

## AEGEAN INTERACTIONS



# Aegean Interactions

*Delos and its Networks in the Third Century*

CHRISTY CONSTANTAKOPOULOU

OXFORD  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

**OXFORD**

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,  
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.  
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,  
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of  
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Christy Constantakopoulou 2017

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

First Edition published in 2017

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in  
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the  
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted  
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics  
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the  
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the  
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form  
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press  
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016962805

ISBN 978-0-19-878727-3

Printed and bound by  
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and  
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials  
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

*To the Liddels: Πήτερ, Φάνης και Τζώνης*



## *Acknowledgements*

This book has been long in the making. I realized that this was a topic for a separate monograph while I was revising my PhD thesis, which was published as Constantakopoulou 2007. Family, work, and the Lernaia Hydra of university bureaucracy and administration in the UK meant that it took me much longer than anticipated to finish writing it.

There are many people who helped me out in developing the ideas of the book. Kostas Buraselis first introduced me to the fascinating history of the third-century Aegean in his wonderful undergraduate seminar at the University of Athens. Little did he know that that seminar would lead me to a path of historical exploration two decades later. For that, and for his overall support, and intellectual generosity over the years, I am deeply thankful.

I was also extremely lucky to have been able to discuss aspects of the book with a great number of people: Gary Reger, whose work has been an inspiration for so many aspects of my research; Francis Prost, who generously discussed with me local Delian identity and the Archegesion; Bonna Wescoat, who shared ideas about royal funding and regional sanctuaries; Yulia Ustinova, who discussed ideas about religion, during many lovely lunches; Will Mack, who was an extremely generous reader; Riet van Bremen, who shared her inexhaustible knowledge of Hellenistic history and epigraphy; Janet Powell, who read a chapter and provided helpful feedback; Tania Panagou gave me a copy of her brilliant PhD thesis on amphora stamps—I am sorry that I decided not to include amphora stamps in my analysis. I also want to thank many friends and colleagues for creating a stimulating academic environment in London and elsewhere for my ideas to develop and take form: Hugh Bowden, John Davies, Esther Eidinow, Maria Fragoulaki, Tom Harrison, Polly Low, Katerina Panagopoulou, Nikos Papazarkadas, April Pudsey, Claire Taylor, and Kostas Vlassopoulos. Part of the book was written in the wonderful intellectual environment of the Centre of Hellenic Studies in Washington, where I spent a term as a fellow in spring 2015. My fellow friends, especially Madalina Dana, Zacharoula Petraki, and Maria Xanthou, were wonderful companions in my research journey, and provided support, friendship, and generous new insights to my work.

My department in Birkbeck is a truly fantastic place to be in. Despite the fact that I am the only Greek historian in the department, I did not feel any isolation; rather, the free exchange of ideas and intellectual developments in other periods and historical disciplines contributed to my growth as a historian. There are many colleagues I want to thank: John Arnold, Sean Brady, Filippo de Vivo, Caroline Goodson, Vanessa Harding, Lesley McFadyen,

Jan Rueger, and Nik Wachsmann. Furthermore, it is four colleagues in particular that deserve special mention: Jen Baird, Serafina Cuomo, Catharine Edwards, and Caspar Meyer, for sharing the burden of teaching Classics and Ancient History, and for discussion and support: I am more thankful than I can ever put in words. Finally, I want to thank the many Birkbeck students that took my undergraduate and postgraduate seminars over the years. I may not have used any of the topics in this book in my teaching, but being in a classroom with so many fantastic students, and discussing with them sources, methods, and topics such as the nature of imperialism, power, and agency, improved my thinking. I may have imparted to my students some knowledge about ancient Greece, but they brought with them in the classroom their rich views on life and history. Their point of view was probably more instrumental in shaping my approach than many specialized ancient history research seminars that I have attended over the years. I feel that I am a much better historian because I have been lucky enough to spend my weekday evenings teaching Birkbeck students.

The contents of the book improved greatly after comments by members of the audience in Athens, Be'er Sheva, Leicester, London, Manchester, Paris, Providence, Rethymnon, Sheffield, St Andrews, and Washington. I would also like to thank the two readers for Oxford University Press for many insightful comments, which massively improved the final outcome.

My final and most heartfelt thanks go to my family. My sister, Varvara Konstantakopoulou, and my father Fanis Konstantakopoulos, have always been my solid rocks of support. I am sorry that this book is probably not an easy one to read, Varvara. I promise the next one will be better! Varvara also designed the maps of this book: for that alone, I am eternally grateful. Peter Liddel lived with this book for a long time: for his companionship and intellectual support, I cannot thank him enough. Finally, our two sons, Fanis and John, who had to put up with my dragging them every summer to Delos (Delos, or the 'D-word', is a dirty word in our household, according to the youngest), and so much more: you are the reason for everything.

Christy Constantakopoulou

*October 2016*



## Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	xi
<i>List of Tables</i>	xiii
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xv
<i>Note to the Reader</i>	xvii
1. Introduction: Delos, its Networks, Regionalism, and the Aegean World	1
1.1. Delians, the Parasites of the God	1
1.2. Delos, its History, and Historiography	4
1.3. Networks, Regionalism, and the Economy	9
1.4. Aegean Interactions	22
2. The Politics of Connectivity: A History of the Islanders' League	31
2.1. Introduction	31
2.2. Evidence, Dates, Structure, Membership	33
2.3. Agency, Negotiation of Power, and Expression of Identity	50
2.4. Conclusions	55
3. Building, Investing, and Displaying on Delos: A History of Third- and Second-Century Monumentalization	57
3.1. Introduction	57
3.2. Delian Civic Building Activity	60
3.3. Delian Religious Building Activity	69
3.4. Private Initiative	78
3.5. Royal Investment	86
3.6. Conclusions: Monumentalization, Funding, and Control of Space	100
4. Proxeny, Statues, Crowns: The Delian Network of Honours	111
4.1. Introduction: Honours, Publication, and Audience	111
4.2. Proxeny Decrees: Format, Language, Familial Relations, Associated Honours, and Proposers	121
4.3. The Reasoning for Honours and the Activities of Honorands	136
4.4. The Delian Network of Honours	156
4.5. Conclusion	167
5. The Social Dynamics of Dedication: The Delian Inventories of the Third Century BC	171
5.1. Introduction	171
5.2. The Delian Inventories	172

5.3. Some Problems	175
5.4. Inventories and Ancient History	181
5.5. Communities of Worship	188
5.6. Methodology	190
5.7. Gender Dynamics	196
5.8. Individual Dedications Versus Community/Collective Dedications	201
5.9. Delians and Non-Delians: The Geography of Distance for the Delian Network of Dedicants	204
5.10. Status Dynamics: Elite and Non-elite Dedicants in the Inventories	218
5.11. Conclusions	224
6. Conclusions	229
Appendices	
Appendix 1: Honours Given to Individuals in Decrees of the Delian Demos and Boule	243
Appendix 2: Honours Given by the Delians to Individuals, Evidenced Through the Inscriptions of Dedications of Statues and Exedras	263
Appendix 3: Honours to Individuals Awarded by the Delians, Mentioned in the Delian Accounts (largely based on Baslez and Vial 1987, esp. 282) and Elsewhere	265
Appendix 4: The Geographic Spread of Delian Honours: A List of Toponyms Associated with the Ethnic Names of Honorands	269
Appendix 5: Dedicants Recorded in the Delian Inventories in the Period 314–200 BC ( <i>IG XI.2 137 to ID 372</i> )	273
<i>Bibliography</i>	293
<i>General Index</i>	321
<i>Index of Places</i>	327
<i>Index of Sources</i>	329

## List of Figures

2.1. The Islanders' League (©Varvara Konstantakopoulou)	48
3.1. Plan of the sanctuary of Delos (GD Plan 1) (©Υπουργείο Πολιτισμού και Αθλητισμού/ΚΑ' Εφορεία Προϊστορικών-Κλασσικών Αρχαιοτήτων, École Française d'Athènes / B. Sagnier)	63
3.2. Plan of the west coast of Delos (GD Plan 8) (©Υπουργείο Πολιτισμού και Αθλητισμού/ΚΑ' Εφορεία Προϊστορικών-Κλασσικών Αρχαιοτήτων, École Française d'Athènes / B. Sagnier)	73
3.3. Plan of the area of Inopos (GD Plan 5) (©Υπουργείο Πολιτισμού και Αθλητισμού/ΚΑ' Εφορεία Προϊστορικών-Κλασσικών Αρχαιοτήτων, École Française d'Athènes / B. Sagnier)	82
4.1. Map of the Delian honours in the Aegean (©Varvara Konstantakopoulou)	160
4.2. Map of the Delian honours in the Mediterranean (©Varvara Konstantakopoulou)	161
5.1. Dedications of individuals according to gender	198
5.2. Community dedications represented in the inventories and number of dedications	203
5.3. Named individuals according to region	208
5.4. Individual and collective dedications in the Aegean (©Varvara Konstantakopoulou)	209
5.5. Individual and collective dedications in the Mediterranean (©Varvara Konstantakopoulou)	210
5.6. Dedications according to region	211
5.7. Female dedications according to region	211
5.8. Female dedications (©Varvara Konstantakopoulou)	212
5.9. Female dedicants according to region	213
5.10. Male dedications according to region	215
5.11. Male dedicants according to region	215
5.12. Male dedicants according to island of origin in the neighbouring region	216
5.13. Elite dedications in the Mediterranean (©Varvara Konstantakopoulou)	223



## *List of Tables*

4.1. Geographic clustering of recipients of Delian honours	162
5.1. Female dedicants in the inventories	199
5.2. Collective dedications in the inventories	203
5.3. Elite dedicants	222



## List of Abbreviations

- Austin M.M. Austin, *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest*, Cambridge 1981.
- Blinkenberg C. Blinkenberg, *Lindos: Fouilles de l'acropole 1902–1914*, 2 vols, Berlin 1941.
- Bringmann and von Steuben K. Bringmann and H. von Steuben, eds. *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer*, vol 1: *Zeugnisse und Kommentare*, Berlin 1995.
- Chaniotis A. Chaniotis, *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften. Epigraphische Beiträge zur griechischen Historiographie*, Stuttgart 1988.
- Chankowski V. Chankowski, *Athènes et Délos à l'époque classique. Recherches sur l'administration du sanctuaire d'Apollon délien*, Athens 2008a.
- Choix F. Durrbach, *Choix d'inscriptions de Délos*, Paris, 1921.
- ED M. Segre, *Iscrizioni di Cos*, Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1993.
- FGrH F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*, Berlin and Leiden, 1923–.
- GD P. Bruneau and J. Ducat, *Guide de Délos*, 4th edn, Athens, 2005.
- ID *Inscriptions de Délos*, Paris, 1926–.
- IG *Inscriptiones Graecae*, Berlin, 1873–.
- IOrop V. Petrakos, *Oι επιγραφές του Ωρωπού*, Athens, 1997.
- IvO W. Dittenberger and K. Purgold, eds. *Inschriften von Olympia*, Berlin, 1896.
- IvP M. Fraenkel, *Die Inschriften von Pergamon*, Berlin 1890–.
- K-A R. Kassel and C. Austin, *Poetae Comic Graeci*, Berlin, 1983–2001.
- Kotsidu H. Kotsidu, *TIMH KAI ΔΟΞΑ: Ehrungen für hellenistische Herrscher im griechischen Mutterland und in Kleinasien unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der archäologischen Denkmäler*, Berlin 2000.
- LGPN *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, Oxford 1987–.

