f
Trapezous Exp. 368

Lakedaimon
Thyrea Destr., Andrap. 424

Argolis
Mykenai Destr., Andrap. c.460
Orneai Destr., Exp. c.416/15
Tiryns Destr., Exp. c.460
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saronic Gulf</td>
<td>Aigina</td>
<td>Exp. 431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attika</td>
<td>Athenai</td>
<td>Destr. 480, 479; planned <em>Andrap.</em> 404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euboea</td>
<td>Eretria</td>
<td><em>Andrap.</em>, Destr. 490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Histiaia/Oreos</td>
<td>Exp. 446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lokris</td>
<td>Naryka</td>
<td>Destr. 352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nikaia</td>
<td>Destr. 353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thronion</td>
<td><em>Andrap.</em> 353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thessalia</td>
<td>Pharsalos</td>
<td><em>Andrap.</em> 395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skotooussa</td>
<td>Citizens killed off, 367/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malis</td>
<td>Herakleia</td>
<td>Exp. 395, 371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achaia Phthiotis</td>
<td>Halos</td>
<td>Exp. C4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesia</td>
<td>Meliboia</td>
<td>Citizens killed off, 367/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Aegean</td>
<td>Delos</td>
<td>Exp. 422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lemnos</td>
<td><em>Andrap.</em> C6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melos</td>
<td>Destr., <em>Andrap.</em> 416/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Naxos</td>
<td>Destr., <em>Andrap.</em> 490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skyros</td>
<td><em>Andrap.</em> 476/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenos</td>
<td>Destr., <em>Andrap.</em> 362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makedonia</td>
<td>Methone</td>
<td>Destr., Exp. 354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalkidike</td>
<td>Galepsos</td>
<td>Destr. 432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mekyberna</td>
<td>Destr. 432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olynthos</td>
<td>Destr., population killed off, 479; Destr., <em>Andrap.</em> 348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poteidaia</td>
<td>Exp. 429; <em>Andrap.</em> 356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sermyma</td>
<td>Destr. 348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singos</td>
<td>Destr. 432, 348?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skione</td>
<td><em>Andrap.</em> 421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stagirgos</td>
<td>Destr. 348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Torone</td>
<td><em>Andrap.</em> 422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos</td>
<td>Apollonia</td>
<td>Destr. C4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eion</td>
<td><em>Andrap.</em> 476/5; Destr. C4f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Galepsos</td>
<td>Destr. C4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phagres</td>
<td>Destr. C5f, C4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrace: from Nestos to Hebros</td>
<td>Stryme</td>
<td>Destr. C4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sestos</td>
<td><em>Andrap.</em> 353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thracian Chersonesos</td>
<td>Tyrodiia</td>
<td><em>Andrap.</em> 341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontos: West Coast</td>
<td>Nikonion</td>
<td>Destr. 331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontos: Skythia</td>
<td>Nymphaion</td>
<td>Destr. C4e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propontic Coast of Asia Minor</td>
<td>Artakia</td>
<td>Destr. 493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kalchedon</td>
<td>Destr. C6l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prokonnessos</td>
<td>Destr. 493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troas</td>
<td>Abydos</td>
<td>Destr. C6l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sigeion</td>
<td>Destr. C4s or later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbos</td>
<td>Arisba</td>
<td><em>Andrap.</em> C6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mytilene</td>
<td>planned <em>Andrap.</em> 427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiolis</td>
<td>Gryneion</td>
<td><em>Andrap.</em> 335/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionia</td>
<td>Kolophon</td>
<td>Destr. c.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magnesia</td>
<td>Destr. C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miletos</td>
<td>Destr., <em>Andrap.</em> 494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phokaia</td>
<td>Destr. 546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priene</td>
<td><em>Andrap.</em> 546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samos</td>
<td>Population killed off, c.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smyrna</td>
<td>Exp. C7e; Destr., <em>Dioik.</em> c.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karia</td>
<td>Halikarnassos</td>
<td>Destr. 334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iasos</td>
<td><em>Andrap.</em>, Destr. 412; <em>Andrap.</em>, Destr. 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kedreai</td>
<td><em>Andrap.</em> 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crete</td>
<td>Lyktos</td>
<td>Exp. C4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Idalion</td>
<td>Destr. C4l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>Barke</td>
<td><em>Andrap.</em> c.514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 21. Synoikismos

### Key
- **syn.** X created by synoecism
- **persists:** partial synoecism, X persists after the synoecism disappears
- **disappears:** full synoecism, X disappears in consequence of the synoecism
- **reappears:** X disappears but is refounded later with Y population of X moved to Y
- **reinf.:** X reinforced by population from pol. (poleis) or vil. (villages)

### Sikelia
- Sikelia with Syrakousai: 339 (persists)
- Euboia with Syrakousai: 480s (disappears)
- Gela with Syrakousai: 485 (persists)
- Kamarina with Syrakousai: 484 (reappears c. 461)
- Katane with Syrakousai: 476 (reappears 461)
- Kentoripa with Syrakousai: 339 (reappears)
- Leontinoi with Syrakousai: 422 (reappears 405), 403 (reappears 396), 399 (reappears 339/8)
- Megara with Syrakousai: 483 (disappears)
- Messana reinf. 396 (pol. Lokroi, Medma)
- Naxos with Leontinoi: 476 (reappears 461)
- Syrakousai reinf. 480s, 424, 403, 396, 389, 388, 340s (pol.)

### Italia and Kampania
- Hipponion with Syrakousai: 388 (reappears 379)
- Kaulonia with Syrakousai: 389 (reappears c. 357)
- Lokroi with Messana: 396 (1,000, persists)
- Medma with Messana: 396 (4,000, persists)

### Epeiros
- Kassopa syn. C4m (vil.)

### Akarnania
- Argos Amph. with Syrakousai: 388 (reappears 379)
- Amprakia with Argos Amph.: C5m (Amprakiot citizens)

### Boiotia
- Erythrai with Thebes: 431 (reappears C4)
- Eteonos/Skaphai with Thebes: 431 (reappears C4)
- Skolos with Thebes: 431 (reappears C4)
- Potniai with Thebes: 431 (disappears)
- Tanagra syn. C2? (vil.)

### Thebai
- reinf. 431 (pol. Erythrai, Eteonos, Skolos, Potniai)

### Megaris, Korinthia, Sikyonia
- Megara syn. C8? (vil.)

### Achaia
- Aigai with Aigeira: C4f? (disappears)
- Aigeira syn. C6–C5f (vil.); reinf. C4f? (pol. Aigai)
- Aigion syn. C5f? (vil.)
- Patrai syn. C6–C5e? (vil.)
- Pellene syn. C6? (vil.)

### Elis
- Agriades with Elis: 471? (disappears?)
- Elis reinf. 471 (pol. Agriades?)

### Triphylia
- Lepreon reinf. C5m (vil.)

### Messenia
- Messene syn. 370/69 (vil.)

### Arkadia
- Alipheira with Megalopolis: 371–68? (persists)
- Asea with Megalopolis: 371–68? (persists)
- Dipaia with Megalopolis: 371–68? (persists)
- Euaimon with Orchomenos: C4m (persists)
- Eutaia with Megalopolis: 371–68? (persists)
- Gortys with Megalopolis: 371–68? (persists)
- Heraia syn. or reinf. C6–C5? (vil. or pol.)
- Lykosoura with Megalopolis: 371 (not implemented)
- Mantinea syn. or reinf. C6–C5? (vil. or pol.), syn. 370 (vil.)
- Megalopolis syn. 371–68 (vil. and pol.)
- Methydron with Megalopolis: 371–68? (persists)
- Orchomenos reinf. C4m (Euaimon)
- Oresthasion with Megalopolis: 371–68? (persists)
Pallantion with Megalopolis 371–68? (not implemented)

Tegea syn. or reinf. C6–C7? (vil. or pol.)

Teuthis with Megalopolis 371–68? (persists)

Thisoa with Megalopolis 371–68? (persists)

Trapezous with Megalopolis 371–68 (not implemented)

Argolis

Argos reinf. C5f (vil. Hysiai), c.460 (pol.

Orneai with Argos 416 (reappears in C4f)

Tiryns with Argos c.460 (disappears)

Attika

Eleusis syn. 403 (Eleusinians and Athenian oligarchs)

Euboia

Hystiaia/Oreos syn. 440s (pol. and vil.); reinf. 342/1 (vil. Ellopieis)

Thessalia

Metropolis syn. before 358 (vil.)

Achaia Phthiotis

Phylake with Thebai C4s (disappears)

Pyrasos with Thebai C4s (persists)

Thebai reinf. C4s (pol. Phylake, Pyrasos)

Magnesia

Amyros with Kasthanaie? c.400

Kasthanaie reinf. c.400? (pol. Amyros?)

The Aegean

Astypalaiia with Kos 366/5 (persists)

Halasarna with Kos 366/5 (persists)

Kos Meropis with Kos 366/5 (persists)

Kos syn. 366/5 (pol. Astypalaiai, Halasarna, Kos Meropis)

Mygdonia

Arethousa reinf.? C5f? (pol. Bormiskos)

Bormiskos with Arethousa? C5f? (disappears)

Chalkidike

Galepsos with Olynthos 432 (disappears?)

Mekyberna with Olynthos 432 (reappears in 421)

Olynthos reinf. 431 (pol. Galepsos, Mekyberna,

Singos; reinf. 370s (pol.?)

Singos with Olynthos 432 (reappears in 421)

Propontic Coast of Asia Minor

Kyzikos reinf. 362 (Prokonnesos)

Lampsakos reinf. C4f (pol. Paisos)

Paisos with Lampsakos C4f (disappears)

Prokonnesos with Kyzikos 362 (persists)

Lesbos

Mytilene syn. planned by Mytilene 428 (pol.)

Ionia

Chios syn.? c.600 (vil.)

Karia

Halikarnassos reinf. C5m (vil.), c.370 (pol. Medmasos,

Ouranion, Pedasa, Telemessos, Termira; vil. Side?)

Latmos reinf. C4l (pol. Pidasa)

Medmasos with Halikarnassos c.370 (disappears?)

Ouranion with Halikarnassos c.370 (persists)

Pedasa with Halikarnassos c.370 (persists?)

Pida with Latmos C4l (persists?)

Telemessos with Halikarnassos c.370 (persists)

Termira with Halikarnassos c.370 (persists)

Crete

Hierapytna reinf. C4e (pol. Larisa)

Larisa with Hierapytna C4e (disappears)

Rhodos

Ialysos with Rhodos 408/7 (persists)

Kamiros with Rhodos 408/7 (persists)

Lindos with Rhodos 408/7 (persists)

Rhodos syn. 408/7 (pol. Ialysos, Kamiros, Lindos)
### Grid-Planned Poleis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spain and France</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massalia</td>
<td>C6m–C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sikulia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akras</td>
<td>C6s–C5e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akrai</td>
<td>C7m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaisa</td>
<td>C4s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>C4s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heloron</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleia Minoa</td>
<td>C4s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himera</td>
<td>C7l–C6f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamarina</td>
<td>C6, C5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasmenai</td>
<td>C7s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonitioi</td>
<td>C7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megara</td>
<td>C8l, C7l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naxos</td>
<td>C7, C5f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selinous</td>
<td>C7, C6e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrakousai</td>
<td>C8l, C7, C5–C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tauromenion</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyndaris</td>
<td>C4f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zankle</td>
<td>C7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Italia and Kampania</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraklea</td>
<td>C4?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyele</td>
<td>C6l–C5e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kroton</td>
<td>C7l–C6e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokroi</td>
<td>C6m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metapontion</td>
<td>C6m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neapolis</td>
<td>C.470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poseidonia</td>
<td>C6–C5?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taras</td>
<td>C6, C5m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thourioi</td>
<td>C5s–C4f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Adriatic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonia</td>
<td>C5m–C4e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spina</td>
<td>undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epeiros</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elea</td>
<td>undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gitana</td>
<td>undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horraon</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kassopa</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Akarnania</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambrikia</td>
<td>C6–C5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leukas</td>
<td>C4–C3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palairos</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>C4f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratos</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terybeia</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aitolia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallion</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalydon</td>
<td>C4–C3f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phokis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troneia</td>
<td>undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boiotia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plataiai</td>
<td>undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanagra</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arkadia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stymphalos</td>
<td>C4f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapezous</td>
<td>C5f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Messenia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messene/Ithome</td>
<td>C4m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Argolis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halieis</td>
<td>C6f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attika</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenai</td>
<td>C5f (Peiraieus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thessalia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pellinaion</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Makedonia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiane</td>
<td>C5f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion</td>
<td>C4l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pella</td>
<td>C4l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chalkidike</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mekyberna</td>
<td>undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olynthos</td>
<td>C4f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thrace: from Nestos to Hebros</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdera</td>
<td>C4m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stryme</td>
<td>C5l–C4m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pontos: Skythia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtmecia</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pontic Coast of Asia Minor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleia</td>
<td>C5–C4?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Troas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neandreia</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenedos</td>
<td>undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ionia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miletos</td>
<td>C5–C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priene</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Karia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halikarnassos</td>
<td>C4m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knidos</td>
<td>C4s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rhodos</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodos</td>
<td>C5l–C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cyprus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idalion</td>
<td>C5?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Libya</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euhesperides</td>
<td>C4l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 23. City Walls