xvi	<i>List of Abbreviations</i>
Migeotte	L. Migeotte, <i>L'emprunt publique dans les cités grecques. Recueil des documents et analyse critique</i> , Quebec, 1984.
Nigdelis	P.M. Nigdelis, <i>Επιγραφικά Θεσσαλονίκεια. Συμβολή στην πολιτική και κοινωνική ιστορία της αρχαίας Θεσσαλονίκης</i> , Thessaloniki, 2006.
<i>Nouveau Choix</i>	Cl. Prêtre, ed. <i>Nouveau choix d'inscriptions de Délos. Lois, comptes et inventaires</i> , Athens, 2002.
OGIS	W. Dittenberger, <i>Orientalis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae</i> , Leipzig, 1903–1905.
<i>Recueil</i>	C. Michel, <i>Recueil d'inscriptions grecques</i> , Paris: Leroux, 1900–1927.
RO	P.J. Rhodes and R. Osborne, <i>Greek Historical Inscriptions, 404–323 BC</i> , Oxford 2003.
Samama	E. Samama, <i>Les médecins dans le monde grec. Sources épigraphiques sur la naissance d'un corps médical</i> , Geneva, 2003.
SEG	<i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i> , Amsterdam.
<i>Syll.</i> <sup>3</sup>	W. Dittenberger, <i>Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum</i> , 3rd ed. Lipsiae: apud S. Hirzelium, 1915–1923.



## *Note to the Reader*

I finished writing this book before the excellent database on proxeny decrees produced by Will Mack became active (<http://proxenies.csad.ox.ac.uk>, accessed 31.10.16). The database includes decrees where the word proxeny (and its products) is either securely attested or can be safely supplemented; in that sense, the corpus of evidence Mack's database is working with is more restrictive than what I used for my discussion in Chapter 4: see discussion in Chapter 4.1 and Appendix 1.



# 1

---

## Introduction

### Delos, its Networks, Regionalism, and the Aegean World

#### 1.1. DELIANS, THE PARASITES OF THE GOD

Most modern visitors visit the island of Delos during the extremely hot and arid Aegean summer months. The normal way for accessing the island is by taking the little ferry from Myconos (or from the more distant Naxos), which arrives at the port of Delos, on the western side, in the calm sea strait (*porthmos*) between Delos and the neighbouring, also currently uninhabited, island of Rheneia. The first visual contact with Delos is, therefore, from the sea, at some distance; from the east if one chooses Myconos as the stepping stone, or the south-west, if one chooses Naxos. Looking at this dry piece of land, in the middle of the Cycladic islands (literally and metaphorically), it is difficult to imagine that in antiquity it supported a vibrant community, with a massive (for the size of the island, at least) population. Yet, it did.

Athenaeus' work *The Philosophers at Dinner* is a wonderful treasury of anecdotes and stories from the ancient world.<sup>1</sup> It contains the following story about the ancient Delians. In the midst of a larger discussion about food served at festivals, Athenaeus talks about how the Delians were also known in some sources as *Eleodytai*, literally 'table-divers' or 'table-dodgers', because so many of them were involved in the serving of food during festivals.<sup>2</sup> The image is a vivid one: the waiters move around carrying meat-trays (*eleoi*), and the Delians move between them dodging the meat-trays, or diving under the trays as they move in the chaotic crowd that their many large festivals required. The association between Delians and sacrificial food then produces

<sup>1</sup> Crito F3 ll.4–8 K-A in Ath. 4.173b-c.

<sup>2</sup> Ath. 4.173a-b: κοινῇ δὲ πάντες Ἐλεοδύται διὰ τὸ τοῖς Ἐλεοῖς ὑποδύεσθαι διακονοῦντες ἐν ταῖς θοίναις [...] ὅθεν καὶ Πολυκράτων ὁ Κρήθωνος Ῥηναῖος δίκην γραφόμενος οὐ Δηλίουσ αὐτοῦσ ὀνομάζει, ἀλλὰ τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἐλεοδυτῶν ἐπητιάσατο.

a further largely derogatory image for the islanders. Athenaeus proceeds to use a fragment of the second-century comic poet Crito's play, *The Busybody* (*Philopragmon*).<sup>3</sup> The poet describes in the fragment how a 'busybody' made a Phoenician ship-owner change his voyage, and go to Delos instead:

because he had heard that that was the one place in all the world that had three blessings for a parasite: a market full of fine food (*euopson*), a population that was idle, and the Delians themselves, who are parasites of the god.<sup>4</sup>

There are many fascinating features about the image of the 'busybody' and the 'parasite'. The association with fish, and especially a market full of fish, if indeed the *euopson* in the fragment refers to fish specifically, as opposed to food delicacies more generally, is an obvious one.<sup>5</sup> But it is the characterization of the Delians as parasites that I find particularly intriguing. Indeed, Delos itself is presented as a paradise for a parasite. Why is that so?

The association of the term 'parasite' with Delos was not Crito's own invention. Once more, it is Athenaeus who provides us with the reference to a body of Delians in Athens who were part of the Athenian *theoria* to Delos.<sup>6</sup> These Delians would 'serve as parasites for a year in the Delion' (one possibly located at Athens, rather than Delos). Athenaeus' source here, Polemon, ascribes the law to Solonian *kyrbeis*; it is not certain, however, that the Delians' dining at the Delion can be linked with Solon's laws.<sup>7</sup> And as Athenaeus says, the use of the term parasite in this context shows without doubt that the term was not always derogatory. So there was an older association between the rites at Delos and the concept of 'parasite', even if in the older stories the term implied dining at public maintenance, rather than 'parasitic' living.<sup>8</sup> But this is not the only explanation for Crito's joke at the expense of the Delians.

The heart of the story, rather, has to do with the understanding that the **Delians survive as parasites on the back of the many thousands of worshippers**

<sup>3</sup> F3 ll.4–8 K-A in Ath. 4.173b-c.

<sup>4</sup> πάντων ἀκούων διότι παρασίτῳ τόπος οὗτος τρία μόνος ἀγαθὰ κεκτηῖσθαι δοκεῖ, εὖσιμον ἀγοράν, † παντοδαπαν οὐκουντ' ὄχλον, αὐτοὺς παρασίτους τοῦ θεοῦ τοὺς Δηλίους. Edition by K-A.

<sup>5</sup> See discussion in Lytle 2012, and Marzano 2013, 19–20. Lytle 2013, followed by Bresson 2016, 185, argues for a relatively high consumption of fish and seafood on Delos during the third century. This seems to validate Crito's association between fish consumption, parasites, and Delos itself.

<sup>6</sup> Ath. 6.234e-f = Solon F 88 Ruschenbusch: ἐν δὲ τοῖς κύρβεσι τοῖς περὶ τῶν Δηλιαστῶν οὕτως γέγραπται: καὶ τῷ κήρυκε ἐξ τοῦ γένους τῶν Κηρύκων τοῦ τῆς μυστηριώτιδος, τοὺτους παρασιτεῖν ἐν τῷ Δηλίῳ ἐνιαυτόν. For the role of the Delians see Parker 2005, 82. For a discussion of the passage in a context of Athenaeus' use of documents see Davies 2000.

<sup>7</sup> See the convincing arguments by Chankowski 2008a, 95–6: it is uncertain whether we can ascribe this law to Solon, as the mention of *kyrbeis* in Polemon may simply imply that the law was written on the walls of Stoa Basileus after the reorganization of the sacred calendar in Athens in 399/8.

<sup>8</sup> For the term and its use in Athenaeus, as well as its historical development, see now Bouysson 2013.

coming to their island. It is true that the island itself, without the presence of the sanctuary, could not support the population it bore. How large a population that was in the period of Independence, which is the period that concerns this book, is something that we shall discuss at a later point.<sup>9</sup> The island is relatively bare, and extremely small in size, even for Greek standards, which, on the whole, associated insularity with small islands.<sup>10</sup> The Greeks had an ideal of polis self-sufficiency; in other words, they expected the territory of their city to be able to feed its population. We know now that this was nothing more than an ideal; the reality of agricultural crop rotation, suitability of land for different products, commerce, population movement, and the presence of luxury goods, meant that few cities, if any, did not engage in the import of food from some other source. Recent work by the French School of Athens, which directed the Delian excavations since the 1870s, has highlighted the uses of the Delian landscape for agriculture and pasturage.<sup>11</sup> Yet, even with the careful construction of walled gardens and terraces, especially to the south of the island, the Delian landscape could support, by itself, perhaps only a handful of families of citizens.

The image of a barren Delos, unable to support its own population, is an old one. In one of the earliest references to the island in Greek literature, in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, Delos appears ‘barren’, or, literally, ‘without richness below the ground’.<sup>12</sup> This is where the pregnant Leto calls upon the island to allow her to bear her divine children, Apollo and Artemis, there. The goddess asks:

Delos, would you want to be the abode of my son, Phoibos Apollo, and to house him in a lavish temple? For it cannot escape you that no other will touch you since I think you shall never be rich in oxen or sheep and shall never produce vintage nor grow an abundance of plants. If you have a temple for Apollo who shoots from afar, then all men shall gather here and bring hecatombs, and the ineffably rich savor of burning fat shall always rise, and you shall feed your dwellers from the hands of strangers since your soil is barren.<sup>13</sup>

What is interesting, I think, is the narrative opted here to present the benefits of being the birthplace of the god. The poet could have easily chosen a different narrative, one that highlighted the actual transformation of an otherwise barren landscape to one of abundance of goods. This is not the case here: rather, what is emphasized is that the presence of the god Apollo

<sup>9</sup> See Chapter 3.2. I work on the assumption that Delos had a total population of about 6,000 during the third century.

<sup>10</sup> I have argued this in Constantakopoulou 2007, 12–15.

<sup>11</sup> Brunet 1990–1993, 1999, Leguilloux 2003.

<sup>12</sup> *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 60: ἐπεὶ οὐ τοι πῦρ ὑπ’οὔδα. See comments in Richardson 2010, 91. See also Miller 1986, 22–3.

<sup>13</sup> *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 51–60. Translation by Athanassakis 2004, 15.

cannot transform the landscape of the island itself; what the god will do is to provide the means for the survival of the inhabitants. Delos cannot have plants, or animals for pasture; instead, it is the scent of hecatombic sacrifices that will feed the inhabitants.<sup>14</sup> This poetic narrative is essentially another version of the ‘parasitic’ story we started with. The island itself cannot feed its population; rather, it is Delos’ place in the centre of the religious, cultic, and mythical networks of the southern Aegean that will provide the means for survival for its population. **It is the pilgrims to the temple of Apollo that feed the inhabitants.** That such a narrative about the island and its inhabitants can be found in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, which is one of the earliest mythical narratives associated with Delos, tells us something about the power of the image, and the antiquity of the association between the Delians and their reliance to outsiders for survival.

The *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* conveys a powerful poetic image. But can we quantify its central assumption, that is the relationship between the Delians and the outsiders, in any meaningful manner? This is one of the questions that this book will attempt to address.

## 1.2. DELOS, ITS HISTORY, AND HISTORIOGRAPHY

In myth, Delos was the birthplace of the twin gods, Apollo and Artemis. We have already looked at one aspect of the early narratives of the divine birth of Apollo and Artemis on Delos, the bareness of Delos. The *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* recounts the trials of the pregnant Leto, as she is chased by Hera’s wrath throughout the Greek world in order to find sanctuary and give birth. Delos is the place that accepts her, and therefore, Delos is destined to be one of the most sacred places of the Aegean.<sup>15</sup> In other mythical narratives, Delos was a floating, wandering island, which became solid only when Leto stepped on it in order to give birth.<sup>16</sup> The mythical importance of Delos in the narratives about Apollo and Artemis and their birth correlated with a notion of geographic centrality of Delos in the island landscape of the Aegean Sea. The

<sup>14</sup> See now the excellent analysis by Hitch 2015. Similar is the presentation of Delphi at the end of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, when the narrative moves to the Pythian part: when the Cretans ask Apollo (526–37) how are they to survive in a place such as Delphi which is not good for vines or pasture, the divine answer is that they will have sheep brought by the glorious tribes of men. Richardson 2010, 148–9, comments on how this exchange picks up the theme of abundance and provision by pilgrims that was introduced in the beginning of the hymn (the Delian section). I want to thank Esther Eidinow for bringing this to my attention.

<sup>15</sup> *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 51–89.

<sup>16</sup> Pindar *Paean* 7b, and Callimachus, *Hymn to Delos* 4.36–52. I have discussed Delos as a wandering island, and the importance of the image of floating, wandering islands, in Constantakopoulou 2007, 117–18.

*Introduction: Delos and the Aegean World*

5

Cyclades took their name because they ‘circled’ Delos,<sup>17</sup> while for Callimachus, the islands ‘danced around Delos’.<sup>18</sup> The mythical and geographic centrality of Delos resulted in the creation of a sanctuary with a wide appeal from an early age.<sup>19</sup> The sanctuary dedicated to the Delian triad (Apollo, Artemis, and Leto) developed early; the monumentalization and history of investment by neighbouring communities showed an active network of participants, predominantly from the Aegean islands and Athens, willing to conspicuously manifest their piety in the eyes of the gods. Delos acquired political centrality too: when the Athenians took control of the Hellenic League to continue the war against Persia in the early 470s, Delos became the headquarters.<sup>20</sup> Accordingly, the League that emerged is called in modern scholarship the Delian League, and this was transformed over the course of the fifth century into the Athenian Empire.

Delos, then, occupied a central position in the Aegean, in terms of myth, religion, geography (and navigation patterns), and politics. This centrality and consequent importance for political, religious, and economic networks meant that control over Delos and its most important asset, the sanctuary, was constantly contested. It is not possible to explore fully this aspect of Delian history; rather, I would like to briefly outline some important events.<sup>21</sup> In the classical period, Delos was under Athenian control; the main officials of the sanctuary were the *amphictiones*, who, contrary to what the name may imply, were Athenian officials. Despite Delian reactions to Athenian control, Athens sustained the management of the sanctuary until 314, when the Delians gained their independence. The period of Delian Independence lasted until 166, when the Athenians regained control of Delos, expelled the population, and installed Athenian cleruchs.

The period of Delian Independence saw a number of important developments taking place in the sanctuary and the city of Delos. The fact that the Delians now had control over their biggest asset, their sanctuary, as well as their independence from Athenian control, obviously transformed many areas of Delian political, economic, religious, administrative, and cultural life. Certainly, some changes were not instantly conspicuous nor could they be seen as a radical departure from previously established practices. Chankowski, whose work on the history of classical Delos and the Athenian administration of the sanctuary is, in my opinion, one of the best studies in ancient history of the twenty-first century, argued powerfully that religious administration, in

<sup>17</sup> Strabo 10.5.1, Pliny *Natural History* 4.12.65, Dion. Perieg. 526.

<sup>18</sup> Callimachus, *Hymn to Delos* 16–22.

<sup>19</sup> Constantakopoulou 2007, 38–41 with earlier bibliography.

<sup>20</sup> Thuc. 1.96, Diod. 11.47.

<sup>21</sup> These are explored more fully in Constantakopoulou 2016b. For a history of Delos see Laidlaw 1933, Chankowski 2008a for the classical period, Vial 1984 for the period of Independence and Roussel 1987 for the period of the Athenian cleruchy.

particular, should be seen as a conservative domain, where we can witness a strong degree of resistance to radical change.<sup>22</sup> This may well be true. On the other hand, however, there was significant change, even on the level of the administration of the sanctuary. As we shall see in Chapter 5, the Delian administrators, called the *hieropoioi*, continued the practices of their Athenian predecessors, the *amphictiones*, by publishing annual documents on stone that recorded the financial dealings of the sanctuary, such as loans to communities and individuals, rents received by land tenants using Apollo's sacred land, and so on, as well as inventories of the gods' wealth stored in the sanctuary.<sup>23</sup> While the practice of publication remained largely unchanged, there were some changes in the format of the inventories.<sup>24</sup>

The period of Independence (314–166), therefore, may be a fascinating period for an exploration of the transformations of Delos and its place in the dense network of interactions in the Aegean. At the same time, however, it is a very problematic period in one important respect. The third century, which is in many respects the heart of the period that interests me, is notoriously a complicated and difficult century. This is not simply because the Aegean world of the third century is, in some ways, fundamentally different from that of the century that preceded it. The third-century Aegean world may be viewed as a different world, not least because of the consequences of Alexander's campaigns. In addition to this, we are facing another important problem, one that has a considerable impact on the history of scholarship on the third century. And this, as is often the case with ancient Greek history, is a problem of sources.

The narratives we have about the history of events of the third century are extremely fragmented. We do have three historians that produce narratives for this period, namely Diodorus, Polybius, and Livy. Diodorus' books that deal with the history of the third century are mostly fragmentary (books 21 to 27). Similarly, Polybius' narrative really kicks off in the last quarter of the third century: the previous period is discussed in what are now the fragmentary later books. Livy's books that discuss the third century may not be fragmentary, but inevitably his interests are focused on a much larger canvas of events than those related to the shifting balances of power of the third-century Aegean. The result is that we lack a coherent narrative of events for the third century; our sources are fragmentary, or, rather, even more fragmentary than what is usual in ancient history. The lack of a secure narrative of events for most of the third century has important implications not just for the history of the third century, but also for the state of modern historiography on that period.

<sup>22</sup> Chankowski 2008a. See my thoughts on the subject in Constantakopoulou 2016b.

<sup>23</sup> For the advantages of publishing documents in a sanctuary see Davies 2003, 337.

<sup>24</sup> See Chapter 5.2.



*Introduction: Delos and the Aegean World*

7

Tarn famously stated that he ‘make[s] no apology for returning to the matter [of dating], for one of the very few ways in which progress can be made with these difficult questions of third-century history is by trying to establish an accurate chronology wherever there is any chance of this being done’.<sup>25</sup> Tarn’s position reflects extremely well how the third century has been approached. I cannot deny that it is extremely difficult to write about the history of a period when its key events are rarely securely dated. Can we write about the social structures, the economic dynamics, the patterns of interaction (to name randomly three subjects that interest me personally) of a region when we do not know (and can never know for sure) when crucial wars and battles took place? To give an extreme example, using perhaps an inappropriate modern parallel, this is the equivalent of writing about the culture of modern Britain without knowing for certain in which decade of the twentieth century the Second World War ended. Or to put it differently: the third century is very much the history of a continuous struggle of power between the various Hellenistic kingdoms for supremacy over the Aegean. Within that context, we know that the battle of Cos had a massive impact on the question of authority over the region, with Antigonos beating Ptolemy and regaining some control over the contested space of the Aegean Sea and its islands. But when did the battle take place? We do not know, as we do not know the dates of a number of key events of that century which we know played a key role in the history of political control of the region. If you want an answer to these questions, this is not a book for you. I do not have anything to contribute to what is already an extremely detailed and complicated discussion in modern scholarship about the third-century narrative of events.<sup>26</sup> But this fundamental problem about the state of the sources and the consequent lack of certainty in relation to the narrative of events for the third century has had an important impact on modern scholarship. In other words, considerable work has been done on attempting to sort out the history of events, especially for the Aegean region, on the basis of extremely few, mostly fragmentary, sources.<sup>27</sup> This is certainly the case for the history of the Islanders’ League (or *koinon ton nesioton*), a relatively obscure federal organization based on Delos during most of the third century (before it was taken over by the Rhodians, who

<sup>25</sup> Tarn 1930, 446.

<sup>26</sup> For the battle of Cos and its date see Buraselis 1982, 119–51, suggesting the date 255/4, and Reger 1985, suggesting 261. The main piece of evidence is the dedication of a ship on Delos by Antigonos Gonatas for his victory in the battle of Cos, mentioned in Athenaeus 5.209e. The building which housed the ship of Gonatas can no longer be identified with the so-called Monument of the Bulls (*GD 24 Monument des taureaux*), on the basis of its date (provided by stylistic criteria and epigraphic attestations): see discussion in Chapter 3.5, with Chankowski 2008a, 263–73.

<sup>27</sup> Reger 1994b is exemplary in this respect. See also Buraselis’ extensive discussion in 1982 *passim*.

placed its headquarters on Tenos). The Islanders' League is the focus of my first case study: instead of discussing the issues of the specific date for the beginnings of the League, and the relationship between patronage and key events in the history of the period, as so much of the previous excellent scholarship has done, I wanted rather to move beyond this type of approach and explore different ways of making sense of the transforming landscape of the region in that period. Tarn's attempt 'to establish an accurate chronology wherever there is any chance of this being done', I thought, had reached its limits.

The problem of sources that I described above meant that, contrary to other periods where we did have a more secure chronology of the key events, modern historiography had not explored as much as it could a number of important aspects of third-century history. My primary interest has always been in the history of interaction and movement of peoples, goods, and ideas. Could we move beyond the problems associated with the narrative of events and explore the different types of interaction we may observe in the third-century Aegean?