**Key**
- Akrop. remains of walls enclosing the acropolis
- Fortified information about walls in written sources, e.g. siege
- Demolished information about demolished walls in written sources
- Ateichistos recorded as unfortified in written sources

**Spain and France**
- Alalie *Town C6s*
- Emporion *Town C5s, C4f*
- Massalia *Akrop. undated, Town C6l, C4

**Sikelia**
- Abakainon *Fortified 393*
- Adranon *Town C4f*
- Agyrion *Akrop. C4e, Town C4s, Fortified C4e*
- Akragas *Town C6e, Fortified 406*
- Akrai *Town C4f, Fortified C7m?*
- Apollonia *Town undated*
- Engyon *Town C4m*
- Euboia *Fortified C5f*
- Gela *Akrop. C6, Town C4s, Fortified C7f, 405*
- Heloron *Town C6, C4*
- Heraklea Minoa *Town C6s–C4l*
- Herbessos *Town C6, C4, Fortified C5l*
- Himera *Town C6?, C5e, Fortified C5l*
- Hippana *Town C4s*
- Kallipolis *Fortified C5e*
- Kamarina *Town C6s, Demolished 405*
- Kasmenai *Town C7?, Akrop. C4f*
- Katane *Fortified 415, Demolished 403*
- Kephaidion *Town C4?, Fortified 396*
- Leontinoi *Town C6e, destroyed c.495, C5m, destroyed c.424, Fortified 396, 356/5, 342/1*
- Lipara *Town c.500, C4f, Fortified C5e*
- Longane *Town C5*
- Megara *Town C7, C6s*
- Mylai *Fortified 426*
- Mytistratos *Town C5–C4*
- Naxos *Town C6m, C5e, Fortified 493, 425, 403*
- Selinous *Town C6l, C5e, 409, Akrop. 409, Ateichistos 405*
- Syrakousai *Town C6, Akrop. C4, Fortified 490s, 466/5, 415–13*
- Tauromenion *Akrop. undated, Town C4, Fortified 394/3*
- Tyndaris *Fortified 396*
- Zankle *Fortified 490s, ruined in 396–94, Fortified 337*

**Italia and Kampania**
- Heraklea *Akrop. C5, Town C4–C3*
- Hipponion *Town C6s–C5f, C5s–C4f, demolished 388, rebuilt C4*
- Hyle *Akrop. c.520, Town c.520, C3e, C4–C3*
- Kaulonia *Town C6, Demolished 389, rebuilt C4s*
- Kroton *Town C4*
- Kyme *Akrop. C6m, Town C6e, Fortified 524, 421*
- Laos *Fortified 390*
- Lokroi *Town C6, C5m–C4m, Fortified C4m*
- Metapontion *Town C6m, C5, C4–C3*
- Neapolis *Town c.470, C4*
- Poseidonia *Town C6?, C4*
- Pyxous *Town C5f, C4l*
- Rhegion *Town C6–C5, Fortified 393, Demolished 387, rebuilt C4m*
- Siris *Town C7–C6*
- Sybaris *Fortified C6, 467*
- Taras *Akrop. C6, Town C5m*
- Terina *Fortified 356/5*
- Thourioi *Fortified C5s*

**The Adriatic**
- Ankon *Akrop. C4*
- Apollonia *Akrop. C6, Town C4–C3*
- Epidamnos *Fortified 437*
- Issa *Town C4*
- Lissos *Akrop. C4*
- Melaina Korkyra *Fortified C4l–C3e*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epeiros</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amantia</td>
<td>Town C5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batiai</td>
<td>Akrop. undated, Town C4s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berenike</td>
<td>Town C4s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boucheta</td>
<td>Town Archaic, C5l, C4f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouthroton</td>
<td>Akrop. C6l–C5e, C5–C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byllis</td>
<td>Town C4m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodona</td>
<td>Akrop. C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elateia</td>
<td>Town C5l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elea</td>
<td>Town undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephyra</td>
<td>Akrop. LH III onwards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurymenai</td>
<td>Town C4, Fortified 312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gitana</td>
<td>Akrop. C4, Town C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horraon</td>
<td>Town C4f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kassope</td>
<td>Town C4m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikaia</td>
<td>Town C5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia</td>
<td>Town C5–C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandosia</td>
<td>Town C4f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passaron</td>
<td>Akrop. C5s, Town C4l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phanote</td>
<td>Town C4l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoinike</td>
<td>Akrop. C5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekmon</td>
<td>Town C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torone</td>
<td>Akrop. C5, Town C5l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Akarnania</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alyzeia</td>
<td>Akrop., Town C4?, Fortified 391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambrakia</td>
<td>Town C5e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaktorion</td>
<td>Town undated, Fortified 425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos</td>
<td>Town undated, Fortified 430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astakos</td>
<td>Town C5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derion</td>
<td>Town undated, Fortified? C4l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinos</td>
<td>Town undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithaka</td>
<td>Akrop. C5–C4, Town C5–C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korkyra</td>
<td>Town C4 or C3, Fortified 373/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koronta</td>
<td>Town C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krainoi</td>
<td>Akrop. C5, Town? C4f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leukas</td>
<td>Town undated, Fortified 429/8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limnaia</td>
<td>Town C4l, Ateichistos 429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matropolis</td>
<td>Akrop. undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medion</td>
<td>Town undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oiniodai</td>
<td>Town C5–C4, Fortified C5m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palairos</td>
<td>Akrop. undated, Town C5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paleis</td>
<td>Town? C4f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoitiia</td>
<td>Akrop. C5–C4, Town C5–C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronnoi</td>
<td>Akrop. C4?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Akrop. C5, Town C4m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratos</td>
<td>Town C5s, Fortified 429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thyrrheion</td>
<td>Town undated, Fortified 373/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torybeia</td>
<td>Town undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aitolia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrinion</td>
<td>Town C4, Fortified 314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion</td>
<td>Fortified 426?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalkis</td>
<td>Town C4?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halikyrna</td>
<td>Town C4?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallion</td>
<td>Akrop., Town C4s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalydon</td>
<td>Akrop. C6l–C5e, Town C4, Fortified 389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makynesia</td>
<td>Town C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molykreion</td>
<td>Town C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trichoneion</td>
<td>Town? C4–C3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Lokris</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphissa</td>
<td>Akrop. undated, Town C4s, Fortified 321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaleion</td>
<td>Town C4l–C3e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myania</td>
<td>Town C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naupaktos</td>
<td>Town Archaic/Classical?, Fortified C5s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolophon</td>
<td>Town undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phokis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abai</td>
<td>Akrop. C6–C5, Town C4?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambyssos</td>
<td>Fortified 339/8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphikia</td>
<td>Town C4–C3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulis</td>
<td>Town undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charadra</td>
<td>Akrop., Town undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daulis</td>
<td>Town C4?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphoi</td>
<td>Town C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drymos</td>
<td>Unwalled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elateia</td>
<td>Fortified 426, 395, 374, 346</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erochos</td>
<td>Town undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyampolis</td>
<td>Town C4s, Fortified 395</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiirha</td>
<td>Town Classical?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledon</td>
<td>Akrop.? C4?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liliaia</td>
<td>Akrop., Town C4m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medeon</td>
<td>Town undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neon/Tithorea</td>
<td>Town C4s, Fortified 349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parapotamioi</td>
<td>Akrop. undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phanoteus</td>
<td>Town 340?, Fortified 395</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philygonion</td>
<td>Town undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiris</td>
<td>Town undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teithronion</td>
<td>Town undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troneia</td>
<td>Akrop. undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boiotia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akraiphia</td>
<td>Akrop. C4?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaironeia</td>
<td>Akrop. C6?, Town C6–C5?, Fortified 424, 354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorsiai</td>
<td>Akrop. C.4, Town C.4, walls demolished 346, Akrop. C4e, Town C.3?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erythrai</td>
<td>Akrop. undated, Town?, unwalled 431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eteones/Skaphai</td>
<td>Unwalled 431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eutresis</td>
<td>Town C.4m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haliartos</td>
<td>Akrop. C6–C.5?, Town C.4?, Fortified 395/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyetos</td>
<td>Akrop. C.6?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hysiai</td>
<td>Town undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopai</td>
<td>Town C.4?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koroneia</td>
<td>Akrop.?, Town? Fortified 353</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mykalessos</td>
<td>Town?, walls in bad repair 413</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchomenos</td>
<td>Town A or C.4, Fortified C.4m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oropos</td>
<td>Akrop. undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plataiai</td>
<td>Town?–426, 386–73, 335–37, Fortified 431, besieged 429–27, walls demolished 426, 373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potniai</td>
<td>Unwalled 431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siphai</td>
<td>Akrop. C.4m, Town C.4m, Fortified 424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skolos</td>
<td>Unwalled 431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanagra</td>
<td>Town C.4e, walls demolished 457</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thebai</td>
<td>Akrop. Bronze Age with repairs in A and C, Town C.5, Fortified 540, 479, besieged 479, 335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thespiai</td>
<td>Town undated, walls Demolished 423, rebuilt 378, Demolished 373, rebuilt after 343</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thisbai</td>
<td>Town C.4m?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megara</td>
<td>Town C.4?, Fortified 460, 424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagai</td>
<td>Town undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikyon</td>
<td>Akrop., Town C.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achaia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigeira</td>
<td>Akrop., Town C.4?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion</td>
<td>Fortified C.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrai</td>
<td>Fortified C.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elis</td>
<td>Ateichistos c.400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyllene</td>
<td>Fortified c.400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marganeis</td>
<td>Fortified 365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkadia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alipheira</td>
<td>Akrop. C.4e, Town undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asea</td>
<td>Akrop. C.4e?, Town C.3?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipiaia</td>
<td>Akrop. undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eutaia</td>
<td>Fortified C.4f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gortys</td>
<td>Akrop. C.4m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halous</td>
<td>Akrop. C.4?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraia</td>
<td>Town undated, Fortified 375?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaphyai</td>
<td>Town undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lousoi</td>
<td>Akrop. C.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lykosoura</td>
<td>Akrop. C5–C.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantinea</td>
<td>Town 370, Fortified 385, walls demolished 385, rebuilt 370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megalopolis</td>
<td>Town 360s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methydronion</td>
<td>Akrop.? C5–C.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchomenos</td>
<td>Town C.4s, Fortified 418, 370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orestasion</td>
<td>Akrop. C6–C.5?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paion</td>
<td>Akrop. C.4?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallantion</td>
<td>Akrop. undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phigaleia</td>
<td>Akrop.? undated, Town C.5?, C.4m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psophis</td>
<td>Town C.5l–C.4e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stymphalos</td>
<td>Town C.4s, Fortified C.5f, 369</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegea</td>
<td>Town C.4e, Fortified 418, 370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teuthis</td>
<td>Akrop. C4–C.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thaliades</td>
<td>Akrop.?, Town undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelphousa</td>
<td>Town undated, Fortified C.5–C.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thisoa</td>
<td>Akrop. undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torthynion</td>
<td>Town undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troszentos?</td>
<td>Town C.5e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triphylia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepreon</td>
<td>Akrop. C.4?, Town undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makiston</td>
<td>Akrop. undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrixai</td>
<td>Akrop. undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messena</td>
<td>Town C.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothone</td>
<td>Town undated, Fortified 431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakedaimon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athena</td>
<td>Akrop. C.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidauros</td>
<td>Akrop. C.5?, C.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eua</td>
<td>Town undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gytheion</td>
<td>Fortified 370/69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kythera</td>
<td>Fortified 393</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las</td>
<td>Akrop. undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>Ateichistos 362</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argolis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos</td>
<td>Town C.6–C.5, Fortified 417/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidauros</td>
<td>Fortified 418/17, 369</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Halieis

Town C5, Fortified C4

Atron

Atrax

Akrop., Town C4

Gyron

Akrop. C5, C4m, Town C4

Hermion

Akrop., Town undated

Kierion

Kronion

Kleonai

Akrop. C4s

Larissa

Town undated, Fortified C4f

Methana

Fortified C4, C4m, Town C4–C3

Metropolis

Town C4

Mykenai

Akrop., Town undated

Ormos

Akrop., Town undated

Phleious

Akrop. C46, Fortified C38, C46

Pagasai

Akrop. Town C6l–C5e, Fortified C36

Tiryns

Akrop. Mycenaean

Peiraia

Akrop., Town undated

Troizen

Akrop., Town undated, Fortified C36

Saronic Gulf

Akrop. C5, Town C4

Phaloria

Town undated

Aigina

Fortified C4, C4m, Town C4–C3

Skotoussa

Akrop. undated, Fortified C36

Attika

Akrop. undated

Dolopia

Town undated

Athenai

Akrop. C23, Town C6, walls demolished C40–C41

Ainia

Hypata

Akrop., Town C4–C3

Chalkis

Fortified C46, C4m

Malis

Akrop. Town undated

Dystos

Akrop. undated, Town C4

Echinos

Town C4

Eretria

Akrop. C46–C47, Town C4

Herakleia

Akrop. Town undated, Fortified C42, C35, walls demolished C37/C40

Histiaia/Oreos

Fortified C46, C4m

Lamia

Akrop. C6, C5–C4, Town C400, Fortified C32

Karystos

Fortified C490, siege C490

Achaia

Akrop. Town undated

East Lokris

Antron

Akrop., Town C4

Alope

Akrop. C6?