I may have been interested in human interaction for some time, but in recent years this particular topic acquired a new level of significance and topicality. As I am writing this chapter, Europe is going through a period of history characterized by the biggest movement of population since the Second World War. I suspect that in a short period of time, this human wave of migration will surpass anything that humanity has experienced in recent times. This is even more significant for someone, like me, whose work is centered on the Aegean islands. Indeed, what is the main story about the Aegean islands today? It is the story of millions of humans, who try to leave behind a life of war, famine, destitution, prosecution, and despair; of humans who want not a better future, but the simple idea of *a* future. Lesbos, Cos, Leros, Agathonissi, Leipsoi are the islands at the forefront of this human movement. These are the islands where refugees from the east land by climbing onto dangerous dinghies and risking their lives in the often treacherous waters of the Aegean. The human cost of suffering is immeasurable; the considerable lack of empathy and provision of support by various agents at different levels, may that be individuals, governments, and the European Union itself, is despicable and shocking. We are living through times where we, the West, are involved in the abhorrent process of building stronger borders and fences, thereby, by implication, if not in actual practice, murdering tens of thousands who drown in the Mediterranean while attempting to cross into Europe. If the world has heard of the Aegean Sea today it is because of the journeys and stories of the millions of Syrians and other refugees from the east. What we see today is Europe using all means to stop this migration from happening, even though one of the causes of the fleeing of the refugees (and indeed perhaps the most important one) has been western intervention

*Introduction: Delos and the Aegean World*

9

over the last three decades into the affairs of the Middle East, for war, imperialism, and profit. Europe is building fences. If this is today's dominant context, and one that, unfortunately, I suspect, will remain the dominant context of narratives about the Aegean in the near future, then an exploration about human interaction in the Aegean in a different period of time acquires a poignancy that I could have never anticipated.

The story of interaction is at the heart of this book. Yet, how do we move beyond the problems posed by the fragmentary evidence that I discussed above? It is inscriptions that, as in so many cases in ancient Greek history, provide the key to the solution. The plethora of inscriptions from the island of Delos during the period of Independence had another, in some ways unanticipated for me at least, result: what started as a project about different types of networks of interaction in the southern Aegean in the Hellenistic period was inevitably transformed into a book about third-century Delos. Delos was not only, as we have seen, the central place in the mythical, conceptual, and religious networks of the Aegean. It was also a place that produced thousands of inscriptions. Inscriptions, of course, come with their own set of problems. One important aspect is, once again, fragmentation. These problems, along with the production, audience, purpose, and function of these documents are discussed in detail in Chapters 4 and 5. But what I would like to say here is that through a careful analysis of the existing epigraphic evidence mainly from Delos, but occasionally from elsewhere in the Aegean world, we can produce a relative elaborate discussion not only of the place of Delos in the extensive networks of interaction of the southern Aegean, but also of the form, development, and density of the southern Aegean networks more generally. This book is about the form, extent, and history of Delian interactions, as they evidenced in the extensive Delian epigraphy and the archaeological record of the island.

### 1.3. NETWORKS, REGIONALISM, AND THE ECONOMY

In recent years, the concept of network has been a particularly fruitful methodological tool with which to explore the ancient world in that it generated new debates. Works focusing on networks and interaction have proliferated, addressing a number of different topics. I do not wish to offer here a comprehensive discussion of recent works applying methodologically, with various degrees of engagement and success, some form of Social Network Analysis (SNA). Indeed, the range of approaches has been so wide in terms of methodology that we cannot speak of a coherent ancient history network approach. Some areas of ancient history, however, have been influenced by a

network approach substantially more than others. The ancient economy, for example, has been an area that has witnessed a certain renaissance in recent years after a certain period of stagnation when the so-called ‘primitivists’ dominated the field. The need to move beyond the debate between ‘primitivists’ and modernists has been one of the most constant claims in the field in the last two decades or so.<sup>28</sup> Indeed, a fresh look focusing on patterns of redistribution and consumption (including the consumption of luxury goods), and the importance of the market, through perhaps a networks lens, has enriched our understanding of the ancient world and has contributed to debates about the ancient economy.<sup>29</sup>

Archaeologists have also developed a social network analysis approach in discussing material evidence. In fact, the impact of a networks approach has been more substantial in the field of archaeology than ancient history.<sup>30</sup> Archaeologists have used network theory to explore ideas about transfer of knowledge, distribution of artefacts, and human agency behind the spread of ideas, people, and objects. The impact of social networks as a methodological approach has not been equally impressive in the field of ancient history. As I will discuss in this section, I think this may be linked with the type (and quantities) of sources that ancient historians work with, as opposed to the data and material that archaeologists use. Ancient historians have employed network theory with varying degrees of methodological engagement.<sup>31</sup> One obvious issue in the work of ancient historians employing a loosely defined network approach is that while ideas about interaction, cultural transfer, human agency,<sup>32</sup> ‘small worlds’,<sup>33</sup> weak and strong ties within networks, and indeed the strength of weak ties,<sup>34</sup> to use one of the most popular (and fruitful) applications of network theory, are present in scholarship, such ideas and methodological enrichments take place without *necessarily* the application of a Social Network Analysis approach. This by itself is not necessarily a negative thing. Indeed, I would include myself in the category of people who discussed ideas about networks and interaction without necessarily engaging fully with a Social Network Analysis (SNA) approach.

<sup>28</sup> See for example Foxhall 2007, Morris, Saller, and Scheidel 2007, and recently Harris and Lewis 2016.

<sup>29</sup> Manning 2011, Archibald 2013, Reger 2013a, Harris, Lewis, and Woolmer 2016.

<sup>30</sup> The literature on this is truly massive. An indicative (I hope) list of SNA approaches in archaeology is Graham 2006, Knapp 2008, van Dommelen and Knapp 2010, Knappett 2011, 2014, Brughmans 2013, 2014, Larson 2013, Hochscheid 2015, and recently Brughmans, Collar, and Coward 2016, Brughmans and Poblome 2016, and Foxhall et al. 2016.

<sup>31</sup> See for example Graham and Ruffini 2007, the articles in Malkin, Constantakopoulou and Panagopoulou, eds, 2009, the articles in Fenn and Römel-Strehl, eds, 2013, Harris Cline 2012, Collar 2013, and the critique in Vlassopoulos 2013, 12–15.

<sup>32</sup> For agency and actor-network theory see Latour 2005.

<sup>33</sup> Watts 1999 and 2003 are the classic works here. See also Buchanan 2002.

<sup>34</sup> Granovetter 1973 and 1982 pioneered the concept of strength of weak ties.

*Introduction: Delos and the Aegean World*

11

One of the most influential books in ancient history employing a network theory approach, loosely defined, is Malkin's recent monograph.<sup>35</sup> Malkin uses fruitfully the concept of the network in order to explore Greek identity on a very large geographic scale: that of the entire Mediterranean. He argues powerfully that distance and geographic space were crucial factors in creating Greek identity. Indeed, the first sentence of the book summarizes this neatly: 'Greek civilisation came into being just when the Greeks were splitting apart.'<sup>36</sup> Malkin uses the concept of network to argue that what matters for the creation of identities is not geographical distance but distance between nodes of a network, whether these nodes are settlements, sanctuaries, or zones of contact. Malkin does not quantify his conclusions, mostly because such a quantification exercise in archaic Greek history is entirely impossible. His application of a network concept of distance contributes greatly to an enhanced understanding of the processes and consolidation of Greek identity in the Mediterranean during the archaic period. At the same time, however, some of the conclusions of the book do not necessarily need a network approach to hold up; this is especially true in the discussion of *nomima* as 'hard' facts, to be found in the early stages of foundation of settlements, rather than imaginary constructions associated with later periods.<sup>37</sup> Malkin's work shows that a network approach can open up new ways of thinking about 'old' subjects, such as the much debated process of Greek 'colonization'. But such works that are clearly influenced by network approaches are not necessarily works that a sociologist working with Social Network Analysis would recognize as products of an SNA approach.

When I started thinking about how and to what extent I could engage with network theory while focusing on the political, social, religious, and economic networks of the southern Aegean islands, I envisaged that I could potentially quantify the attested social, political, religious, and economic relations. I knew that the epigraphic material from Delos in the Hellenistic period was extremely rich and I was convinced that it could be tapped in order to generate the kind of network graphs, also called 'messy spaghetti monsters', that sociologists have been working on. Certainly, no one had used the Delian inscriptions in such a way before; indeed, as we shall see in Chapter 5, even well-known categories of inscriptions, such as the inventories, have not been used to their full potential for a reconstruction of the social dynamics of the visitors to the sanctuary in the period of Independence. The future, in other words, back in 2008, looked bright. In that context, I found Ruffini's work on the social networks of Byzantine Egypt particularly rewarding.<sup>38</sup> Ruffini focused

<sup>35</sup> Malkin 2011. <sup>36</sup> Malkin 2011, 3.

<sup>37</sup> For a longer and more in depth engagement with Malkin's book see my review in Constantakopoulou 2011.

<sup>38</sup> Ruffini 2008.

on two sites in Byzantine Egypt, Oxyrhynchos and Aphrodito. Using prosopographical data, he was able to create network maps of the connections between individuals and places. The result was a fascinating picture of social networks that included not just the elite, with considerable differences in two of the sites examined. Ruffini used UCINET as the main computer programme to analyse the structures of its given networks.<sup>39</sup> The results he produced could not have been generated without the specific programme. UCINET is in many ways the standard programme used by social scientists for this kind of approach. For my purposes, however, it proved impractical.

In order for the programme to operate, it needs a set of data: this should be numerous enough for the result to be meaningful. And once again, I found that the single most important impediment in applying this kind of approach to an ancient history topic, such as mine, was the nature of my sources. I have already explained how scarce ancient literary sources are for Hellenistic Delos. The existence of a great number of inscriptions from the island, unfortunately, in this respect did not help matters. I was interested in reconstructing the social networks of Delos in relation to the world of the south Aegean islands. For UCINET to work, I needed datasets that had references to persons and places. For example, when Ruffini created his dataset, two individuals mentioned in the same document appeared as having a direct link. The kind of documents he worked on facilitated such an approach, as they were numerous and each document did not include normally more than a handful or so names. My dataset, however, was entirely different. We have no letters, no contracts between individuals, no wills from Delos (all the documents, in other words, normally found in papyri in Egypt). What we have is the monumental inscriptions that the Delian demos decided to set up in their sanctuary. The implications of the decision to set up the inscriptions, whether these are honorary decrees, accounts or inventories, are discussed more fully in Chapters 4 and 5. In short, the publication of these inscriptions have to do with the creation of an audience, which may have been understood as both divine and human, and the promotion of the fame of Delos as a regional sanctuary that attracted the attention of individuals, common and elite, from the entire Mediterranean world. In other words, the survival of my sources was not just accidental (not all inscriptions survive, after all), but also related to conscious decisions about publication, communal space, and accountability. More particularly, the most important dataset for my project, that is the inventories of the Delian treasures recording the names, ethnics, and dedications of numerous individuals and communities from the extended Greek world (and beyond) could not be used meaningfully in a programme such as

<sup>39</sup> Ruffini 2008, esp. 39–40.

UCINET. The nature of the Delian epigraphic sources, in other words, prohibited their manipulation by a network analysis software programme.