Ekkarra

Akrop. undated, Town C4

Alponos

Akrop. C5, Fortified C46

Halos

Fortified C4m

Halai

Akrop. C6, C4m, Town C4–C3

Melitaia

Town undated

Kynos

Akrop. undated

Peuma

Akrop. undated, Town C4?

Larymna

Town C6l–C5e?, C4

Proerna

Akrop. undated, Town C4?

Naryka

Akrop. undated, Fortified C352

Thaumako

Akrop. C4

Opous

Town C4l–C3, Fortified C33

Thebai

Akrop. undated, Town C4l–C3

Thronion

Town undated, Fortified C451, C353

Magnesia

Akrop., Town undated

Doris

Akrop. undated

Eurymenai

Akrop., Town C5

Akyphas/Pindos

Town undated

Kasthanea

Town C5

Boion

Town undated

Korakai

Town C4l (Goritsa)

Erineos

Town undated

Methone?

Town undated

Kytinion

Town undated

Olizon

Town undated

Thessalia

Fortified C36

Argoussa

Town C5–C4

Perrhaibia

Azoros

Akrop., Town undated

Chyretiai

Akrop. Town undated

Doliche

Akrop., Town C4–C3
Akrop. C6?
Akrop., Town undated
Akrop., Town undated
Akrop. undated
Akrop. undated
Akrop., Town undated
Akrop. C6?

Tenos
Thasos

Town C7–C6, New Town C45
Town C6l, Fortified 494, walls demolished 491, rebuilt, demolished 463, rebuilt 411

Town C4l
Town undated
Town C4l, Fortified 432
Town C4l
Town C4l
Town C4l
Town C45

Town undated, Fortified 382
Town C4l

Town C5s, Fortified 424, 357
Town C5–C4

Akrop. C5f, Fortified 424
Town C5–C4, Fortified 405
Fortified 423
Fortified 425
Town undated
Akrop. c.700, Fortified 423
Town C5–C4, Fortified 432, 381, 349–8

Town C5, Fortified 479, 432
Fortified 423
Akrop. undated, Fortified 423
Fortified 429
Akrop. C5–C4, Town c.500, C4l

Town C5–C4, Fortified 423

Town C4
Town C4l–C3
Walls demolished 364, slim walls C45
Walls demolished 364, slim walls C45
Town C6l, walls demolished 364, slim walls C45
Walls demolished 364, slim walls C45

Town undated, walls built 366/5
Town C5?, unfortified 412
Town C4s

Town C4
Town C6l–C5e, Fortified 424, 416
Town undated, Fortified C6l, 4708, 376
Town C4s
Fortified C4m

Town C7–C6, Fortified C6l, C5e
Fortified 426
Fortified 424

Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos

Berga
Eion
Galepsos
Myrkindos
Neapolis
Oisyme
Phagres
Town undated
Fortified C5e, 424
Fortified C5e
Fortified 509
Akrop. C5–C4, Fortified 410
Akrop. C6, Town C5f
Fortified 480
CITY WALLS

Philippoi Fortified C4m
Pistyros Town C6l

**Thrace: from Nestos to Hebros**
- Sestos Fortified
- Bisanthe Fortified
- Propontic Thrace
- Byzantion Fortified C4m
- Krithote Fortified
- Eliaious Fortified 411, 360/59
- Drys Fortified 375
- Maroneia Town undated
- Mesambria Fortified 480
- Stryme Akrop.? C5–C4m
- Zone Town undated

**Thracian Chersonesos**
- Alopekonnesos Fortified 360/59
- Elaious Fortified 411, 360/59
- Krithote Fortified 360/59
- Sestos Fortified 479/8, 394, 365

**Propontic Thrace**
- Bisanthe Fortified 410
- Byzantium Fortified 478/7, 409/8, 357/6, 340
- Daminon Teichos Fortified C5s, C4
- Heraion Teichos Fortified 352
- Neapolis Fortified C4m?
- Perinthos Akrop. C5, Town C5, Fortified 399, 340
- Selymbria Fortified 408, 403, 340
- Serrion Teichos Fortified C5s, 346

**Pontos: West Coast**
- Apollonia Fortified C4m
- Istrus Town C6, C5–C4
- Kallatis Town C4f
- Mesambria Town C5 or C4e
- Nikonion Town C5f
- Odessos Fortified C4s
- Olbia Town C4l, Fortified C5s, 331
- Orgame Akrop. C4, Town C4
- Tyras Town C4

**Pontos: Skythia**
- Chersonesos Town C5f, Town C4
- Gorgippia Town C4
- Hermonassa Town C4s
- Karkinitis Town C5m
- Kimmerikon Town C5l–C4e
- Kytaia Town C4e
- Myrmekeion Akrop. C6l–C5e, Town C4e
- Nymphaiion Akrop. C5l–C4e, Town C5e, C4e
- Pantikapaion Akrop. C5l–C4f, Town C5e

- Phanagoria Town C5l, destroyed C4e, rebuilt C4
- Theodosia Town C5e

**Pontic Coast of Asia Minor**
- Heraclea Fortified C5s
- Kotyora Town C5l
- Sinope Fortified 370

**Propontic Coast of Asia Minor**
- Artaiou Teichos Fortified C5
- Astakos Fortified C4m
- Kalchedon Fortified 513, 409, 387, 360s
- Kios Town undated
- Kyzikos Ateichistos 410, Fortified 409, C5f, 364, 334
- Lampsakos Ateichistos 411, Fortified 409, 405
- Miletouteichos Fortified 395
- Parion Town undated, Fortified c.360

**Troas**
- Abydos Fortified C5l, C4
- Antandros Fortified C5l
- Assos Akrop., Town C6?, C4?, Fortified 365
- Gargara Akrop. C6?
- Gentinos Akrop. C4
- Gergis Fortified C4e
- Hamaxitos Fortified 398
- Ilion Fortified C4f
- Kebran Akrop., Town C5l, Fortified C4e
- Kokylion Fortified C4e
- Kolonai Fortified C4e
- Lamponeia Town C6?
- Larisa Fortified C4e
- Neandria Town C6?, C5l–C4e, Fortified C4e
- Ophryneion Akrop. undated
- Palaiperkote Town C6?
- Rhodoion Akrop. undated
- Sigeion Fortified C6
- Skepsis Fortified C4e

**Lesbos**
- Antissa Town C6? Fortified 428/7
- Arisba Akrop., Town C6?
- Eresos Town C6? Fortified 428/7, 412
- Methymna Town C6? Fortified 428/7, 406
- Mytilene Town C6–C4m, Fortified 428/7, 405, 333 walls demolished 427
- Pyrrha Akrop. undated, Fortified 428/7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aiolis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigai</td>
<td>Town C4?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atarneus</td>
<td>Town C5 or C4, Fortified 398/7 and c350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalkis</td>
<td>Town C5 or C4?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleia</td>
<td>Town undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyme</td>
<td>Town C6, Fortified 546, c.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larisa</td>
<td>Akrop. C5, Akrop. and Town C4,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fortified 398/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanpago</td>
<td>Town undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrina</td>
<td>Akrop., Town undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neon Teichos</td>
<td>Fortified C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergamon</td>
<td>Town C7, C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitane</td>
<td>Town C4, Fortified 335/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ionia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airai</td>
<td>Town C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chios</td>
<td>Fortified 425/4, 412/11, C4f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesos</td>
<td>Town c.500, Fortified C6f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erythrai</td>
<td>Town C4l, Fortified C4l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klazomenai</td>
<td>Akrop. C6, Town C4, Fortified C6?, C4f,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ateichistos 411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolophon</td>
<td>Town C4l, Fortified C4l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesia</td>
<td>Ateichistos 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miletus</td>
<td>Akrop. C7, Town C6, C5, Fortified C7,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>494, C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notion</td>
<td>Fortified c.430?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phokaia</td>
<td>Town C6f, Fortified 546, 406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polichnita</td>
<td>Fortified 412?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priene</td>
<td>Town C4s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pteleon</td>
<td>Fortified 412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pygela</td>
<td>Town C4, Fortified 409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samos</td>
<td>Akrop. C6, Town C6, C4e, Fortified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>524, 441, C4f, wall demolished 339,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ateichistos 411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidousa</td>
<td>Fortified 412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyrna</td>
<td>Town C9m?, C8m, C7l, Fortified C7e,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teos</td>
<td>Akrop. C6?, Town C4–C3, Fortified C6,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wall demolished 494, rebuilt 412,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>demolished 411, rebuilt C4e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thebaid</td>
<td>Town C6?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Karia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabanda</td>
<td>Town C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alinda</td>
<td>Akrop., Town C4m, Fortified C4s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>Akrop. C4l, Town C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amyzon</td>
<td>Town C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargasa</td>
<td>Akrop. undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crete</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anopolis</td>
<td>Town undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptara</td>
<td>Town undated, Fortified C3l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axos</td>
<td>Akrop. undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bionnos</td>
<td>Town undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datala</td>
<td>(Aphrati) Akrop. undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dragmos</td>
<td>(Koutsoulopetres) Town undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D erot</td>
<td>Akrop., Town undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleutherna</td>
<td>Town undated, Fortified C3l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyros</td>
<td>Akrop.?, Town undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gortyns</td>
<td>Town Geometric, unfortified until C3s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyrtakina</td>
<td>Town C4l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istron</td>
<td>Town undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itanos</td>
<td>Akrop., Town undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keraia</td>
<td>Akrop. C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knossos</td>
<td>Fortified guard-post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kydonia</td>
<td>Akrop.? Fortified C4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lato</td>
<td>Town undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oclus</td>
<td>Fortified guard-posts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petra</td>
<td>Akrop. undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phaistos</td>
<td>Town Geometric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phalasarna</td>
<td>Akrop. C5–C4, harbour C4s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Polichne  
Polyrhen  
Rhitten  
Sybrita  

**Rhodos**  
Kamiros  
Lindos  
Rhodos  

**Lykia**  
Phaselis  

**Pamphylia**  
Aspendos  

**Kilikia**  
Aphrodisias  
Kelenderis  
Nagidos  

**Cyprus**  
Amathous  
Idalion  
Karpasia  
Marion  
Paphos  
Salamis  
Soloi  

**Libya**  
Barke  
Euheesperides  
Kyrene  
Taucheira  

City walls
### Key
- **italics** buildings attested in written sources
- **bold** buildings attested archaeologically

### Sikelia
- **Agyrion**
  - bouleuterion C4
- **Akragas**
  - bouleuterion C4; ekklesiasterion C5–C4
- **Katane**
  - bouleuterion? undated
- **Lipara**
  - prytaneion C4
- **Syraukousai**
  - bouleuterion? C6l–C5e; palace C4e; desmoterion C4f

### Italia and Kampania
- **Hyele**
  - bouleuterion C5f; ruler’s house? C6l theatre-like structure undated
- **Kaulonia**
  - desmoterion C5f
- **Kroton**
  - bouleuterion C6
- **Kyme**
  - bouleuterion C6
- **Lokroi**
  - prytaneion? undated ekklesiasterion? C7–C4
- **Metapontion**
  - ekklesiasterion? C5m–C4
- **Poseidonia**
  - ekklesiasterion? C4
  - prytaneion C4f; bouleuterion? undated
- **Taras**
  - ekklesiasterion C3 above earlier structure?

### Epeiros
- **Kassope**
  - ekklesiasterion C3 above earlier structure?

### Akarnania
- **Korkyra**
  - bouleuterion C5s
- **Stratos**
  - bouleuterion C4

### Aitolia
- **Kallion**
  - archive C4s

### Phokis
- **Delphi**
  - prytaneion C4s; dikasterion? C4f
- **Hyampolis**
  - bouleuterion C4f

### Megaris, Korinthia, Sikyonia
- **Korinthos**
  - bouleuterion C4m
- **Sikyon**
  - prytaneion C6e; bouleuterion C4l
- **Elis**
  - prytaneion C5e; bouleuterion C6s

### Arkadia
- **Mantinea**
  - bouleuterion C4f
  - Megale polis federal? assembly hall C4f
  - Tegea desmoterion C4f

### Argolis
- **Argos**
  - prytaneion C4l; bouleuterion C5f; ekklesiasterion? C5m; desmoterion C4
  - Phleious bouleuterion or dikasterion? C5s
  - Troizen prytaneion C4l–C3e

### Saronic Gulf
- **Attika**
  - bouleuterion (Hellenistic?)
  - Kalaurria
  - Athenai

### Euboia
- **Histiaia/Oreos**
  - desmoterion C4m

### Achaia Phthiotis
- **Halos**
  - prytaneion C5f

### The Aegean
- **Delos**
  - prytaneion C5; bouleuterion C6f; ekklesiasterion C5f
  - (Keos)
  - Ioulis
  - Karthaia
  - Koresia
  - Paros
  - Peparethos
  - Siphnos
  - Thasos

### Makedonia
- **Aigeai**
  - palace c.400
  - Ioulis
  - prytaneion C5
  - prytaneion C4m
  - Karthaia
  - Koresia
  - Paros
  - Peparethos
  - Siphnos
  - Thasos

### Chalkidike
- **Akanthos**
  - prytaneion C5f
  - (Keos)

### Ioulis
  - prytaneion C4m
  - prytaneion C5
  - prytaneion C4m
  - prytaneion C5f
  - prytaneion C5s
  - prytaneion C6s
  - prytaneion C5f
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thracian Chersonesos</td>
<td>Chersonesos/Agora</td>
<td>prytaneion C6s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontos: West Coast</td>
<td>Olbia</td>
<td>prytaneion (hestiatorion)? C6; ekklesiasterion C4e; dikasterion C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontos: Skythia</td>
<td>Pantikapaion</td>
<td>palace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontic Coast of Asia Minor</td>
<td>Herakleia</td>
<td>bouleuterion C4m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propontic Coast of Asia Minor</td>
<td>Kyzikos</td>
<td>prytaneion C6l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troas</td>
<td>Ilion</td>
<td>prytaneion c300; dikasterion? c300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sigeion</td>
<td>prytaneion C6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenedos</td>
<td>prytaneion C5m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbos</td>
<td>Methymna</td>
<td>bouleuterion? undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mytilene</td>
<td>prytaneion c.600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiolis</td>
<td>Larisa</td>
<td>palace C6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyme</td>
<td>desmoterion undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nasos</td>
<td>prytaneion C4l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionia</td>
<td>Airai</td>
<td>prytaneion C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erythrai</td>
<td>prytaneion C4s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kolophon</td>
<td>prytaneion annex or metron C4s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priene</td>
<td>Prytaneion annex C4s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samos</td>
<td>bouleuterion (C7l); bouleuterion (klерouchy C4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karia</td>
<td>Datala</td>
<td>palace C4s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Halikarnassos</td>
<td>Prytaneion (C4l); palace C4f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crete</td>
<td>Apellonia</td>
<td>Archeion C4s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dreros</td>
<td>Prytaneion? C6–C3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gortyns</td>
<td>(Aphrati) bouleuterion? C7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lato</td>
<td>Prytaneion? C4s–C5f; theatre steps C8f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhitten</td>
<td>dikasterion C5m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prytaneion? C4s; ekklesiasterion? C4–C3; dikasterion? C4–C3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Patela Prinias) Prytaneion? C7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypris</td>
<td>Amathous</td>
<td>Palace? C8m–c.300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idalion</td>
<td>Palace C6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paphos</td>
<td>Palace C6–C5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soloi</td>
<td>Palace C5l–C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Naukratis</td>
<td>Prytaneion? C4l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>Kylene</td>
<td>Prytaneion C4l; bouleuterion C4; geronteon C4l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. **Temples, Theatres, Stoas, Gymnasia, Stadia, Hippodromes**

**Key**
- *italics* buildings attested in written sources
- *bold* buildings attested archaeologically

**Spain and France**
- Alalie: temple C6
- Emporion: temples C5s
- Massalia: temples C6l

**Sikelia**
- Adranon: temple C4
- Agyrion: temples C4s; theatre C4s
- Aitna: theatre C5f
- Akragas: temples C6sff; stoas C5
- Akrai: temple C7m
- Gela: temples C6ff; theatre C5m
- Heloron: temple C4s; theatre C4–C3
- Herakleia Minoa: theatre C4l–C3e
- Himera: temples C7sff
- Hippana: theatre undated
- Kamarina: temple C5f
- Kasmenai: temple C6m
- Katane: theatre C5?
- Leontinoi: theatre C4m
- Megara: temples C6sff; stoas C7s
- Morgantina: theatre C4l
- Naxos: temple C6s
- Selinous: temples C6sff; stoa C6m; theatre C4m
- Syракousai: temples C8sff; theatres C5ff
- Tyndaris: theatre C.300
- Zankle: theatre C4s

**Italia and Kampania**
- Herakleia: temple C6
- Hipponion: temples C6sff
- Hyele: temple C5e; theatre? C5e; stoas C4
- Kaulonia: temple C6ff
- Kroton: theatre C5
- Kyme: temple C5m
- Lokroi: temples C6, C5; theatre C4m; stoa C6m
- Metapontion: temples C6sff; stoa C4; theatre C4–C3
- Metauros: temple C6–C4
- Pithekousai: temple C6–C4

**Poseidonia**
- Rhegion: temple C5s; temple undated
- Siris: temple C6e
- Sybaris: temples C7ff
- Taras: temples C6eff
- Thourioi:

**The Adriatic**
- Ankon: temple C4f
- Apollonia: temples C6sff; stoas C4–C3

**Epeiros**
- Amantia: temple, stadio, both undated
- Boucheta: stoa undated
- Bothroton: theatre C4l; stoa C4
- Dodona: temple C5l
- Kassope: temple C4m; theatre C4–C3
- Passaron: temple C4; theatre undated

**Akarnania**
- Ambrakia: temple C.500
- Anaktorion: temple C5
- Ithaka: temple C6ff
- Korkyra: temple C5ff
- Kranioi: temple undated
- Leukas: temples C5
- Medion: temple undated
- Oiniadai: temples C5
- Phoitiiai: temple undated
- Pronnoi: temples C6ff
- Same: temple undated
- Stratos: temples C6ff; stoai C4; theatre C4
- Stadia: stoai undated

**Aitolia**
- Agrinion: temple C4l
- Kalydon: temple undated
- Makynnea: temples C6ff
- Molykreion: temple undated

**Phokis**
- Delphi: temples C7ff; theatre C4; stoa C5f;
- Gymnasion C4s; stadio C4l; hippodromos C4
Hyampolis *theatre C4m*

**Boiotia**

Akrainia *temples C4l*

Chaireoneia *theatre C5–C4*

Haliartos *temple C7–C6; stoa C6?*

Koroneia *temple undated; theatre undated*

Lebadeia *temples C4; stoa C4*

Orchomenos *temples C6; theatre C4s*

Oropos *temple C5l–C4s; theatres C5l–C4m; stoa C5l–C4s*

Plataiai *temples C5*

Tanagra *temples C5ff; theatre C4f*

**Thebai**

*temples C8bff; theatre C4; stoa C4; stadia and gymnasion C6; stadion and gymnasion C5; hippodromos C5; temple C5f*

**Thespiai**

**Megaris, Korinthia, Sikyonia**

Korinthos *temples C7ff; theatre C5; stoa C5–C4; stadia C5f*

Megara *temple undated; stoa undated*

Sikon *temple C6*

**Achaia**

Aigeira *temple C7s*

Dyme *temples C6ff*

Helike *temples C6ff*

Keryneia *temple C6*

Leonion *theatre C4*

**Elis**

Elis *temple C6; theatre C4; stoa C5; gymnasion C4*

**Arkadia**

Alea *temple undated*

Alipheira *temples C5eff*

Asea *temples C7ff*

Gortys *temples C3lff; stoa C4eff*

Heraion *temples C6ff*

Kleitor *theatre undated*

Lykosioua *temple C4*

Mantinea *temples C5–C4; theatre C4; stoa C5ff*

Megalopolis *temple undated*

Methydron *temples C6ff; theatre C4l; stoa C4s*

Orchomenos *temple undated*

Paion *temples C6ff*

Pallantion *temples C7bff; theatre C4f*

Phigaleia *temples C7bff; theatre C4f*

Psophis *temple C5; stoa C5*

Symphalos *temples C5eff; theatre undated*

Tegea *temples C7ff; theatre C4*

Thelpousa *temples C6l–C5eff; stoa C4*

**Tripilhia**

Lepreon *temples C4*

Makiston *temple C5e*

Pyrgos *temple C5e*

**Messenia**

Messene/Ithome *temple undated; stoa C4s*

Pharai *temple C6*

**Lakedaimon**

Geronthrai *temple C6–C5?*

Las *temple C5–C4?*

Tiryns *temple C6; stoa? C6*

Troizen *temples C6m; stadia C4l–C3e*

**Argolis**

Argos *temple C5s; stoa undated; gymnasion C5f; stadios C4s*

Epidauros *temples C4m; theatres C4sff*

Halieis *temples C7ff; stoa C4; stadios C5–C4*

Hermion *temple C6l*

Kleonai *temple C6*

Phleious *theatre C4?*

Tiryns *temple C6; stoa? C6*

**Saronic Golf**

Aigina *temples C6mff; stadios C5–C4*

Kalareia *temple C6l; four stoas C5–C4*

**Attika**

Athenai *temples, theatres C4–; stoa C6l–; gymnasia C5–; stadia C5–; hippodrome*

**Eubeia**

Eretria *temples C8ff; theatre C4; palaistra C4; gymnasion C4?*

**Karyostos** *temple undated*

**East Lokris**

Halai *temple C6e*

Kynos *temple? undated*

Naryka *theatre? undated*

Thronion *temple? undated*

**Thessalia**

Argoussa *temples undated*

Atrax *temples C4ff; theatre C4*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kondaia</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krannon</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larisa</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>C5; temple C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolis</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>C6l; temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagasai</td>
<td>temples, theatre</td>
<td>C5–C4; stoa C5–C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelinna(ion)</td>
<td>temples, theatre, stoa</td>
<td>undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pherai</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>C6e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skotoussa</td>
<td>theatre</td>
<td>C4f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achaia Phthiotis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halos</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>C7?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thebai</td>
<td>temple, theatre</td>
<td>C6; theatre C4m; stoa C4–C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurymenai</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>C5–C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iolkos</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olizon</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spalauthra</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perrhaibia</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>C7s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonnos</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pythoion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Aegean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minoa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andros</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delos</td>
<td>temples, theatre, two stoas</td>
<td>C6m–l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halasarna</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>C6f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hephaistia</td>
<td>temples</td>
<td>undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ios</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karthaia</td>
<td>temples, theatre</td>
<td>C6l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kos</td>
<td>temples, theatre</td>
<td>C4; theatre C4; stoa C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kythnos</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>C6f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrina</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naxos</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>C6s; theatre C6?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oine</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>C6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paros</td>
<td>temples</td>
<td>C7ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poissia</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhesia</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seleinus</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyros</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thasos</td>
<td>temples, theatre</td>
<td>C6mff; theatre c.300; stoa C4mff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thera</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>c.600; stoa C6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makedonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigeai</td>
<td>temples, theatre</td>
<td>C4; theatre C4s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloros</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beroia</td>
<td></td>
<td>theatre C4l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion</td>
<td></td>
<td>temples C6l; theatre C4e; stadios C6l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mieza</td>
<td></td>
<td>stoa C4; gymnasion C4; school of Aristotle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pella</td>
<td></td>
<td>theatre C4s; stoa C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pydna</td>
<td></td>
<td>temples C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisaltia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphipolis</td>
<td></td>
<td>temples C5ff; gymnasion C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalkidike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akanthos</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>C5f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aphytis</td>
<td>temples</td>
<td>C4ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olynthos</td>
<td></td>
<td>temple C6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poteidaia</td>
<td></td>
<td>temple C5e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staglios</td>
<td></td>
<td>stoa C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torone</td>
<td></td>
<td>temple C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galepsos</td>
<td></td>
<td>temple undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neapolis</td>
<td></td>
<td>temple C6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oisyme</td>
<td></td>
<td>temple C5e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thracian Chersonesos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kardia</td>
<td></td>
<td>gymnasion C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propontic Thrace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byzantion</td>
<td></td>
<td>temples C5e; gymnasion C4; stadion C6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontos: West Coast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istros</td>
<td></td>
<td>temples C6mff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesambria</td>
<td></td>
<td>theatre C4?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olbia</td>
<td></td>
<td>temples C6mff; theatre C4; stoa? undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontos: Skythia</td>
<td></td>
<td>gymnasion C5e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chersonesos</td>
<td></td>
<td>temples C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorgippia</td>
<td></td>
<td>temples undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermonassa</td>
<td></td>
<td>temple C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kepoi</td>
<td></td>
<td>temples C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrmekeion</td>
<td></td>
<td>temple C5–C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nymphaion</td>
<td></td>
<td>temples C5mff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pantikapaion</td>
<td></td>
<td>temples? undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phanagoria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontos: Kolchis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phasis</td>
<td></td>
<td>temples? undated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pontic Coast of Asia Minor
Herakleia  
+ theatre C₄