So what could I do? I could not engage with what a social scientist would understand as an SNA approach because my sources did not allow it.<sup>40</sup> But I could still try to reconstruct some of the networks of interaction that took place on Delos through the available evidence. A network approach could be implemented, albeit on a different scale and nature than what Ruffini or the archaeologists working with material evidence datasets have been used to. Indeed, in recent years, a historical examination of networks has produced some fascinating results, especially in terms of regional geographic networks.<sup>41</sup> Indeed, the creation of a region should be understood as part of a process involving human networks and active associations between individuals. Human mobility and interaction, which includes the movement and exchange of goods and ideas, lie at the heart of what makes a geographic region. In that sense, a network approach which focuses on regional interaction may contribute to an enhancing of our understanding not only of the history of the particular region (be it the Black Sea, the northern Aegean, or the Aegean itself, to mention some areas that have attracted the attention of scholarship), but of what we now understand as a geographic region. In other words, a network approach would not only throw light on relatively neglected aspects of the history of the period, but could actively contribute to a better understanding of how a region was constructed. Landscape and geography do not exist outside human experience; rather human intervention constructs, mediates, and transforms the environment in which humans operate. Human interaction and networks affected and constructed the geographic region in which such interaction took place.

Regionalism and region, therefore, are important concepts for a research approach that focuses on networks and interaction. In ancient Greek history, research which focuses on regionalism may be seen as part of a larger debate that has taken place in the last decade or so as to how we understand Greek culture. Greek history and Greek culture is traditionally associated with the culture of the polis, the Greek city-state. This has been the dominant narrative for most of the twentieth century. Classical Greek history, in particular, has been mostly interpreted as the history of the most important poleis of the Greek world, with Athens occupying, because of the nature of our sources, the most prominent position. Such emphasis on the polis as the most important

<sup>40</sup> J. Davies' comment (2015, 241) that for scholars who wished to go beyond narrative, and beyond 'the simple description of constitutions and institutions, which offered no framework for systematic comparison [...] the quest has been frankly dispiriting: it is understandable that many have taken productive refuge in historiography and reception studies' describes painfully accurately the state of the field.

<sup>41</sup> I would include here as highlights the works by Müller 2010, Dana 2011, Archibald 2013, and Collar 2013.

political formation in the Greek world is the underlying assumption of projects such as the Copenhagen Polis Centre that have produced the indispensable *Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*.<sup>42</sup> In recent years, however, scholars have increasingly criticized this focus, by putting emphasis on the importance of institutions, groups, and associations whose activities transcended, transformed, and reconstructed what we traditionally understand as the Greek polis.<sup>43</sup> Greek history should not be viewed exclusively through the prism of the polis. Indeed, as Vlassopoulos argued so convincingly,<sup>44</sup> Greek history and culture is a history without a single centre; rather than focusing on the Greek city-states as a way of providing a narrative for a culture without a single centre, we should enhance our approach with regional approaches, and narratives about groups which transcended the polis, whether these groups were below the level of the adult male citizen (slaves, women, foreigners) or those that existed outside the polis.

The polis model as the primary focus of Greek history has been recently substantially modified in works on Greek religion. The polis model in Greek religion was perhaps best articulated in Sourvinou-Inwood's famous statement that 'polis religion embraces, contains, and mediates all religious discourse', and that 'the Greek polis articulated religion and was itself articulated by it'.<sup>45</sup> This is not to say that recent approaches have rejected the usefulness of the polis model for our understanding of Greek religion and society; rather, emphasis on networks and religious experience beyond and below the polis have allowed alternative narratives to be put forward, which do not focus on the relationship between religion and the institutional framework of the polis. As a result, our understanding of Greek religion has been greatly enriched.<sup>46</sup>

Within the context of the study of Greek religion, space and locality are particularly important parameters. Religious activity is an area where we can see the tension between the local and the panhellenic dimension (to pick the two main poles in the spectrum of geographic identification within Greek culture).<sup>47</sup> And as the polis religion model has been expanded and subjected to refinement, the identification of locality with the polis has been questioned. Greek religious activity was inherently linked with local activity (though not exclusively linked); but local activity did not necessarily mean activity within

<sup>42</sup> Hansen and Nielsen 2004. See also my comments in Constantakopoulou 2015b, 213–15.

<sup>43</sup> See comments in J. Davies 2015. The important work on associations is part of this trend: see (indicatively) Rauh 1993, Kloppenborg and Wilson 1996, Gabrielsen 2001, Arnaoutoglou 2003, Fröhlich and Hamon 2013, Harland 2014, Steinhauer 2014, Gabrielsen and Thomsen 2015. See also now the essays in Taylor and Vlassopoulos 2015.

<sup>44</sup> Vlassopoulos 2007, 2013.

<sup>45</sup> Sourvinou-Inwood 1990, 302 and 304. See also Sourvinou-Inwood 2000.

<sup>46</sup> See particularly the work by Eidinow 2011 and 2015, Kindt 2012 and 2015, and the excellent and succinct presentation of new developments in Harrison 2015.

<sup>47</sup> I have explored this more fully in Constantakopoulou 2015a, discussing previous bibliography. See also Polinskaya 2006, 2010 and Kindt 2012, chapter 1.



the polis. How we understand locality, in other words, matters: this is true not just in the realm of Greek religion, but for all levels of human activity. As Müller argued, the primacy of the local for the ancient Greeks did not necessarily correspond to the notion of the Greek polis.<sup>48</sup> If we are to revisit our conceptual understanding of Greek history, and place that in a framework that is not exclusively about the Greek polis, then we need to consider the various geographic entities that construe human activity, from local, to regional, to ‘panhellenic’ (an extremely problematic term), to Mediterranean and beyond.

A focus on regionalism, therefore, enhances the debates about the shift of focus away from the traditional view of the primacy of the Greek polis for Greek history. The concept of region itself, however, as well as the associated term regionalism, are not unproblematic. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines region as ‘an area having definable characteristics but not always fixed boundaries’.<sup>49</sup> This definition is clearly geared towards an understanding of modern regions in contrast to geographic entities, such as the modern nation state, which obviously have fixed and clearly defined boundaries. The lack of clearly defined boundaries is an important element of the term as it is used in debates about modern regions, but as the ancient Greek world did not necessarily have as clearly fixed boundaries as the modern world of the nation state, this differentiation between areas with clearly defined boundaries and areas without is not as a matter of course particularly helpful. However, the absence of clearly defined boundaries as a constituent element of the modern definition of a ‘region’ is a crucial aspect of the concept. In other words, a region is a constructed device, not an area defined by permanent geographical facts.<sup>50</sup> One could argue that all geographical features, be they mountains, islands, rivers, or deserts, are not pure ontological entities based on geographic reality, but rather constructed and mediated through human experience, ideology, and culture. For example, insularity for the classical Greeks, or, what is an island, is very much the product of specific cultural constructs generated by the existence of the Athenian Empire, which dominated the Aegean world for large parts of the fifth century, as my previous work has shown.<sup>51</sup> The Athenian control of the Aegean created specific contexts in which insularity as a concept developed and appeared in our literary sources, such as Thucydides, comedy, and tragedy. It was not simply the geographic reality of small island insularity that characterizes the Aegean region; the context in which the terms island and insular developed over the course of the fifth century also played an important role in their historical development. The politics of Athenian imperialism and the necessity of control of islands for

<sup>48</sup> Müller 2016. <sup>49</sup> *OED*, 3rd edn, 2005, s.v. ‘region’.

<sup>50</sup> See also Roy 2009, 822 on ‘world areas’.

<sup>51</sup> Constantakopoulou 2007, esp. 10–19.

a sea power, such as fifth-century Athens, created some of the most important and long-living parameters that framed the concept of a Greek island: an island, therefore, was weak, small, and prone to subjugation. If something as (relatively) clearly defined as an island (which is, after all, a piece of land surrounded by water) can be subject to conceptual manipulation and transformation because of the cultural context of production of the relevant sources, then what can we do with a term, such as a region, which has little, if any, basis in geographic reality or permanent geographic features?

A region, then, is a heuristic device, which makes it a particularly useful but at the same time complicated concept to work with. In addition, regionalism as a methodological approach has similar but at the same time extremely important added complications.<sup>52</sup> The term ‘regionalism’ has come under scrutiny in the fields of human geography because of its not so apparent (to an ancient historian, at least) associations with neo-liberal ideology and economic policies. This is linked with our previous observation that regions are culturally constructed, as they are on the whole not dependent on hard geographical facts. When human geographers study modern regions, they essentially study the result of global geographic and cultural processes; this has important ideological underpinnings that are perhaps not obvious at first sight. One important example here is the Middle East: its very name has embedded orientalist constructive elements.<sup>53</sup> Different models of regionalism, in particular, have developed as a reaction to globalization as a neo-liberal economic development model:<sup>54</sup> regionalism may be understood as a step towards globalization (through enhancement of local economies) or as a form of resistance to globalization (through preservation of some elements of national policy and economic development). In both cases, regionalism was seen as essentially linked with the modern capitalist nation state and the economy of a capitalist globalized market. Regionalism, therefore, was linked with debates about the nation state and its usefulness, as well as the politics, legal status and economic policies and behaviours of the nation state.<sup>55</sup> Often such regionalism as a methodological tool adopted an approach of an almost deterministic relationship between economic behaviour and geographical features. This type of deterministic relationship has given rise to the concept of ‘New Regionalism’ in the last couple of decades. New Regionalism attempted to dissociate the concept of a region from strict economic protectionist structures.<sup>56</sup> But even though New Regionalism provided a much needed critique of the underlying deterministic and neo-liberal economic

<sup>52</sup> See Fawcett 2005 and 2012. See also the historiographical discussion of the development of the term and the discipline in Söderbaum 2016a and 2016b.

<sup>53</sup> Roy 2009, 823: ‘Middle of what and east of where?’

<sup>54</sup> Nesadurai 2002.

<sup>55</sup> See Cloke, Philo, and Sadler 1991, for an analysis of the history of geography as a discipline and its association with the concept of the ‘region’.

<sup>56</sup> Warleigh-Lack and Robinson 2011.

assumptions that old regional approaches have adopted, still its focus is very much linked with economic development within neo-liberal economic structures that surpass the level of the nation state, such as the European Union (at the time of writing a very contested idea),<sup>57</sup> or China and South America as rising economic powers.<sup>58</sup>

Debates in regionalism and New Regionalism, therefore, are ultimately linked not only with the nation state but with neo-liberal economic practices, even when the emphasis is (in New Regionalism) on a critique of the deterministic relationship that has been adopted in relation to economic development. New Regionalism may stress the importance of movements of peoples, of non-hierarchical structures and identities, but ultimately such debates still take place within the context of the nation state and its capitalistic economy. If this is the dominant context within which regionalism (and the concept of a region) are discussed in the field of human geography, what are the implications for our field? In other words, is it possible to fruitfully engage with the concept of the ‘region’ and ‘regionalism’, without adopting the dominant underlying assumptions in the field of human geography about the primacy of the nation state and the ‘desirable’ outcome of capitalistic economic development?