Propontic Coast of Asia Minor
Kyzikos  
+ temple C₆; theatre C₄; stoa C₄₁

Troas
Assos  
+ temple C₆; stoa undated
Gargara  
+ temple C₆
Gentinos  
+ temple C₆–C₅
Hamaxitos  
+ temple C₅?
Ilion  
+ theatre C₄₁
Neandreia  
+ temple C₆; theatre C₄; stoa undated
Tenedos  
+ theatre undated

Lesbos
Antissa  
+ stoa C₄₈
Eresos  
+ temple C₆
Methymna  
+ temples C₆₁; theatre C₄?
Mytilene  
+ theatre undated; stoa C₄–C₃
Pyrrha  
+ temple C₄₈

Aiolis
Aigai  
+ temple? C₆
Kyme  
+ temple C₄?
Larisa  
+ temples C₆ff; stoa C₆–C₅

Ionia
Chios  
+ stoa C₄₁
Ephesos  
+ temples C₈ff; theatre C₄₁
Erythrai  
+ temples C₈ff; theatre C₄; stoa C₄
Kolophon  
+ temples C₄₁; stoa C₄
Miletos  
+ temples C₇ff
Myous  
+ temples C₆ff
Phokaia  
+ temple C₆; theatre C₄₁
Priene  
+ temple C₄; stadiōn C₄
Samos  
+ temple C₈; theatre C₄₁
Smyrna  
+ temple C₇; stoa C₇₁
Thebai  
+ temples undated

Karia
Amyzon  
+ temple C₆; temple C₄₁

Halikarnassos  
+ temples C₅ff; theatre C₄?; Maussoleion C₄₉
Kedreai  
+ temple C₆?
Knidos  
+ temples C₅ff; stoa C₄₈
Latmos  
+ temple C₄₁
Mylasa  
+ temples C₄; stoa C₄; palaistra C₄₁; gymnasium C₄₁
Myndos  
+ temples undated; stadiōn undated

Crete
Aptara  
+ temples C₅–C₄
Axos  
+ temples C₆
Datala  
+ (Aphrati) temple C₇
Dreros  
+ temple C₈ff or C₆
Eltynia  
+ temple C₆?
Gortyns  
+ temples C₇₁; stoa? C₆
Itanos  
+ temples undated
Kydonia  
+ temples C₆₁
Lato  
+ temple C₄₅–C₃ₑ; stoa C₄₅–C₃ₑ
Phaistos  
+ temples C₇₁–C₆ff
Phalasarna  
+ temples undated
Praisos  
+ temple C₄–C₃
Rhōtten  
+ (Patela Prinias) temples C₇

Rhodos
Ialysos  
+ temples C₆ff; theatre C₄
Kamiros  
+ temples C₆–C₅
Lindos  
+ temples C₆ff; theatre C₄
Rhodos  
+ temples C₄ff; theatre C₄₁; gymnasium C₅–C₄; stadiōn C₄

Cyprus
Soloi  
+ temple C₆ff

Egypt
Naukratis  
+ temples C₆ff

Libya
Kyrene  
+ temples C₆ff; theatre undated; four stoa C₆–C₄
Taucheira  
+ temple undated
Key

Metal: silver if nothing is stated, G = gold, E = electrum, B = bronze.

Legend: only toponyms, ethnics and a few other legends important for site-classification are recorded in this index, and only the longest preserved form of the legend is recorded.

Spain and France

Emporion C5f–?. ΕΜΠΟΡΙΤΩΝ
Massalia c.525–?. ΜΑΣΣΑΛΙΩΤΑΝ or -ΤΩΝ
Rhode C4l–C3e. ΡΟΔΗΤΩΝ

Sikelia

Abakainon c.340–?, B–C3m–?. ΑΒΑΚΑΙΝΙΝΟΝ or -ΝΩΝ
Adranon B–C4s–?. ΑΔΡΑΝΙΤΑΝ
Agryron B–C3m–?. ΑΓΥΡΠΙΝΑΙΩΝ
Aitna 476–?, B–C4s. ΑΙΤΝΑΙΩΝ
Akragas c.520–406, 338–?, B–430–406. ΑΚΡΑΓΑΣ, ΑΚΡΑΓΑΝΤΟΣ, ΑΚΡΑΓΑΝΤΙΝΟΝ or -ΝΩΝ
Alaisa B–C4s–?. ΑΛΑΙΣΙΝΩΝ
Alontion B–C4e–?. ΑΛΟΝΤΙΝΟΝ
Galeria C5m–C3l. ΓΑΛΑΡΙΝΟΝ
Gela 490–405, c.340–?, G–C3l. ΓΕΛΑΣ, ΓΕΛΙΩΝ or -ΙΩΝ
Henna 460–?. ΕΝΝΑ, ΗΕΝΝΑΙΟΝ
Herbessos B–C4s–?. ΕΡΒΗΣΣΙΝΩΝ
Himera C6m–408, B–c.340–?. ΗΙΜΕΡΑ, ΗΙΜΕΡΑΙΩΝ or -ΙΩΝ
Hippana C5m, B–C4m. ΗΠΑΝΑΤΑΝ
Imachara C4. ΙΜΑΧΑΡΙΩΝ
Kamarina 492–484, 461–440, 420–405, G–C5l, B–C3s, C4s. ΚΑΜΑΡΙΝΟΝ or -ΝΩΝ
Katane c.461–?, B–C5l–?. ΚΑΤΑΝΑΙΟΣ or -ΙΩΝ or -ΙΩΝ
Kentonirpa B–339/8–?. ΚΕΝΤΟΝΙΠΠΙΝΩΝ
Kephalioidion C5l–C4e, B–C5l–C4e. ΕΚ ΚΕΦΑΛΟΙΔΙΟΥ, ΚΕΦΑΛΟΙΔΙΤΑΝ

Leontinoi c.476–C4m, B–405–C4m. ΛΕΟΝΤΙΝΟΣ or -ΝΩΝ
Lipara B–C5s. ΛΙΠΑΡΙΑΙΩΝ
Longane B–C5l. ΛΟΥΓΚΑΝΑΙΩΝ
Megara C4s. ΜΕΓΑ
Morgantina c.465–?, B–c.330–?. ΜΟΡΓΑΝΤΙΝΑ, ΜΟΡΓΑΝΤΙΝΩΝ

Syrakousai c.460–C5l. ΣΤΙΕΛΑΝΑΙΟ(Ν) ΣΥΡΑΚΟΣΙΟΝ or -ΙΩΝ
Taumonia C4f, B–357–?. ΝΕΟΠΟΛΙΤΑΝ or -ΤΩΝ, ΝΕΟΠΟΛΙΤΙΜΕΝΩΝ
Tyndaris B–C4m. ΤΥΝΔΑΡΙΣ, ΤΥΝΔΑΡΙΤΑΝ
Tyrrhenoi B–C4s. ΤΥΡΡΗ

Sicily

Alaisa B–C4s–?. ΑΛΑΙΣΙΝΩΝ
Alontion B–C4e–?. ΑΛΟΝΤΙΝΟΝ
Galeria C5m–C3l. ΓΑΛΑΡΙΝΟΝ
Gela 490–405, c.340–?, G–C3l. ΓΕΛΑΣ, ΓΕΛΙΩΝ or -ΙΩΝ
Henna 460–?. ΕΝΝΑ, ΗΕΝΝΑΙΟΝ
Herbessos B–C4s–?. ΕΡΒΗΣΣΙΝΩΝ
Himera C6m–408, B–c.340–?. ΗΙΜΕΡΑ, ΗΙΜΕΡΑΙΩΝ or -ΙΩΝ
Hippana C5m, B–C4m. ΗΠΑΝΑΤΑΝ

Italia and Kampania

Imachara C4. ΙΜΑΧΑΡΙΩΝ
Kamarina 492–484, 461–440, 420–405, G–C5l, B–C3s, C4s. ΚΑΜΑΡΙΝΟΝ or -ΝΩΝ
Katan B–C5l–?. ΚΑΤΑΝΑΙΟΣ or -ΙΩΝ or -ΙΩΝ
Kentonirpa B–339/8–?. ΚΕΝΤΟΝΙΠΠΙΝΩΝ
Kephalioidion C5l–C4e, B–C5l–C4e. ΕΚ ΚΕΦΑΛΟΙΔΙΟΥ, ΚΕΦΑΛΟΙΔΙΤΑΝ

Leontinoi c.476–C4m, B–405–C4m. ΛΕΟΝΤΙΝΟΣ or -ΝΩΝ
Lipara B–C5s. ΛΙΠΑΡΙΑΙΩΝ
Longane B–C5l. ΛΟΥΓΚΑΝΑΙΩΝ
Megara C4s. ΜΕΓΑ
Morgantina c.465–?, B–c.330–?. ΜΟΡΓΑΝΤΙΝΑ, ΜΟΡΓΑΝΤΙΝΩΝ
Naxos 525–493, 461–403, B–410–403. ΝΑΧΙΟΝ, ΝΑΞΙΩΝ
Pakos B–C5s. ΠΑΚΑΚΙΝΟΣ
Piakos B–C5s. ΠΙΑΚΙΝΟΣ
Selinous c.540–409, B–420–409. ΣΕΛΙΝΟΣ, ΣΕΛΙΝΟΝΤΙΟΝ
Syrakousai 510–?, B–C5l–?, G–C5l, E–C4f. ΣΥΡΑΚΟΣΙΟΝ or -ΙΩΝ

Italia and Kampania

Herakleia c.430–?, B–C4. ΗΕΡΑΚΛΑΕΙΩΝ
Hipponion B–C4m. ΕΠΙΠΩΝΙΕΩΝ
Hyde C66–?. ΥΕΛΗΤΕΩΝ
Kaulonia c.525–?, B–c.425–?, G–C5m. ΔΑΝΚΛΕ, ΔΑΝΚΛΑΙΩΝ, ΜΕΣΣΑΝΑ, ΜΕΣΣΑΝΙΟΝ or -ΙΩΝ
Kroton c.530–?, B–c.400–?. ΚΡΟΤΩΝΙΑΤΑΣ, ΚΡΟΤΩΝΙΑΤΑΝ

26. Coins
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kyme</td>
<td>c.475–?</td>
<td>G–c.475. Kyme, Kymeia</td>
<td>Anaktorion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>c.510–?</td>
<td>B–C.4. Aion</td>
<td>Argos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokroi</td>
<td>c.375–?</td>
<td>G–C.4m, B–C.4m–?. Aokro</td>
<td>Astakos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medma</td>
<td>c.375–?</td>
<td>B–c.375–. Mesmaion</td>
<td>Echinos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metapontion</td>
<td>c.550–?</td>
<td>B.4c–5. G–C.4m.</td>
<td>Herakleia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neapolis</td>
<td>c.450–385</td>
<td>NEHPIOLIS, NEHPIOLITIS, NEOPOLITEION, NEOPOLITIKON</td>
<td>Koronta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandosia</td>
<td>c.500–?</td>
<td>Πανδοσία</td>
<td>Krani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poseidonia</td>
<td>c.530–?</td>
<td>Β–C.420, G–C.5l.</td>
<td>Leukas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyxous</td>
<td>c.600–?</td>
<td>Πυξος</td>
<td>Matropolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhegion</td>
<td>c.510–?</td>
<td>Β–C.55–?. Phiginos, Phigion, Phigion</td>
<td>Medion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siris</td>
<td>c.600–1</td>
<td>Σηρίνος</td>
<td>Palairos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sybaris</td>
<td>c.540–510, ca.500, c.453–443,</td>
<td>C.4.400. Συβαρίτας, Συβαρίτων</td>
<td>Paleis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taras</td>
<td>c.520–?</td>
<td>G–C.45. Ταράς, Tarantinon</td>
<td>Phoitai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temesa</td>
<td>C.6l–C.3m. T.E.</td>
<td>Pronnoi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terina</td>
<td>c.460–?</td>
<td>B–C.4l. Terinaion or Τερίνα</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thourioi</td>
<td>c.440–?</td>
<td>B–Ca.440–?. Θούριον</td>
<td>Stratos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Adriatic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thyrrheion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonia</td>
<td>C.5m–C.4m. ΑΠΟΛΛΟΝΟΣ</td>
<td>Torybeia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidamnos</td>
<td>C.5m–C.4m. ΔΥΡΑΧΙΝΩΝ, ΔΥΡ</td>
<td>Zakynthos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraklea</td>
<td>B–C.4. Πρακλειωταν</td>
<td>Aitolia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issa</td>
<td>B–C.4f–?. Ιώνιο(Σ) (name of Hero)</td>
<td>Chalkis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melaina Korkyra</td>
<td>B–C.4. ΚΟΡΟΥΡΙΩΝ</td>
<td>Delphoi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharos</td>
<td>C.4, B–C.4. Φαριών</td>
<td>Hyampolis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epeiros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lilaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elea</td>
<td>B–C.4m. Ελαταν, Ελεαί(ὅν)</td>
<td>C.4f. AI</td>
<td>C.480–421. NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kassopa</td>
<td>C.45, B–C.45. ΚΑΣΣΩΠΙΑΙΟΝ</td>
<td>Aktion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akarnania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lebadeia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambrakia</td>
<td>480, 430, C.45. ΑΜΒΡΑΚΙΩΤΑΝ</td>
<td>Chaironeia</td>
<td>C.4e, B–C.45. ΧΑΙΡΩΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Haliartos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hyetos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kopai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Koroneia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lebadeia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mykalessos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orchomenos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pharei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plataiai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tanagra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thebai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thespiae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megaris, Korinthia, Sikyonia</td>
<td>Attika</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korinthos</td>
<td>Athenai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megara</td>
<td>Salamis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikyon</td>
<td>B–C4. ΣΑΛΑΔΑ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achaia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigai</td>
<td>500–370. ΑΙΓΙΑΙΟΝ or -ΙΩΝ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigeira</td>
<td>B–C4m. ΑΙΓΙΠΑΤΑΝ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyme</td>
<td>Ερετρία</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helike</td>
<td>Ηστιαία/Ορέως</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pellene</td>
<td>Καρύστος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arkadia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alea</td>
<td>525–446, 411–400. ΕΥΒΟΙ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kleitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantinea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megalopolis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methydronym</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchomenos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallantion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheneos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psophis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stymphalos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thaliades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelphousa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Argolis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos</td>
<td>530–350–?, G–C3, B–C3–C4. ΑΘΗ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidaurus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halicis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermione</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kleonai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phleious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troizen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saronic Gulf</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigina</td>
<td>530–350–?, G–C3, B–C3–C4. ΑΘΗ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karystos</td>
<td>B–C4. ΣΑΛΑΔΑ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Euboia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalkis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eretria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histiaia/Oreos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Lokris</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larymna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skarpheia</td>
<td>B–C4. ΣΑΛΑΔΑ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thronion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thessalia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atrax</td>
<td>540–500–?, B–C4–C5. ΑΤΡΑΓΙΟΝ or -ΙΩΝ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gomphoi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kieron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kranon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larisa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methyion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mopsion</td>
<td>B–C4. ΣΑΛΑΔΑ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peirasia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelinnaion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phalaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharkadon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharsalos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pherai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **C** indicates centuries, **G** indicates generations.
- **M** indicates miliary orders.
- **B–C** indicates both before and after.
- **AΘΗ** indicates Athens.
Dion C₄, ΔΙΕΩΝ
Kampsa C₅e, ΚΑ
Mende c.500–358, B–C₄, ΜΕΝΔΑΙΟΝ or -ΙΩΝ
Olophykos B–C₄m, ΟΛΙΦΥΞΙΩΝ
Olynthos c.432–348, G–C₄, B–C₄, ΟΛΥΝ, ΧΑΛΚΙΔΕΩΝ
Poteidaia C₆l–356, B–C₄, ΠΟΤΕΙ
Sermylia c.500, B–C₄, ΣΕΡΜΥΛΙΚΟΝ, ΣΕΡΜΥΛΙΑΙΟΝ
Skapsaioi C₄f, ΣΚΑΨΑΙ
Skione C₆l–c.424, B–C₄f, ΣΚΙΩΝΑΙΟΝ
Skithai c.500, ΣΚΙΘ(ΑΙΟ)Ν
Stagiros C₆l, ΣΤΑΙΓΙ
Toroee C₆l–420, ΤΕΡΩΝΑΟΝ

**Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos**

Berga C₅s, ΒΕΡΓΑΙΟΥ
Eion C₅f, EL–C₅f
Galepsos B–C₄e, ΓΛΑΝΗΨΙΩΝ
Krenides C₄m, G–C₄m, B–C₄m, ΘΑΣΙΟΝ
Neapolis 530–C₄m, B–C₄, ΝΕΑΠΟΛΙΤΙΩΝ
Oisyme B–C₄, ΟΙΣΥΜΑΙΩΝ
Phagres B–C₄f, ΦΑΓΡΠ
Philippoi C₄s, G–C₄s, B–C₄s, ΦΙΛΙΠΠΙΩΝ

**Thrace: from Nestos to Hebrons**

Abdera C₆s–?, B–C₅m–?, G–C₄m.
Ainos 478–341, B–C₅s, G–C₄f, ΑΙΝΙΩΝ
Dikaios C₆s–476, C₅m, ΔΙΚΑΙΑ
Kypselia C₄l–C₃e, ΚΥΨΕ
Maroneia C₆l–C₃s, ΜΑΡΩΝΙΟΣ, ΜΑΡΩΝΙΤΕΩΝ
Orthogoria C₄m, B–C₄m, ΟΡΘΟΓΟΡΕΩΝ
Zone B–C₄–?. ΖΩΝΑΙΩΝ

**Thracian Chersonesos**

Aigos potami C₅–C₄, B–C₄, ΑΙΓΟΣ ΠΟ
Alopekonnesos B–c.400–200, ΑΛΟΠΕΚΕΩΝ
Chersonesos/Agora C₆l–C₅e, C₄m–?, B–C₄m–?. ΧΕΡΡΟ
Elaios B–C₄m–C₃e, ΕΛΑΙΟΥΣΙΩΝ
Kardia B–C₄s, ΚΑΡΔΙΑΙΟΝΟΣ, ΚΑΡΔΙΑΙΩΝ
Krithe B–C₄m–C₃e, ΚΡΙΘΟΥΣΙΩΝ
Madytos B–C₄s, ΜΑΘΥ

**Propontic Thrace**

Byzantium C₅l–?, Iron–C₅s, B–C₄, ΒΥ

Perinthos C₄m, B–C₄m, ΠΕΡΙΝΘΙΩΝ
Selymbria 492–470, 425–10, ΣΕΛΥΜΒΡΙΑ

**Pontos: West Coast**

Apollonia C₅m–?, B–arrow-head C₅, Α
Istrons c.480–?, B–C₄, ΙΣΤΡΙΗ
Kallatis C₄s–?, ΚΑΛΛΑΤΙ
Mesembria C₅m–?, ΜΕΤΑ
Nikonion B–C₅f–m, ΣΚΥΛΑ (King Skyles)
Olbia C₅l, B–arrow-head C₅f, B-dolphin
C₆s, B–C₅–?, ΟΛΒΙΩΝ, ΟΛΒΙΟ
Tyras C₄m, B–C₄m, ΤΥΡΑΛΟΝ

**Pontos: Skythia**

Chersonesos C₄e–?, B–C₄e–?, ΧΕΡ
Gorgippeia c.400, ΣΙΝΑΙΩΝ (regional ethnic)
Karkinitis C₄s–?, ΚΑΡΚΙΝΙ
Nymphaion C₅l, ΝΥΜ
Pantikapaion C₅e–?, B–C₅e–?, G–C₄, ΠΑΝΤΙ, ΑΠΟΛ
Phanagan C₅l–C₄m, ΦΑΝΑ
Theodosia C₅l–c.370, B–C₅l–c.370, ΘΕΟΔΟΣΙΑ

**Pontos: Kolchis**

Phasis C₅e–?

**Pontic Coast of Asia Minor**

Amisos/Peiraeus C₅l–c.330, ΠΕΙΡΑΙΩΝ
Heraclea C₅l–?, ΠΗΡΑΚΑΛΕΙΑ
Kromna C₄, B–C₄, ΚΡΟΜΝΑ
Samos C₄s, B–C₄s, ΣΗΜΑΝΗ
Sinope c.480, ΣΙΝΩ
Tieon C₄l–?, ΤΙΑΝΩΝ, ΤΙΑΝΟΣ
Trapezous C₅l–C₄e, ΤΡΑΠΕΖΟΥ

**Propontic Coast of Asia Minor**

Astakos C₅, ΑΣ
Harpagion B–C₄–?, ΑΡΠΑΓΙ
Kalchedon C₄–?, ΚΑΛΧ
Kios C₄m–?, G–C₄m–?, ΚΙΑΝΩΝ
Kyzikos C₄m–?, E–C₅f–?, B–C₄–?, ΚΥΖΙ
Lampsakos C₆l–E–C₆l–?, B–C₄–?, ΛΑΜΠΣΑ
Miletus C₄–?, B–C₄–?, ΜΙΛΗΤΟΠΟΛΕΙΤΩΝ
Myreia (Bryllion) C₄–?, ΜΥΡΕΑΙΩΝ
Parion C₅e–?, E–C₅e–?, B–C₄–?, ΠΑΡΙ
Plakia B–C₄, ΠΑΛΑΙΑ
Prokonnesos C₅m–C₄m, B–C₄e–C₄m, ΠΡΟΚΟΝ

Zeleia B–C₄s, ΖΕΛΕ
COINS 1387

Troas
Abydos C6l–C3e (G,E,S), B–C4l. 
ABYΔΗΝΟΝ
Achilleion B–C4s. AX
Antandros c.440–C3e. B–c.440–C3e. ANΤΑΝ
Assos c.480–C3m, B–c.400–C3m.
ΑΣΥΩΝ
Astyra C5–C4, B–C5–C4. ΤΙΣΣΑ, ΑΣΤΥΡΗ, ΑΣΤΥΡΑ
Birytis C4l–C3e, B–C4l–C3e. ΒΙΠΥ
Dardanos C6l–C4 (E,S), B–C4. ΔΑΡΔΑΝ
Gargara c.420–C3e. B–c.400–C3e. ΓΑΡΓ
Gentinos B–C4. ΓΕΝΤΙ
Gergis c.400–C3m, B–c.400–C3m. ΓΕΡ
Hamaxitos B–c.400–C4l. ΑΜΑΞΙ
Ilion C4l–C3m, B–C4l–C3m. ΙΑΙ
Kebren C6–C4l, B–c.400–C4l. ΚΕΒΡΗΝΙ
Kolonai B–c.400–C4l. ΚΟΛΩΝΑΩΝ
Lamponeia c.420–400, B–c.400–350. ΛΑΜΜ
Neandreia c.430–C4l, B–c.430–C4l. ΝΕΑΝ
Ophryneion c.350–300, B–c.350–300.
ΟΦΡΥΝΟΝ
Rhoiteion c.350–300. ΡΟΙΤΕΙ
Sigeion C4m, B–C4m. ΣΙΓΕ
Skpepsi c.460–C4l, B–c.460–C4l.
ΣΚΗΠΣΩΝ
Tenedos c.550–387. ΤΕΝΕΔΙΩΝ

Lesbos
Antissa C5f. Monogram = ΑΝ?
Eresos B–C4–C3. ΕΡΕΣΙ
ΜΑΘΥΜΝΑΙΟΣ, ΜΑΘΥΜΝΑΙΩΝ
Mytilene C5f–C4s, E–C5f–C4s, Billon
C480–450, B–C4. ΜΥΤΙΛΕΝΑΩΝ
Pyrrha B–c.370–?. ΠΥΡΡ

Aiolos
Adramyttion C3m, B–C4f. ΔΡΑΜΥ
Atarneus c.400–?, B–c.400–?. ΑΤΑΡ
Autokane B–C4m–?. ΑΥΣΤΟΚΑΝΑ
Boione B–C4. ΒΟΙΩΝΙΤΙΚΟΣ or -ΙΚΟΝ
Chalkis B–C4. ΧΑ
Elaia 460–400, B–c.340–?. ΕΛΑΙ
Gambrion C4, B–C4. ΓΑΜ
Heracleia C5. ΗΡΑΚ
Iolla B–C4. ΙΟΛΛΑ, ΙΟΛΛΕΩΝ
Kisthene B–C48. ΚΙΣΘΗ
Karyanda  B–C₄–C₃, KARY
Kaunos  C₆–C₅, B–C₄. Karian legend, C₄: KAY
Keramos  B–C₄, KE
Kindye  C₆l–C₅e. KI
Knidos  c.500–?, KNKDION or -ION
Mylasa  C₄m, B–C₄s–?, MY?, EUPOLEMOY
Syangela  C₃l–C₄e. SY
Termera  C₆l–C₅e. TYMNO, THERMERICON