These are very important questions, to which there is no immediate answer. As a modern Greek national, I find discussions about regional economic development of the south (of Europe) particularly loaded in terms of the economic exploitation of Greece and its (albeit modest) resources by the centralized—through the European Union and European central banks—economies of the north. As an ancient historian, I find the ideological implications of these debates restricting and occasionally irrelevant. While, therefore, it is a positive development that regionalism and region have become important concepts in the discipline of geography, one cannot adopt the methodology and definitions put forward by the social sciences lock, stock, and barrel. In this respect, the fact that regionalism in ancient history, as so many other subjects in our field, has largely remained outside this type of debate is perhaps a blessing. Indeed, over the course of the last decade or so, we have witnessed the beginnings of a new interest in regionalism and the concept of the region, pioneered by the excellent work by Reger and Vlassopoulos.<sup>59</sup>

<sup>57</sup> Not least because of the electoral result—surprising to some—of the British population on 23 June 2016 to leave the European Union (Brexit), but also because of the despicable, in my opinion, stance that the European Union has held over the refugee crisis.

<sup>58</sup> See the essays in Fawcett and Hurrell 1995, in Warleigh-Lack, Robinson, and Rosamond 2011, and Baccini and Dür 2011. What is new in New Regionalism has also been subject to critique: see comments in Söderbaum 2016a, 4.

<sup>59</sup> Reger 2007, 2011, 2013b, 2013c, Elton and Reger 2007, Vlassopoulos 2007, 166–8, 2011. Feyel 2006, 341–68 also discusses the limits of regionalism as an approach, while Archibald 2013 has applied fruitfully the concept in her exploration of the economies of the northern Aegean. See also recently Purcell 2013b, 89–91, for a reflection on the critiques to regional approaches in ancient history.

As I have already mentioned, a focus on a region is important as it helps us overcome some of the limits that the polis model has imposed in the field of Greek history.<sup>60</sup> The definition of a region and its construction are important elements of a historical approach that puts emphasis on interaction. I would highlight two principal dimensions in the construction of a region: human intentionality and historical contingency.<sup>61</sup> In other words, a region is not an independent geographic entity: rather it is constructed through human agency operating in a specific historical context.<sup>62</sup> There is also another important additional layer: regions are also constructed by modern scholars asking specific questions. In other words, an ancient Greek awareness of a region is not necessarily a prerequisite for us viewing an area as a region and applying regionalism as a methodological tool to explore the dynamics, links, associations, and human actions that took place in that particular geographic area. Intentionality, therefore, is not a necessary feature of a region. We should also stress that, as with all hermeneutical categories used in Greek history, regions should not be perceived as static entities: rather, as they are the result of human agency, they are ‘dynamic processes’.<sup>63</sup> A region can be defined by some degree of coherence in physical geography, political authority, identity or mentalité, and culture in terms of fashion.<sup>64</sup> I would also add the impact of war and military intervention (or other forms of violent aggression) as an important potential formative factor. Archibald has recently stressed how the Persian forces’ demands for food, human resources, and so on during the Persian wars on the local populations of the northern Aegean created a regional response and could be seen as a defining factor for an emerging northern Aegean regional identity.<sup>65</sup> Yet, not all of these features have to co-exist at the same time: the question of identity, in particular, is a crucial one, and one that I shall discuss in 1.4 below.

The discussion of the usefulness of region and regionalism in ancient history has largely centered on debates about the ancient economy and the nature of economic exchange, including the much-debated topic of markets.<sup>66</sup> Indeed, many of the discussions about regionalism and the economy had as their starting point the truly excellent book by Gary Reger, *Regionalism and Change in the Economy of Independent Delos*.<sup>67</sup> Reger examined carefully the extremely detailed accounts that survive from the period of Independent Delos in order to argue that the Delian sanctuary was the centre of an economic region, which encompassed the islands of the southern Aegean (mostly the

<sup>60</sup> Opening comments in Vlassopoulos 2011. <sup>61</sup> Reger 2013c.

<sup>62</sup> Reger 2013b, 125. <sup>63</sup> Vlassopoulos 2011, 27.

<sup>64</sup> Definition taken from Reger 2013c; see also discussion in Reger 2011.

<sup>65</sup> Archibald 2013, 124.

<sup>66</sup> Reger 1994a, 2011, and 2013b, Davies 2001, Chankowski 2005 and 2011, Chandezon 2011, Migeotte 2013. On markets see now the essays in Harris, Lewis, and Woolmer 2016.

<sup>67</sup> Reger 1994a.

Cyclades). As we shall see in more detail in Chapter 5, when we will examine the Delian third-century inventories, the Delian *hieropoioi*, the administrators of the sanctuary in the period of Independence, published annually their inventories and accounts on big slabs of stone. The survival of this epigraphic material makes Delos one of the best places in the Hellenistic world to examine the workings of the economy in minute detail. The Delian accounts record prices, costs, wages, imports, and a plethora of other information, which prove invaluable for any ancient historian working in the field of economy. They also preserve for us information about the wealth of the sanctuary, both in money and land (farms and other tenancies). The Delian administrators used the sanctuary's wealth as a bank for the southern Aegean region; they would lend out amounts to both individuals and communities and then they would receive interest on the loan. As Chankowski brilliantly showed in her work on Delos in the classical period, when the island was under the control of Athens, the initial capital for the function of the sanctuary as a bank probably came from the original *aparche* of the allies in the Delian League; in other words, before the treasury moved to Athens in, most likely, 454, the 1/60th or equivalent of the tribute would be offered to Delian deities, as Delos was the treasury for the League.<sup>68</sup> This accumulation of quite a significant capital in the early fifth century allowed the sanctuary to be able not only to cover the costs for its expensive festivals and sacrifices, but also to essentially function as a lending bank. It was not unusual for sanctuaries to develop such banking activities.<sup>69</sup> What is exceptional for Delos is the detailed accounts that it produced in relation to this activity. The reasons for the annual publication of the accounts and the inventories is an extremely important topic, and one that we will discuss in detail in Chapter 5.<sup>70</sup> The accounts allow us to fully visualize in detail the workings of the sanctuary in relation to its island neighbours; the loans and payments to communities and individuals show the making of a regional economy in action. Reger's masterful analysis of the many, often fragmented and difficult to read, accounts showed without doubt that Delos played a central role in the economies of exchange in the region.<sup>71</sup>

Indeed, economic exchange and the presence of the markets is one of the crucial aspects of the modern approaches to regionalism, as we have seen. It is therefore extremely fortuitous that Delos produced evidence for the networks of not just religious interaction (such as *theoria*, pilgrimage to a sacred place, or the dedications recorded in the inventories from the sanctuary), but also political power and authority (through the investment in monumentalization by Hellenistic kings and queens), and economic exchange (the accounts). If we

<sup>68</sup> Chankowski 2008a.

<sup>69</sup> See Bogaert 1968, 281–8. See also Chankowski 2005 and 2011, 149–59.

<sup>70</sup> See especially Chapter 5.5. <sup>71</sup> Reger 1994a, followed largely by Migeotte 2013.

try to think outside our modern economic (and by that I mean primarily capitalist) mental constraints, which force us, on the whole, to prioritize profit and the pursuit for profit above all other economic (and often political, cultural, and ideological) considerations, then, as Davies argued, we can truly understand the importance of sanctuaries and their institutional centrality.<sup>72</sup> Sanctuaries operating as banks and financial centres of regional exchange did not necessarily prioritize profit, but sought security, stability, and divine trust. In that sense, Delos in the Hellenistic period continued a much longer tradition, which placed sanctuaries at the heart of economic networks and exchange. Recent research has highlighted the links between the origin of festivals (especially agonistic festivals) and regional sanctuaries functioning as low-frequency long-range periodic markets.<sup>73</sup> If sanctuaries with a large catchment area, such as Delos, functioned as centres of a region for economic exchange already in the early archaic period, then Delos' role as a banking centre for the southern Aegean islands in the late classical and Hellenistic periods was the continuation of their role in creating and defining a region through economic transactions.

Reger stressed that explanations for ancient economic phenomena must be sought first in their local context.<sup>74</sup> In other words, the answer to the debates about primitivism or modernism in the ancient economy lies in the understanding of economic behaviour and the role of economic exchange in a local context. In the case of Delos, the local context was not the island itself. Delos was such a small island that the territory of the island alone, its territorial insularity in other words, could not sustain the population it had, as we have seen, nor allow it to acquire the significance it held in the networks of exchange in the ancient period. Rather, as I argue, it was its insularity in the sense of a node in maritime networks of exchange that allowed Delos to develop into the prominent sanctuary and political, economic, and cultural centre it became. Reger linked Delos' insularity with its economic development and role in the networks of the southern Aegean. Delos' economy, in other words, can be understood within its regional context: that of increased maritime and dense networks of exchange of goods, peoples, and ideas, and mobility between the islands of the Aegean. The simultaneous existence of maritime connectivity and geographic fragmentation is the dominant feature of this region.<sup>75</sup> Reger stressed the importance of locality as a response to attempts to explain the ancient economy as a result of a grand narrative that encompassed an analysis of pretty much the entire Mediterranean over a millennium of history, including both the Greek and the Roman past. In doing so, he revealed the complex workings of a regional economy that depended both on historical contingency and geographic context. The Delian

<sup>72</sup> Davies 2011, 201.

<sup>73</sup> Davies, 2007, 63–5.

<sup>74</sup> Reger 1994a, 3.

<sup>75</sup> Horden and Purcell 2000.

*Introduction: Delos and the Aegean World*

21

networks of economic interaction were extremely dense, yet at the same time, relatively limited in reach. War, hegemonic struggles, the rise of piracy, and the various attempts to suppress it, all affected the Delian economy. At the same time, Delos' development can only be understood if its insularity and the consequent lack of any substantial agricultural territory are taken into account.

I find Reger's analysis of the Delian economy outstanding. His stress on the importance of regionalism and, by implication, geographic context, which in this case is primarily the Delian insularity, has been really influential on more recent works on the ancient economy. At the same time, other outstanding Delian scholars, such as Chankowski and Migeotte, worked on the economy of Delos in the classical and Hellenistic periods.<sup>76</sup> In that sense, I found that I really had very little to contribute to Reger's overall argument. If anything, I could perhaps provide some small nuanced contribution by spending considerable time looking at the epigraphic evidence of the accounts from the sanctuary. This is not to say that I do not find economic considerations important when examining the pattern of interactions in the southern Aegean during the third century, which is the main topic of this book. On the contrary, I believe that economic interactions are an indispensable part of the overall networks this book examines. Rather, I felt that my examination of the kind of evidence that is directly linked to economic exchange, such as the accounts recording prices, wages, loans, rents, and so on, would add very little to the overall picture masterfully reconstructed by scholars such as Reger, Chankowski, and Migeotte. Expediency, therefore, partly informed my decision not to discuss extensively the accounts;<sup>77</sup> this decision seemed rational to me, especially when I soon realized that there were aspects of the Delian evidence, such as the inventories, which were largely untapped as a source for the networks of interaction I wanted to examine. I therefore decided to leave economic interactions as these manifested in the accounts largely outside the focus of this book. I have accepted Reger's interpretation that the Delian accounts reflect the reality of a regional economy with dense networks between Delos and the neighbouring islands of the southern Aegean, but with limited reach beyond that region. As we shall see in this book, the networks of interaction in other aspects of Delian history, such as those revealed by the inventories and the honorific decrees, to mention two, do not have the same features as the economic networks discussed by Reger. Rather, we see both dense interaction in the main Delian region and, at the same time, an impressive reach in terms of geographic distance.