Lykia
Phaselis  C₆m–?, PHAS
Xanthos  C₅m–c.370. Lykian legend

Crete
Allaria  330–270. ALAPRIOΣNA(N)
Aptara  330–270. APIΠAPAOY
Arkades  330–270. APRAΩDION
Axos  380–270. FAKSΞION
Chersonasos  330–270. XEPΣΩΝΑΣΞION
Eleutherna  350–270. ELYEΘΕΡΝΑΙΟΝ
Elyros  330–270. ELYPION
Gortyns  470–300. GORTYNΩΣΤΟΠΑΙΜΑ, GORTYNΣ, GORTYNION
Hierapytna  C₄f–270. I ΡΑΠΙΥ
Hyrtakina  330–270. G–C₄s–C₃f. YRTAKINΩN
Itanos  380–270. ITANΩN
Keraia  330–270. KERAITAN
Knosos  450–270. KNΩΣΙΩN
Kydonia  475–280. KUDΩN
Kytain  350–280. KY
Lappa  330–270. LAΠΠΑΙΟΝ
Lisos  C₄s–C₃f. G–C₄s–C₃f. ΛΙΣΞION
(with Hyrtakina)
Lyktos  470–C₄l. ΛΥΚΙΩΝ
Olaus  330–270. ΟΛΟΝΤΩΝ
Phaistos  470–300. ΠΑΙΣΙΤΝΩΝΠΑΙΜΑ, ΠΑΙΣΙΤΚΩΝ, ΦΑΙΣΞΙΩΝ
Phalasarna  330–280. ΦΑ
Polyrhen  330–270. ΠΟΛΥΡΗΝΙΟΝ
Praisos  350–C₃e. ΠΡΑΙΣΙΩΝ
Prisansos  330–270. ΠΡΙΑΝΣΙΕΩΝ
Rhaikos  330–270. PAYKION
Rhithynmos  330–270. PI

Sybrita  380–270. ΣΥΒΡΙΤΙΩΝ
Tarrha  330–270. ΤΑΡ
Tylisos  330–270. ΤΥΛΙΣΙΩΝ

Rhodos
Ialysos  C₆s–C₅s. ΙΑΛΥΣΙΩΝ
Kamiros  C₆–c.400. B–C₅. KAMIΡΕΩN
Lindos  G₆–408. ΑΙΝΙΩΝ
Rhodos  c.400–?, B–C₄, G–C₄s. ΠΑDIΩN, ΡΟDIΩI

Pamphylia
Aspendos  C₅e–?, B–C₄. ΕΣΤΦΕΔΙΙΥΣ
Side  C₅m–?. ΣΙΔΗ

Kilikia
Aphrodias  c.520–?. Letters of uncertain meaning
Holmoi  C₄. ΟΛΜΙΤΙΚΩΝ, ΟΛΜΙΤΟΝ
Issos  c.400–?. ΙΣΣΙΚΩΝ, ΙΣΣΕΩΝ
Kelenderis  C₅m–?. ΚΕΛΕΝΔΕΡΙΤΙΚΟΝ
Mallos  C₅s–?. ΜΑΡΛΟΤΑΝ, ΜΑΛΑΛΟΤΗΣ
Nagidos  C₅l–?, B–C₅l–?. ΝΑΓΙΔΙΚΩΝ, ΝΑΓΙΔΕΩΝ
Soloi  480–333, B–C₄. ΣΟΛΙΚΟΝ, ΣΟΛΕΩΝ

Cyprus
Amathous  c.460–350. Name of king in syllabic script
Idalion  C₆l–C₅m. Name of king in syllabic script
Lapethos  C₅f–C₄l. Name of king in Phoenician script
Marion  C₅e–C₄l, G–C₄s, Β–C₄s. Name of king in syllabic script, ΜΑΡΙΕΥΣ
Paphos  C₆l–C₄l. Name of king in syllabic script. C₄s: ΝΙΚΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ, ΠΑΦΙΟΝ
Salamis  C₆l–C₄l. Name of king in syllabic script. C₄s: ΒΑ ΕΥΑ
Soloi  C₅f–C₄l. Name of king in syllabic script. C₄s: ΒΑ ΠΑΣΙ

Syria
Posideion  C₄s, B–C₄s. ΠΟΣΙΔΑ

Egypt
Naukratis  B–C₄s. ΝΑΥ
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Coin Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>Barke</td>
<td>c.525–308</td>
<td>BAPKAION</td>
<td>C5.4l.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Euhesperides</td>
<td>C5e–m</td>
<td>EYESSEPITAN</td>
<td>G5.4l.C4l.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyrene</td>
<td>c.570–308</td>
<td>KYPANAION</td>
<td>G5.4l.C4e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taucheira</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C5s. TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unlocated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C5s. ΦYTAION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phytaioi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. Colonisation and Hellenisation

**Key**
- P. = primary colony
- S. = secondary colony
- Re. = refoundation
- Hell. = Hellenised indigenous community
- occ. = Athenian short-term occupation by klerouchs or colonists

**Spain and France**
- Alalie: Phokaia, C6m, P. α
- Emporion: Massalia and Phokaia, c.600, P.S. β
- Massalia: Phokaia, c.600, P. α
- Rhode: Massalia, C5–C4, P. α

**Sikelia**
- Abakainon: Hell.
- Adranon: Syrakousai, c.400, S. α
- Agyrion: Hell., Re. Syrakousai, c.340, S.
- Aitna: Syrakousai, 476, S. α
- Akragas: Gela (and Rhodos?), C.580, S. α
- Akrai: Syrakousai, 664, S. α
- Alaïsa: Herbita, 403/2, S. β
- Alontion: Hell., γ
- Apollonia: ?
- Engyon: ?
- Euboia: Leontinoi, C7, S. α
- Galeria: Hell.
- Gela: Rhodos and Crete, 689/8, P. α
- Heloron: Syrakousai?
- Henna: Hell.
- Herakleia Minoa: Selinous, C6?
- Herakleia: Sparta, c.500, P. α
- Herbessos: Hell.
- Herbita: Hell.
- Himera: Zankle and Syrakousai, 648, S. α
- Hippana: Hell.
- Imachara: Hell.
- Kallipolis: Naxos, C8, S. α
- Kamarina: Syrakousai, c.598, S. α

**Italy and Kampania**
- Kasmenai: Syrakousai
- Katane: Naxos, 729, S. α
- Re. exiled Katanians: 461, S.
- Re. exiled Naxians: 424, S.
- Re. Gela and Kamarina: 405/4, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 396, S.
- Re. exiled Naxians?: 700?, S. α
- Re. Gela and Kamarina?: 424, S.
- Re. Syrakousai?: 396, S.
- Re. Lokroi, Medma: 395, S.
- Re. mixed: 488/7, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 392, S.
- Re. Naxos: 358, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 396, S. α
- Re. Lokroi, Medma: 395, S.
- Chalkis: 735/4, P. α
- Megara Hyblaia: 728, P. α
- Re. exiled Naxians: 468, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: c.340, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 396, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 392, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 396, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: c.340, S.
- Re. mixed: 488/7, S.
- Re. Lokroi, Medma: 395, S.

**Hellenised Indigenous Communities**
- Kentoripa: Hell., γ
- Kephaloidion: Hell., γ
- Leontinoi: Naxos, 729, S. α
- Re. exiled Naxians: 461, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: c.340, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 396, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 392, S.
- Re. Naxos: 358, S.
- Re. Lokroi, Medma: 395, S.
- Re. mixed: 488/7, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 396, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 392, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 396, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: c.340, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 396, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: c.340, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 396, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 392, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 396, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: c.340, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 396, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 392, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 396, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: c.340, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 396, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 392, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 396, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: c.340, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 396, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 392, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 396, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: c.340, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 396, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 392, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 396, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: c.340, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 396, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 392, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 396, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: c.340, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 396, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 392, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 396, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: c.340, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 396, S.
- Re. Syrakousai: 392, S.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Colony Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaulonia Kroton</td>
<td>Achaia</td>
<td>709/8</td>
<td>Pandosia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re. Syrakousai</td>
<td>337 S. Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kroton Chalkis (and Eretria?)</td>
<td>750 P. Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos Sybaris</td>
<td>C6 S. Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re. Sybaris</td>
<td>500 S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokris Lokroi</td>
<td>C7e P. Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metapontion Achaia</td>
<td>C630 P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metauros Zankle</td>
<td>C7 S. Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re. Lokroi</td>
<td>C75 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neapolis Kyme</td>
<td>C470 S. Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re. Chalkis, Pithekoussai, Athenai</td>
<td>453 P. Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandosia Achaia</td>
<td>C6 P. Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pithekoussai Chalkis and Eretria</td>
<td>750 P. Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poseidonia Sybaris</td>
<td>C600 S. Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyxous Sybaris</td>
<td>C6 S. Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rheidburg Chalkis and Messenia</td>
<td>471/0 S. Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re. exiled Rhegians</td>
<td>350 S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siris Kolophon</td>
<td>C81–C7e P.  Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sybaris Achaia and Troizen</td>
<td>C81 P. Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re. Thessalians</td>
<td>453 P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rey. Athenai and others</td>
<td>446/5 P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taras Sparta</td>
<td>706 P. Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temesa Aitolians</td>
<td>C65 P. Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terina Krotos</td>
<td>C5f S. Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thourioi Mixed</td>
<td>444/3 P. Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Adriatic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adria Aigina,</td>
<td>C6l P. Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re. Greek</td>
<td>446 P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankon Syrakosai</td>
<td>C387 P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonia Korinthos</td>
<td>C600 P. Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentesion Hell.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidamnos/Dyrrachion</td>
<td>Kyrkos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.625 S. Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleia Syrakosai?</td>
<td>C4f S. Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issa Syrakosai</td>
<td>C4f S. Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lissos Syrakosai</td>
<td>C385 S. Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melaina Korkyra Knidos</td>
<td>C6 P. Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re. Issa C4l S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharos Paros</td>
<td>385 P. Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thourioi Mixed</td>
<td>444/3 P. Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Aegean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigalos (Amygdalos)</td>
<td>Samos</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andros Athenai occ.</td>
<td>C5m P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkesine (Amygdalos)</td>
<td>Samos</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astypalai Edfouros</td>
<td>? P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kos Edfouros</td>
<td>? P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemnos Athenai occ.</td>
<td>500 P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imbros Athenai</td>
<td>500 P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalymna Edfouros</td>
<td>? P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leros Miletos</td>
<td>C6 P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saronic Gulf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigina Athenai occ.</td>
<td>431 P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euboia Chalkis</td>
<td>Athenai occ.</td>
<td>506 P.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histiou/Aires</td>
<td>Athenai occ.</td>
<td>446 P.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karystos Athenai occ.</td>
<td>C5m P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malis Herakleia</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>426 P.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epeiros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batiai Elis</td>
<td>? P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boucheta Elis</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akarnania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alyaeia Korinthos</td>
<td>? P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambrakia Korinthos</td>
<td>c.650–25 P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaktorion Korinthos</td>
<td>c.650–25 P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aitolia Chalkis</td>
<td>Korinthos</td>
<td>? P.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korone Exiled Messenians</td>
<td>369 ? P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothone Nauplia</td>
<td>C8 P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lokris</td>
<td>Naupaktos Re. East Lokris and Chaleion C5f P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messenia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aithaia Sparta</td>
<td>C8 P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asine Asine in Argolis</td>
<td>C8 P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exiled Messenians</td>
<td>369 ? P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saronic Gulf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malis Herakleia</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>426 P.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epeiros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boucheta Elis</td>
<td>? P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teos Chalkis</td>
<td>Korinthos</td>
<td>? P.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leukas Korinthos</td>
<td>c.650–25 P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saronic Gulf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malis Herakleia</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>426 P.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epeiros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melos</td>
<td>C8e</td>
<td>P.</td>
<td>Galepsos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thasos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re. Athenai occ.</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>P.</td>
<td>Gigonos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naxos</td>
<td>C5m</td>
<td>P.</td>
<td>Iastos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisyros</td>
<td></td>
<td>P.</td>
<td>Kalindoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miletos</td>
<td></td>
<td>P.</td>
<td>Kamakai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peparethos</td>
<td></td>
<td>P.</td>
<td>Kampsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samothrake</td>
<td>C6f</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Kioskos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skiathos</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Kithas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Skyros                |               | 476/5 P.     | Kleonai              |\
| Stagiros              |               | ?            | Miletos              |
| Thessalia             | C8l-C7e P.    |              | Lipaxos              |
| Thera                 |               | C8e P.       | Mende                |
| Thermy (Ikaros)       |               | P.           | Eretria              |
| Makedonia             |               |              | Milkoros             |
| Ichnae                | Unknown       | ? P.         | Neapolis             |
| Methone               | Eretria       | c.730 P.     | Mende                |
| Mygdonia              |               |              | Olyrhoxos            |
| Apollonia             | Chalkides     | 432 S.       | Osaia                |
| Arethousa             | Hell.         | a            | Othoros              |
| Bormiskos             |               | ?            | Pharbela             |
| Chalestre             | Hell.         | ?            | Phigontioi           |
| Herakleia             |               | a?           | Piloro               |
| Lete                  | Hell.         | ?            | Pistas               |
| Sindos                | Hell.         | ?            | Pleume               |
| Therme                | Hell.         | ?            | Polichnitai          |
| Bisaltia              |               |              | Posideion            |
| Amphipolis            | Athenai       | 437/6 P.     | Poteida             |
| Argilos               | Andros        | B            | Poteida              |
| Traillos              | Hell.         |              | Poteida             |
| Chalkidike            |               |              | Re. Athenai occ.     |
| Aige                  |               | a            | Sane, Pelle           |
| Aineia                |               | a            | Sane, Akte           |
| Aioleion              |               | a?           | Sarte                |
| Akanthos              | Andros        | C7e P.       | Sermelia             |
| Akrothoii             | Hell.         | ?            | Singos               |
| Alapta                |               | a            | Sinos                |
| Anthemous             |               | a?           | Skabala              |
| Aphytos               |               | a            | Skapsaios            |
| Assera                |               | a            | Skione               |
| Charadrous            |               | ?            | Achaia (Pelle?)      |
| Chedrolias            |               | ?            | Re. Athenai          |
| Chytropolis           |               | a            | (Plataians) occ.     |
| Dikaia                | Eretria       | ? P.         | Smila                |
| Dion                  | Hell.         | ?            | Spartolos            |
| Eion                  | Mende         | ? S.         | Stagiros             |
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Stolos/Skolos Chalkideis? ? S. α
Strepsa ? α
Therambos ? α
Thestoros ? ?
Thyssos Hell. β
Tinde ? ?
Torone ? c.1000 α
Tripoi ? ?
Zereia ? ?

Thrace, Unlocated
Aison ? ?
Brea Athenai c.445 P. α
Kossaia ? ?

Thrace: from Strymon to Nestos
Apollonia Ionia ? ? ? α
Berga Thasos ? S. β
Datios Thasos c.360 S. β
Eion Athenai occ. 476 P. α?
Galepsos Thasos C7l S. α
Krenides Thasos 360/59 S. α
Myrkinos Hell. β
Re. Miletos 497 P.
Neapolis Thasos 650–625 S. α
Oisyme Thasos 650–625 S. α
Phagres Thasos C6? S. α
Philippoi Philip II 356 ? α
Pistyros Thasos C6 S. α
Sirra Philip II C4m ? β

Thrace: from Nestos to Hebros
Abdera Klazomenai c.650 P. α
Re. Teos 544 P.
Ainos Alopeke, Mytilene and Kyme C7s–C6f α
Bergepolis Abdera? ? S. ?
Dikaia Unknown, Samos? C6 ? α?
Drys Samothrake? ? S. ?
Kypsela ? ? β
Maroneia Chios C7f P. α
Mesambrie Samothrake ? S. ?
Orthogoria ? ? α?
Saly Samothrake? ? S. ?
Stryme Thasos C7 S. α
Zone Samothrake? ? S. α

Inland Thrace
Alexandropolis Hell. β
Apros Hell.? γ

Kabyle Philip II C4m P. γ
Philippopolis Philip II C4m P. γ
Pistiros Pistyros on the coast? ? S. β
Seuthopolis Seuthes III C4l P. γ

Thracian Chersonesos
Aigos potamoi ? α
Araplos ? α?
Alokekonnesos Aiolis C7–C6FP. α
Chersonesos/Agora Athenai C6m P. α
Re. Athenai C5m, C4f P
Deris ? α?
Elaious ? C7l P. α
Re. Athenai C6m P. α
Re. Athenai occ. 353–343 P. α
Ide ? α?
Kardia Miletos and Klazomenai ? P.
Kressa Re. Athenai C6m P.
Krithote Athenai C6m P. α
Limnai Miletos ? P. α
Madytos Lesbos C7 P. α
Madytos Lesbos P? α?
Paktye Athenai C6m P. α
Sestos Lesbos, C7 P. α
Re. Athenai C6m P.
Re. Athenai occ. 353/2 P.

Propontic Thrace
Bisanthe Samos C6? P. α
Byzantion Megara c.660 P. α
Damiminon Teichos ? α?
Heraioun Teichos Samos or Perinthos ? P.S. α?
Neapolis Athenai occ. C5? P. α
Perinthos Samos 602 P. α
Selymbria Megara C7f P. α
Serrion Teichos ? α?
Tyrodisa ?

Pontos: West Coast
Apollonia Miletos c.610 P. α
Bizeon Miletos? C6 P. α
Dionysopolis Miletos? C6l–C5P. α
Istros Miletos 657 P. α
Kallatis Herakleia Pontike C6l? S. α
Mesambria Kalchedon and Byzantium
Mesambria C6l S. α
Nikonion Istrs C6l S. α
Odessos Miletos 585–570 P. α
Olbia Miletos 647/6 P. α
Ophiousa ? a
Orgame Iströs C6s S. β
Tomoi Miletos C6 P. a
Tyras Miletos C6 P. a

Pontos: Skythia
Chersonesos Herakleia Pontike 528 P.S. a
and Delion
Gorgippia Mixed, from neighbours
Hermonassa Ionia 580–570 P. a
Karkinitis Unknown C6l ? a
Kepoi Miletos 580–570 P. a
Kimmerikon East Greeks C6m ? a
Kytia East Greeks C5e ? a
Labrys Hell. γ
Myrmekion Ionia 580–560 ? a
Nymphaios Miletos or Samos 560s P. β
Pantikapaion Miletos 575 P. β
Phanagoria Teos c.540 P. a
Theodosia Miletos c.570 P. β
Tyrinike Ionia c.580–560 ? a

Pontos: Kolchis
Dioskouris Miletos C6m P. a
Gyenos East Greeks C6m ? β
Phasis Miletos C6–C5 P. β

Pontic Coast of Asia Minor
Amisos Phokaia (or Miletos?) c.560 P. a
Becheirias ? a
Choirades ? a
Herakleia Megara and Tanagra C6m P. a
Iasonia ? a
Karambis ? a
Kerasous Sinope ? S. a
Kinos ? a
Koloussa ? a
Kotyora Sinope ? S. a
Kromna Miletos? ? P. a
Kytoros Miletos? ? P. a
Limne ? γ
Lykastos ? a
Odeinios ? a
Sesamos Miletos? ? P. a
Sinope Miletos C7l P. a

Propontic Coast of Asia Minor
Artaiou Teichos Hell. β
Artake Miletos C6 P. α
Astakos Kalchedon or Megara C7 P.S. α
Bysbicos Hell. ?
Dareion ?
Daskyleion Miletos? ? P. a
Didymon Teichos Hell. ?
Harpagion Hell. ? a
Kalchedon Megara c.675 P. a
Kallipolis Hell. α
Kolonai Lampsakos? ? S. ?
Kyzikos Miletos 679 P. a
Lampsakos Phokaia 654/3 P. a
Metropolis ? ? ? a
Miletoupolis Miletos? C7l–C6e P. a
Miletouteichos Athenai occ. 410 P. a
Myrleia (Bryllion) Kolophon ? P. a
Olbia Megara? ? P. a
Olenoi ?
Parion P. a
Plakia Athenai ? P. β
Priapos Miletos or Kyzikos C7e P.S. a
Pythopolis Hell. ?
Sombia Hell. ?
Tereia Hell. ?
Zelee Hell. ?

Troy
Abydos Miletos C7e P. a
Achilleion Mytilene? C6 P. a
Antandros Aiolis ? P. β
Arisbe Miletos? ? P. a
Assos Aioliens from Lesbos C6 P. a
Astyra Hell. a
Astyra Troika Hell. ?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Colonisation and Hellenisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Azeia</td>
<td>Hell.</td>
<td>β? Carcharia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birytis</td>
<td>Hell.</td>
<td>? Bolbake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dardanos</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>? ? α Chalkerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gargara</td>
<td>Assos</td>
<td>? S. β Chersonsos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentinos</td>
<td>Hell.</td>
<td>? Chios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gergis</td>
<td>Hell.</td>
<td>γ Erinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamaxitos</td>
<td>Hell.</td>
<td>α Euromos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilion</td>
<td>Aiolis</td>
<td>? P. α Halikarnassos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kebrion</td>
<td>Kyme (Aiolis)</td>
<td>C6? P. α Hybliseis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokylion</td>
<td>Aiolis</td>
<td>? P. α Hydaeous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolonai</td>
<td>Aiolis</td>
<td>? P. α Hydios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamponeia</td>
<td>Aiolis</td>
<td>C6? P. Hymisios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larisa</td>
<td>Hell.</td>
<td>α Iasos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neandreia</td>
<td>Aiolis</td>
<td>C6? P. α Idrias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ophryneion</td>
<td>Hell.</td>
<td>α Idyma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaiperkote</td>
<td>Hell.</td>
<td>? Kalynda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkote</td>
<td>Hell.</td>
<td>α Karbasaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polichna</td>
<td>Hell.</td>
<td>? Karynda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhoiteion</td>
<td>Astypalaia</td>
<td>C7/6 P. α Kasolaba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigeion</td>
<td>Athenai</td>
<td>C71 P. α Kaunos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skepsis</td>
<td>Aiolis</td>
<td>? P. α Kedreai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re. Miletos</td>
<td>C5e P.</td>
<td>Keramos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenedos</td>
<td>Aiolis from Lesbos</td>
<td>? P. α Killareis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbos</td>
<td>Athenai occ.</td>
<td>427 P. Kodybeis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eresos</td>
<td>Athenai occ.</td>
<td>427 P. Kolybergeis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mytilene</td>
<td>Athenai occ.</td>
<td>427 P. Koranza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrrha</td>
<td>Athenai occ.</td>
<td>427 P. Krya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiolis</td>
<td>Adrmytton</td>
<td>Delos 422 P. Kyrbissos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atarneus</td>
<td>Chios</td>
<td>547/6 P. Latmos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leukai</td>
<td>Klazomenai and Kyme c.383/2</td>
<td>P. Lepsimandos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neon Teichos</td>
<td>Kyme?</td>
<td>? P. Medmasos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionia</td>
<td>Athenai occ.</td>
<td>427 P. Mylos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samos</td>
<td>Athenai occ.</td>
<td>365 P. Narissareis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karia</td>
<td>Athenai occ.</td>
<td>365 P. Naryandos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabanda</td>
<td>Hell.</td>
<td>γ Olaeis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alinda</td>
<td>Hell.</td>
<td>γ Olympos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>Hell.</td>
<td>α Ouromion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amynandeis</td>
<td>Hell.</td>
<td>β Parmariotai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amyzon</td>
<td>Hell.</td>
<td>β Passaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlissos</td>
<td>Hell.</td>
<td>γ Pedasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armelites</td>
<td>Hell.</td>
<td>γ Peleiaetes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aulai</td>
<td>Hell.</td>
<td>? Pidasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargasa</td>
<td>Hell.</td>
<td>γ Pladosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilikia</td>
<td>Aphrodisias</td>
<td>Hell.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holmoi</td>
<td>Hell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issos</td>
<td>Hell.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kelenderis</td>
<td>Samos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mallos</td>
<td>Hell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nagidos</td>
<td>Samos?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soloi</td>
<td>Lindos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Posideion</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Naukratis</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oasis</td>
<td>Samos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>Barke</td>
<td>Kyrene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Euhesperides</td>
<td>Kyrene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kinys</td>
<td>Lakedaimon (Dorieus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyrene</td>
<td>Thera (and others)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re. Peloponnese and islands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taucheira</td>
<td>Kyrene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamphylia</td>
<td>Aspendos</td>
<td>Argos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idyros</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perge</td>
<td>Hell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Side</td>
<td>Aiolian Kyme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crete</td>
<td>Phaselis</td>
<td>Lindos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Xanthos</td>
<td>Hell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kydonia</td>
<td>Samos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re. Aigina</td>
<td>C6l P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lykia</td>
<td>Xanthos</td>
<td>Hell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lindos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlocated</td>
<td>Okolon</td>
<td>Eretria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>