<sup>76</sup> Chankowski 2005, 2008a, 2008b, 2011, 2013a, 2013b, Migeotte 2008, 2013, 2014.

<sup>77</sup> Inevitably, there are references to the accounts throughout the book, as the information they provide is indispensable for my discussion of all the subjects focused in this project.

#### 1.4. AEGEAN INTERACTIONS

What is the primary region of Delian interactions? This is an extremely important question and one that has significant repercussions about the type of networks we witness in the Delian evidence. The first aspect that needs to be stressed is that this is an insular maritime space. Indeed, a glimpse at any map of the Aegean shows immediately how it is a unique geographic environment shaped by the presence of hundreds of islands, creating a bridge between mainland Greece and the coast of Asia Minor.<sup>78</sup> The presence of so many islands, especially in the southern Aegean, was also the background for the poetic image of the dance of the islands, which became also the title of my first book.<sup>79</sup> The primary region, therefore, for Delos was the south Aegean islands, mainly the Cyclades, which, as we have already seen, took their name because they ‘circled’ Delos. This was a geographically fragmented region, facing similar ecological challenges and crises, but one with sustained increased maritime connectivity.<sup>80</sup> The practice of cabotage, in particular, allowed island connectivity almost throughout the year, and certainly well beyond the established sailing season between March and October.<sup>81</sup> Insularity, fragmentation, and maritime connectivity are, therefore, the three crucial features of this particular region. This observation may sound like a truism, but it is the one indisputable aspect of any analysis of the region in historical and archaeological works, especially since the tremendous influence in the field that the publication of Horden and Purcell’s *The Corrupting Sea* in 2000 has achieved. It is when one attempts to discuss aspects of the region further that the problems pile up.

Since the southern Aegean region is such a fragmented space, or, rather, it is not a landscape, but an island-scape, then the problem of arbitrary divisions in the definition of a region becomes even more acute. In a space of insular groupings, what kind of grey zones can we allow? How arbitrary are our divisions? The physical discontinuities of the Mediterranean create what Purcell described as an ‘atmosphere of arbitrariness’.<sup>82</sup> The sea as a defining feature of a region, in fact, may liberate us from an attempt to provide clear limits or boundaries, as the sea is particularly good at ‘eliding the boundaries

<sup>78</sup> See Constantakopoulou 2007, 1–28 for a fuller discussion and previous bibliography. Brun 1996 provides also an excellent summary of the key aspects of this discussion.

<sup>79</sup> Callimachus, *Hymn to Delos*, 16–22. See also Aelius Aristides 44.12–13, for a prose hymn to the Aegean, using similar narrative techniques as Callimachus.

<sup>80</sup> Fragmented landscape yet one connected through maritime mobility: Horden and Purcell 2000, and Horden and Purcell 2005.

<sup>81</sup> I have discussed elsewhere the role of small-scale connections through the practice of *porthmeutike* (ferrying): see Constantakopoulou 2007, esp. 222–5, following largely Kolodny’s observations of the importance of the presence of ‘scala’ in the modern island Aegean life in 1974, 99 and 120. See also Horden and Purcell 2000, 142, and Purcell 1993 on cabotage.

<sup>82</sup> See comments in Purcell 2013a, esp. 274–6.



of space and time'.<sup>83</sup> Even the boundary between a single island and the sea is not as clear as one thinks at first glance: the Aegean may be a sea where tides do not play an important role, but even so, in the island states of classical antiquity, the limit of the island littoral was not always the boundary of the territory of an island state: fishing rights, including the fishing of sponges or the valuable murex,<sup>84</sup> extended the boundary of control of an island to the arbitrary grey zone of the sea. A well-known anecdote from Herodotus illustrates beautifully, I think, the human inability to provide clear boundaries in the sea, to control and measure the seascape. When Croesus, the king of Lydia, attempted to test the Greek oracles, proving in this way, that even though he was part of an extended network of cultural exchange between the Greeks and the Lydians, he still lacked the ability to fully comprehend the Greek cultural context of oracular knowledge and human–divine exchange within that context, Pythia provided this answer to the riddle asked by the Lydian King: 'I know the number of the grains of sand and the extent of the sea, and understand the mute and hear the voiceless.'<sup>85</sup> Pythia's answer shows clearly that the 'extent of the sea' (*metra thalasses*) could not be grasped by human consciousness; it did not belong to the sphere of human knowledge and comprehension, but rather to the divine.<sup>86</sup>

The presence of the sea, therefore, creates inherent difficulties in attempting to clearly define boundaries in an island region. But even with these inherent difficulties, in addition to the methodological problems of regionalism discussed in the previous section, we can still identify some important features in the seascape of the Aegean sea, which may help us, in turn, delineate some broad, but not entirely arbitrary, regional zones. The Aegean Sea, I argue, can be viewed in a north–south axis: the southern Aegean is characterized by the presence of many islands, clustering between mainland Greece and the coast of Asia Minor. These island groupings are called the Cyclades and the Dodekanese, but membership in each of the groups was not always straightforward in antiquity.<sup>87</sup> Mutual visibility, which was at the heart of ancient

<sup>83</sup> Purcell 2013b, 85.

<sup>84</sup> Purple shell was harvested from the seas around Delos (particularly between Delos and Rheneia): see the Delian accounts in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1636A 5*, with Bruneau 1985b, and Hansen 1987. Fishing was also an important activity for the Delians: the accounts record revenues generated either from leases of fishing rights in the 'lake' (the lagoon between Rheneia and Delos?) (as at *IG XI.2, 161A 36*) or from duty collected on the raw snails delivered to dye-works (see Lytle 2007). The 'Delian divers' (*Δήλιοι κολυμβηταί*) were proverbial in antiquity (much like the present day sponge-divers from Kalymnos) for the depths of their dives (*Diog. Laert. 2.22 and 9.12*) and may also have engaged in purple-diving (Bruneau 1969, 1979, 1985a, Brun 1996, 134, and Lytle 2007, 250 with n. 13).

<sup>85</sup> *Hdt 1.47.3: Οἶδα δ' ἐγὼ ψάμμου τ' ἄριθμὸν καὶ μέτρα θαλάσσης, καὶ κωφοῦ συνήμι, καὶ οὐ φωνεῖντος ἀκούω.*

<sup>86</sup> See Cole 2010.

<sup>87</sup> See Counillon 2001 and Doukellis 2001 for a discussion of literary representations of the Cyclades, Brun 1996, 15–17, Shipley 2011, 128 and 132, and recently Bonnin 2015, esp. 47–84 for

sailing, is an indispensable feature of the southern Aegean island-landscape.<sup>88</sup> This is certainly not the case in the north, where rather than clusters of many small islands, there are a few larger islands dominating the landscape. The absence of islands, and therefore suitable ports and resting places, contributed to the reputation of the northern Aegean as a more inhospitable sea than the south; this is exemplified by the description of the sea around Samothrace as 'rough'.<sup>89</sup> Indeed, as I have argued elsewhere, the relative inaccessibility of Samothrace in the north, compared to the perceived centrality of Delos in the south may have contributed to the reputation of the Samothracian mysteries.<sup>90</sup> We are looking, therefore, at two regions within the Aegean with substantial geographic differences: the presence and absence of many islands. This geographic feature had important repercussions in the maritime accessibility of these seascapes, and consequently their representation in the sphere of myth, religion, and culture. So is the Aegean one or many seas? As Ceccarelli so powerfully argued, the name itself implies a conceptual unity; indeed, the history and etymology of the name in our ancient sources reveal fascinating attempts at appropriation.<sup>91</sup> The unity of the Aegean, however, does not preclude the possibility that within that space there existed smaller regions, structured by the presence (and absence) of island groupings. The Aegean in other words is one sea, which encompasses smaller seas and regions.

This book is about Delos and its networks. In the case of Delos, it is the southern Aegean and its island groupings, the Cyclades and, perhaps to a lesser extent, the Dodekanese, that is the primary region for the Delian networks of interaction. In my previous work, I explored how the concept of the 'islander' was shaped in classical sources by the presence of the Athenian empire and its control over the Aegean islands.<sup>92</sup> Within the Athenian imperial context of the fifth century, the words 'island' and 'islander' acquired connotations of weakness, danger, and contempt. The reality of the Athenian empire and its control over the islands contributed to a conceptual grouping of the islands, at least in the minds of the Athenians, where the word *nesiotes* (islander) became a synonym for the imperial subject.<sup>93</sup> Athenian imperial practice and ideology, therefore, treated the islands as a grouping and contributed to the creation of an externally imposed identity that turned a blind eye

a thorough discussion of which islands belong to the group according to different genres and historical contexts. Astypalaia, in particular, is a good example: geographically it is close to the eastern Cyclades, but occasionally it is clustered with the Dodekanese.

<sup>88</sup> Horden and Purcell 2000, 126. <sup>89</sup> Dion. Hal. *Roman Antiquities*, 1.61.4.

<sup>90</sup> Constantakopoulou 2016a, esp. 68–70, discussing previous bibliography.

<sup>91</sup> Ceccarelli 2012.

<sup>92</sup> Constantakopoulou 2007, esp. 90–125. What follows is a summary of some of the conclusions of that work.

<sup>93</sup> See Constantakopoulou 2007, 76–84 for a discussion of Herodotus, Aristophanes, and Thucydides.

to the important differences between individual islands ('feeble' Seriphos, as opposed to wealthy, powerful Naxos, to give two extreme examples), but rather emphasized the homogeneous state of their fate: as islands, they had to be subjects to a thalassocratic power, such as fifth-century Athens. We lack the literary sources from the classical period that give us the islanders' own point of view. But what the Athenian imperial narratives do show is that the conceptual association between islands and weakness was an important feature of their collective identity from the Athenian point of view. Being an island, in other words, during the classical period also meant the adoption of a form of identity, with negative associations because of the imperial connotations of insularity.

Can we see, then, any form of collective identity in the region of the southern Aegean islands in our period? This is indeed one of the main questions that drove the research behind this book. While the Hellenistic period is not richer in terms of literary sources articulating the islanders' point of view than the fifth-century one, the existence of so many more inscriptions from Delos and the other south Aegean islands means that it is not impossible to provide an answer to the question of islander identity. I do not consider the presence of a coherent identity as a necessary feature for the existence of a region, especially when the region in question (the southern Aegean and its islands) is a landscape dominated by geographical fragmentation. What my examination of interaction and networks in the south Aegean reveals, I think, is that there was a certain degree of regional island identity, which in one particular case, came to be expressed by the presence of a federation, or *koinon*, of islands, called the Islanders' League.<sup>94</sup> Identity is a particularly elusive historical subject matter, as it is multifaceted, constantly negotiated, and adapted depending on context, and often contradictory. The kind of regional interaction that the evidence allows us to observe during the third century does result, I think, in the creation of a regional identity: this is the result of bottom-up interaction, which obviously affected the overall historical developments that took place in the contested space of the third-century Aegean.

Indeed, the last two decades or so have been a particularly fruitful period for the writing of the history of the Aegean. A number of scholars have written some excellent work on the history of the sea and its islands in the archaic, classical, Hellenistic, and Roman periods. The focus of these studies is often diverse: from the history of a single island and its relations to the wider island world, to an analysis of large sections of the Aegean, or specific island groupings.<sup>95</sup> Additionally, the history and archaeology of Delos continues to

<sup>94</sup> See Chapter 2.

<sup>95</sup> Rutishauser 2012 and Bonnin 2015 on the classical Cyclades and their relationship with Athens; Brun 1996 (a truly inspirational work), and more recently the essays in Bonnin and Le Quéré 2014 on the Aegean islands more generally; Archibald 2013 on the northern Aegean; Tully 2014 on the history of Paros; Le Quéré 2015 and Sweetman 2016 on the Roman Aegean; Deligiannakis 2016 on the late Antique eastern Aegean.

attract scholarly attention.<sup>96</sup> This book aims not only to contribute to scholarly discussions on the history of Delos, but also to enhance our understanding of the history of the southern Aegean, and the cultural, political, religious, and economic networks in that region.

Obviously, the topic of interactions in the southern Aegean islands, even during a relatively restricted time period, such as the third century, is a massive topic. Most (if not all) aspects of human life involve interactions of one type or another. In addition, the Aegean islands in the period in question experienced high degrees of maritime mobility. I certainly could not cover all aspects of interaction, as this is recorded in our ancient evidence. Rather, I decided to focus on four case studies for three reasons: first, the specific research areas exemplified different types of interaction, to the extent that we can differentiate between different areas, such as politics, the economy, culture, and religion; second, the four topics explored in this book could be researched, because of the ancient (mostly epigraphic) evidence that survived from the island of Delos; third, in some cases, such as the exploration of the social dynamics of dedication, the evidence has not been looked at by modern scholars for that particular purpose—in other words, I felt I had something important to contribute to scholarly discussion. This is not to say, therefore, that other aspects of interaction are not as important or that they are impossible to explore. I am certain that a careful analysis of coinage distribution would produce extremely fruitful results for the history of Aegean interactions. Similarly, amphora distribution could also potentially reveal patterns in economic interaction. This could be achieved through an examination of stamped amphora handles distribution in the Aegean,<sup>97</sup> while also keeping in mind that, as Lawall has argued so well, unstamped amphoras, which represent the bulk of the finds, have also an extremely important role to play in our reconstruction of traffic and movements of goods.<sup>98</sup> I have already explained why I decided not to address the issue of economic networks of interaction as these are represented in the Delian accounts.<sup>99</sup> The possibilities for further research on the subject of Aegean interactions are indeed numerous. I had to take a decision, however, to focus on those subjects that were feasible, interesting to me, and had the potential in highlighting different aspects of interaction.

The book, therefore, includes four case studies of interaction that, hopefully, complement each other. The first is the history of the Islanders' League, a

<sup>96</sup> In addition to the excellent work produced by the French School of Athens, see Tang 2005 on housing on Delos, Barrett 2011 on figurines, and Zarmakoupi 2013a, 2013b, and 2015 on recent archaeological discoveries and the inter-relationship between housing and economic activities.

<sup>97</sup> See now the excellent work by Panagou 2010, which provides the much needed comprehensive catalogue of all published amphora stamps distribution in the Greek world, and also her analysis in Panagou 2016.

<sup>98</sup> See Lawall 2005 and 2016.

<sup>99</sup> See previous section, 1.3.

*Introduction: Delos and the Aegean World*

27

federal organization of, mainly, the islands of the Cyclades.<sup>100</sup> The history of the League is relatively obscure, as there are no references to it in our literary sources. Epigraphic evidence, on the contrary, is relatively rich. The League produced decrees; through a careful analysis of a number of key inscriptions, we can reconstruct the history of the League, its membership, and what perhaps has attracted most scholarly attention, the complicated relationship between the League and its royal patrons, the Hellenistic Kings. My main argument is that the very existence of the League, and indeed the choice of its name ('Islanders', or *koinon ton nesioton*), reflects a strong sense of regional island identity. In other words, instead of scholarly narratives that explain the League in terms of a top-down intervention from the point of view of the Hellenistic kings, whether they are the Antigonids, who, in my understanding of the chronology, were the first patrons of the League, or the Ptolemies after them, I would like to emphasize the islanders' own agency in the negotiation of their position within the complex nexus of powers of the third-century Aegean. This is why, I suggest, the patronage of the League could change smoothly from one Hellenistic court to another (from the Antigonids to the Ptolemies, and later to the Rhodians) without considerable ruptures in the form of political interaction that the islands sustained during the early parts of the third century. The epigraphic evidence of the League reveals strong interaction between the island members in terms of political, cultural, and economic collaboration.

My second case study is anchored on the material culture of Delos, with particular emphasis on the processes of monumentalization of the sanctuary.<sup>101</sup> The advent of Delian Independence, after the long period of Athenian control over the island and its sanctuary, had a critical impact in the use of public space. As Delos was an important regional sanctuary, with a significant island catchment area, investment in the sanctuary and its buildings was not the prerogative of the Delian community alone. Rather, already from an early period, outside communities and individuals invested in monumentalization in order to advertise to the Delian gods, the local community, and the expanding community of worshippers coming to the island, their piety, power, and wealth. My examination of the history of monumentalization of third-century Delos is structured around the question of funding: who funded the building of new constructions, or the repair and expansion of existing ones? In the case of Delos and its sanctuary, we can observe three main sources of funding: the public funding of the Delian community, the impressive royal investment, and, to a much lesser extent, as one would expect, the contributions of wealthy non-royal individuals. The history of monumentalization on Delos, therefore, reveals a different network of interaction between the island and the outside world;

<sup>100</sup> Chapter 2.

<sup>101</sup> Chapter 3.

indeed, a study of royal funding for monumentalization, in particular, exemplifies well, I think, the role of Delos in the constant construction and reconstruction of power networks between the Hellenistic royal houses and the Greek world.

The third case study looks into a different form of attestation of power relations in third-century Aegean.<sup>102</sup> By examining the extensive Delian epigraphic record of honorary decrees and of other attestations of honours (such as entries in the accounts recording the cost for honours), I attempt to reconstruct the network of honoured individuals in the period of Independence. The vast majority of the evidence is proxeny decrees, that is, decrees honouring an individual from another community for his services to the community of the Delians, by making him proxenos, an honorary friend of the Delians. The Delian network of honours reveals different dynamics than the network of monumentalization or indeed the political network of the Islanders' League. The network of honours is geographically huge, and covers most of the Mediterranean littoral. The spread of the honours reveals the extent of the associations between prominent individuals and the Delian community: such associations, I argue, should not be viewed through the lens of a single interpretation, whether that is economic, diplomatic, or other. Rather, the geographic extent and the density of the Delian network of honours underlines the importance of Delos as a regional sanctuary with a considerable catchment area.

The importance of the sanctuary as a regional and inter-regional centre for communities and individuals to come and engage in a range of activities can be further illustrated by the final case study, which examines the social dynamics of dedication through a detailed analysis of the records preserved in the Delian inventories.<sup>103</sup> The inventories record the objects dedicated to the Delian deities (or rather the ones worthy of record, that is, mostly precious objects); often, they also record the name, patronymic, and ethnic of the dedicant, as well as the occasion for the dedication. The entries in the inventories are not straightforward, as there are duplications, omissions, and the ever-present problem of fragmentation. Yet, even in their fragmented state, the Delian inventories allow us to reconstruct who it was that came to Delos to dedicate objects to the gods. The inventories may not give us a comprehensive answer to the dynamics of pilgrimage, as many visitors did not necessarily dedicate objects, so that their name would not be recorded in the inventories. But the wealth of information they include in terms of ethnic origin, gender, and class dynamics, has been largely left untouched by modern scholars. The list of named dedicants can be found in Appendix 5. This forms the basis of my analysis. Some of my conclusions may seem unsurprising: that

<sup>102</sup> Chapter 4.

<sup>103</sup> Chapter 5.

*Introduction: Delos and the Aegean World*

29

is, that there are more male names than female ones, and that we see a clustering of dedicants originating from the southern Aegean islands, which is, after all, the main catchment area for the sanctuary of Delos. Unsurprising some of the conclusions may be, but this is the first time such an approach has been applied to the Delian inventories. The presence of women, in particular, is quite significant, compared to evidence from other sanctuaries, even though, as I argue, there is some conscious bias against the recording of female dedications (especially those by ‘common’ women, as opposed to royal individuals) from the point of view of the Delian administrators. The geographic spread in the inventories is immense, and shows how the Delians performed a remarkable achievement in enhancing the fame of their sanctuary.

The four case studies, therefore, hopefully complement each other in illustrating the extensive networks based on Delos during the third century. The Aegean interactions formed around Delos also appear in the literary evidence.<sup>104</sup> The main example comes from the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (ll. 30–44). The list of places that Leto visited and was rejected from before she gave birth to the twin gods, Apollo and Artemis, may be interpreted as the poetic image of the links between Delos and the Aegean space in the archaic period. The poetic image of connections between different Aegean islands and spaces articulated in the *Homeric Hymn* may not necessarily represent actual connections but it does indicate the conceptual geographic groupings the poet and his audience understood Delos to belong to.<sup>105</sup> As McNerney argued, the hymn itself negotiates between local tensions and panhellenic identities, and becomes a way to build cross-regional networks.<sup>106</sup> I would alter very slightly the stress in the tensions between locality and panhellenism, and argue that rather the different identities expressed here are local (the Delian) and the largely regional Aegean one. The birth of Apollo on Delos is the focus of another great hymn: Callimachus’ *Hymn to Delos*. The historical context in this one is much more relevant to the project, as it is well-known that Callimachus expressed poetically the politics and ideology of the Ptolemaic court, to which he belonged. This is not to say that Callimachus was a simple mouthpiece of Ptolemaic propaganda: on the contrary, his nuanced and multilayered creations provided part-justification, part-critique of the changing geographic, political, economic, and cultural landscape of the third century.<sup>107</sup> Callimachus’ *Hymn to Delos* has a different list of places visited by Leto (ll. 41–50); its geographic context builds upon the *Homeric Hymn*, while also creating a poetic picture of a different world and the changed Delian

<sup>104</sup> See now the excellent analysis by Ceccarelli 2016.

<sup>105</sup> The bibliography on this aspect of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* is quite vast: see Clay 2006, esp. 33–9 and Chappell 2011, and recently Hitch 2015, McNerney 2015, and Thomas 2016.

<sup>106</sup> McNerney 2015, 111.

<sup>107</sup> Stephens 2003 and 2015 are exemplary in this respect.

connections.<sup>108</sup> While the hymn may be reflecting an understanding of the Aegean from the point of view of the Ptolemaic royal circle, it does not directly help us to understand the Delian networks as the Delians themselves experienced them and reflected upon them. For that, the epigraphic record alone can provide an insight to the islanders' life and their view of the changing world around them.

<sup>108</sup> Bing 1988, 91–143, Bruneau 1990b, Asper 2011, Giuseppetti 2013, Stephens 2015, 157–62.